TRIBHUVAN UNIVERSITY

Orientalist Portryal of India in *Kim* and *A Passage to India: A Contrapuntal Reading*

A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts in English

By

Madan Kumar Paudyal

Central Department of English

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

February 2009

Tribhuvan University

Faculty of Humanities and Social Science

Approval Letter

This thesis entitled **Orientalist Portryal of India in *Kim* and *A Passage to India: A Contrapuntal Reading*** submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Madan Kumar Paudyal has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee:

_____ _____
Internal Examiner

_____ _____
External Examiner

_____ _____
Head
Central Department of English

_____

Date: _____

Tribhuvan University

Central Department of English

Letter of Recommendation

Madan Kumar Paudyal has completed his thesis entitled **Orientalist Portryal of India in *Kim* and *A Passage to India: A Contrapuntal Reading*** under my supervision. He carried out his research from May 2008 to February 2009 I hereby recommend his thesis be submitted for viva voce.

_____

Mr. Saroj Ghimire

Supervisor

Date: Feb., 2009

Abstract

Both the writers – Kipling and Forster have ambivalently presented Indian life and culture in their novels *Kim* and *A Passage to India* respectively. Kipling's India, in Kim, has quality of permanence and inevitability that belongs not just to that wonderful novel, but of British India, its history, administrators, and apologists and, no less important, to the India fought for by Indian nationalists as their country to be won back. By giving an account of this series of pressures and counter pressures in Kipling's India, the process of imperialism itself as the great work of art engages them. The issues that Forster raises in *A Passage to India* are of enduring interest. It is unique among English fictions in its presentation of the complex problems which were to be found in the relationship between the British and the Indians and its portrayal of the Indian scene in all its magic and all its wretchedness. By applying the postcolonial theory the researcher claims that both the texts have dramatized the dialectics between native India and colonial Britain on orientalist ground.

Acknowledgements

This thesis owes its existence to Mr. Saroj Ghimire who not only supervised me throughout the work or went through every line of manuscript but also gave me consistence encouragement and supporting materials so as to materialize this thesis. Special thanks go to Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma, the head of the department for his innovative guidelines. I express my heartfelt gratitude for Dr. Beerendra Pandey who gave précis and thought-provoking comments about this thesis. I can not help thanking my friend Mr. Uttam Poudel whose unprecedented help made this thesis to come into existence. Lastly, I would like thank all my friends who helped me directly or indirectly in the process of writing this thesis.

Madan Kumar Paudyal

Contents

I. Orientalist Ethos in *A Passage to India* and *Kim*

A Passage to India (1924) and *Kim* (1901) are the two novels written by two English novelists: E.M. Forster and Rudyard Kipling, who were considered to be opposed to each other in their attitude towards India, and who therefore, present an interesting subject for a contrapuntal reading. This subject is interesting also because it provides an opportunity to study how prejudices generated by Petty interests for the creative vision of a great writer.

This thesis is striving and aspiring to accentuate the portrayal of India and its undercurrents in the most acclaimed books *Kim* and *A Passage to India*. Both the texts express and expose the space having been occupied by the complex network of Imperial domination of British colonialism. Generally there is an understanding that both the texts are supersaturated by superficially charged chauvinistic and racist attitudes of colonial force. If carried out critical reading one cannot deny the fact that these texts uniquely present the positive details of colonized India.

E (Edward) M (Morgan) Forster was born on January 1, 1879, educated at Tonbridge School (1893-97) and at King's College Cambridge. His father an architect, was of Anglo-Irish extraction on the paternal side and through his mother was descended from a family which for some generation had given rise to notable members of the intellectual middle class. His father died shortly after he was born. Consequently he was brought up by women: his mother, maternal grandmother and his great aunt, Marrianance Thorton, whose influence started him as a writer. Forster is a rare and special man. He is rare because he is in part of Victorian and Edwardian and in a part modern. It is his aesthetic response that makes him vary rare and special writer. Vasant A Shahane goes on saying, “Humanism, liberalism, intellectualism, freedom and sensitivity- such are the qualities of the temper of the twentieth century

to which Forster has given his allegiance as a man and writer" (6). Forster spent his days in Indian traveling by railway or motorcar throughout northern and central India. He saw that beneath the charming arcane customs, the rampant confusions of the governmental process, and dazzling costumes of man and nature, there was a dilemma, one that was for him a key to understanding India.

Born in Bombay, India, on December 30, 1865, Rudyard Kipling was brought up by an 'aya' in India through her he came in close contact with Indian traditions and cultures. Kipling was actually born in India-an Anglo-India, but had been packed off to boarding school in England at the age of six. Returning to India in 1882, he found work as a journalist, first with the *Civil and Military Gazette* and *The Pioneer* and this helped him to gain a rich experience of colonial life, which he later presented in his stories and poems. A dyed-in-the-wool imperialist, Kipling was also a man who loved India, the land of his own childhood. He began to achieve literary fame during his early years along with Tennyson and Browning. The glory of Imperialism influence at work in Kipling dominated much the greater part of his literary works, which draws attentions of many critics. In this regard Margaret Peller Feeley writes, "Kipling transcended his racism in several ways; he cuts casual racist remarks and added sensitive observation" (qtd. in Peely 266).

Kim (Kimball O'Hara) is the orphaned son of an Irish Soldier (Sahib). He earns his living by begging and running small errands on the streets of Lahore. He occasionally works for his friend, Mahbub Ali, a horse trader who is one of the native operates of the British secret service. One day, he befriends a Tibetan Lama who is on a quest to free himself form the Whell of Things. Kim becomes the *chela*, or disciple, and accompanies him on his journey. On the way, Kim accidentlally leans about parts of the Great Game and is recruited by the British to carry a message to the British

commander in Umballa. Kim's trip with the Lama along the Grand Trunk Road is the first great adventure in the novel. By chance, Kim's father's regimental Chaplain identifies him by his Masonic certificate, which he wears around his neck and Kim is sent to a top English school in Lucknow, but he keeps in touch with both the Lama and his secret service connections. After three years of schooling, Kim is given government appointment so that he can begin his role in the Great Game. Kim rejoins the Lama and, at the behest of Kim's superior Hurree Chunder Mookherjee, they make a trip to the Himalayas. Here the epionage and spiritual threats of the story collide, with the Lama, unwillingly falling into conflict with Russian intelligence agents. Kim obtains maps, papers, and other important items for the Russians who were working to undermine British control of the region. Mookherjee befriends the Russians undercover, acting as a guide and thus ensuring that they do not recover the lost items. Kim, poters, and villagers all come to the aid of the Lama. The Lama realizes that he has gone astray. His search for the River of the Arrow should be taking place in the Plains, not the mountains, and he orders the porters to take them back. Here, Kim and the Lama are nursed to health, Kim delivers the Russian intelligence documents to Babu, a concerned Mahbu Ali comes to check on Kim, and the Lama finds his river and achieves Enlightenment.

Any work of art, be it poetry or novel, is a verbal artifact, which to varied interpretation. Being no exception to this, in Kipling's Kim, the political implication of a 'novel' has been emphasized and interpreted form various point of view.

Philip E. Wegner sees it form the perspective of imperialist literature and writes “Kim celebrated India at the high watermark of British formal imperial domination has occupied a special place in the complex field of imperialist literature” (97). The vast majority of critical attention devoted to colonialist criticism restricts by

bracketing the political context of culture and literature. As Abdul R. Jan Mohamed argues, "Kim attempts to find syncretic solutions to the Manichean opposition of the colonizer and the colonized" (66). Similarly, Edward said comments with the vein of contrapuntal reading. He writes:

> Kim occupies a very special place in the development of the English novel [. . .] its picture of India exists in a deeply antithetical relationship with the development of the movement for Indian independence. (*Culture and Imperialism* 32)

In the novel, though Kipling has shown Kim as a main character of the novel outsmarting other Indian characters thereby showing his colonial mentality, he equally, at the same time seems to shed light on the Indian subject matters that are uniquely valuable and valuably unique.

