

CHAPTER TWO

**HEGEMONY AND DEVIANCE: THE POWER OF
PLEASURE AND THE PLEASURE OF POWER**

“If he be Mr. Hyde,” he had thought, “I shall be Mr. Seek.”

-Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde

The Jackal was neither a slow nor stupid man. He read voraciously and planned meticulously, and possessed the faculty to store in his mind an enormous amount of factual information on the off chance that he might later have a use for it.

-The Day of the Jackal

I

This chapter is a continuation of the framing done in chapter one. To this end, the chapter examines how the meaning of deviance has shifted over the last few centuries. The chapter outlines the eighteenth- and nineteenth century knowledge systems where knowledge and power circulate and redistribute hegemonic truth and treat any sign of deviance, in the long run, as anti-society and anti-humanity. On the other hand, twentieth century and subsequent knowledge systems often idolize the deviant as a counter-hegemonic force that instruments social change in narratives of crime and detection.

This chapter begins with the following hypotheses:

- (a) that the “deviant” is a social construct and a determining factor in the maintenance of systems of power;
- (b) that historically propositions of deviance are necessarily restrictive in that they define the characteristics of the lower orders, the working classes, and certain marginal races;
- (c) that the production and circulation of knowledge of “crime” and “criminal” is intended to serve and determine methods of social control by removing the conditions of deviance or the deviant itself.

In any given society, the meaning of deviance is defined by hegemonic ideological social/cultural norms. In other words, the influence of hegemonic power and its relations to subjects is instrumental in establishing parameters that define deviance in a given social structure. To some extent, it is seen that delinquency and deviance which are products of the mechanism of disciplinary society is set off as an apparatus that exemplifies the legitimation of state power to punish. The question who is a “deviant” actually labels any kind of insurrection that threatens its privileges and challenges the destruction of the economic, political and cultural established order of the elite civilization.

The chapter contends that the nineteenth century proposition of deviance is actually the hegemonic designs of the ruling class for legitimating its power and ideological interests. It argues that in nineteenth century narratives, it is the white male bourgeois norms that associate certain races and classes with moral savageness and an entirely separate physical and mental constitution. On the contrary, the deviant in twentieth century narratives defy what the nineteenth century bourgeois power states about criminality, its correlations with savagery and an innate absence of intelligence. Rather, the modern deviant in textual constructions of the times does not subscribe to the dominant hegemonic views. He is no longer treated as a textual produce of the ideological apparatus of the ruling class and its mechanics of repression and social control. It foregrounds a largely vindicated position of the deviant than his pathetic, muted, déclassé predecessor.

The possibility that a normal human being may have abnormal characteristics fascinates the crime fiction writer. In fact, more than any other literary form, the novel engages with the social destination of human thought. Within the novel and the literary genre, detective fiction and a specific variant also known as crime thriller or mystery thriller seeks to analyze the seamless overlapping between the normal and the abnormal, the criminal and the non-criminal, the docile and the dangerous, etc.

This kind of fiction begins by questioning the epistemological walls that divide the criminal from the non-criminal. The types that come in for increasing scrutiny, however, are not necessarily related to the criminal world. Examples of overlapping criminal-non criminal behaviour can be seen in classic nineteenth century fictional texts that consolidated the novel as a literary form. In Dostoevsky’s *Crime and Punishment* (1866),

the presentation of Raskolnikov's relationship with Porfiry, the investigating officer, repeatedly plays with narrative expectations. For, Raskolnikov's degeneration into criminality is matched by the novel's increasing intertwining of narrative empathy and social justifications for whatever it is that Raskolnikov is doing. As Porfiry gets close to detecting Raskolnikov's involvement in the crime scenes, the narrative absolves Raskolnikov of criminal guilt. It is interesting to note that Raskolnikov's crime is seen as a kind of inevitable psycho-social consequence of a situation. On the one hand, there is his intellectual passion for knowledge that overwrites his impoverished existence in Saint Petersburg. On the other hand, his sister's unseemly engagement with a crook and his mother's ambiguity towards what he sees as an act of his family's amoral engagements with Luzhin and Svidrigailov are seen as events that justify his subsequent criminality. In other words, Raskolnikov's deviance from the norm is both the condition and consequence of social deprivation. To this extent, the degeneration of the young student becomes a kind of moral requirement for eliminating the immoral-amoral agents and links that eat into the purity of a sister's heart and his own soul. Raskolnikov emerges as a person whose intense suffering caused by his own guilt gives in the narrative license to commit more crimes. Dostoevsky proposes that the formulation of crime and punishment is not only ideologically motivated but also materially guided by the rich and the powerful.

Any attempt, therefore, to disable the nexus between crime as an ideological formation and crime as an anti-social activity must begin by interrogating the very apparatus that identifies, describes and stratifies crime. In other words, rather than looking at crime as a juridico-legal formation, Dostoevsky examines crime as a moral issue. Hence, Raskolnikov's intense suffering before his detection and eventful deportation to Siberia is seen as a greater punishment than what the law offers.

At every stage in the novel Dostoevsky deals with Raskolnikov's and his moral double. At no stage Dostoevsky allows Raskolnikov to remain indifferent to the amoral-immoral world around him. The narrative creates a hero in Raskolnikov by invoking characteristics of heroism that draw more on moral rather than juridical righteousness. Interestingly, the opposition between Raskolnikov, the criminal, and Raskolnikov the innocent is repeatedly erased in the novel. The idea that Dostoevsky wanted to present is perhaps dialogic as suggested by Bakhtin. What is pertinent here is the openness to

conflicting views of crime and punishment endorsed by the narrative instead of a monologic view of the diabolical nature of crime as well as the pull of evil and greed. Dostoevsky demystifies the epistemology of evil by showing how contradictory claims and interests examine crime as a moral failure, rather than looking at its social origins. At the same time, any attempt to look at crime and deviance in terms of deterministic naturalism needs to be seen for what it is. For, to suggest that a child born into a poor and lawless environment will end up being a criminal cannot be accepted for the simple reason that exceptions and norms in such cases are only ideological formations. In other words, Dostoevsky creates a hero by denying him the regular features of heroism. To put it differently, deviance is a more potent moral weapon than compliance to social norms.

