

I. Introduction

Rudyard Kipling and Joseph Conrad are the two novelists of colonial period. Generally, both of them are read as anti-colonialist writers. Many of the researchers have projected them as the writers writing against colonialism. But, in reality, they are pro-colonialists writers who accept the superiority of the colonizers over the colonized. In the present research work, two novels *Kim* by Rudyard Kipling and *The Secret Agent* by Joseph Conrad have been taken to prove the pro-colonialist tilt of these two writers.

Kim is the orphaned son of a British soldier. He earns his living by begging and running small errands on the streets of Lahore. One day, he befriends a Tibetan monk who is on a quest to free himself from the wheel of Life. Kim becomes his chela, a disciple, and accompanies him on his journey. On the way, Kim accidentally learns about parts of the 'Great Game' and is recruited by British to carry a message to the British commander in Umballa. Not only this, Kim is even sent to a top English school in Lucknow but he keeps in touch with both Lama and his secret service connections. He is trained as espionage.

After three years of schooling, Kim is given a government appointment so that he can begin his role in the Great Game. He rejoins Lama and, at the behest of Kim's superior the Babu, they make a trip to the Himalayas. Here the espionage and spiritual threads of the story collide, with Lama unwittingly falling into conflict with Russian intelligence agents. Kim obtains maps, papers, and other important items from the Russians--who were working to undermine British control of the region.

On the other hand, Lama realizes that he has gone astray. His search for the River of the Arrow should be taking place in the plains, not in the mountains, and he

orders the porters to take them back. Here Kim and Lama are nursed to health. Kim delivers the Russians' Intel documents to Mahbub Ali. He comes to check on Kim, and the Lama finds his river and achieves Enlightenment. Kipling has presented Kim as the heroic character who is even capable of the adventures.

Similarly, Adolf Verloc is the secret agent in the novel *The Secret Agent* employed by an unnamed foreign embassy in London.

Adolf Verloc runs a pornographic shop as a cover business. The shop is a meeting place for various anarchists. The anarchists are happy to sit around talking about revolution. But their revolutionary ideology is empty like their souls. One of the anarchists named professor is a nihilist, whose only ambition is to annihilate, to destroy, everything once he invented the perfect detonator. Verloc lives at the shop accompanied by his unsuspecting wife Winnie, retarded brother-in-law named Stevie, and crippled old mother-in-law. Verloc persuades Stevie to blow up the Greenwich observatory wall. Unfortunately, as he is carrying the bomb across Greenwich Park, Stevie accidentally triggers the detonator, and blows himself up.

The remainder of the novel deals with the consequences. Detective Inspector Heat finds Adolf responsible for the conspiracy. Adolf pays with his life and Winnie commits suicide. Comrade Ossipon, tricks Winnie out of her money by pretending to help her flee the country and subsequently conscience-stricken when he learns of Winnie's suicide. At the end of the novel, the nihilist professor, Still involved in his obsessive search for the perfect detonator, walks frail, insignificant, like a pest.

It is important to search the reason behind creating heroic character in *Kim* by Kipling and ironic character in *The Secret Agent* by Conrad. Both of the central characters are espionages but one works to strengthen British empire whereas another

works against it. The one who works in favour is valorized whereas, the another who works against is ionized.

As a work of art is open to any angles of interpretation, *Kim* and *The Secret Agent* have received a number of criticisms from different perspectives. Some argue that the novel *Kim* deals with colonial overtones whereas some are of the view that it talks about the religious journey of a man. So, different critics have their own view on the novel *Kim*. Bhaskar Rao, comments on *Kim* as "the greatest novel about India by an Englishman . . . is a valid depiction of India chiefly because of its emphasis on the religious side of life" (qtd. in Greenburger 167). Edmund Wilson, who lables Kipling as an arch priest of racism and authoritarianism, argues that "Kim turns his back on the black man and identifies with the white conqueror" (qtd. in Reid et al. 14). Fred Reid and David Washbrook, placing *Kim* in an ambivalent position, argue that "Kim's education consists ultimately of learning to be master, through participation in empire and 'the Great Game', but also, and crucially, to be 'a friend of all the world' - his nickname when still a wild bazar boy in Lahore" (15).

Similarly Edward Said is of the view that *Kim* is "a master work of imperialism . . . a rich and absolutely fascinating, but nevertheless profoundly embarrassing novel" (qtd. in Reid et al. 20).

Interprets *Kim* as a successful imperial agent in India. He says, the novel is the product of ambivalent position of Kipling. He writes:

Torn from his home in India at the age of six, Kipling was thrust into the hostile environment of Victorian England so he presents *Kim* as an effective, successful imperial agent in India because one character in *Kim* emphatically asserts that the "good" imperial agents are those who know the land and the customs of the land. (131-132)

For him, *Kim* is the outcome of imperial thought. Abdul R. Jan Mohamed argues that "Kipling is determined by strong emotional ties that collide with his intellectual prejudice and colonialist sympathies" (78). For him, *Kim* is produced by blending emotion and intellect of an imperialist.

According to Andrew St. John, "*Kim* is a depiction of intellectual, rhetorical and representational system of the Raj in a mutually formative relationship with the political systems operating under British rule" (Historiography, Power and Politics in Kipling's Panjab, 623). In other words, *Kim* is the representation of imperial politics.

Like *Kim*, *The Secret Agent*, is also a widely read text. David Mulry reads *The Secret Agent* as a historical novel, written on the background of a historical event 'Greenwich Bombing'. Mulry, in his article "Popular Accounts of Greenwich Bombing and Conrad's *The Secret Agent*", writes: "The novel is an examination of the social and political eliminate that led its shaping allows the modern reader to penetrate the historical penumbra" (43). He sees the history of colonial period of England in the novel but has not penetrated the reasons behind the portrayal of such characters in the historical novel.

Stephen Skinner sees *The Secret Agent* as "a complex and darkly comic novel, partly rooted in fact and characterized by Conrad's ironic narrative style" (55). Skinner finds the novel comic because he sees irony in narrative style. But he has also failed to find the irony in characters and the reasons behind it.

Similarly, A. Michael Matin, finds *The Secret Agent* consisting largely "of a satire of insulator British Xenophobia of the sort that Conrad believed himself to be an object" (263). In this manner, Matin thinks that this novel is a satire on the colonial power.

Agreeing with Matin, Robert Spector comments that "*The Secret Agent* presents perfect illustration of the ironic theme, cast in the characters of the story, and manifested in the plot" (69). Matin does not probe into why the ironic characters are used in the novel.

After observing these critical responses from different scholars, it is more relevant to make research on the novels *Kim* and *The Secret Agent* by Kipling and Conrad respectively. Various scholars responded the novels from different perspectives but no attempt has been made to know the intention of the authors behind the use of espionage as the central characters as such. Unless we know the reasons behind the presentation of Verloc as an ironic spy and Kim as a heroic spy, our understanding on the novels remains incomplete. So, this research is an attempt for justifying Kipling and Conrad as the pro-colonial writers, that is, the supporters of British empire. Since, both the writers are of the same (colonial) period, central characters are from the same profession (espionage) and goal is also the same (to support the British Empire), comparative study of these novels is more relevant. So, this dissertation is a comparative study of *Kim* (1901) by Rudyard Kipling and *The Secret Agent* (1907) by Joseph Conrad.

This research has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter focuses on an introductory outline of the study and also a brief introduction to the both writers, both the texts and critiques of different writers on both the texts, along with the point of departures and the claims.

The second chapter deals with the theoretical modality that is to be applied in this research work. It will discuss on Said's theory of *Orientalism* and *Theory of Irony*. In one hand, it will focus on Said's theoretical discussion on how the west dominates

and controls the east not only by producing colonial discourses about the East but also by valorizing the characters from European origin and dominating the characters from eastern origin while on the other hand, it will demonstrate the politics of Irony.

The third chapter will center its discussion on the analysis of both texts. Extracts from the texts will be presented analytically to prove the hypothesis of the study.

At last, the fourth chapter will focus on the conclusion of the dissertation on the basis of textual analysis. It will be focused to probe on the politics used by both the writers in their texts.