Similarly in *A Passage to India* Forster brings forth the history of the British in India. While the novel opens at a point of high tension between the British and their Indian subjects, such social and political strife was not always to apparent. Indian resentment toward its British rulers developed over a long history of oppression. It would prove nearly impossible to understand Foster's plot and characters without some knowledge concerning the history of the British in India. The novel received almost universal acclaim when it was published in 1924. The novel depicts life in British colonial Indian during the early part of the twentieth century, offering a balanced look at both the English and the Indians they ruled. At the time of publication, its unflattering portrayal of the English caused many to view the book as a critique of the British government's colonial policies. Only later did critics begin to see themes in the novel that transcended the immediate politics of the time. The novel depicts the fact that under the tutelage of British colonialism so far hibernated Indian

civilization gets sporuted but its another fact can be forgotten as its valorizes the friendly relation between Dr. Ajiz and Mr. Fielding.

Any literary work of art laid open its interpretation since its publication, *A Passage to India*, too, has succeeded in attracting the attention of a chunk of critics form different perspectives. After its publication I.P. Harteley found the cosmic significant and writes, "[. . .] is so much more than a study of racial contrasts and disabilities. It is intensely personal and intensely cosmic" (qtd. in Shahane 6). Elizabeth McLeod Walls says that he novel is an attack on the British rule in India, and also presents the conflict of the day, she writes:

> *A Passage to India* is [. . .] his attempt to articulate conflicts ranging among nations and civilizations while perpetuating the colonial ethos of Anglo-India in 1920s. The crux of Forster's efforts is an interrogation of hegemonic rhetoric, passage is an attempt both to criticize and mere covertly, to stifle the authoritative voice of British rule. (57)

The political image of India is marked by mutual distrust and fear between Anglo-Indians and Indians. Liberal and academic critics like F.R. Levais and Lionel Trilling praises it in terms of the artistic expression of the liberal imagination.

Although both the writers Kipling and Forster – have their own way to tell their narratives, their representation of Indian life and culture in their novels – *Kim* and *A Passage to India* becomes ambivalent. Forster, form the very outset of his novel, has presented, to a great extent, the rift between the English and the Indians whereas Kipling's novel lacks it. They, on the one hand, stereotype India and the Indians, and on the other hand privilege Indian life and culture.

Both the writers, while stereotyping India and the Indians have their own way to deal with the subject matter, but they meet a common point that is to demean the Indians. In both the novels – *Kim* and *A Passage to India*, both of them have tried to be liberal humanist in dealing with India, but their liberal attitude fails to work and their sense of being the members of colonizing nation and their colonial mentality come to the fore, and their representation of Indian life and culture turns out to be a fiasco. In both the novels, the process of self-validating sense of Western superiority and the process of othering through the medium of discourses becomes a fundamental colonialist concern. At the same time, they, in their novels, show their ambivalent attitude towards Indian life and culture. On the one hand, Kipling places his protagonist, Kim in the whirlwind of lack of clear-cut identity, for he owes both to the West and the East, not fully any of them. While the Great Game makes Kim aware of the world of action, his spiritual and moral awakening is the direct result of the Lama's influence. The rapidity with which Kim slides between the two slaves – European and Indian – is to be noted. Because of the entirely malleable self, Kim neither belongs to India nor to Europe. So, the fluidity of Kim's subjectivity leads him no where, but makes him more ambivalently between two poles the East and the West. Forster, on the other hand, fosters Indian nationalist movement and advocates India's decolonization. Forster's deliberate stereotyping of India is vividly demonstrated in his ironic scorn for the Indian's being very reckless to time and keeping appointments. But at the same time, he does not convey the Orientalist othering of colonized Indians, particularly the colonized Muslim males on being erotic. Forster's ultimate rejection of the idea that Dr. Aziz is a rapist shows that he does not participate in the Imperialist discourse of natives being rapist.

Hence, it is seen that Kipling, through the valorization of Kim's subjectivity, places himself in ambivalent position, and Forster captures ambivalent stance by simultaneously stereotyping India and the Indians and fostering Indian Nationalist Movement. Here both the novels have underlying similarity in terms of theme and motif. Therefore, the contrapuntal study between these two novels can be done and the research is venturing to do so.

II. Postcolonial Discourse

Colonial Discourse and Ambivalence

This term has brought into currency by Edward W. Said who saw Foucault's notion of a discourse as valuable for describing that system within which that range of practices termed 'colonial' come into being. Said's *Orientalism*, which examined the ways in which colonial discourse operated as an instrument of power, initiated what came to be knowledge as colonial discourse, in 1980 that saw colonial discourse as its field of study. Aaprt from Said, Homi K Bhabha analysis posited certain disability contradictions within colonial relationships, such as hybridity, ambivalence, which reveled the inherent vulnerabilty of colonial discourse.

Discourse, as Foucault theorizes it is a system of statements within which the word can be known. it is the system by which dominant groups in society constitute the field of truth by imposing specific knowledge, disciplines and values upon dominated groups. As a social formation it works to constitute reality not only for the objects it papers to represent but lost for the subjects who from the community on which it depends. Consequently. Colonial discourse, is the complex of signs and practices that organize social existence and social reproduction within colonial relationship. an important features of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of 'fixity' in the ideological construction of otherness. In this regard Homi K. Bhaba in his book *The Location of Culture* argues 'fixity, as the sign of cultural/ historical 'racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation. it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition' (66).

Colonial discourse is greatly implicated in ideas of the centrality of Europe, and thus in assumptions that have become characteristics of modernity: assumptions

about history, language, literature and technology. Colonial discourse construct the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to established system of administration and instruction. Thus it is a system of statements that can be made about colonies and colonial people, about colonizing powers and about the relationship between these two. It is a system the knowledge and belief about the world within which acts of colonization take place. Although it is generated within the society and cultures of the colonizers, it becomes that discourse" produces the colonized as a social reality which is at once and other and yet entirety knowleable and visible" (*The Location of Culture* 71). At the very least, it creates a deep conflict in that consciousness of the colonized because of its clash with other knowledge about the world. Rules of inclusion and exclusion operate on the assumption of the superiority of the colonizer's culture, history, language, art political structures, social contentions, and the assertion of the need for the colonized to be 'raised up' through colonial contact. In particular, colonial discourse hinges on notions of race that begin to emerge at the very advent of European imperialism. Through such distinctions it comes to represent the colonized, whatever the nature of their social structures and cultural histories, as 'primitive' and the colonizers as 'civilized". colonial discourse seek to exclude, of course, statements about the exploitation of the resources of colonized, the political status accruing to colonizing powers, the importance to domestic politics of the development of an empire, all of which may be compelling reasons for maintaining colonial ties. Rather it conceals these benefits in statements about the inferiority of the colonized. The primitive nature of other races, the barbaric depravity of colonized societies, and therefore the duty of the imperial owner to reproduce itself in the colonial society, and to advance the civilization of the colony through trade, administration, cultural and moral

improvement. Such is the power of colonial discourse that individual colonizing subjects are not often consciously aware of the duplicity of their position, for colonial discourse constructs the colonizing subject as much as the colonized.

Being developed in psychoanalysis to describe a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and wanting its opposite, ambivalence refers to a simultaneous attraction toward and repulsion from an object, person or action. Adopted into colonial discourse they by Homi Bhabha, "it describes the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between colonizers and colonized. The relationship is ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simply and completely opposed to the colonizer" (Ashcroft et al 12). Rather than assuming that some colonized subjects are 'complicit' and some 'resistant', ambivalence, suggests that complicity and resistance exist in a fluctuating between within the colonial subject. Ambivalence also characterizes the way in which colonial discourse relates to the colonized subject, for it may be both exploitative and nurturing, or represent itself as nurturing at the same time.