In the fiction of Joseph Conrad, similar reversals in epistemological as well as juridico-legal projections of the human self underscore the birth of a dark anti-heroic figure whose heroism cannot be denied. On the one hand, fiction seems to draw from its most potent figural, the picaresque hero, while figures like Tom Jones or his great predecessor Lazarillo de Tormes muted into their criminal anti types. So men and women looked increasingly acceptable in their criminal adventurism in spite of the fact that narratives both in their intention and method underscore the criminality of their acts that could be forgiven because of who they were. Conrad repositions the picaresque hero by stripping him of his comic status. He repeatedly pushes the hero into dark and diabolical settings. Marlow, both in *Lord Jim* (1900), and *Heart of Darkness* (1899), is made to fight demons within his own soul. These demons are neither metaphysically generated nor exclusively socially conditioned. Marlow's aloofness from both criminality and morality even as he is deeply embedded in both gives Conrad's anti-hero a different kind of currency. Both Dostoevsky and Conrad create anti-heroes that feed on the socially marginalized and the morally feeble but ethically right. It is necessary to locate the most powerful double that Marlow has in Kurtz. While Dostoevsky manages to maintain the critical continuum between sin and sainthood through Raskolnikov and his moral double, Conrad splits the displaced picaro and its antitype into more double selves. So Marlow has his double that maintains a moral ambiguity regarding his lapses but remains morally alert to the lapses of his colonial masters in *Lord Jim* and *Heart of Darkness*. By foregrounding Marlow's hidden criminality in the figure of Kurtz and by associating Kurtz with a certain prelapsarian innocence that the narrative associates with Marlow, Conrad creates a figure who is simultaneously the hero and his moral double and the

anti-hero and his moral double. Marlow's figuration of the hero – anti-hero continuum becomes increasingly complex and the narratives refuse to make a clear distinction between heroes and villains in novels like *Under Western Eyes* (1911), and *The Secret Agent* (1907).

These two novelists present heroes who are anti-heroic and yet the anti-heroes so produced never cease to be heroic. To put it differently, Dostoevsky and Conrad narrativized the circulation of moral and psycho-sexual deviance by pitching it against forces that are overwhelmingly large and overarchingly global. It can be suggested that this fictional representation of a continuum between criminal and non-criminal acts and thoughts is powerfully seized by R.L. Stevenson. Stevenson often remembered for books like *Treasure Island* (1883), explores the world of piracy, buried treasure and adventures that show how thin the line separating crime and innocence is. In *Treasure Island*, he creates a group of characters who remain till the end morally ambivalent towards crime and criminally acquired wealth.

Jim Hawkins, the young narrator-hero gets increasingly drawn into the world of crime, piracy, blackmail, conspiracy and violent personal histories. Jim's fascination with wealth is underplayed by the narrative by way of foregrounding his obsession with adventure. His moral obduracy, a sign of purity in the middle of venal criminality and conspiracy, seems to be the novel's hallmark. In fact, the novel's long history of popularity is explained by Jim's innocence and vulnerability combined with moral strength. On closer scrutiny, however, Jim looks increasingly vulnerable. In spite of the fact that the narrative delivers judgements on the characters through Jim's point of view, Jim remains oblivious to his own lapses. Jim remains ambiguous towards his own suppression of facts regarding the source of the celebrated, hidden treasure. He thinks it is unnecessary to complicate matters at the end and remains a passive inheritor of a large fortune.

In other words, Stevenson offers a narrative plot that draws on border line moralities. Long John Silver, the comic and cruel pirate emerges as the double of the apparently upright Jim. Stevenson never allows Jim to assess his own complicity with crime and criminality. The narrative subtly hints at Jim's liminal existence where he is neither the angel he appears to be nor the monster his hidden companions are. Interestingly, we find in Jim a narrator who does not lie but does not always tell the truth. This is a peculiar production of an ambiguous source of rhetoric that dominates the novel. However, in the

absence of serious scrutiny, Jim remains or appears to remain an epitome of innocence and social harmony who brings together the morally upright world of his parents and the morally depraved world of the pirates to a happy union.

Treasure Island remains divided against itself especially when its judgemental narrator hero paints the others with a dark brush but spares himself. In other words, Stevenson positions his hero in a no man's land where crime and angelic behaviour co-exist. Having done this, however, the novel opens up further explorations of the relationship between the non-criminal social being and the criminal psychic being that Jim Hawkins is.

Fiction recognizes the overlapping epistemological categories that dwell in crime and innocence or in crime and punishment. To the extent that criminality is seen as the opposite of innocence, Jim Hawkins' decision to remain strategically silent about the origins of a huge amount of wealth, to which he has access at the end of the narrative borders on criminality. However, the narrative positions Jim in such a way that his access to wealth, even though it is from the world of crime, seen as a compensation for his and his family's suffering as well as vulnerability. This kind of positioning of a character between crime and innocence points to the liminality of the world where crime and innocence are first categorized and then stratified.

On closer analysis, this stratification appears heavily dependent on ideological motivations of the ruling elite. In the event of a non-member seeking entry into the ruling elite, there are tests and conditions that appear clearly meditated. While the historical origins of the meditation are not clear, the rise of the middle classes and the decentering of feudal economies may have played a role in making entries to the elite section of society flexible. Literature, as a social formation both critiques and facilitates this entry to the extent that it often shows the claims of such new entrants as hollow. Yet it defends certain provisional admissions into the power structures as inevitable.

The primary argument behind this presentation of social mobility is that class, wealth, and character—and to that extent, criminality—are nothing but accidents that have been ideologically legitimized by given groups. Second, in so far as social nobility is concerned, the admission of flexibility into given hierarchies is necessitated by new conditions for the creation and consumption of wealth. It can be suggested that the

creation of hypothetical worlds where the poor and the rich are recognized as poor and rich but are allowed to switch roles is not less important. The collapse of absolute boundaries between criminal and non-criminal beings is therefore a logical consequence. To start with, literature creates ambiguous allegorical shifts between moral and immoral by hollowing out the very basis of defining and distinguishing them.