II. An Overview of Irony

The term "Irony", is derived from the Greek eiron, a dissembling character in Greek comedy by Aeschylus, to denote a mode of behavior and expression wherein the eiron "more plausibly pretends to be saying or doing one thing while really conveying a quite different message" (Muecke 33).

Basically, the term irony refers to the contrast between the statement and its meaning, or a contrast between the appearance and the reality. No sensitive authors, critics and readers can avoid sensing its presence and feeling its powerful impact in literature. So, irony has become a major literary mode or device these days.

Irony in its simplest meaning can be defined as, "a mode of speech of which the meanings is contrary to the word" (Johnson, qtd. in Enright 5)

The semantic evolution of irony has been haphazard, though the word has been applied to different phenomena. M. H. Abrams' observation deserves citation on the evolution of the concept:

In Greek comedy the character called the eiron was dissembler who characteristically spoke in Understatement and deliberately pretended to be less intelligent than he was, yet triumphed over the alazon- the self deceiving and stupid braggart. In most of the modern use: of the term "irony" there remains the root sense of dissembling or hiding what is actually the case not however in order to deceive but to achieve especial rhetorical or artistic effects (134-135)

From the above citation, it has been clear that the origin of the term has a long history.

Searching the origin of irony, D.C. Muecke writes:

Eironeia is first recorded in Plato's Republic, applied to Socrates by one of his victims; it seems to have meant something like a smooth, low down way of taking people in. For Demosthenes an eiron was one who evaded his responsibilities as a citizen by pretending unfitness. For Theophrastus, an eiron was evasive and non-committal concealing his enmities pretending friendship, misrepresenting his acts and never giving a straight answer(15)

So the origin of irony dates back to Greek period. Wayne C. Booth, in the preface of his book *A Rhetoric of Irony* tries to clarify the concept of irony as:

For both its devotees and for those who fear it irony is usually seen as something that undermines certainties, opens up vistas of chaos, and either liberates by destroying all dogmas or destroys by revealing the inescapable canker of negation at the heart of every affirmation. It is thus a subject that quickly arouses passion. (ix)

This view supports that, irony has become another name of confusion and there is no agreement among critics about what irony exactly is. It has never been fully explored. That is why irony can mean different things in different periods. The scope of irony as a rhetorical enforcement was first observed in Socratic dialogue. Such irony was later called the Socratic irony which characteristically involves "a smooth low-down way of taking people in" that refers to Socrates simulated ignorance to make his arguments stronger (15). Socratic irony emerges from the speaker's pretension "to be ignorant...under the guise of seeking to be taught by others" but ultimately s/he teaches others by investing the things beneath the earth and in the heavens" (Enright 9). The speaker dissembles by assuming a pose of ignorance, an eagerness to

be instructed by the partner's opinions, although the naïve questioning ultimately turns out to be vain. The ironic effect is further sharpened by the audience's knowledge of speaker's pretended ignorance. The mode of Socratic irony has also been adopted by Cicero and Quintilian who define irony "as a figure of speech" to elaborate "the verbal strategy of a whole argument" (qtd. In Muecke 17).

Verbal irony comes into being from the ostensible use of language intending a sharp contrast between the expressed meaning and the implied meaning. Verbal irony is also called instrumental irony in which language is the instrument. In verbal irony the ironist says something in order to have it rejected as false. In observable irony, the ironist presents something ironic like situation, a sequence of events, a character etc.

M.H. Abrams observes verbal irony as:

Verbal irony is a statement in which the meaning that a speaker implies differs sharply from the meaning that is ostensibly expressed. The ironic statement usually involves the explicit expression of one attitude of evaluation but with indication in the overall speech situation that the speaker intends a very different and often opposite attitude or evaluation. (135)

Irony is a figure of speech in which the meaning of a statement is different and opposite to the meaning overtly stated. For example, when the son deviates from his study, fails the exam and his father says "congratulation". Here the word congratulation is not used to appreciate the son rather it is used to express father's dissatisfaction towards his son's performance. So, we find a sharp difference between an expressed and an intended meaning.

In verbal irony, the speaker provides some clues and also makes the sharp ironic undercutting of the ostensible meaning inevitable. So the ironic intensity of the verbal irony depends on the ironist's pretension to "aim at achieving maximum plausibility for his/(her) ostensible meaning" (45). In this sense, ironist and ironic pretension are the basic features of verbal irony, which is :

. . . a game for two players, the ironist, in his/her role of naïf , prefers a text but in such a way or in such a context as will stimulate the reader to reject its expressed literal meaning in favor of an unexpected 'transliteral meaning of contrasting import . . . in which the basic technique is either that going with their ironic butt and placing him/her in high relief or that of depreciating oneself, which is the countersinking ontaglio method.(39-40)

The above quote further underscores the point that the verbal irony depends on the author's ironic intention that is shared with the reader – a bond that allows for playing a verbal game of irony to take place. Verbal irony is most often confused with sarcasm since the latter, too has its apparent meaning undercut by the intended meaning. However, they are explicitly different as sarcasm is the taunting use of apparent praise for dispraise. Thus, sarcasm is harsh, direct, and crude, whereas verbal irony is "outwardly accommodating and amiable and inwardly serene and reserved . . ." (being) qualified by gentleness and benevolence (17). Irony becomes "rhetorically effective and aesthetically pleasing" and generates "curious feeling of paradox, of the ambivalent, of the ambiguity, of the impossibility made actual, of a double contradictory reality" that merges with "feeling of liberation" as in verbal irony "reality definitely unmasks the appearance," while sarcasm lacks this feeling

of liberation, which is not “ for a moment plausible in its literal sense, [and] the tone conveys reproach so strongly that no feeling of contradiction is possible” (45-46).

Another widely used irony is dramatic irony, in which the character is ignorant whereas the author and readers know the present and future. Here, at least, normally the character has a journey from ignorance to knowledge. Unlike verbal irony, it involves character’s action in a particular situation. Dramatic irony, therefore, is a situation in which the reader shares with the author’s knowledge of immediate circumstances or future events of which the character is ignorant. According to M.H. Abrams :-

Dramatic irony involves a situation in a play or a narrative in which the audience or reader shares with the author’s knowledge of present or future circumstances of which a character is ignorant; in that situation, the character unknowingly acts in a way we recognize to be grossly inappropriate to the actual circumstances. (136-137)

Another very striking type of irony is the romantic irony which especially came to the fore in the nineteenth century. This type of irony was originated from the paradoxical relationship between nature and human beings. Romantic irony is more familiar to German than to English scholars. In M.H. Abrams’ words:

Romantic irony is a term introduced by Friedrich Schlegel and other German writers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries to designate a mode of dramatic or narrative writing in which the author builds up the illusion of representing reality only to shatter it by revealing that the author as artist is the creator and arbitrary manipulator of the character and their action.(137)

In romantic irony the character builds up an imaginative and romantic world but at last this imaginative world is destroyed by the realization of ugly reality.

Irony gives the true-vision of nature and human life. “The world has become an ironic stage and human beings are merely the players” under this unavoidable irony of nature where human beings as a life is inevitably undercut by the necessity of death. Irony implies itself in the incessant paradoxes of life versus death, meaning versus infinite and so on. In this context, no human being can be an ironist in a true sense except as one who builds up of the illusion of reality destabilized by immediate shattering. Romantic irony, as Schlegel says, is

the only involuntary and yet completely deliberate dissimulation. . . everything [in it] is playful and serious, guilelessly open and deeply hidden. It originates in the union of *savior-vivre* and scientific spirit, in the conjunctions of a perfectly instinctive and perfectly conscious philosophy. It contains and arouses a feeling of indissoluble antagonism between the absolute and the relative, between the impossibility and the necessities of complete communication. (qtd. in Muecke 26)

This view of irony has established literature as the site of human consciousness about his/her ironical relation with nature, which is full of dialectical tensions.