In Bhabha's theory, however, ambivalence disrupts the clear-cut authority of colonial domination because it disturbs the simple relationship between the colonizers and colonized. Ambivalence, therefore, unwelcome aspect of colonial discourse for the colonizer. The problems for colonial discourse is that it wants to produce compliant subjects who reproduce its assumption, habits and values- that is 'mimic' the colonizer. But instead it produces ambivalent subjects whose mimicry is never very far from mockery. In this regards Homi K. Bhabha goes to saying on *The Location of Culture*:

> It is form this area between mimicry and mercy, where the reforming civilizing mission is threatened by the displacing gaze of its

> disciplinary double, that [. . .] instance of colonial imitation come. What they all share is a discursive process by which the excess or slippage produced by the ambivalence of mimicry does not merely rupture the discourse. (86)

Ambivalence describes this fluctuating relationship between mimicry and mockery, ambivalence. In this respect, it is not necessarily disemboweling for the colonial subject; but rather can be seen to be ambivalent or two-powered'. The effect of this ambivalence is to produce a profound disturbance of the authority of colonial discourse.

Ambivalence therefore, Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin says that ambivalence given rise to a controversial position in Bhabha's theory, that because the colonial relations is a always ambivalent, it generates the seeds of its own destruction. This is controversial because it implies that the colonial relationship is going to be disrupted, regardless of any resistance or rebellion on the part of the colonized. It is because of search for a compliant subject [. . .] almost the same but not white. Bhabha's argument is that colonial discourse, say Ashcroft et al., is compelled to be ambivalent because it never really wants colonial subjects to be exact replica of colonizer [. . .] this would be too threatening.

Robert young has suggested that the theory of ambivalence is Bhabha's way of turning the tables in imperial discourses. The periphery which is regarded, young says, "The borderline, the marginal, the unclassifiable, the doubtful" by the centre, responds by constituting the centre as an "equivocal, indefinite, indeterminate ambivalence" (qtd. in Ashcroft et al. 14). But this is not a simple reversal of a binary. For Bhabha shows that both colonizing and colonized subjects are implicated in the ambivalence of colonial discourse. The concept is related to hybridity because, just as

ambivalence decentres authority form its position of power, so that authority may also became hybridized when placed in a colonial context in which it finds itself dealing with, and often inflected by, other culture.

Post Colonial Discourse and Hybridity

This is a much used word in contemporary theory and in postcolonial criticism is mostly employed in such terms as colonial discourse, which is specifically derived from Foucault's use of the concept. Discourse was originally used form the about the sixteenth century to describe any kind of speaking, talk or conversation, but became increasingly used to describe a more formal speech, a narration or treatment of any subject at length, a treatise, dissertation or sermon more recently discourse has been used in technical sense by linguistics to describe any unit of speech longer than a sentence.

The assertion of the text as taking place in space and time lead to the notion of text as a form of discourse. Every form of discourse neither written nor spoken, with its specific context, has a pragmatic function. In speech, the relationship between addressor and addressee, and the function of discourse and common cultural background through the exchange of language, are the relationship through which the discourse becomes fully meaningful. Foucault developed a theory of discourse in relation to power structures operating in society. Foucault's main thesis is that discourse is rooted in social institution and that social and political power operates through discourse. The discourse therefore is inseparable from power because discourse is ordering force that governs every institution.

Michael Foucault argued how the power creates the truth and the existing relationship between power and knowledge. Foucault says:

> In this strange world, knowledge become not so much a matter of fact as the outcome of struggle for power, in which events and discourse, vehicles of 'economies of power', created new 'net works' and 'regimes' of knowledge-regimes which world themselves survive only until such time as new one arose, capable of taking their place. Truth, therefore as Foucault remarks in a conversation regarding power and knowledge, was not outside power or lacking on it. (Truth and Power 41)

Discourse, therefore joins power and knowledge together. Those who have power have control of what is known and the way it is know, and those who have such knowledge have power over those who do not. This link between knowledge and power is particularly important in the relationship between colonizers and colonized, and has been extensively elaborated by Edward Said in his discussion of Orientalism, in which he points out that this discourse, this way of knowing the 'orient', is a way of maintaining power over it. Said insistence on the central role of literature in promoting colonialist discourse is elaborated in his later work, where he argues that the nineteen eth-century novel comes into being as part of the formation of Empire and acts reflexively with the forces of imperial control to established imperialism as the dominant ideology in the period. This emphasis has made Said's work of special interest to those concerned with postcolonial literature and literary theory.

As understood within the domain of postcolonial criticism, hybridity is the result of orientalist project of the west. The term has something to do with the traumatic colonial experience, since it is the 'ambivalent relationship 'of the colonizer and the colonized. The colonial settlers, once they arrived in an alien land, they felt the necessity of establishing new identity since they were displaced from their own point of origin. In colonized society there emerged a binary relationship between the

poles of two cultures, races and languages and such relation produced a hybrid or cross-cultural society.

One of the most widely employed and most disputed term in postcolonial theory; hybridity commonly refers to the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization. The fundamental discourse of hybridity lies in the anthropological and biological discourse of conquest and colonization. The modern move to deploy hybridity as a disruptive democratic discourse of cultural citizenship is a distinctly anti-imperial and antiauthoritarian development. The antecedents for this discourse lie in an intimidate negotiation between colonial objectness and modernity's new historic subjects, who are both colonizer and colonized.

Hybridity at best can be understood by referring to Bhabha's notion of 'ambivalence'. For Bhaba, it is the 'cultural cross-over' of various sorts emanating form the encounter between colonizer and the colonized. Ambivalence is the mixture of the colonizer and the colonized, where colonized people work in the consent of the colonizer. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin had defined ambivalence along Bhabha's line as "it describes the complex mix of attraction and reputation that characterizes the relationship between colonizer and colonized. The relationship is ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simple and completely opposed to the colonizer" (Ashcroft 12). Hybrid culture do exist in colonial society where people occupy an 'in-between' space by the 'mimicry' of the colonizer.

Hybridity, thus, is an expression of everyday life in the post-imperial era. It continuously alters the national and international. Hybridity draws on local and transnational identification and generates historically new meditations such 'mediation' are new because they are located outside the official practices of

citizenship situated in the interstices of new numerous legal and cultural boarders. Hybridity reverses the formal process of disavowal so that the violent dislocation of the act of colonization becomes the conditionality of colonial discourse.

Contrapuntal Reading

There are many reasons why the public reputation of Said comes to be thought extended by the brilliant literary works. Said has achieved a wide fame in literary horizon from his most acclaimed book *Culture and Imperialism* (1993). He mired the public reputation from the novel as he ranks among the great figure of the humanist tradition. In his most celebrated and ground breaking *Orientalism* (1978), Said equally attempt to show that all European discourse about orient, and all European scholars of the orient complicit in the aims of European imperialism equally ground breaking thesis in culture and Impearls. The gist is even so simple: a text must be referred and interpreted in its fullest context. This novel has properly treated and examined the social, cultural and political environment reflecting struggles against colonial domination, anti-colonial resistance that gave shape to the novel. The critic concept of contrapuntal reading sparklingly reflects “reading back” with the view of colonized ones’suppressed voice that brings the hidden colonial history so triumphantly inaugurates nineteenth century European literary texts. It attempt to show and celebrate the immense range of countries and literature from which the theorization of the post colonial conduit has emerges, and in so doing to place the more publicized recent concern of colonialist discourse theory in a wider geographic and historic context. *Culture and Imperialism* has come to stand for both the material effects of colonialism and the huge diversity of everyday and sometimes hidden responses to it throughout the world. Said mainly serves an amorphous term that

provides tools for cultural criticism with the major demonstration even in the discourse of the west and the rest evaluating their artistic worth.

In Orientalism Said examines western stereotypes about the orient and argues that orientalist scholarship is based on western imperialism. Said developed Foucault version of post structuralism and linked the theory and discourse with real socio-political struggle. He chiefly uses discourse theory to examine the western image of the orient and how actually Orientalism came to be constructed. Orientalism is discourse of the west about the east; a huge body of texts constructing certain stereotypes Said acknowledges meaning and adds “a western style for dominating, reconstructing, and having authority over the orient” (Orientalist 3). Orientalism in this sense is a discourse about the orient as the other and Europe which confirms Europe’s dominant position Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffths and Helen Tiffin write with the same vain in their book *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* “Orientalism depends for its strategy on this flexible positional superiority which puts the westerner in a whole series of possible relationship with the orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand” (46).