As seen in the case of Dostoevsky's Raskolnikov, it is possible to highlight the difference between crime and innocence in moral terms rather than juridico-legal considerations. By creating what could be called an allegorical divide between the criminal and the non-criminal—not a juridical divide between the presence of crime and the absence of crime Stevenson foregrounds an aspect of the difference that is only hinted in Dostoevsky and to a certain extent in Conrad. What distinguishes Stevenson from the other two novelists is a refusal to see crime exclusively in psychological or juridical terms. He as in the case of Dostoevsky sees that a human being can be simultaneously a saint and a sinner but he does not allow the intensity of moral suffering to compensate for whatever penitentiary arrangements may exist at a given point of time to apprehend a criminal.

Having done so, he does not want the criminal-noncriminal division to operate as an infallible marker, which it would, if he allowed the 'sane' individual to face the consequences for his 'insane' criminal acts or criminal thoughts. This is where he introduces characters and their psychic doubles that also have the ability to act and operate as independent physical entities. While the allegorical divide between good and evil or between the criminal and the noncriminal is admitted by way of epistemological overlapping the social problem of visible consequences of crime cannot be addressed through such methods.

In other words, this ambiguity of having to choose between the social-realistic and the allegorical-moral makes available to the novelist a character that is angel-like and devil-like at once. However, the consequences of angelic acts and monstrous acts can no longer be swapped. So, we have a good doctor and a wolf man but the allegorical indivisibility is modified in a revolutionary way. Clearly, the good doctor is the conscience keeper of the community, fighting serious odds against class and station to serve the needy. The fact that he stretches himself to serve and to ensure a certain sense of organic community legitimizes his status in the community as a moral leader. At the

same time, one is not blind to the decadence surrounding him. This decadence cannot be challenged or eradicated by the genteel Christian principle bound community of which he is part. So, an anti person has to be brought in to challenge this society from within.

In any realistic social situation the insertion of a reformer is always seen with suspicion, given the fact that nobody knows for sure how any challenge to any established social system will end. So, the antithesis of the compliant hero is seen as an answer while society needs change, no established system would admit agents of change without changes in the power structure or the structural apparatus that takes care of law, order, harmony and existing systems that legitimize the former.

Stevenson, therefore, inserts the figure of the bogey man who is in reality none other than the 'good' doctor. While the bogey man kills people, including those who look innocent and vulnerable, the good doctor continues to fine tune social perfection through service alone. In a reversal of social order many of the killings gradually look like completions of inadequately pursued penitentiary measures. Jobs that should have been undertaken by the police or the legal system are in a way completed by the bogey man's violent acts. While this aspect of the violence is not lost on anyone, the collateral damage is such that it is difficult to associate the elimination of evil and the perpetration of violence. Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde do what is right and wrong at the same time. While the legal system would not accept the elimination of deviance through agents such as the bogey man, the introduction of such a character in a literary text anticipates winds of change in society.

The fact that the good doctor in a way identified and annihilates his own double indicates how the criminal and the noncriminal are to be seen as coterminous and coexistent even as they are antithetical and separate beings. This idea that a person can carry his own antitype without somehow being responsible for the consequences of the hypothetical antitypes action is used in detective fiction by admitting a certain kind of parity, similarity or resonance between the detective and the criminal. Stevenson extends Jim Hawkins moral-allegorical divide not by withholding vital information but by releasing it. While Jim Hawkins manages to disown his psychic criminal double Long John Silver even as he accumulates the latter's wealth, the Jekyll-Hyde division can no longer be pursued with such narrative intentions or consequences. Stevenson ensures that the pursuit of justice can be cold and inhuman just as the bogey man's acts are. At the same

time, the role of the law keeping agency can be nothing short of helpless or ambivalent. The drama of Jekyll and Hyde cannot exactly be seen as a game between the detective and the criminal but uses the narrative frame that is common to detective fiction in order to dramatize the conflict between law and criminality within the same social system. In other words, detective fiction seeks to allegorize and dramatize the creation of differential conditions that mark good from evil and in the same vein, crime from innocence.

II

2.2.1. Mapping Deviance

During the nineteenth century, the approach to the understanding of crime and criminal opens up a split argument between those who consider the state being responsible for preparing deviance and those who see individual free will as a factor for perpetration of crime. Medical studies on criminality undertake the examination of skull structure and brain function of individuals who are condemned to death for their criminal acts. Francois-Joseph Gall's study blames physical organization for criminal deviance, while Prosper Lucas in his opus on heredity argues that propensity to crime only is hereditary. The term "moral insanity" is coined by J.C. Prichard and is taken a step further by Thomas Blackwell who states in his work *The Domestic Guide in Cases of Insanity* (1809), that discipline, moderation, and self-help should be the key to mental health. Interestingly, any study on criminality or moral insanity points to a particular section of society who becomes the targets of this particular "ailment," rather than considering it as a problem which threatens any individual in a given society.

Thus, the state considers criminality as a condition which can be prevalent only among the economically weaker classes or those who are at the bottom of the social hierarchy. In this context, both Henry Maudsley and B.A. Morel identify the criminal population as degenerate beings from "lower orders" with inferior physical and mental characteristics. In addition to Gall, Prichard, Blackwell, Maudsley and Morel, there is Cesare Lombroso,

Alexandre Lacassgne, Gabriel Tarde, Leonce Manouvrier, Paul Topinard etc., who in their personal study of the criminal arrive at different but important traits.

Lombroso defines the deviant as “born-criminal type,” while the others describe deviance as professional, or social factors being responsible for it. These studies yield divergent results, and these researches on deviance are carried by physicians, psychiatrists, anthropologists, judicial and penal authorities who represent bourgeois knowledge and power thereby establishing hegemonic truth produced by the rules and norms of the bourgeoisie. The techniques, tests, and researches on the criminal man are largely influenced by certain ideological principles regarding morality and correct behaviour predetermined for particular races, classes, and gender. It is the white male bourgeois norms that associate certain races and classes with moral savageness and an entirely separate physical and mental constitution. The attempt to study criminal behaviour and the establishment of criminology as a branch of knowledge “authorized the establishment of new power relations.... A closer analysis of the extensions and implications of the criminal type will demonstrate that it was intended to transform the relations of power exercised in the judicial system; it made possible the preclusion of social and economic factors in the determination of crime; finally, it favored the development of totalitarian relations of power by allowing knowledge of the criminal” (Leps, *Apprehending* 57-58).