In romantic irony, the author is like God or nature immanent in every created element and the reader is also aware of his transcendent presence. Muecke observes Romantic irony as:

Creative surpassing of creativity is Romantic irony, it raises art to a higher power since it sees for art a mode of production that is in the highest sense artificial because fully conscious and arbitrary and in the highest sense natural because nature is dynamic process internally creating and externally going beyond creation. (25)

Romantic irony has established literature as site of human consciousness about his/her ironical relation with nature, which activates dialectical tensions. The writer, as a romantic ironist, is "obliged to recognize the limitations of his/[her] perceptions of the infinite as inevitably partial and thus in some degree false, yet she/[he] must rightly value them" and should preserve "a balance in his/[her] work between rhapsodic affirmation and skeptical reservations"(Enright 12).

The paradoxical concept of irony has been rediscovered and also highlighted in new criticism, especially by its prominent proponents such as I.A. Richards, Cleanth Brooks and Kenneth Burke in the twentieth century. New criticism also views irony as "the bringing in of the opposite, the complementary impulses" to achieve a "balanced poise (Muecke 26)." However, unlike the romantics, for new critics, a paradoxical relationship of human beings with nature rather of the multiple impulses and experiences that are likely to be subverted by another. So, to new critics, literature is the representation of this fact of paradox, which shows how human beings maintain poised balance over such a contradiction. Irony, for new critics, has become a general criterion of literary value- an internal equilibrium of opposite experiences, attitudes and evaluations. Thus, it becomes clear that "every literary context is ironic because it provides a weighting or qualification on every word in it" thus requiring the reader to

“infer meanings which are in a sense not in the words themselves; all literary meanings in this view become a form of...irony” (Booth 7).

Successful romantic ironic mode seems to be art raised to a higher power, a work whose raw material is already art. Romantic irony even embraces verbal, structural, sophoclean irony, too.

In some works of literature “the author introduces a structural feature that seems to sustain a duplex meaning and evaluation throughout the work”(Abram 135). One common literary device of this is the invention of a naïve hero, or else a naïve narrator to spokesman whose simplicity leads him to persist an interpretation on affairs which the reader shares the presence of author behind the naïve persona. In verbal irony, the speaker has the ironic intention which is realized by both speaker and the readers but in structural irony, the knowledge of the author’s ironic intention is shared by the readers but is not intended by the speaker. To intensify the sense of irony the author uses the fallible narrator who may not be stupid or credulous but has a “failure of insights”(136).

Jonathan swift in *Modest Proposal* (1729), has used a naïve spokesman as economist who writes to convert the excess children of the oppressed and poverty stricken Irish into a financial and gastronomical asset. The economist here does not realize the ironic intention of the author whereas the readers realize it. In Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travel*, an amusingly simple Gulliver is a typical example for the invention of a “naïve hero” for the purpose of generating structural irony. Here, too, Gulliver can not realize the ionic intention whereas the author and the readers realize it. The structural irony veers towards defeatism.

Wyane Booth, in his *A Rhetoric of Irony* discusses on two types of irony: stable and unstable irony. M.H Abrams writes:

In *A Rhetoric of Irony* (1974), Wyane Booth identifies as stable irony that in which the speaker or author makes available to the readers an assertion implied, serves as a firm ground for ironically qualifying or subverting the surface meaning. Unstable irony, on the other hand, offers no fixed stand point which is not itself undercut by further ironies (136)

The next type of irony is labeled as cosmic irony which has its roots in the implied faith in the relationship between the supernatural power and human beings. Cosmic irony is marked wherein supernatural forces such as a deity, or fate is represented to deliberately manipulating events leading individuals to false hopes and only to frustrate and mock them. So, it is also most often known as “the irony of the universe with [human beings] or the individual as victim” (Mueeke 23). In this mode of cosmic irony or the irony of universe, the expressed meaning is that human beings are like helpless puppets in the hands of supernatural forces, while the ironic meaning is often critical causing people to question God and Universe as hostile and villainous to human beings. The ironic intensity in cosmic irony is further intensified by the characters’ blind faith in supernatural forces, in divinity and destiny though such a faith may ultimately generate frustration and tragedy.

In the works of Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Aristophanes, Cicero, Shakespeare, Pope, Swift, Johnson, Baudelaire, Henry James, Chekhov, Brecht and many more other writers cosmic irony is significantly presented.

The discussion of irony, in the proceeding pages, shows the dynamic and complex nature of irony. Wayne C Booth interprets irony in his book, *A Rhetoric of Irony* (1974) by categorizing all types of ironies into stable and unstable. According to Booth, Stable Irony comprises four “intended”, “convert”, “fixed”, and “finite”, marks in “application” (6). Booth identifies that as stable irony in which the ironic writers make available to the reader an assertion, whether explicit or implied, serves as a firm ground for ironically qualifying or subverting the apparent meaning. The irony whose ironic intention of the speaker is shared with the reader by some patent clues offered in the established circumstances by the writer is called stable irony. The ironic writer in such an irony provides “literary fixity” of which we can have “unequivocal, absolute”, and fixed ironic interpretation. The stable irony, in this sense, covers all intentional Socratic, verbal, structural, dramatic, and cosmic ironies, which say one thing and give to understand the opposite(3-5). Unstable irony, on the other hand, offers no any fixed standpoint for its unequivocal interpretation to give any fixed clue. It is either impossible or inadequate as the one interpretation essentially undercuts another. Rather such an irony explicates the world and human existence as essentially ironic and equivocal. Unstable irony therefore, is a mode of reflecting the paradoxes and incongruities implicit in the structure of universe and in our existence. In this sense, unstable irony seems similar to what we call deconstructive irony.

Deconstructive irony is the dominant twentieth century view of irony which is based on the theoretical concepts of Paul De Man and Jacques Derrida. It exposes the impossibility of univocal and stable meaning. Its:

Overt production of meaning through deferral and difference has been seen to point to the problematic nature of all language: from a purely semantic point of view, the ironic situation of plural and separate meanings- the said together with unsaid held in suspension might challenge any notion of language as having a direct one – to – one referential relation to any single reality outside itself. (Hutcheon 57)

The above quote further suggests to think about ironic meaning as something in flux, and not fixed and stable. It is virtually impossible to label any fixed ironic meaning since every position gets undercut itself. It operates where, as de Man claims, “the sign points to something that differs from its literal meaning and has for its function the thematization of this difference.” (qtd. In Hutcheon 64).

Deconstructive irony, as Birendra Pandey rightly posits in his essay on “Deconstructing Irony”, “becomes the motor of the entire rhetorical system. It signifies a refusal to hypothesized notions of the self, of meaning, or interpretative as an end point” to the “otherwise vertiginous process of textual such as Booth’s Sharable norms”(55). So, the deconstructive irony is inherent in signification, in its deferrals and in its negations of certainty. It is , in the words of Pandey in *Intellectual History Reader*, “ a power to entertain widely divergent possible interpretations” to “provoke the readers into seeing that there is *mise en abyme-radical* openness- surrounding the process by which meaning gets determined in texts and interpreted by the readers”(665). Thus, irony in its latest sense leaves open the question of what the literal meaning might signify: there is a perpetual deferment of signification. It is therefore, the old definition of irony – saying one thing and giving to understand the

opposite is superseded. Irony is now saying something in a way that activated not one but an endless series of subversive interpretations.

Orientalism

Orientalism is a brilliant concept developed and popularized by Edward Said. It is based on the European concept of 'East' Europeans create a textual university defining east in different terms, exotic, alien, fairy, far etc. They are seen as exotic being, emotional, weak, strange... others. The concept of west is that "the orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences" (Said 1). In Said's words:

The orient is not only adjacent (next) to Europe, it is also the place of Europe's greatest, oldest, richest colonies the source of its civilization and language, its cultural contestant and one of the deepest and most recurring images of the other. In addition, the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience. (2)

Orient has helped to define west or occident as its contrasting image, idea and personality. The orient is an integral part of European material civilization and culture. Orientalism is defined in different ways. Academically it is defined, "Anyone who teaches, writes about or researches the orient either in its specific or general aspect is an orientalist, the person can be a anthropologist, sociologist, historian or philologist and what the orientalist does is Orientalism" (2).

Generally Orientalism is defined as, "a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between the orient and most of the time the occident" (2).

Similarly, Orientalism is defined historically and materially as "the corporate institution for dealing with the orient-dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the orient" (3)

However, Orientalism is neither merely a political subject matter nor a large collection of texts about the orient. It is shaped by the exchange of political, intellectual, and cultural and moral power.