In *Orientalism*, said attempts to show that all European discourse about the Orient is the same, and all European scholars of the orient conflict in the aims of European imperialism. *Orientalism* examines the origin and development of a body of knowledge related to the Arab-Islamic world produced by Western scholars. The text reveals the body of knowledge, much of it accumulated after Napoleons invasion of Egypt in 1798, in voluminous but contradictory. On the one hand, it incorporates scientific observation; on the other hand, it makes use of imaginative speculation to produce erroneous stereotypes of the orient its land and people examining the works of early orientalist scholars such as Constantin Volney and William Jones the critic

finds that their scholarship objects both a Willingness to investigate a non-European part of the world with an open mind and scientific objectivity, and a legacy of mistrust of Muslims who had fought Christian Europe for centuries. Said acknowledges ordinary meaning and adds: "a style of thought base upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between the orient and the occident, a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the orient" (*Orientalism* 4). *Orientalism* in the sense is a discourse about the orient as the "other" of Europe, which confirms Europe's dominant position. Orientalist studies far and widely spread through the work of Sylvester de Sacy and Renan in France, and Edward William Lane in Britain. Said considers the orient to be the source of the West's deepest and most recurring images of the other. It helps define Europe in terms of contrast: one culture is what the other is not.

If Said's *Orientalism* suggests to the readers that East-west encounters reflect native passivity, *Culture and Imperialism* offers a corrective. In *Culture and Imperialism*, Said continues his unique and extremely important critical work. At a time when literary criticism has tended to become an energetic game, Said emphasizes its relation to the vast problems now he is facing with the world as a whole, and argues with great forces for the essential changes of attitude required of honest intellectuals. It states with the critique of culture perceived as controversially isolated from its worldly affiliation which Said contends leads to a disjunction of the cultural realm from its connection to power. He defines "worldliness" as the intellectuals' engagement with contemporary political realists and commitment to connecting the text to the world. He argues that all texts are always trapped in circumstances, time, place and society, involved in particular historical situations and hence "worldly". In his view texts are worldly in the sense that they are "part of the

social world, human life, and of course the historical movements in which they are located and interpreted" (The World 4). He is of the opinion that the works, in particular the novels, that originated in the modern western empires of the nineteenth and twentieth century better illustrate the worldliness of culture. Said goes on to show that the worldly affiliation of metropolitan cultural productions can be foregrounded through an analysis of their "structure of attitude and reference" and through the practice of contrapuntal reading, which consists in looking at the cultural" with a simultaneous awareness both of the metropolitan history that is narrated and of those histories against which the dominating discourse acts" (51). Through a contrapuntal analysis of Victorian and French novels, the book illustrates the link between European literature and imperial ideology. The book massively discusses anti-imperial resistance discourses arising out of the peripheries. Said considered the orient is almost a European intention, and has been since antiquing a place for romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences. It is an integral part of European material civilization and culture to express and represent that part culturally and even ideologically as a mode of discourse with supporting institutions, doctrines even colonial bureaucracies, define Europe in terms of culture and what the other is not. The text calls for inclusion, not destruction; it is a richer study of the cultural treasures of the west and its others. It depends upon the historical context of the empire and its aftermaths.

Said views that the text is a silent printed object and explores the Worldliness of texts. The mode of the text is to produce "Secular criticism" which is possible through the contrapuntal analysis. This reading does not take recourse to only re-reading of a text; rather it "must take account of both processes, that of imperialism and that of resistance to it, which can be done by extending our reading of the texts to

include what was once forcibly excluded" (66). He points out the blending of metropolitan history of colonization and peripheral history of resistance leads one to come up with the secular criticism. And, he highly emphasize on this mode of criticism due to his view of the world from the different angle which highlight "all cultures are involved in another; one is single and pure, all are hybrid, extraordinarily differentiated and unondithic" (xxv). Said seem to circulate in the relationship between the metropolitan west and its impact on Europeans and non-Europeans. In this contra punctual analysis there is the judgement of a text from both aesthetic and historical sense which balances views of a work uniquely.

The study of the relationship between *Culture and Imperialism* develops neither chronological nor simple anecdotal narrative, but attempt at a globalized (not total) description. by looking at the different experiences contrapuntally, as making up a set of what Said insists "intertwined and overlapping histories . . . try to formulate and alternative both to a politics of blame and to even more destructive politics of confrontation and hostility" (18). Said, in his analysis acts emphasize upon novels, the European novels. He puts the lasting effect of imperialism emerges with them. Imperialism during nineteenth and twentieth centuries, he contends, was mere "thinking about, settling on, controlling land you do not possess, that is distant that lived on and owner by others" (7).

Said insisted that literary and discursive texts are not so much embedded in history as sediment with history, the history with which texts are sediment rarely fits within some rigid of subversion and containment because it belongs to that he called." The essential unmasterble presence that constitutes a large part of historical and social situations" (72). He finds the novel an incorporative historical form and an entire system of social references.

His attempts at a contrapuntal reading in history that sees western and non-western experiences as belonging together because they are connected by imperialism, second, by an imaginative, even utopian vision which reconceived emancipator theory and performance. Third, by an investment neither tin new authorities, doctrines, nor encoded orthodoxies, nor in established institutions and causes, but in a particular sort of nomadic, migratory, and anti-narrative energy. That is precisely why his contra punctual interpretation is "assailable neither to the standard view of particular text noir more generally to prevailing views of the great master narratives" (111).

> In a counterpoint of the western classical musical music, various themes play off one another, with only a provisional privilege being given to any particular one, yet in resulting polyphony there is concert and order, an organized interplay that derives from the themes, not from melodic formal principle outside the work. In the same way, I believe we can read and interpret English novels. (50)

The culture is a concept that has undergone massive change. Most people, said believes are aware of one culture, one setting and one home; exiles, however, are aware of at least two. And this plurality of vision gives rise to a contrapuntal awareness of simultaneously dimensions. He evokes relationship of exile's heightened awareness of multiple dimensions. the position of exile grants a critic and scholar a plural consciousness which can he express through the notion of contrapunctality and links it to the experience of exile.

Said was born in Palestine in 1935 and grew up in Arab speaking household that valued European Education. It was his father's influence he learned value of European language schooling. He completed his undergraduate degree at Princeton

and his doctorate at Harvard. he charts his education in Cairo Through the British and American English language school system. He was aware of the inappropriateness of curriculum to his own needs. Life in British school gave him both a sense of colonial authority and feeling of exclusion from the lives of the educational experience in Egypt to be a ambiguous one.

Since his childhood he experienced war and exile. Political conflict of Israel and Arab has changed his life. He finds himself as an outsider among Americans supporting Israel in the conflict as he was living and working in the United States. This political awaking has played an important role for his intellectual development. He no longer believed that he could- or should keep his political and academic paradise separately. The critics struggle with a sense of exile as well as his commitment to link the text to the world became key elements to his life.

In his writing said examines a hierarchy of race and the right of race belong to the superior position. He encourages readers to re-examine western perceptions- and misconceptions of the Third World, explore colonial resistance to imperialism while racing imperialist complicities in the works of modern European Canonical Writers and craft a sensitive memory that depicts the complexities of trans-cultural identities. He emphasizes upon the imbalance of power between occident and orient caused by the western imperial dominance, the critic provides the reader with the concept of imaginative geography, dichotomy between "our land" and "their land". West is a self government producing factory and self-government is a stuff, which should be imported from the occident to the orient. Said opines that such types of ideas and knowledge are formed to dominate and to rule over the orient. According to Said, the Westerners treat as if the regions of non-western world "have no life, history or culture to speak of, no independence or integrity worth representing without the west.

And when there is something to be descried it is [. . .] unutterably corrupt, degenerate, irredeemable" (*Culture and Imperialism* xix). If name viewed trough the Orientals spectacle, the home space that western occupies is safe and secure; the rest is unknown and dangerous. Therefore Said explores the method of contra punctual reading that allows him to read novels of empire with a simultaneous awareness of metropolitan history and the concealed history of the colonized and to engage postcolonial writers sharing his commitment and preoccupations the continued struggle to unearth repressed or resistant history, the importance of worldliness, the experience of exile and the value of revisit *Orientalism*.