That deviance in the nineteenth century is a typically social/moral and biological defect of the social class upon whom the ruling class exercises its unlimited powers and ideological interests are described by Marie-Christine Leps as:

There existed a wide consensus on this point; discourses originating from different institutions (medical, penitentiary, as well as government, private, and “sociological” centers of inquiry) and employing different methods of knowledge production (empirical surveys, statistical compilations, and medical examinations), all agreed to describe a segment of the “dangerous classes,” often labeled the “residuum,” as lower forms of human life, a race apart suffering from largely incurable physical, intellectual, and moral defects. For the others, the rest of the “lower orders” whose sense of morality could be reformed, measures needed to be taken in well-defined doses: too much education or indiscriminate charities were recognized as major contributing factors to crime. (Leps 30-31)

To this extent, the deviant is described in terms of a negative force representing “hordes of invading barbarians” (Leps 63), who threaten the white male bourgeois social and economic order. Therefore, to maintain the elite’s dominant position, the deviant in the nineteenth century are accepted as what Darwin stated in his theory of evolution as particular social or racial groups which must essentially go down or remain at the bottom of the survival ladder. This is explained by Leps as: “If degeneration and devolution were considered common in the ‘lower orders,’ evolution and progressive refinement were conversely regarded as natural in the ‘higher’ one—the elite are born to lead, as the masses were to be led” (Leps 65). In other words, the white male bourgeoisie is the unrivalled developed and progressive social class and this predominant force establishes the connection between criminality with his lower social class counterpart with the larger intentions of securing his “intellectual and moral superiority” (Leps 66). In this context, it is important to understand that the severe criticism of Lombroso’s theory of atavism focusing on chance and fatality in hereditary influences results from the preclusion of the legitimate exercise of power and position on the born criminal.

While dealing with the constant upsurge of deviance, reformists and policy makers realize that educating the “lower orders” could serve to slow down or restore their depravity. In other words, literacy is seen as the tool for moral management of the deviants. But educating the masses also means making them aware and seditious about their conditions of existence. This situation therefore becomes a political strategy for the ruling class which is explained by Leps aptly in her work:

At that time, the prospect of literate masses ... provoked concern, and occasionally outright panic, among political, economic, and religious man of authority. It was feared that should “the million” be able to read, the natural order of society would be irremediably upset, existing economic and political systems would collapse, and civilization itself would be threatened. More pragmatically, conservatives worried that the “lower orders” would learn to be discontented with their lot in life. Well into the nineteenth century the notion of “teaching their heads to reason rather than their hands to work” was denounced as a certainly dangerous, and possibly seditious tendency. (Leps 71)

To this end, with the French Revolution, Industrialization, Urbanization and the Declaration of the Rights of Man, mass literacy and a free press becomes an inevitable

social requirement. But it is significant that this entire process of social reformation or regeneration is strategically schematized as a bulwark for the established order of the ruling class. Thus, the schema of education is a veneer for propagating hegemonic truth, and the strategy for reinforcing and stabilizing the position of dominance among different political groups. In this connection, it needs to be specified that mass literacy and the free press are used as the tool for the circulation and production of deviance or criminality in mediating norms of hegemonic dominance.

2.2.2. Nineteenth Century Knowledge System and Deviance

Given that the ruling class' sole concern is "the development of efficient social management policies to maintain the established order" (Leps 76), and to affirm its value as absolute considers sedition in the form of strikes, riots, pauperism as well as the formation of trade unions as social crimes. This means that insurrection is seen not as a prospect of social change, but as deviance arising from immorality among the weaker sections of society. Thus, the distribution of knowledge proper for reforming criminal behaviour is taken up by educationists, philanthropists, the Catholic Church etc. But It is seen that "in spite of the grand designs of government and religious authorities involved in education" (Leps 78), a severe and vast gap is found in the system of knowledge distribution between the "ruling class" and "lower orders": "Teachers and students of the "lower orders" were meant to acquire minimal skills, appropriate for their natural station in society" (Leps 78). Leps further refers to this limited learning as 'anti-knowledge' which is intended to make them merely eligible for discharging the duties thrust upon them. In this context, the ruling class remains hesitant in educating the lower classes from fear of losing their dominance. But when it does so, the design of teaching and imparting knowledge becomes manipulative to the end that curriculum in morality and patriotism becomes the focus for addressing and defining deviant behaviour, thereby solidifying hegemonic positions and policies. Thus, the literate mass now is provided with tracts, leaflets and literary works which is a strategy to secure the support for the "leaders and policies" (Leps 80). In other words, these writings try to suppress or "counterbalance irreligious and seditious writings" (Leps 80).

In this connection, literature that reaches directly to the masses functions as the ideological apparatus for social subservience. The right kind of knowledge is used "to produce and market the religious, political, and economic beliefs considered

indispensable for the maintenance of social order” (Leps 80). Since knowledge is power and the elitist class’ power depends on the diplomatic distribution of public opinion through production and dissemination of knowledge, literature and the representation of deviance plays a significant role in establishing hegemonic power. Given that production and circulation of socially deviant cases or criminal cases begins with crime reporting, it is observed that the ideological construct is an objective presentation of crime as a regular fact of life which helps in “institutionalizing” (Leps 99) the entire procedure. This reinforces the mass’ faith in the state apparatus where “prisons were better kept, punishment was more humane, prisoners had higher standards of morality, crime rates were down, police were better organized and less corrupt ...” (Leps 99). Interestingly, the objectivity, terseness and formal style used in these reports carry the message that the law can never be overcome. Hence, the judiciary imparts impartial justice to each one, thereby, generating a belief in the minds of the masses.