Orientalism is not an airy European fantasy about the orient, but a created body of theory and practice. Considerable material has been continually invested which made Orientalism, a system of knowledge about the orient.

Edward said says Orientalism is not merely a political subject matter, as it was believed previously, nor is it a large collection of texts about the orient. It is rather a distribution of geopolitical awareness that plunges into the passages all about literature, science, history, language, aesthetic, historical sociological, scholarly, economic, philological texts.

Said says, nearly every writer of 19th century was aware of the fact of empire. They were familiar with Orientalism. Because of this thought, many European writers are able to produce great literature.

Said reads Orientalism as the large political concern shaped by the three great empires, British, French, and American. Britain and France were the pioneer nations

in the discussion of orient and two greatest colonial networks in pre-twentieth century. America emerged as new powerful empire after IInd world war.

The concept of orient and Orientalism was almost begun since the time of Homer. Said has divided Orientalism in two parts - ancient and modern Orientalism. The age after late eighteenth century is the age of modern Orientalism and before late 18th century is the age of ancient Orientalism. Modern concept of Orientalism is database whereas ancient concept was based on imagination. In ancient time, orient was treated as inferior in every field but in modern time the concept about orient is changed and they have started to think something special is there in the orient too. So they want to rule the orient and capture the important things like petroleum oil.

Said has used two methods to study Orientalism, strategic location and strategic formation. Strategic location studies the writer's position on the text whereas strategic formation studies the way one text is related to other texts.

An important thing Said says here is that the cultural discourse is produced by a writer in a text. Here, he seems to be influenced by Michael Foucault. The difference between representation of the orient before the last third decades of the eighteenth century and those after it, modern Orientalism, is that the range of representation expanded enormously in the later period.

Michael Foucault, a poststructuralist critic, developed a theory of discourse in relation to the power structure operating in society. Foucault's main thesis is that discourse is involved in power. He is of the view that discourses are rooted in social institution and that social and political power operates through discourse. The discourse is, therefore, inseparable from power because discourse is the ordering force that governs every institution. Foucault constructs the term discourse because

discourse is, for him, related to the production of any information, which provides knowledge.

Said takes Foucauldian notion of discourse as his guideline, and being influenced from him, he writes in *Orientalism*:

I have found it useful here to employ Michael Foucault's notion of discourse, as described by him in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and in *Discipline and Punish*, to identify Orientalism. My contention is that without examining Orientalism as a discourse one can not possibly understand the enormously systematic discipline by which European culture was able to manage and even produce - the orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively during the post-Enlightenment period. (3)

Having faith on the notion of discourse wedded with power, he linked the Foucauldian theory of discourse with real social and political struggles. Said's main contention is to study and analyze the relations between the west and the east and the role of Orientalism as the governing force in this relationship. Orientalism, as the discourse of the west about the east, Said argues, designates the long term images, stereotypes and general ideology about the orient as 'the other'.

In *Orientalism*, Said mentions that "the Orient-European relationship was determined by an unstoppable European expansion in search of markets, resources and colonies and finally, because Orientalism had accomplished its self metamorphosis from a scholarly discourse to an imperial institution" (95).

Orientalism as a discourse produces a form of knowledge which is of great utility in defining the west as superior and the alien culture; the Orient as inferior and

so an object of study. In their discourse, the westerners try to present orient as inferior as they could. They have created different stereotypes to the east like irrational, sexual, eccentric, wild, barbaric, arrogant, emotional, weak, uncivilized, unable to rule, untrustworthy, prototypical, feminine, ignorant, dynosiac etc.

Orientalism becomes a discourse at the point of which it starts systematically to produce stereotypes about orientals and the orient, such as the heat and dust, the teeming marketplace, the terrorist, the courtesan, the Asian despot, the child-like native, the mystical east. These stereotypes confirm the necessity and desirability of the west over the inferiority of the east.

The discourse of the west, presenting everything non-western as inferior, manifests west's desire to govern, to dominate and to control 'the other' and that this attitude is colonial at heart. Orientalism, the discourse of the West about the East, in Said's word, serves this colonial purpose in an effective manner. It piles stereotype on stereotype of the Orient describing it as an object of study stamped with an otherness so as to make it easier to have power and authority over the orient. Said seems to be right when he says, "the scope of Orientalism exactly matched the scope of empire" (Orientalism 104).

One of the twentieth century Marxist thinkers, A. Gramsci believes that the proletariats do on their landlords interest. They are hegemonied by the ruling class. He means to say that the easterners accept the interpretation of west about them. This is false consciousness. Orientalism is the same type of institutional form of belief in which the west takes orientals as cultural surrogate, juniors.

The eastern people are under the hegemony of the west. The easterners consent the west to rule over the east. They believe on what types of stereotypes as

true. They feel inferior themselves in front of the west. There is a certain culture in every society. The eastern society is influenced by the ideas and institution of west, but not by domination. It means, eastern culture is being led by western culture and the east has allowed the west to lead. This cultural leadership is, what Gramsci has identified as 'hegemony'. It is the cultural hegemony that gives orientalism the durability and the strength.

R. Williams dismisses the distinction between high and low culture formed by the orientalist. High culture is the one which is supported by a few high status people but the low culture represents the mass says Williams. Orientalism is shifted from Europe to America after second world war. According to him, today's world is run by thousand of multinational companies which are working for the betterment of the rich economic cultural politics. All are imposed according to the interest of America. It is a new kind of empire in the name of globalization.

Said's influential *Orientalism* has led to fresh appraisal of the manner in which the westerners have historically represented the east in all the arts as well as a whole range of scholarly writings. It is Said's premise that the West has habitually dominated and controlled the East by making it 'other'; that is, having qualities that make it separate and outside the norm of the so-called civilized European centre. There has been a habitual, deeply ingrained need for the colonizing powers of western Europe to represent the East as mysterious, exotic, erotic, but also barbaric, superstitions and irrational. By this means, imperial powers justify their occupation and seek to dominate and subdue their colonized or subservient peoples.

Having analyzed the affiliation of knowledge with power, Said has discussed how the Westerners and the scholars of the period of empire helped create an image

of the East which, replete with fake and hollow stereotypes, became the yardstick to measure Orientals' cultures and civilizations. Said offers detailed elaboration and powerful critique of Orientalism as a set of discursive practices for knowing and dominating the East; and hence bolstering the idea of European superiority.

III. Textual Analysis

Kim as a Heroic Spy

Kim (1901) is widely regarded as Rudyard Kipling's finest work combining first hand knowledge of India and Indian's with his acute observation of human interaction and his flair for historical context. The protagonist of the novel, *Kim*, is the orphaned son of a sergeant in an Irish regiment. Kim's childhood is spent as a waif and vagabond on the street and in the bazaars of Lahore until he meets an old Tibetan holy man Lama, who is in search of a mystical river, and Kim accompanies him on his journey. On the way he joins up his father's old regiment and is adopted and sent to school. Colonel Creighton of the Ethnological survey is struck by Kim's aptitude for secret intelligent work and he joins the British secret service.

Under the tutelage of an Indian agent, Huree Babu, he joins in the 'Great Game' of espionage which has played with the Russian along the North West Frontier of the Indian empire for very nearly the entire duration of British rule in the subcontinent. In this chapter, the researcher aims at analyzing how Kipling presents Kim as a heroic spy, superior than the natives and his peers.