The following concepts are the matter of hot discussion while carrying out the narration of the third world issues that brilliantly give the halo effect of colonial and post-colonial ethos.

III. Orientalizing India: Kipling's *Kim* and Forster's *A Passage to India*

Both the writers Kipling and Forster have extended the Indian life and culture in their widely-acclaimed novels *Kim* and *A Passage to India* respectively. Both the novels are striving and aspiring to accentuate the clear-cut picture of every nook and corner of Indian society during colonial period and its pervasive material effects. Western perspective to look at the Indian society with the established parameters can not be denied in the both novels. Every length and breadth of the novels hereby has been highlighted with a view to doing contrapuntal study.

Kim is the story of Kimball O'Hara, an orphan, who, at the beginning of the novel, lives in the city of Lahore in India. He is Irish by birth but can easily pass on Indian as he is bazaar-forestered (he more or less grew up on the streets) and years in the sun has Given him the same skin tone as the natives. Kim can also speak numerous varieties of Hindi fluently and he blends in among people of different castes as is described as a "sahib" (a European man) who wears native clothes.
The story begins when Kim meets a Lama and decides to follow him as his disciple. The Lama is in search of the River of the Arrow which, he believes, mill grant him salvation and free him for his signs. Kim and the Lama travel through many cities and a verities of landscapes and they meet people of different castes and origins. Apart from a disruption when Kim is adopted by his late father's regiment and put in school, the two friends stay together throughout the whole story and experience many adventures before finally finding the River of Arrow. For instance, Kim is recited into the British serest service and takes part in the 'Great Game' of espionage played out with the Russians.

In *Kim*, the hill-people's society is described as polyandrous which is form of polygamy, and the most prominent character among the hill-people is the woman of

Shapleigh. The woman of Shapleigh is an interesting character in that even though she offers her love to men she does not seem to like them, her husbands (whom she refers to as cattle) in particular, similarly the main *Pathan* character in *Kim* is a man called Mahbub Ali complained to the Afghans. Kipling has written about Mahbub Ali who does not have that many stereotypical traits.

However, he does possess the impulses of a *Pathan* and every now and then his blood-thirst shining through. Hurree Moskerjee, who is also called Hurree Babu, is an educated Bengali Hindu, and hybrid who possesses both western knowledge and eastern superstition. He also possesses many other characteristics that Kipling considered typical of Bangali Hindu, he is for instance fearful, does not like responsibility, and he is good at lying.

In *Kim*, Kipling also spends time describing different religions and he focuses on Hinduism, Buddhism and Islam. For instance, at the time Kim was written the caste rules still dictated how people live their lives, and Kipling has also included many references to magical practice and superstitions in his work, the most important which is the Lama himself as Lamas are believed to have magical powers. On one occasion in the novel some Hillmen get extremely upset when a Russian strikes the Lama full on the face. They believe that committing such a grave sacrilege as striking a holy man will result in serious materials consequences, not only for the one who does the deed for the people witnessing the event as well. However, the Lama is also Buddhist symbol and his search for the River of the Arrow can likened to the Buddhist's strives to reach Nirvana.

Kipling gives a very detailed account of India. Kipling himself was born in Bombay in 1865, but left India in 1872. He did, however, return in 1882 and then left for good in 1889. This means that he lived a total of 13 years in the country he clues

as the setting for history about Kim. Still, as he was European man living in India some claim that what he writes about is a glorified version of India. He never actually spent time with the people he wrote about and therefore we are presented with a train-window picture of life instead of a true one. Kim actually seems to have a great deal in common with Kipling himself. Kim is of British origin although he was born in India. He is more fluent in the Indian language Hindustani than in English, and he lives a carefree life wondering the streets of Lahore. All these things were also true of Kipling.

Throughout *Kim*, the protagonist, Kim moves between the white and nonwhite worlds in India with the case and skill of a chameleon. His unique ability to ignore caste divisions and experiences true freedom of motion allows Kipling to render a vision of India unconstrained by typical limits of perspective. The motif of Kim's white blood further provides a unifying there for the portrayal of India's struggle between British Imperialism and national pride. There is a deep connection between imperial power and the will-to-knowledge, evident in the narrative of Kipling. In *Kim*, the first British institution we encounter is the Museum at Lahore, where we find how artifacts of the various cultures of past and present of colonial territory are assembled; studied and catalogued. Having a glance at the lives of Kipling more clearly:

> In the entrance-hall stood the large figure of the Greco-Buddhist sculptures [. . .] there were hundreds of pieces, friezes of figures in relief, fragments of statues and slabs crowded with figures that had encrusted the brick walls of the Buddhist *Stupas* and *Vihars* of the North country and now, dug up labeled, made the pride of the Museum. (7)

Kipling's main goal in *Kim* is to show a nostalgic picture of India with a starry attention to minute details of its rich tapestry of cultures to readers in Europe. With sweeping views of the country from southern cities to northern mountains, Kim's adventures explore the totality of the empire in a manner reminiscent of Odysseus, "seeing all India spread out to left and rights [and feelings] these things, though could not give tongue to his feeling" (77). Kipling wants to be so enthralled with India and so familiar with his love for the land that he can share the taste of Kim's sugar-cane and the Lama's snuff (78). This scene on the Grand Trunk Road typifies the sweeping view of India Kipling is attempting to render. Yet, the novel's focus is not exclusively on a distant bird's eye view of India from above, where it can be seen spreading out from a distance, but an intimate safari into places English men cannot enter without the help of Kim, who can befriend anyone and pass unnoticed into the heart of India.

Said in his article, "Kim, the Pleasures of Imperials", argues for the need to discuss the novel with a focus on its extrinsic context "we must not unilaterally abrogate the connections in it [history and political circumstance], and carefully observed by Kipling, to its contemporary actually" (Said 41). Said's main extrinsic connection is the sepoy mutiny, which was fresh on most English minds. Kipling, he assumes, must have ignored the true drive behind the rebellion freedom from English imperialism as he viewed British power as the logical and welcome goal in India.

Assumptions aside, Kipling clearly recognized the social hierarchy in India and it is meticulous in his attention to castes and their mannerism. In this manner Kim is aware of contemporaneous social and political baggage, incorporating current realities into the core of this novel. In this regards said argues, "The division between white and non white India as elsewhere, was absolute and is alluded to throughout Kim: a Sahib's is a sahib, and no amount of friendship or camaraderie can change the

sediments of racial differences" (Said 30). Yet, despite this absolute sending thesis, Kipling manages to disprove said with Kim, who is both white and nonwhite. Kim remains subordinate to the Lama for the duration of the novel in this position of *chela*, begging for him, washing his feet and carrying his baggage. It is precisely this ability to shrug of a Sahib's niche in Indian society that allows Kim to enter the nonwhite world. Thus, Said's racist judgment of British absolutes finds an exception in *Kim*.

Race, nevertheless, plays a crucial role in the novel and is the focus of its main motif, Kim's white blood is referenced in various places, despite the lack of necessity because of its significant in the context of an empire ruled by white men. The opening lines of the novel identify Kim without complication as "white, a poor white of the very poorest" (3). This is the centerpiece of his personality and several of his non-Indian mannerisms and instincts are attributed to his English heritage, despite his total lack of white men. Nurturing Kim swiftly picks up the roped silver because "he was Irish enough by birth or reckons silver the least part of any game" (31). This explanation of his behavior seems illogical because Kim does not even know what "Irish" means, much less how such people supposedly behave clearly Kipling, imagination wondered during this passage, but that hardly justifies other similar passages. For example, Kim claim to hate snakes and the narrator attributes this to" the white man's horror of the serpent" (44). Considering both his parents died before he can remember them and his step mother was a half-caste which is difficult to determine where such instincts arise from other than from a dogmatic Irish predisposition that can't be erased with nurturing.