In this regard, Douglas Hay remarks that the apparently neutral and classless administration of justice generates a submission to the formalism of law thereby strengthening its ideology:

The punctilious attention to forms ... argued that those administering and using the laws submitted to its rules. The law thereby became something more than the creature of a ruling class—it became a power with its own claims, higher than those of prosecutor, lawyers, and even the great scarlet-robed assize judge himself. To them, too, of course, the law was the Law. The fact that they reified it, that they shut their eyes to its daily enactment in Parliament by men of their own class, heightened the illusion. When the ruling class acquitted men on technicalities they helped instill a belief in the disembodied justice of the law in the minds of all who watched. In short, its very inefficiency, its absurd formalism, was part of its strength as ideology. (see Leps 100-101.)

Thus, reported deviance and its handling by a rather illusive kind of law and justice helps in recognizing social norms and in disseminating the message of efficiency in maintaining social order by catching and punishing criminals.

2.2.3. Fictitious Presentation of Deviant and Deviance: A Hegemonic Construct

Further, the picture of the deviant in crime journalism is more fictitious and dramatic, rather than commenting on crime and its relations to the social conditions of the times. In other words, reality remains hidden and therefore undoubted or unquestioned. Deviance is always associated with a particular look that signifies “otherness” from the normal and the respectable. Moreover, they are usually vagabonds, but in many cases reports are made of these homeless criminals as members of respectable families. Leps’ reference to homeless labourers constantly being brought before magistrates and imprisoned with hard labour for stealing, drunkenness and assault is seen as the ruling class’ prejudice against the poorer section and indifference to their pitiful social and economic status. That deviance is directly related to sociological factors is overlooked by the state and the only solution to the problem is maintaining records of such acts and retribution. The upper class simply refuses to admit the seriousness of this social issue by making it appear a commonplace day to day affair keeping it suppressed under the veneer of a perfect social order. The association of deviance with a regular “lower order” characteristic raises the need to understand that by circulating a particular kind of hegemonic truth, counter-hegemonic forces are kept under control.

In this context, it needs to be mentioned that stories of crime which present deviants with dramatic effects and heroic descriptions is an ideological construct to enhance the efficiency of the state and its established order. Leps explains:

[T]he most popular angle ... was to present them as daring exploits of master criminals. The master swindler was particularly prized.... These usually took the form of short narratives propped up with well-known catch phrases to spark the reader’s interest: ‘daring burglary’ was the preferred title for such reports ... which often assured the reader that ‘no stone will be left unturned in the endeavours to discover the offender or offenders.’ (Leps 107)

Moreover, deviants are often described in reports with attributive references as “choice sharper,” “hardy swindler,” “swindler gifted with a true talent,” “handsome, impeccably dressed, well mannered,” and “having new, rather ingenious procedure” (Leps 107). It is not hard to see that these are techniques of distancing reality through the fantastic and the fictional. It is only logical that these reinforce the hegemonic ideological construct that

nothing can escape the forces of law, and these brilliant and intelligent swindlers are just ordinary criminals whose activities cannot disturb or scathe the established order. Hence, the fictionalized presentation of crime and criminal mainly in the newspapers of the times provide as sources of entertainment for the public rather than opening up social truth in a democratic manner.

For instance, the reporting of the Ripper murders creates a public sensation by offering “all the elements which made contemporary gothic novels so popular: violence, sadism, torture, and sex, all happening in modern city ruins, the East End slums” (Leps 116). In other words, it fails to create public awareness regarding problems of poverty and prostitution. It rather circulates the hegemonic truth that both criminals and victims necessarily belong to the “lower order” and that immorality, poverty and criminality is blended into a single issue without making any references to its relations to economic, social, or political factors.

To this extent, social deviance is used to criticize the inefficiency only of the police and the rising moral depravity among the lower class population, rather than questioning the entire state machinery. An analogy evolves among criminality, the lowest classes and filthy surroundings, and therefore journalism addresses largely the need to sanitize the slum areas and the lodging house of the poor, as well as purify the souls of the “necessitous and dangerous classes” (Leps 126), through philanthropists and charities. So, one can come to the conclusion that the knowledge and truth produced and circulated by the press on deviance promotes the maintenance of social order, supports the established power relations and extends various means of disciplinary supervision. In other words, instead of becoming the voice of the masses, the press becomes the ideological apparatus of the ruling class by legitimating hegemonic truth or knowledge about the lower orders and their connection to deviance.

2.2.4. Nineteenth Century Literature and Hegemonic Policies

Given that the nineteenth century criminological studies and the press play a significant role in understanding class power and deviance, literature also emerges as a field for the radical critique of social conditions. It also promotes progressive reforms especially when it comes to understanding the “criminal man.” Hence, it becomes necessary to understand the significance of a nation’s literature on its people irrespective of class and

race. Matthew Arnold argues that “the teaching of literature would elevate the lower classes, civilize the middle classes, and fuse all into a common nation under the guidance of the state” (see Leps 140). Moreover, “English and French Literature were indeed first taught in Mechanics’ Institutes and Working Men’s Colleges, in elementary schools, and in girls’ schools—in short, to all those who could not be expected to learn the classics but needed to be moralized into acceptance of their social position” (Leps 140). Following this, it becomes quite obvious that nineteenth century literature does not function as an autonomous body, but its role is that of a mediator of the state’s hegemonic policies. D.A. Miller in his work *The Novel and the Police* (1988), demonstrates the disciplinary processes which police the reader in the reading process:

[T]he novel encourages a series of deferential cathexes—all the more fundamental for being unconscious—onto various instances of authority. What is promoted in the process is a paternalism that, despite the dim view the novel takes of the power structures of the British state, can only be useful in maintaining such structures. (see Leps 141)

To take this point further, literature during this time is expected not to reveal reality. Rather, its mission must be to enhance the representation of “beauty” which stands in stark contrast to the position of the working class conditions. In this context, “higher truth” can be referred as the normative expectation of public decency imposed by the ruling class. Writers like Gustave Flaubert and Charles Dickens during their times are criticized for violating the periphery of hegemonic truth. Ironically, the knowledge about the “lower orders” as criminals and as other kinds of social deviants which have been produced and widely circulated through the press is a categorically rejected subject in fiction. The reason for this biased view draws from bourgeois taste for morality and the *bête-noir* for anything that is rough and crude associated with the “lower classes.” This is explained by Leps in her work:

For the cultured elite, as for the penitentiary scientists and anthropologists, morality served as the point of dispersion of “man,” the point where distinctions according to class, race, or gender could be recognized within the category of “universal man”; it also provided the grounds for the dominant classes to claim power, both physical and spiritual, over reality, through this indescribable sense. (Leps 145)

Thus, when finally criminality and social deviance starts featuring in fictions, it is with the purpose of investigating and accumulating knowledge on “man” that functions as an apparatus of power. This helps one to arrive at an observation that eventual institutionalization of literature serves as a manifesto for hegemonic truth.