In the novel, *Kim*, the main character, is from Irish origin. The whole story of the novel revolves around the dominance of colonizers over the Indian economy, politics and culture. The white characters exploit the native Indians. From the very beginning of the text, Kim, the white protagonist, marginalizes the natives, resorting to gun and Municipal order. For instance, Kipling presenting Kim as a King, creates hierarchy between the whites and the Indians. In this regard, the lines in text articulate:

He sat in defiance of Municipal orders, astride the gun Zam Zammah on her brick platform opposite the Ajaib Ghar-the Wonder House, as the natives call the Lahore Museum, who hold Zam- Zammah, that give breathing dragon hold the Punjab for the great green bronze piece is always first of the conqueror's loot. (1)

The above lines praise Kim's Valor and bravery, projecting the Indians as weak and inferior. It is reflected that Indians can not be in touch with the gun Zam-Zammah that shows the imperial presence but Kim plays with it because he has courage. Even the Indians are restricted from holding the gun, giving municipal order, as well as projecting its false image. Kim, though an inexperienced and uneducated young boy, enslaves Lama, a spiritual Buddhist monk and mentally keeps him under his control. Lama follows Kim's idea and can not remain untouched from him. Kim provides him food, shows direction and introduces India. In return to it, Lama gives him money to accomplish his study at St. Xavier, Lucknow. This shows that Lama's intellectuality succumbs to Kim's colonial power and Lama bears his responsibility as his servant. Moreover, Kim, exploiting Lama economically, fulfills his vested interest.

Kim followed like a shadow what he had overheard excited him widely. This man was entirely new to all his experience and he meant to investigate further, precisely as he would have investigated a new building or a strange festival in Lahore city, the Lama was his trove and he proposed to take possession. (10)

Kim while walking on their way together understands the band of the regiment that surprises Lama. It shows that Kim was seeking power and the order, that he has to give to the native Indians. On the other hand, the knowledgeable Lama is convinced

to send money to Kim. Despite his initial dislike for the education, Kim is convinced and attracted towards the education of St. Xaviers. Kim says:

I thought, I was betrayed by Pathan. I was senseless, for I was newly caught and I wished to kill that low cast drummer boy. I say now Hajji, that it was well done and I see my road all clear before me to a good service. I will stay madrissah till I am ripe in the Madrissah, I will be Sahib. (116)

Lama , the wise man, has been compelled to send money for the education of white man Kim. On the other hand, Kim wants to come back after being educated. Lama's agreement to send money for Kim is the acceptance of British education as great and valuable. The education in the British school is given to control the natives:

You were going off to-day to the Military Orphange at sanawar, where the regiment would keep you till you were old enough to enlist. You'd be brought up to the church of England. Bennet arranged for that on the other hand if ye go to St. Xaviers, ye'll get better education and can have the religion. The regiment would pay for you all the time you're Military exchange, but best schooling in India at Lucknow. (90)

Lama also lionizes Kim as a Sahib-a Hindi word used to address master by the servant and accepts himself as an inferior to Kim, having been trapped in a grip of colonial conspiracy. One of the post colonial critic Edward said comments about Kim as a colonial institution:

Two factors must be kept in mind when we interpret Kim. One is that whether he likes it or not its author is writing not just from the dominating view point of a white man in a colonial possession but

from the perspective of massive colonial system whose economy, functioning and history had acquired the status of a virtual fact of nature. Kipling basically assumes uncontested empire. (133)

The Irish blood of Kim as a colonizer has been presented. From the very beginning, Kim intends to make Lama, as his puppet object. Whatever he says, Lama has to obey. Kim has been presented as a power holder and his action represents the British air of superiority.

Kim, exploiting ignorance and illiteracy of natives, holds his upper hand and rules out their role in the society. He shows his misdominear, beating and intimidating the natives, particularly Lala Dinnath's son. Additionally, Kim forcibly takes the documents from Russian spies who are sent to India by Russia, to find out proper way on how to extend Russian Imperialism. Kim, snatching the documents, thwarts Russian plan, and consolidates British-Imperialism that ultimately leads to the crisis of Indian identity. Kipling writes:

There was justification for Kim he had kicked Lala Dinnath's boy off the trunnions, since the English held the Punjab and Kim was English, Kim was white. Though he was turned back as any natives, though he spoke the vernacular by preference, and his mother tongue in a clipped uncertain sing-song, he consorted on terms of perfect equality with the small boys of the bazaar. (1)

Kipling identifies Kim with Red Bull in a green field, which stands for the presence of British Imperialism in Indian soil. Kim finds the Red Bull and gets admiration from the whites later when he is identified as their race. Then he gets responsibility of

commanding natives and establishing himself as a colonizer. Kim's identification with the Red Bull lends strength to whites and puts the identity of Indians into crisis.

Kipling has praised the government of British India in the novel. Not only that he has presented the whites as wise and intellectual. Kim also accepts and tells that he has got the education from the whites. It is the white education that helps him in controlling the natives. Kim is taught to do so. Likewise, Kipling also speaks about the British education and presents St. Xavier education in a great value. He presents that the education is possible for whites who can only afford it. The following lines elaborate about education, "There is a school for Sahibs and half Sahibs. They will make a man to you at St. Xaviers - a white man and hope a good man. They know all about your coming and colonel will see that ye're not last or mislaid and where on the road" (101).

The word "Sahib", has been used for the whites. The sense of greatness and its realization is found when Kim finds the regiment. Kim, the hero of Kipling, dives into the formless and disordered India. Kipling signals that it is the white's duty to give the form and order to it.

On the other hand, politically, Creighton's love to Kim as a father like figure and his promise about the educational and moral development is the colonizer's love to the whites. Kim is called by his father's name O'Hara when his identification as white is found in the regiment. So, Kim has to become the part of imperial rule as a spy after his perfection in his Great Game and learning his Indian loyalties; Colonel Creighton is important for him, as he signals out Kim for the recruitment into the British secret service. The love and promise taken by Creighton for Kim, helps Kipling to immortalize and glorify the British colonizers.

Kipling presents Indian people as waving in the fields but not in advanced company. Even Kipling is hardly understood when he mentions the sentences spoken by Lama to Kim. So, he tries to immortalize his hero Kim. Lama always needs his youth, his guidance and wits. So, Kim is presented as active, dynamic and even clever. When Lama speaks himself. "Never was such a chela. I doubt at times whether Ananda more faithfully nursed out Lord. And thou art a Sahib? When I was man a long time ago I forget that. Now I look upon thee often, and every time I remember thou art a sahib. It is strong" (232).

Lama, the wise abbot at last is compelled to consider Kim as a great. If Kim's help is not there Lama's Nirvana remains unfulfilled. And Kim by the contact of colonizers' world accepts his whiteness and realizes that he is really a Sahib. On the other hand Kim can very easily collect food for old and needy Lama.

It is very dramatic that Kim's identification as a white is to make a spy for the Great Game. Kim is supported by Mahbub Ali to enter into the game. He reports the real condition of Kim to the whites. No other natives have got chances to acquire the position. Even the well educated Babus are mocked. But it comes to be their duty to make a white boy perfect in mapping and playing the Great Game.

The money which is sent by Lama is used to be a perfect player, like spy, to Kim. Lama can't understand the real intension of white and even of Kim himself. Many times Kim has lied Lama unknowingly to fulfill his certain desire, "Babu Ji' said Kim, looking up at the broad, grinning face, 'I am a Sahib'. And I hope to play the 'Great Game'. I am only a beginner at the Game, that is true. I couldn't have leaped into safety as did the sadhu" (190).

So, after the completion of education at St. Xavier, he doesn't hesitate even to say him Sahib. He shows his superiority to the Babu. And he even accepts his role in the Great game. Poor Lama could not get back the money that he invested for Kim but send Kim back to Lama for trial. But Lama thinks that his true chela will never leave yet but can't understand the hidden intention of Kim and the whites.

Kim, at first unknowingly and later knowingly, works as a spy for British in India. Every time he gets success and proves himself as a hero. Mahbub Ali uses him to take a secret message because Kim was highly trusted by him. The lines read:

But R. 17's report was the kernel of the whole affair and it would be distinctly inconvenient if that failed to come to hand. However, God was great, and Mahabub Ali felt he had done all the could for the time being. Kim was the one soul in the world who had never told him a lie. That would have been a fatal blot on Kim's character if Mahbub had not known that to others for his own ends or Mahabub's business, Kim could lie like an oriental. (30)

The given lines valorize Kim who is addressed as "the one soul in the world" (30). He is trusted by Mahbub Ali and used to carry secret letters with him. He uses Mahbub's secrets very wisely for his own benefits. His sharp intellect, quick-art, clarity, quickness and secrecy can be observed in many places. Kim is also helped in many places by Mahbub Ali. He often sends Kim in secret works. Sometimes he sends Kim to follow men and inform him about them.