Another scene shows "Kim's white blood set (ting) him upon his feet" "where a native would have lain down" (48) . Kim does not understand Sahib's and can not relate to them until he has finished his training at St. Xavier's after living with white

people and learning their customs, Kim can understand the Priest's and Mahbub Ali's assertion that "once a sahib always a Sahib" (82). Yet, throughout the novel Kim rebels this labeling "I do not want to be a Sahib" (114). To accept the priest and Mahbub Ali would mean his chameleon powers has vanished and he could no longer enter the nonwhite would. This is the key dilemma in the novel, and it is something Kipling never resolves in the end how Kim assimilates his work for the British government and his love for India culture is an issue Kipling either fears to face or neglects to perceive. The closest the novel approaches to laddering this issue:

> But I am to pray to Bibi Miriam, and I am a Sahib! He looks at his boots ruefully. No; I am Kim. This is the great world, and I am only Kim. Who is Kim? He considered his own identity a thing he had never done before, till his head swam. He was one insignificant person in all this roaring whirl of India, going southward to he know not where fare. (111)

This existential passage faces Kim's duality head on. He can not be both Indian and sahib according to the rules of the society, but somehow he is exactly that dichotomy, Kim concludes that he is Indian, as implied in the title "insignificant person". If he were a Sahib he would not be insignificant and could not be mixed in the "roaring whirl of India". Another passage shows Kim's dichotomy is when he states his necessity to "be free and go among my people so there wise I die!" (125). Kim accepts the Sahib training as practice for another disguise and a necessary step to play the Game, but does not embrace the training as a connection to his born heritage. The possessive connection with the people of India and the desire for freedom of motion betray Kim's true identity as an Indian at heart "what am I? Mussalman, Hindu, Jain, or Buddhist? That is a hard knot" (134).

Kim's definable identity challenges the notions of empire as applied to the novel extrinsically Kipling denies the absolute power of race in social order, white superiority is debunked and asserted in Kim's dichotomy. On the one hand, Kim is successful because he is not a British native and can view the richness of India because he is part of it. On the other hand, Kim is the only person in the novel who can see all the beauty in India and he happens to be a white mans thus implying that a non white could not have the same vantage point. Thus empire is in the back of Kipling's mind at all times, even while attempting to flee from it in the most genuine setting in India. Kim's blood and related identity dilemma is best restive when he speaks to the Lama, reminding him of his blindness to race:

> Now I look upon thee often, and every time I remember that those art a Sahib". It is strange though has said there is neither black nor white. Why plague me with this talk, holy one? Let me rub the other foot. It vexes me. I am not a sahib. I am they *chela*, and my head is heavy on my shoulders. (323)

Rudyard Kipling's Kim in reveals a genuine love and sympathy for India but remains a jingoistic product of its time and place. Benita parry points out that" the history of Kipling criticism mirrors the history of attitudes to the imperial encounter itself" (205). Several of the characters in *Kim* illustrate the underlying links between imperialism and anthropology, Lama and the museum creator at Lahore is the first instance of this type of relationship in the novel. It is surely anomalous for the white creator to have the authority of knowledge in to educate him through "the labours of European scholars, who have identified the holy places of Buddhism" (7). By cataloguing, labeling, and classifying Indian ritual and practice the curator has somehow acquired a body of knowledge which renders the Lama helpless" as a child

(7). Time and again in *Kim* it ill be shown how western knowledge is used to appropriate autonomy and agency from the Indian people.

Although he is designated the "little friend of the world" (2). Kim reiterates raciest theory about the inherent irrationality and discarder of the Indian psyche. Kim's value to Creighton and therefore to imperialism lies in his ability to 'pass' a native. However his Sahibhood is stressed from the outset…" though he consorted on thermos of perfect equality with the small boys of the bazaar; Kim was while" (1). Kim roves his racial superiority by his strength of resistance to eastern mesmerism aided by the recitation of his multiplication tables. Kipling repeatedly exploits his relationship with Indians but, far from questioning his motives, they prove to be complicit in the abstraction of the great game. Political realities of the era are ignored in favour of an implied 'natural' relationship between sahib, Pathan, Tibetan, and Bengali.

Just as the museum curator patronized the Lama, Kim itself has been viewed as a realistic representation of India. It acts as another example of how colonial powers judge themselves best qualified to represent the colonized nation to itself and others. Kipling's vision of "happy Asiatic disorder" (56) on the grand trunk road has often been read as indicative of the 'real' India instead of a nostalgic evocation of a much loved childhood. Blurring distinctions between caste and class, Kipling also manages to blur distinctions between the colonizers and the colonized. In many aspects *Kim* has tended to function as an anthropological text as it cultivated popular opinion of India an the colonial experience. While the modern reader can recognize the ideology behind Kipling's reductive maxims it is important to appreciate the links between rational sciences and the core projects of imperialism.

Kipling, while portraying Indian life and culture, hides the reality of contemporary imperial history that is the conflict between the tow-English the ruler and Indian the ruled. His portrait of India is not as it should be because it lacks 'conflicts'. He fails to dramatize the conflicts between the two the ruler and the ruled. If we put it into the words of Phillip E. Wagner it seems:

> By imaginatively holiness the incommensurable social realities of the Indian ruled and the British rules at arm's length from one another, Kipling finds himself unable to dramatize the "fundamental conflicts" that was central fact of imperial Indian history. (130)

So, in order to bolster the fiction of an uncontested British rule, Kipling had no any option left except obscuring the real conflicts that took place within the historical context of colonial India. Instead of showing harmonious India which was not during the time of the gestation of *Kim*, Kipling would have shown what we call in the worlds of Edmund Wilson, "large social force, or uncontrolled lines of destiny or antagonistic impulses of the human spirit, struggling with one another" (qtd. in Wagner 130).

This the ideological function of all "imaginary" and some "symbolic" imperial literature is to articulate and justify the moral authority of the colonizer and by literature is to articulate and justify the moral authority of the colonizer and by positing the inferiority of the native as a metaphysical fact to mask the pleasure the colonizer derives form that authority.

Although each text has its own genuine of geographical region of the world, it overlaps experiences and interdependent histories of conflict. As far as imperial work is concerned a distinction between particularity and sovereignty can use fully made.

Obviously on reading should try to generalize so much as to affect the identity, by the same token Said in his *Culture and Imperialism* writes:

> Kipling's India, in Kim has a quality of permanence and inevitability that belongs not just to that wonderful novel, but to British India, its history, administrators, and apologists and no less important to the India fought for by Indian nationalists as their country to be won back [. . .] Kipling's Indian process of imperialism itself as the great work of art engages them, and of later anti-imperialist resistance. (67)

Kim cannot be seen, then as a book of linear movement or a series of loosely woven together episodes. Nor can it be seen merely as a set of three configurations comprising of Kim, the Lama and the Great Game. It is infect a work of Kipling's which is the most organically integrated, where form the content have indeed merged, and it represents India the India which the sages and the men of action had tried to create. Kipling catches the true spirit of the nation: in his interpretation of the secular and the spiritual he presents the genius of the country. It is in his sense that Kim is not an imperialistic or colonial novel but an interpretation of a civilization more truthful and penetrating.

In *A Passage to India,* E.M. Forster, without a doubt, made profound impression the things that most fascinate him about the country and its culture. While presenting Indian life in the novel, forester caught in between colonialism and resurgent nationalism. He basically portrays world of cultural encounter between the east as represented by the native Indian characters and their religion and cultural preoccupation, and the west as represented by the bureaucratic Anglo-Indian and English people in a social, cultural and political context. He advocates Indian nationalism movement with the critique of British Raj. On this regard Binita Parry has

rightly comment the novel "can be seen as at once inheriting and interrogating the discourses of the Raj" (qtd in Davides et al. 13-14).

Most of the critics such as Edward Said, Homi K. Babha and others take of *A Passage to India*, as an encounter between the east and west while regarding the west as superior in its culture and civilization. Highlighting the western imperial culture, they try to justify ultimately unapproachable. Forster places all the European Anglo-Indian characters in the position of power from where they not only can describe and define the Indian categories but also can enforce and impose the so-called truths… the West is superior and the East is inferior […] that they are supposed to have embodies, and that it is natural for them to take it as their duty to legitimize those truths. Native critics of imperial Anglo-Indian take an account of forester's misrepresentation of Indian life and characters. They argue the picture of India is discriminated because forester himself has inherited on an orientalist mind and looks Indian form orientalist eyes.