2.2.5. Production and Circulation of Deviance in Fiction

Naturalist novelists like Emile Zola, Rosny Aine, and George Gissing etc. are denounced for exploring the “bodies and instincts of the ‘lower orders’” (Leps 159). In this connection, Leps’ analysis of Rosny Aine’s *Dans le rues* (1913), Paul Bourget’s *Le Disciple* (1889) and Robert Louis Stevenson’s *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1868), looks at the production and circulation of deviance in fiction that negotiates the production and circulation of hegemonic truths. She explains that in *Dans le rues*, Aine considers the criminal man as having physical attributes of the “other” which is the result of the dual influence of the social milieu of lower orders and hereditary influence. The fact that Aine describes similarities among the appearances of workers, lower orders, anthropoids, prehistoric men and deviants in his novel conforms to hegemonic ideological maxims and prevailing scientific precepts of the times, especially, Lombroso’s theory of criminals having prognathous jaws or low foreheads.

But despite this, Aine “paradoxically maintain[s] the principles of free will and personal responsibility needed to justify class domination” (Leps 178). Moreover, crime is defined according to social and racial background and the ruling notions of acceptable behaviour. The lower class values are referred to as “horde morality,” or “Apache customs,” and “the Apaches” lead parasitic lives, stealing and preying on the needs and weaknesses of others, while the bourgeoisie support themselves through hard work, self-help, and self-discipline” (Leps 178). Aine’s novel serves the hegemonic truth that it is the bourgeoisie who are morally eligible to attain knowledge and social sense that affirms the existence of good and evil. Further, it also establishes the fact that crime results from the unacceptability of one’s station in life and the urge to thwart class precincts can only lead to repression and retribution. Leps explains: “Although each race and class has its own value system, the novel constantly reaffirms that only one path leads to truth: society on the whole is well established, and those who follow its rules—the bourgeois—are right” (Leps 179).

Paul Bourget's novel *Le Disciple* examines the correlation between “man” and “criminal man.” The scientific precept of determinism defines deviance not as a consequence of free will but as an effect of a cause. According to this doctrine Adrien Sixte should be held responsible for Robert Greslou's crime. But Bourget denies science the position to govern society—rather, he gives morality the authoritative structures of power and the status to decide the good of man. Moreover, the novel condemns the spread of scientific education and democratic thinking. In this context Leps explains:

Indeed, in this text both the producer and practitioner of determinism and scientific psychology are “déclassés”: their knowledge and perceptions are antisocial because they spring from the social movements initiated by the Revolution. Sixte is a philosopher by default: the son of simple artisans, his ascent into philosophy was provoked by public schooling and his parents' wish for social advancement rather than any “true destination” (the contemporary euphemism for social position). Such unnatural developments only lead to atheism and nihilism.... Greslou's personal background provides a more complete socio-political statement on the harmful effects of revolutionary democratic movements and the wide distribution of knowledge in France. (Leps 187-88)

That Greslou is identified as the criminal for seducing an aristocrat and refusing to participate in a double suicide—the count's premeditated murder of his sister's lover being considered a justified action—is an instance of the novel's transmission of hegemonic values confirming that an individual's social and racial position and deviance are interrelated issues. It affirms the hegemonic truth that the society maintains a well established social order and its norms and rules are always followed by the bourgeoisie, whereas broken or transgressed by the lower classes.

Similarly, R.L. Stevenson's novel the *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* (1886), contends on the issue of what and who defines the criminal man. Possibly, normality and deviance is once again explained under the guidance of the Lombroso theory of Atavism and the “divergence from the white male bourgeois norms” (Leps 50). Further, the ideological maxims on deviance established by “the upper- and middle-class white male—the social group of the producers of criminology” (Leps 46), have also been illustrated in the novel.

To this end, Edward Hyde's physical and moral features concur with the nineteenth century scientifically determined, born criminal type that is common only among the lower orders of society: "He is small, ape-like, with bony and hairy hands, and an immoral, violent, and ultimately coward nature" (Leps 205). Hence, it is Jekyll who identifies Hyde's crime as a symptom of moral insanity proposing that the morally sane cannot be criminals. It is Hyde who "brutally beats a gentle, handsome, and wealthy M.P." (Leps 205), and not the other way round. This concept of animalistic instincts, ugliness and the pre-historic man associated with the "antisocial" and "non-bourgeoisie" is aptly explained by Leps: "As Hyde corresponds to hegemonic apprehensions of the born-criminal type, Jekyll presents the true image of the non-deviant. Like most scientists of his time, he is male, white, and upper class" (Leps 206). Further, the hegemonic view establishes that the morally sane and the preserver of the just and the orderly world—the bourgeoisie—never strays into deviance. This is foregrounded by the narrative technique of disguising Jekyll's urge to enjoy the antisocial through the figure of Hyde, whose taste for deviance and forbidden pleasures suit his social, moral and physical non-bourgeois existence.

2.2.6. The New Deviant and Counter-Hegemonic Force in Fiction

A very important aspect of some novels written in the nineteenth century serve as a platform to voice the conventional authorities, and deviance is defined according to the power and knowledge of appropriate social institutions. It rejects scientific knowledge and accepts the traditional knowledge of the existence of human soul and human nature and its relations with the understanding of "man" and "criminal man." Contrary to these narratives, some narratives mostly written in the twentieth century treat deviance as a counter-hegemonic force which is indispensable for social change. It also establishes the fact that classes other than the ruling class necessarily lives its own ideology.