Kim had had many dealings with Mahbub in his little life, between his tenth and his thirteenth year. Sometimes he would tell Kim to watch a man who had nothing whatever to do with horses to follow him for one

whole day and report every soul with whom he talked. Kim would deliver himself of this tale at evening, and Mahbub would listen without a word or gesture. It was intrigue of some kind, Kim knew; but its worth lay in saying nothing whatever to any one except Mahabub, who gave him beautiful all hot from the cook shop at the head of the serai, and once as much as eight annas in money. (25)

Kim works for Mahbub Ali, an espionage, just for hot meals and less money. He does everything unconsciously but never gets failed. One day, at the request of Kim, he gives him three rupees and a secret news to deliver to a white stallion at Amballa. He gives papers and a code "the pedigree of the white stallion is fully established" (27). He delivers this news very secretly and successfully. When he reaches the place where Mahbub Ali's men live, he speaks in a humming tune. It is dark and he tries an old experiment. The conversation goes:-

'Protector of the Poor !'

The man backed towards, towards the voice,

'Mahbub Ali say —

'Hah ! What says Mahbub Ali ?' He made no attempt to look for the speaker, and that showed Kim that he knew.

'The Pedigree of the white stallion is fully established.'

What proof is there ? The Englishman switched at the rosehedge in the side of the drive.

'Mahbub Ali has given me this proof.' Kim flipped the wad of folded paper into the air . . . (45)

The conversation makes clear how carefully and cleverly Kim has worked as a professional espionage. Kim has protected Mahbub Ali once from being attacked by two fakirs. While Kim is sleeping, he hears two men whispering to each other. They are looking for Mahbub to kill with a shot.

'Two men wait thy coming behind the horse-trucks.

They will shoot thee at thy lying down, because there is a price on thy head. I heard, sleeping near the horses. 'Didst thou see them ?

Hold, still, Sire of Devils !'

'No'.

'Was one dressed belike as a fakir ?'

'One said to other, "What manner of fakir art thou, to

Shiver at a little watching ?" (154)

Mahbub Ali turns back and arrives to his camp at dawn. Kim protects the spy by employing his cleverness. Mahbub praises Kim as a wise man. According to him, he has met many men, women and boys, and a few Sahibs, but not the people like Kim. Because Kim has always told him the truth.

When Kim goes to second class in St. Xavier's he is formally sent to Great Game. He is taught to involve in the game practically. There are some letters to be procured from some people in the south who are kidnapping woman within British territory. One letter is procured but the secret Agent is murdered. Kim is provoked for his courage and forced to involve in the game flattering him to be Sahib.

'It is great luck for you, for you are only sixteen; but of course you understand that you do not become permanent till you have passed the autumn examination. So you must not think you are going out into the

world to enjoy yourself, or that your fortune is made. There is a great deal of hard work before you. Only if you succeed in becoming *pukka* (Permanent), you can rise, you know, to four hundred and fifty a month. (192)

The above quote makes it clear that Kim is tempted by showing money to involve in the Game. It is said that doing good in the Game is his exam. He welcomes the proposal and proves himself as hero by accomplishing the task.

The last, involvement of Kim in the Great Game is to procure the Kilta from the Russians in which many maps and documents are there having the information of good diplomacy of the Russians for eight months. It is a wonderful Great Game played by Kim. While Kim and Lama are going for the quest of River, they come across a Frenchman and a Russian. Lama explains his hand made map to the Russian as per his desire. But the Russian does not understand and tries to snatch it from Lama. Lama gets very angry with him when the map is torn:

The Lama rose at the insult; his hand went to the heavy iron pencease that is the priest's weapon, and the Babu dance in agony (262). Before Kim could ward off him, the Russian struck the old man full on the face. Next instant he was rolling over and over downhill with Kim at his throat. The blow had waked every unknown Irish devil in the boy's blood, and the sudden fall of his enemy did the rest . . . Kim banged the Russian's head against a boulder. (263)

The fight continues for sometime. In horror, the coolies run with the baggage and all the funs up the hill. The Frenchman shoots at Kim, but Kim is saved. Kim takes out his revolver and shoots towards the Frenchman. In the tensed situation, they

run for their lives. The coolies and local people are afraid of some calamity because of the injury to Lama. Taking advantage over their fear, Kim asks the red-topped Kilta for making charm over it. Hurree Babu has already informed him that the Kilta contains the letters and other documents. A fair colored woman comes with the Kilta early in the morning. Kim carries it into a secret room. He takes out the letters and the documents from the box and throws unnecessary things and carries the secret documents of Russians. In this way, Kim plays the Great Game very cleverly and gets success to prove himself the heroic spy among the British in India.

Verloc as an Ironic Spy

The story *The Secret Agent* is fairly straightforward, yet complexities arise since the narration moves back and forth in time. The action of the novel is set towards the end of the Victorian period. The skeleton of the story line is that the secret agent, Verloc is employed by an unnamed foreign embassy to foment activity amongst emigre political dissidents who have sought asylum in the relatively liberal atmosphere of Britain. These people known either as anarchists or revolutionists are tolerated in London because they represent no real threat. They are simply talkers, they always condemn the British colonial system with words but they are actually too lazy to act.

Adolf Verloc runs a pornographic shop as a cover business. Various anarchists meet in the shop and have a talk about revolution. But their revolutionary ideology is totally useless. The ambition of the anarchists is only to destroy the structures and create the chaotic situation in London for the failure of British empire. One of the anarchists named professor always desires to annihilate, to destroy with the detonator he has invented. Verloc has married a younger woman Winne. His retarded brother-in-law named Stevie, and crippled old

mother-in-law. Verloc persuades Stevie to blow up the Greenwich observatory wall. Unfortunately, as he is carrying the bomb across Greenwich Park, Stevie accidentally triggers the detonator, and blows himself up.

The remainder of the novel deals with the consequences. Detective Inspector Heat finds that Adolf was responsible for the conspiracy. Adolf pays with his life and Winnie commits suicide. Comrade Ossipon, tricks Winnie out of her money by pretending to help her flee the country and subsequently conscience-stricken when he learns of Winnie's suicide. At the end of the novel, the nihilist professor, Still involved in his obsessive search for the perfect detonator, walks frail, insignificant, like a pest.

The Secret Agent explains ironic mode of narration and presents the central character ironically to undercut the anarchist activities in London, held to turn upside down the British colonial system of the time. The ironic portrayal of the central character who is the secret agent for foreign embassy shows his colonial bent of mind. Verloc is an agent provocateur assigned to spy on anarchists in London. In the novel Conrad employs irony to negativize the anarchists because these anarchists threaten and challenge the British colonial system. He brutally underscores the anarchist activities as a sort of conspiracy against the system. Conrad posits pro-colonial position in the novel since he undercuts the anarchists and wants them to be complicit with the system rather than challenge the system. Joseph Conrad, while ironizing the anarchist activities, employs irony as 'a discursive practice or strategy' demystifying the politics of representation (Hutcheon 9). Conrad, from the conservative position, makes political use of irony against the anarchists to advocate on behalf of the existing British social system.

Conrad takes side with British authority and ironizes the anarchists by portraying their character as vain and absurd. Verloc, the central character, is completely failed in his mission who works against British empire as a double crosser: both the Russian spy and British one. Conrad locates immorality at the very root of the espionage. In *The Secret Agent*, the brutal irony against the anarchist and the espionage emerges from their pretended concern for social improvement. But the unbridgeable gap between anarchists' words and their actual deeds lends Conrad sufficient room to direct brutal irony against the ongoing anarchism and secret service in London, which is also suggestive to his support to the British colonialism.

The Secret Agent is rich with events and descriptions which functions as evidence to Conrad's pro-colonial position and his ironic attitude, conveying hatred and complains, towards the anti-British activities of double standard Verloc. The writer's contempt and lack of fellow-feeling for Adolf Verloc, the agent provocateur comes to the surface in his description of the first appearance of Verloc as:

Undemonstrative and burly in a fat pig style, Mr. Verloc, without either rubbing his hands with satisfaction or winking sceptically at his thoughts, proceeded on his way. He trod the pavement heavily with his shinny boots, and his general get up was that of a well-to-do mechanic in business for himself. He might have been anything from a picture frame makers to a locksmith... an indescribable air which no mechanic could have acquired in the practice of his handicraft however dishonestly exercised: the air common to men who live on the vices, the follies... to drink sellers. . . to the inventors of patent medicines.