Forster puts interest in human relationship in the novel a passage to Indian. Here relationship in terms of separation Lionel trilling has said:

> Forester's novel is in a passage to India, hugely expanded and everywhere dominant. The separation of race from race, sex from sex, culture form culture event of man from himself is what underlies every relationship. The separation of the English from the Indians is merely the most dramatic of the chasms in this novel. (151)

Trilling remarks the separation is the major event in tracing the novel. This means that the relationship between the characters does not remain enduring. They are separated culturally, socially, sexually and from religious point of view. There is a gulf between

Hindus and Muslims but they are united to each other because both of them stand against the English.

Forster's most obvious target is the unfriendly bigotry of the English in Indian, or the Anglo-Indian Indians as they were called. At times he scores them for their pure malice, as when Mrs. Collendar says, "The kindest thing one can do to a native is to let him die" (27). More tellingly, Forster shows up their bigotry as prejudice in the literal sense of pre-judgment the Anglo-Indian, as Forster them act on emotional preconceptions rather than rational and open minded examination of facts. When fielding loses a study just before his tea party Azia' in an impulsive gesture of friendship, hand over his own, pretending it is a spare. As an orientalist has the habit to misread the orient and the Orientals the basis of self-evident fake and amorphous ideas, Ronny, a role model of an orientalist in the novel, does the same. He consistently misjudges or misunderstands then behaviour of the Indians he meets because he does not know all the facts, either the reason why the Nawab Panics or why Aziz is lacking a collar-stud. Ronny ridicules Aziz's shabbiness, saying "Aziz was exquisitively dressed, from tie-pin to spats, but he has forgotten his back collar-stud, and there you have the Indians all over inattention to detail; the fundamental slackness that reveals the race" (82). But what the reality is that Ronny's criticism of Aziz's dress, the collar climbing up his neck, has been a result of lending the stud to Fielding, a sign of his generosity. So, Ronny without reaching to the facts, has demonstrated his homogeneous attitude towards the Indians as has been showed by western orientalist in different texts.

India in the novel frequently referred as a "muddle" not necessarily but because of logical western mind that does not accept the extreme diversity of Indian religions, society, wildlife and even architecture westerners always trying to

categorize and label things, but India defies labeling. But the Indian quietly accept this diversity, not as a muddle but as a mystery that accepted but cannot be explained in terms of reason. Additionally, Indians relay more on emotion and intuition in their judgments of people and event, where as British are always trying to make their opinions scientific and logical, like Mc Bryde with his pseudo-scientific theory about the lusting after of dark men for while woman. These differences in outlook and psychology, forester implies, are the ultimate differences between the westerners and Indians. For western minds, shackled by reason and race, cannot understand the Indian psyche.

Hunt Hawkins rightly observes the novel "suggest a solution to the echo of course there is some doubt, however whether Forster himself subscribed to this solution [. . .] contributes nothing to the argument against the Raj since it transcends politics and all other worldly concerns" (62). The solution is Hinduism which is shown countering the echo by abandoning reason and embracing the muddle of the universe with irrational joy. While Hinduism may provides a metaphysical solution. K. Vankata Reddy, while analyzing social and political image of India terms to religious and cultural theme of the novel when he argues that "the principle and most dominant image that A passage to India projects is essentially religious and spiritual" which an image is presented through its three fold symbolic structure- "mosque", caves" and "temple" each presents a different aspects of Indian religious and cultural belief" (616). Of course, more accurately, the three parts of the novel comprise different versions of an English writer's western perspective on certain aspects of Indian culture. Leland Monk Further supports on saying "characterization three different narrative modes used in relation to three areas of Indian culture that consider in the noel, explores the way accommodates subject mater and storytelling technique

to the place, meaning and philosophic-religious importance of Muslim mosque, per-historic cave, and Hindu temple" (393).

Forster sense of being an imperialist comes to fore as the treatment Aziz receives in his very first encounter with the British in the novel. The two ladies take his carriage and ignore his very existence. "The inevitable snub-his bow gnored, his carriage taken"(18). They "glanced at the Indian and turned instinctively away" upon seeing Aziz and, when "he called courteously" to them, they "did not reply bring full of their own affairs" (18) Paul B. Armstrong observes the events and rightly comments, " appropriating his object while denying his status as a fellow human subject, they act as if he were invisible" (368). This ladies treat Aziz not only shows their hatred for the native Indian, whom they despise as Belonging to an inferior race, but also demonstrates their attitudes of ignoring the existence of a human race, simply because he does not fall in their category. Mc Bryde fells fielding "The psychology here is different" (166). Mc Bryde promulgates psychological laws which justify his right to treat Indians as objects of his administrative power. As law which claims to know others better than they know themselves. As said says knowing other not only means identifying other but also showing dominance over others, Armstrong seems to be right when he posits, "whether in the form of regarding others as beneath notice or of categorizing them according to preset ideas, knowing is an act of taking power over others if it is not a reciprocal recognition which respects each person's right to self-definition" (360).

As orientalist have the habit of generalizing eastern culture and civilization, Forster does not succeed in keeping himself aloof from the habit of orientalist. Tony Davies seems to be right when he writes". The novel seems to be unable to entirely extricate itself from the kind of generalizing Orientalism" (15). The symptomatic

slippage from particular to general, not merely to this or that character but to the 'oriental' as a whole is well illustrated by the passage describing Aziz's suspicion that fielding has persuaded him not to press his defamation suit against Adela quested because she is his mistress:

> Aziz did not believe his own suspicious-better if he had, for then he would have denounced and cleared the situation up. Suspicion and believe could in his mind exist side by side. They sprang from different sources, and need never intermingle. Suspicion in the oriental is a sort of malignant tumor, a mental malady that makes him self-conscious and unfriendly suddenly; if he trusts and mistrusts at the same time in a way of westerner can not comprehend. (272)

It is the very habit of Orientalism which *A passage to India* has portrayed the British India from the stand point of liberal humanist critique of British imperialism. If we view from the perspective of colorized Indian people, Forster's representation of India tends to be questionable; he has recreated so as to make them fit into the images and stereotypic set by the generation of the western orientalists. Anglo-Indian characters are projected as if they are the gift of the west to the east as an emissary of justice and civilization and their superiority has been established as 'The English men posing as gods' (69). A loyal servant to the government Ronny performs the duty to serve western imperialism. For them ruling is more important than anything else for them. Ronny's conversation with his mother Mrs. Moore portrays this conviction:

> We're not out here, for the purpose of behaving pleasantly […] were out here to do justice and keep the peace – I am out here to work mind, to hold his wretched country by force [. . .]we are not pleasant in India,

and we don't intend to be pleasant, we've something more important to do. (69)

This comment to the native Indians by Anglo-Indian sounds very arrogant. Like Runny, many other Anglo-Indian from ruling party seems unable to come out from the prison slaughter house of colonial mentality. This 'brutal conqueror' and 'sundried bureaucrat' hold a law opinion about the Indians in general.

Although this novel can be taken as manuscript of Orientalism but it also bridges the gulf between east and west thus, it serves as an account fostering national hood and nationality. As a study of race relations *A Passage to India* provides a pitiless exposure of the evils of the British rule in India, the degrading effects it had on both the rulers and the ruled. Forster vividly shows how the ruling Anglo-Indians, by being racially arrogant and insensitive, have destroyed their chances of winning over their Indian subject which ultimately serves as the fuel for spreading the sprits of National hood through national unity.

Commenting upon the positive details U.R. Rao argues "however there is the other aspect of India, the positive side, and from this follows another of Forster's themes-the theme of unity and affirmation. While there is a deep underlying sadness at the heart of novel, that is relieved by occasional glimpses of harmony that transcends the distinction between the finite and the infinite, the human and the divine" (10). On the same regard Hunt Hawkins comments the novel and writes, "The chief argument against imperialism in E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* is that it prevents personal relationship" (54). Thus, Forster positioned himself as a kind of humanist barometer between points east and west, predicting machine faced mounting threats of insurrection among the colonies.