To this extent, the creation and launch of a criminal like Professor Moriarty defies what the nineteenth century physicians, psychiatrists, anthropologists and the bourgeois power states about criminality and its correlations with atavistic savagery and innate absence of intelligence. The new deviant, thus, is not necessarily of low birth or low intelligence—Professor Moriarty is a man of good birth and excellent education combined with all the attributes of a genius. He is therefore considered by Sherlock Holmes as his intellectual equivalent. Moreover, if Holmes must ever die, he must do so by fighting against not

petty thieves or solving puzzles, but his glorified end must be eternalized by his attempt to destroy Moriarty, the ultimate powerful and formidable opponent.

Further, the narrative production of truth and knowledge is gradually unblinded and disabled of its century old hegemonic truths on “man” and “criminal man.” Leps explains this in her work as the new textual devise of altering strategies of power-knowledge relations by referring to Conan Doyle’s *A Study in Scarlet*:

Finally, the ... criminals are often good men who failed to adapt to the requirements of social organizations either through misfortune or misjudgement. In *A Study in Scarlet*, ‘victim’ and ‘criminal’ are floating signifiers, equally attributable to the same characters, depending on the social context. John Ferrier, a criminal according to Mormon rules, is also their victim, since he was forced to adopt them without believing in them. Drebber and Stangerson are justiciaries for the Mormons, criminals for Jefferson Hope, and victims for Scotland Yard. Hope, the victim of the Mormons (who cause the loss of his fiancée, his fortune, his health, and ultimately his life) is forced into crime because the justice system cannot prosecute Drebber and Stangerson; a murderer according to Scotland Yard, he considers himself to be the justiciary of John and Lucy Ferrier, working as the hand of providence. (Leps 196-97)

In this context, the case of the new deviant in textual constructions of the times do not subscribe to the dominant hegemonic views or serve as an exemplification for repression and social control. Rather, the narrative produces a resonance of resistance towards class power and creates a counter power structure through deviance from official order. This aspect opens up an entire field of social perspectives, thereby exploring the limits of hegemonic truth.

2.2.7. Jackal: The Modern Deviant

Frederick Forsyth’s creation of the unconventional deviant figure, the Jackal, in *The Day of the Jackal* (1971), presents the strains of a genius almost capable of altering an established power structure. It is an attempt to redefine the given reality through narrative possibilities of reinterpreting “the nature of ‘man’ and of social organizations, in the positivist hope that the knowledge so produced would authorize the creation of new and better realities” (Leps 176). In this sense, the Jackal is considered a genius for

the fact that he is definitely above the average/ordinary individual, irrespective of the nineteenth century standards set for criminals. His extraordinary mental power is capable of challenging and threatening the security apparatus of France, Italy, Belgium and England. If so long the nineteenth century deviant is defined by the white, male, bourgeoisie as the “other,” now the modern deviant like the Jackal is created along the patterns of the white, male, blond features accompanied by his racial superiority of ‘supposedly’ being an Englishman. Criminality is not exclusive of any particular class, race, sex, or mental capability, and deviance is found in “each individual, and at the basis of every social relation, as an integral force of (human) nature” (Leps 173). The narratives on deviance like the Jackal’s case present a dominating image of power and terror that is generated and sustained by a mind, dangerously sharp and calculative.

Detective narratives usually present detectives and investigators as champions of courage and heroism, and a final confirmation of the white middle and upper class’ mental superiority. The seeker of truth and the restorer of order are always considered as the political and ideological constructs of the bourgeois ruling class. Consequently, law and justice and the restoration of the entire social structure rest on the “moral interventions of respectable middle—or upper-class investigators” (see Priestman, *Cambridge Companion* 212). The likes of Holmes, Poirot, and Wimsey etc. encounter deviants who surprisingly move along hegemonic determinants thereby securing the equation between social hierarchies and power relations. But contrary to this, in *The Day of the Jackal*, Claude Lebel’s power of logical investigation and acute analysis meets a match in the Jackal’s superhuman foresightedness and intellectual ability. The new deviant is no longer considered as the déclassé “other” with a distorted body and mind. The Jackal belongs to one of the superior white races, and denying or affirming any national identity to him is seen as the narrative design of highlighting his almost heroic proportions. His social status becomes insignificant in comparison to his exceptional mental power.

To take this point further, what the ordinary white collar individual fantasized about himself or expected from the ideal detective, is now transposed from Claude Lebel to the Jackal, considering his power of observation, deduction and faculty extraordinaire. Undoubtedly, he is a mercenary, but he becomes an integral part of a counter-hegemonic force responsible for subverting the values of a dominant culture and striving to present “a world on the verge of violent disintegration” (see Priestman, *Cambridge Companion*

223). The Jackal almost overshadows Lebel and the entire security apparatus of France by his meticulous planning, research and strategic skills. He thinks almost in the lines of a brilliant scientist or a visionary who patiently utilizes his specialized knowledge for intellectual satisfaction:

In London the Jackal spent the last fortnight of June and the first two weeks of July in carefully controlled and planned activity.... he set himself among other things to acquire and read almost every word written about or by Charles de Gaulle. By the simple expedient of going to the local lending library and looking up the entry for the French President in the Encyclopaedia Britannica he found at the end of the entry a comprehensive list of reference books about his subject. (*Jackal* 66)

Further:

These he scoured until the small hours each morning in his flat, building up in his mind a most detailed picture of the incumbent of the Elysee Palace from his boyhood until the time of reading.

The Jackal was neither a slow nor stupid man. He read voraciously and planned meticulously, and possessed the faculty to store in his mind an enormous amount of factual information on the off chance that he might later have a use for it. (*Jackal* 66)

That the notion of deviance and genius is yoked into a single precedent in certain detective texts is evident in the Jackal's power in breaking through the security operations of France and targeting "the most closely and skilfully guarded figure in the western world" (*Jackal* 67). The fact that he is highly accomplished in executing his plan independently—depending exclusively on his mental powers and way ahead of the state apparatus of France—establishes his ingeniousness.