(20)

The irony implicit in the quote above arises from the tension between Adolf Verloc's ideal appearance and his dark inner reality. Though, Verloc looks almost like an ideal late-Victorian man: a mechanic, or artisan, who has succeeded in business, the reality is that Verloc is actually a man of moral nihilism; not an honest craftsman's turned businessman, but someone who lives with the vices, follies and fears of mankind. Verloc's outward appearance suggests the ideal, and his expression is specifically not evil, but his inner reality is that of a parasite, an exploiter of other people. The description of fat pig Verloc is ironic, and the tone both disapproving and throw-away. The image of fat pig heaviness ironically works against the idea of efficiency required for a secret agent, suggesting Verloc's confidence and efficiency as mere superficial qualities.

This anarchist Verloc who pretends to be seriously committed at bringing necessary social change is actually fond of domestic comforts, which is very ironic. Verloc "had an air of having wallowed, fully dressed, all day on an unmade bed" (14). The writer's ironic characterization towards anarchist Verloc reaches to extremity in his gratuitously unflattering comparison:

He generally arrived in London (like the influenza) from the continent, only he arrived unheralded by the press, and his visitations set in with great severity. He breakfasted in bed and remained wallowing there with an air of quite enjoyment till noon everyday and sometimes even to a later hour. But when he went out he seemed to experience a great difficulty in finding his way back to the temporary home in the Bulgarian Square. (45)

The writer's characterization of Verloc above demands Sardonic amusement at the lazy, inept Verloc who is described as excessively fond of domestic comforts. The disease "influenza" enclosed in the parenthesis or ironic marker, with which Adolf Verloc has been compared, intensifies, Conrad's ironic attitude toward the anarchist. The unjust and unflattering comparison between Adolf Verloc and the disease suggests Conrad's contempt for anarchist, and to say that the only difference between him and this disease is that the newspaper takes no notice of him also suggests piling on insults upon anarchists, unnecessarily. Similarly, Verloc stays out late not because he cannot find his way or has difficulty to find his way back to his hotel but because he has business to attend to. But, this imputation of navigational incompetence gets out its way from Conrad's distrust upon the anarchist activities. Conrad's contempt for the London based anarchists reveals his support to the British colonization of the time. His irony debunks the anarchists because they stand to challenge and change the colonial system.

The politics of ironic labeling attains extreme height in the writer's peroration on Verloc's death:

Night, the inevitable reward of men's faithful labour on this earth, night had fallen on Mr. Verloc, the tired revolutionist 'one of the old lot' - the humble guardian of society; the inevitable secret agent of baron Scott-Wartenheim's dispatches; a servant of law and order, faithful, trusted, accurate, admirable with perhaps one single amiable weakness: the idealistic belief in being loved for himself.(204).

The strategy of gratuitous insult in the previous passage has been replaced here with excessive compliment, but the absurdity of the praise is equally ironic. The discrepant

gap between the virtues invoked by the writer and Verloc's actual deficiencies foregrounds the role of the negative in irony. The adjectives such as "faithful", "trusted", "accurate", and "admirable" in the quote above do not rightly label or describe Verloc. Each of these adjectives listed, contrarily suggest its opposite. In reality, Verloc is Steeve's murderer, and the scorned double agent, and certainly has more than "one single amiable weakness. (204)

Joseph Conrad takes ironic notice of Verloc's ideal of his self-importance and indolence, and the reality of Vladimir's power over him. Verloc's defense of self importance gets ruined when Vladimir, the Embassy's first secretary, shouts "You are a lazy fellow" on his face and demands "activity" from him and even threatens to cut him off his regular monthly pay (26). The writer displays discrepancy, in yet another instance, between Verloc's ideal of his self-importance and his actual timidness and helplessness as Verloc gets, so easily, disturbed by the "the faint buzzing of a fly" against the window pane (29). The fly's tininess is stressed against the largeness of the fat-pig Verloc. The big man is not literally or physically threatened by the energetic organism, yet it affects him unpleasantly. The useless activity of the fly is a philosophic challenge to the lazy fat-pig whom Vladimir pressured into action. Thus, Verloc's sense of importance and significance is shattered into dust. Conrad's irony towards anarchist Verloc, thus discloses an absence of community and his utter disbelief in the anarchists. The irony, therefore, in the novel turns to be political as it is directed towards anarchism to negate, negativize and destroy anarchist belief and to convince them to merge into the existing authority.

Conrad shows no sympathy for anarchists. *The Secret Agent* evokes the dramatic range and depth of Conrad's moral concerns. Conrad's ironic method is

dominant and even a passional aspect of the novel. Conrad's ironic treatment attains his special aim to dislodge the illusions of the anarchists, who, avoiding or disregarding the data of human existence, embrace false conceptions, and remain transfixed in the gulf between appearance and reality.

In *The Secret Agent*, Conrad's demonic portrait of anarchist motivation is that political goals such as - revolution, justice, and freedom have little to do with what really drives the anarchists. Conrad's firm belief in colonial structure is revealed as he disapproves what the anarchists are doing in the society as an outrageous betrayal of humanity. The alignment with the British system inspires Conrad to adopt a very aggressive attitude towards the anarchist's rhetoric of political ideology. Conrad, therefore, exploits irony as a weapon to disarm and completely destroy them and their political ideals. His projection of the anarchists as betrayer of humanity reveals his support for the British social system. Conrad does not want anarchism to flourish only to breed chaos and betray humanity.

In this light, Conrad undercuts Adolf Verloc, who pretends to be an agent provocateur, the protector of the Verloc family, and the society. The hypocrite Verloc, for personal safeguard, sacrifices the life of his mentally degenerated brother-in-law, Steve while bombing the Greenwich observatory wall. The hypocrite anarchist Verloc is a repugnant killer, responsible for dismembering a mentally defective child. The discrepancy between Verloc's outward manifestation as the protector of the family when rub against his inner dark and demonic reality gives Conrad's political use of irony a cutting edge.

The immoral and murderous anarchist, Verloc not only makes his innocent and disturbed brother-in-law an scapegoat to save his own life but also runs a

pornography shop as a cover business. In this light, Conrad ironizes the disparity between Verloc's social responsibility and the reality he hides. The disparity is ironically conveyed by Conrad's summary of the shop "in which Mr. Verloc Carried on his business of a seller of shady whereas, exercised his vocation of a protector of society and cultivated his domestic virtues" (15). Verloc pretends to be an ideal husband and a bastion of the social embellishments by the sale of goods people are ashamed of buying. Conrad's choice of words "exercised his vocation" is the kind of portentous phrase the self-important Verloc might use of himself, but in reality, he is a dishonest secret agent because he is too lazy to do a decent job, and "cultivated his domestic virtues" is a grand description to cover his disinterest in what actually happens at home. Adolf Verloc's hypocrisy and immorality come to the fore when Mrs. Verloc cries out in a whisper full of scorn and rage "he cheated me out of seven years of life", "he was a devil" (195-96). But like Mr. Verloc, Mrs. Verloc is not faithful in her conjugal life, either. Conrad, thus ironizes Winnie's unfaithfulness as she recalls her early romance with the young butcher and confesses;-

. . . 'that was the man I loved then,' . . . I supposed he could see it in my eyes, too. Five and twenty shillings a week, and his father threatened to kick him out of the business if he made such a fool of himself as to marry a girl with a crippled mother and a crazy idiot boy on her hands. But he would hang about me, till one evening I found the coverage to slam the door in his face. I had to it. I loved him dearly. Five and twenty shillings a week ! There was that other man-a good lodger. What is a girl to do ? Could I've gone on the streets ? He seemed kind.

He wanted me anyhow. What was I to do with mother and that poor boy ? Eh ? I said yes. (196)

The quote above ironizes their marriage, as neither of them is sincere to the other.