The Jackal's expertise in donning false identities and operating is not the work of a mere conman, rather, it heightens his position as the Machiavellian hero. Moreover, his superhuman qualities are highlighted through the dynamics of power between him and the Brigade Criminelle of the Police Judiciaire. By presenting Claude Lebel, the Deputy Chief of the Police Judiciaire, as the best detective in France, the Jackal's capacity to

challenge the state authority and the mechanics of surveillance is a narrative valorisation of him. Each time Lebel's plan of detecting the Jackal's moves and operational manoeuvres is frustrated, it is a setback to the political and juridical/penal power structure of France that venerates his heroic power of defying subjection and resisting the ruling power.

The Jackal's genius is acknowledged by Lebel himself as: "... he's ... devilishly clever" (*Jackal* 362). It is only logical that an individual who is capable of disintegrating and terrorizing the entire state apparatus is not someone who possesses an ordinary or average mind. The persona of the Jackal redefines the notion of the deviant so long described by the hegemonic truths of social control. The narrative legitimates the fragility of the elitist apparatus of power by confirming his genius for recalcitrance. To this extent, *The Day of the Jackal* foregrounds deviance not as a tool of producing and circulating the normative codes of hegemonic dominance. It rather contests traditional (eighteenth and nineteenth century) notions of criminality. Moreover, it also functions as an apparatus to subvert the legitimacy of the determinant factors responsible for deviance, and the widespread image of the archetypal criminal produced by the ruling class.

In this light, the narrative presents the Jackal as a genius possessing multifaceted talent almost venerated in heroic denominations. His meeting and conversation in the very beginning of the narrative with Marc Rodin, Rene Montclair and Andre Casson highlights the fact that he is not simply a mercenary hunting for a kill that would fetch him a good remuneration. But his thorough understanding of the OAS's mission and present crisis reveals the Jackal's extreme mental capacity for acquiring important data and information through background research. Moreover, the fact that he negotiates the deal with the OAS men with preconditions in his favour confirms his shrewd and confident entrepreneurial skills of knowing how to lay the bait:

If you want the job done you will have to make the sum from somewhere. I do not need the job, you understand. After my last assignment I have enough to live well for some years. But the idea of having enough to retire is appealing. Therefore I am prepared to take some exceptionally high risks for the prize. Your friends here want a prize even greater—France herself. Yet the idea of risks appeals them. I am sorry. If you cannot acquire the sum involved, then you must

go back to arranging your own plots and seeing them destroyed by the authorities one by one. (*Jackal* 58)

Further, the narrative neither glorifies Charles de Gaulle and his government nor the anti-government OAS revolution. Given that both De Gaulle and the OAS are responsible for the Jackal's course of action, it is eventually seen that these characters are relegated to the background and the entire mission transforms into a single-man show with the Jackal's obsession for killing De Gaulle. The focal points of the narrative are specifically the Jackal's personality and capability as a human being that belies the petty lawbreaker, or what the nineteenth century psychiatrists and anthropologists believed and circulated as lower forms of human life—suffering from physical, intellectual and moral defects. These hegemonic ideologies are subverted by the narrative blurring of ideas as what is regarded as “moral” and “immoral”, and the “hero” and “anti-hero.” That the Jackal is extremely intelligent, smart and confident is evident from his precision and errorless method of lifting the passports of the American student Marty Schulberg and the Danish Pastor Per Jensen. Moreover, his farsighted deduction regarding the security precaution taken by the Belgian armourer M.Goossens against him establishes the Jackal's exceptional intellectual perception. He tells Goossens:

I do not intend to harm you. Besides, I imagine a man of your intelligence has taken certain precautions against being killed by one of his customers. A telephone call expected within an hour perhaps? A friend who will arrive to find the body if the call does not come through? A letter deposited with a lawyer, to be opened in the event of your death. For me, killing you would create more problems than it would solve. (*Jackal* 156)

The Jackal's ingeniousness is evident in his preparation for his journey from London via Belgium, Italy and the suburban France to Paris' Boulevard de Montparnasse, where from 154 Rue de Rennes he is just 130 metres away from De Gaulle, the nerve centre of the power structure of France. The Jackal's ability to break into the power structure of any country through his expertise in impersonation, his engineering skills in conceptualizing the design of the extraordinary rifle, and the various other superhuman qualities that resist the security apparatus of so many countries idolizes the deviant empowered to defy hegemonic subjection. In this context, the narrative designs the Jackal's escapades in every advancing stage of his venture whenever he is faced with the

threat of exposure. Finally, when he is killed by Claude Lebel, the narrative withholds any revelation regarding his identity and the scheme of action undertaken. Moreover, through the Jackal's death, the narrative does not intend to establish the social/penal expectations. Rather, it is a means of eternalizing or immortalizing his superhuman aptitude.

III

Therefore, in conclusion it can be said that deviance as textual constructions begins in the conservative and hierarchy based society of the nineteenth century where the deviant is always a product of the hegemonic designs of the upper class. The criminal is defined and understood as recourse to hegemonic values and the narratives are silenced by a single voice constraining interpretations. The “good” and the “bad” are strictly opposites, the “good” being always the followers and ironically the constructors of the social norms—the bourgeoisie. The textual production and circulation of deviance mostly in the twentieth century is approached with an entirely modern understanding of the individual and its relations with the “illegitimate.” These modernist narratives on crime do not present a power struggle between the unequal where the privileged class from the very beginning is placed way ahead in the ideological resonance of the texts. In other words, the deviant is no longer treated as a textual produce of the ideological apparatus of the ruling class and its mechanics of repression and social control. What the nineteenth century sees as an essential preoccupation of the lower orders with malfunctioning bodies and minds measured by standards of human intelligence, takes a different course with this novel image, and more importantly a vindicated position of the deviant than his pathetic, muted, déclassé predecessor.

Works Cited:

Forsyth, Frederick. *The Day of the Jackal*. 1971. London: Arrow Books, 1995. Print.

Leps, Marie-Christine. *Apprehending the Criminal: The Production of Deviance in*

Nineteenth - Century Discourse. Durham, North Carolina: Duke UP, 1992. Print.

Pepper, Andrew. "Black Crime Fiction." *The Cambridge Companion to Crime Fiction*. Ed. Martin Priestman. 2003. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.

Priestman, Martin, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Crime Fiction*. 2003. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. Print.