Winnie's selfishness, weakness and unfaithfulness become subject to the writer's ironic attack since, for her, marriage with Adolf was a sort of contract that guaranteed social and economic safeguard for her own, her crippled old mother and her mentally degenerated brother. The irony, here, emerges from the contrast between Winnie's apparent self-portrayal as a good wife and her inner selfish personal who never loved Adolf in the true sense of the term. The effect of moral blindness, as the lives and fates of Adolf Verloc and Winnie Verloc demonstrate, are staggering. Adolf's belief that he has been loyal to his employer, to the cause of social stability and to his affection embodies grand illusion for which he pays with his life. Clearly both husband and wife have been dishonest with each other, masking their motives in the most insidious ways. They always refrain from going to the bottom of facts and motives. During their marriage of seven years, Adolf has kept his activities secret from Winnie, and Winnie has never fully admitted that she married him primarily for social and economic reasons.

For Conrad, the anarchists personify moral corruption and negation. Whether Conrad is viewing Adolf Verloc or any other characters, he depicts them as odious human beings, ugly and malevolent. In this sense, Conrad argues, while treating the anarchists ironically, that these anarchists are mere breeders of chaos with no principle, no virtue and no tradition.

Conrad repeatedly attributes Verloc with mock-heroic tags and insulting adjectives which simultaneously elevate and deflate them. The novel displays Verloc

in his repulsiveness and degeneracy. His slothfulness is always magnified, with graphic emphasis on physical extremes. Conrad's politics of irony demystifies Verloc's pride which reveals that a will-to-power can be a motivating force behind his false claim, will-to-know. Conrad applies brutal irony to debunk Verloc who lives for dreams of power since he is just too lazy to work.

Conrad's central character Adolf Verloc, is proud as the breeder of chaos and violence. He breeds chaos and causes violence for fame and power, unconcerned about society and humanity, which naturally results into irony.

IV. Conclusion

Although both the writers - Kipling and Conrad have created espionage as the central characters, in their novels *Kim* and the *Secret Agent* respectively, their treatment to the character is different. Kipling, from the very beginning of the novel, has presented Kim as a heroic, brave, and clever character whereas Conrad, in his novel *The Secret Agent*, has presented Adolf Verloc as a weak, lethargic and ironic character.

Both the writers have their own way to develop the narratives and deal with the characters, but they meet in a common point - to glorify the British empire and demean the opponents of imperialism. In this light we can interpret both the novels from political perspective. Kipling being white man, has selected Kim, out of many other peers, to make the central point because he wants to show the heroic quality of whites through Kim. In the beginning unconsciously and later consciously Kim works for the British empire by providing secret message of Russians which he gets from different sources and sometimes by his own might and cleverness, for it was in the latent of Kipling. Every time Kim has been able to accomplish his task not because he was capable to do all these things but because he was the son of whiteman. So, *Kim* is the product of colonial power and Kipling's colonial mentality.

Joseph Conrad too has produced many great literatures where he tried to be very objective. But he is always seen politically bent to the Empire. In *The Secret Agent*, Conrad has ironized the protagonist who mocks at the British Empire, working as double crosser: both as Russian and British Spy. Verloc, the central character of novel, plots to blast Greenwich observatory though he was an employee of British Empire. Since he has also been working in Russian Secret service against the British

Empire, he is doomed to face the painful death. In the eyes of Conrad, the one who appears against the colonial power, is a criminal and should face miserable ending.

Conrad ironizes the anarchists to negativize and destroy their rhetoric of revolutionary politics. Conrad defends the British colonial structure by exploiting political irony against the anarchists and especially to the central character, Verloc, since the latter pose challenges to the existing social order. His position is thus pro-colonial in *The Secret Agent*. Conrad's utter distrust upon the anarchists and his repeated use of irony to undercut their activities explicitly suggests his pro-colonial position in the novel. Conrad's alignment with the British colonial system inspires him to adopt cynical attitude towards the anarchists.

Conrad has described the appearance of Adolf Verloc as "Fat-pig" and one who lives on the "vices" and the "follies". The description of fat-pig heaviness ironically works against the idea of efficiency required for a secret agent. Conrad ironizes Verloc's confidence and efficiency as mere superficial qualities and the motives behind the employment of political irony against the anarchists is to negativize the anarchists' political ideology. Conrad compares Verloc with the disease "influenza" which intensifies Conrad's ironic attitude towards the anarchists.

In Kipling's *Kim* Britishers take responsibility for helping Kim to define himself as white. They provide love, shelter and education, hoping their perfect secret agent in future. Kim is not given other type of education but surveying and mapping, so that he can control and know the natives. Huree Babu is left behind, though more qualified than Kim, because he is native Indian or colonized and suppressed. Because of partial nature, Kipling can be presented as an imperial novelist and almost like the

spokesperson of British colonialism. As a result, Kipling has been able to present Kim as a successful spy for British empire.

Thus, both Kipling and Conrad seem to be the literary agent of British Empire and the colonial power. In Kipling's novel *Kim*, Kim is presented as a hero who is no more qualified than the other Indians but love and sympathy of whites has remained in his blood. On the other hand, Verloc, in Conrad's *The Secret Agent*, is described ironically as "fat-pig" and one who lives on the "Vices" and the "follies" not because he bears these qualities but because he has tried to dismantle the colonial system.

This research is concentrated on finding the political stance of two novelists of colonial period Rudyard Kipling and Joseph Conrad—reading their novels *Kim* and *The Secret Agent* respectively. The research concludes that the colonizers had extended their colonies through culture and literature too by using the writers, and the writers also are not unaffected by the politics of the colonizers. It can be claimed because of the presentation of Kim as Heroic spy in Kipling's *Kim* who supports British empire and Verloc as an ironic spy in Conrad's *The Secret Agent* who works against British empire in London.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. Noida: Harcourt Asia Ltd., 1999.
- Booth, Wayne C. A. *Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Conrad, Joseph. *The Secret Agent*. England: Wordsworth Editions Ltd., 1996.
- Enright, D.J. *The Alluring Problem: An Essay on Irony*. New York: OUP, 1986.
- Greenberger, Allen, J. "Rudyard Kipling's India." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 27.1 (1967): 166-167.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Jan Mohamed, Abdul R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature." *Critical Inquiry*, 12.1 (1985): 59-87.
- John. Andrew st. "In the year '57: Historiography, Power, and Politics in Kipling's Punjab." *The Review of English Studies* 51.201 (2000): 62-79.
- Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*. New Delhi: Rupa & Co., 2001.
- Matin, A. Michael. "We aren't German Slaves here, Thank God: Conrad's Transposed Nationalism and British literature." *Journal of modern Literature* 21.2 (97/98): 251.
- Muecke, D.C. *Irony and the Ironic: The Critical Idiom*. New York: Methuen and Co, 1982.
- Mulry, David. "Popular Accounts of the Greenwich Bombing and Conrad's The Secret Agent." *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 54.2 (2000): 43-64.

- Pandey, Beerendra. "A Paradigm Shift in the Representation of Violence in Partition Short Stories by Women: Political Irony in Shauna Singh Baldwin's Family Ties." *The Atlantic Literature Review* 5.3-4 (2004):105-11.
- . "Deconstructing Irony: Reading Paul de Man." *Literary Studies* 15 (1996): 51-55.
- Reid, Fred and David Washbrook. "Kipling, Kim and Imperialism." *History Today* 32.8 (1982): 14-20.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- . *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 1978.
- . *The World, The Text and The Critic*. New York: Vintage Books, 1984.
- Spector, Robert D. "Irony as Theme: Conrad's Secret Agent." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 13.1 (1950): 69-71.
- Skinner, Stephen. "A Benevolent Institution for the suppression of Evil': Joseph Conrad's *The Secret Agent* and the Limits of Policing." *Journal of Law and Society* 30.3 (2003): 420-40.
- Wagner, Phillip E. "Life as He Would Have it: The Invention of India in Kipling's Kim." *Cultural Critique* 26 (1993-1994): 129-159.
- Wollen, Peter. "Kim: The more Things Change the more they Stay the Same." *Emergences: Journal for the study of Media and Composite Cultures* 12.1 (2002): 157-170.