A Passage to India was written in 1924 when the British Empire had been shaken to its very foundation under external pressure, and when disturbances in India itself had forced the English rulers to look for a new kind of relationship with the colony, a kind of relationship which would be free from the tension inherent in the old one. This "whether it is possible to be friends with an Englishman" (12) is a reality the theme of the novel and the answer of the question is provided near the end of the novel by Dr. Aziz:

> Down with the English anyhow. That's certain clear out you fellows, double quick, I say. We may hate one another, but we hate you most. If I don't make you go, Ahmed hill, Karim will, if its fifty five-hundred years we shall get rid of you, yes, we shall drive every blasted Englishman into the sea, and then [. . .] and then you and I shall be friends. (317)

These lines addressed to fielding direct the rhetoric of political independence towards affection and friendship and show that for Aziz political independence is not an end in itself. The real end is the transformation of hate into friendship.

This book is a social document about the British in India and about the Indians in British India. Forster discusses friendship and religion. His attention to the social and historical context is to make India, a land of multiplicity. The unveiling of the mystery that is India provides the crucial speculative background for forster's examination of human relationship. Professor Godbole, in inhom east and west meet in harmony, provides an answer to the problem. As V.A. Shahane observes:

> The festival of Lord Krishna's birth symbolizes renewal and regeneration and Godbole's attempt to encompass everything, to transcend the chaos and nullify and to reach out to the unity and

> affirmation which lie beyond the transitory disorder is a significant spiritual quest. His search for the spiritual is limited neither by place nor by time but is beyond them. (281)

Thus, the festival builds up to a reassertion of the possibility of personal relations, an affirmative answer to the negating echo of the Marabar.

A Passage to India is about the difficulties men face in trying to understand each other and the universe they live in. The understanding each other remains until there is equality in terms of politics, social and economical aspects. The main cause behind the failure of friendship is the imbalance of power between the two. Hunt Hawkins Writes, "Forster shows how intolerance results from the unequal power relationship between English and Indians" (56). Officialism can also be taken as an obstacle of relationship until it corrupts man with power. English at first friendly with Indians as soon as they find the role of British Raj, they begin to treat them unfairly where "Officialism very human relationship suffers" (207). Any relationship based on inequality of power inevitably leads to failure, Forster advocates Indian Nationality. As they tried to legitimize British Raj breaks the relationship of Britishers with Indian freedom fighter especially with Mahatama Ganmdhi. Thus, Indian national congress gave authority to lead Indian independence movement to Gandhi and purpose of the Non-Cooperation movement. With the view to the end of the Raj Forster captures the soul of nationalist movement. On the same regard Hawkins comments "Forster's novel does not explicitly spell out what has happened in the previous ten years, however, the book is full of muted references to recent events" (59). The most important among these was the 1919 surprising in the Amritsar of Punjab which the British brutally suppressed. Lionel Trillin in the same vein writes "*A passage to India* is not a radical novel, its data were gathered in 1912 to 1922, before the full spate of

Indian nationalism" (148). In response to Amritsar massacre, Gandhi launched the Non-cooperation movement, through all incidents [. . .] renouncing of Nawab Bahadur title strike of students and swear of Mohammedan ladies "to take no food until the prisoner was acquitted" (209) successfully capture the spirit of nationalist movement.

Thus, the image of India has been projected by Forster in *A passage to India* and *Kim.* In doing so, both the writers have celebrated portrayal of India at the high watermark of British imperial domination; have occupied a special place in the complex field of imperialist literature. Although their chauvinistic and racist overtones are now generally acknowledged, both *A Passage to India* and *Kim* also represent many positive detailed and non-stereotypic portrait of the colonized that is unique in colonial literature. In the length and breadth of both the texts there is a brilliant dramatization of the dialectic between native India and colonial Britain.

IV. Conclusion

It is almost impossible to arrive at a conclusion in any literary work in general and widely acclaimed works like *Kim* and *Passage to India* in particular. The power of both novels lies in the fact that they have drawn the attention of number of readers and critics from the very outset of their publication. Though there are several readings of these texts, the present study has drawn a distinct conclusion through an application postcolonial critical theory.

Both the writers- Kipling and Froster have presented Indian life and culture in their novels- *Kim* and *A Passage to India* ambivalently. *Kim* introduces a positive, detailed, and nonstereotypic portrait of the colonized Indian life. Kipling does not look at India as a poor and weak country inhabitated by a week and uncivilized people which ahs been easily overrun and subjected by a western power, but as a land of mystery and grandeur beyond the comprehension of the ordinary westerners.

It, then, come to us as a novel of cosmic significance. Froster men and women, even animals and apparently inanimate objects such rocks participate in the cosmic drama. The image of India projected by Forster in *A Passage to India* is complex. The significance of the image steam from the vision that embraces all the structures. By giving an account of this series of pressures and counter pressures in Kipling's India, the process of imperialism itself as the great work of art engages them, and of later anti-imperialist resistance. The issues that Froster raises in *A Passage to India* are of enduring interest. It is unique in English fiction in its presentation of the complex problems which were to be found in the relationship between the British and the Indians and its portrayal of the Indian scene in all its magic and all its wretchedness. As the study of the British rule in India, it mercilessly exposes the racial arrogance and thoughtless snobbery displayed by the ruling Anglo-Indians towards Indians

which is shown to be solely responsible for the wide gulf separating the rulers and the ruled. Forster and Kipling on the one hand stereotype India and the Indians, and on the other hand privilege Indian life and culture. While stereotyping India and the Indians, they have their own way to deal with the subject matter, but they reached to their common point [. . .] that is to demean the Indians. Their liberal attitude fails to work and their sense of being the members of colonial nation and their colonial mentality come to the fore although they have tried to be liberal humanist with India and its culture. Their representation of Indian life and culture turns out to be a fiasco. Both have been guided by western superiority of the process of othering through the medium of discourse. However, as Forster shows in the novel, the Indians are not free form vices either. While Froster is sympathetic towards the Indians, he does not spare them from his satire and shows them as being unreliable, suspicious and childish. Forster allows the emotions and values instilled in him during his social formation in an alien culture to inform his appraisals of the other in *A Passage to India'* as Kipling does in *Kim.* These two novels offer the most interesting attempts to overcome the barriers of racial differences. Forster attempts to articulate conflicts raging among nations and civilizations while perpetuating the collective ethos of Anglo-India in the 1920s. The crux of Forster's effort is an interrogation of hegemonic rhetoric; an attempts both criticize and more covertly through an imperil legal crisis precipited by the intangible experiences of the newly arrived Briton, Adela Quested. It is this civic crisis, fueled by Adela Quested's gender and nationality, that is the catalyst for anti-imperial consciousness between the novel's male protagonists, Cyril Fielding and Dr. Aziz. Kipling places his protagonist Kim between two poles with lack of clear-cut identity, neither East nor West. It is because of Lama's spiritual and moral awakening, Kim enters the world of action with The Great Game. Kipling is generally thought of

an spokesman of the ruling race, and he looked at Indians with the arrogance and superciliousness characteristic of the rulers. Kim's characters has been given an extra dimension; he is not only a shrewd and practical person capable of the most incredible and plans, he is also an accomplice of Mahabub Ali, who has been working as an spy for the British Government. He does not look at India as a poor and weak country inhabited by a weak and uncivilized people which has been easily overrun and subjected by a western power, but as a land of mystery and grandeur beyond the comprehension of the ordinary Westerners. Forster also presents India as a land of mystery and poetry, of religious rites and beliefs not easily comprehensible to the ordinary westerner who has been taught to judge everything by the yardstick of commonsense and reason.

Thus, both the authors celebrated portraits of India at the high watermark of British Imperial domination have occupied a special place in the complex field of colonialist literature derives its framework form Said's a contrapuntal reading. The ambivalent attitude of both the authors towards the Indians makes the texts as a contrapuntal reading: If Kipling privileges native India even as he insists that he Indian reality requires British tutelage, Forster sees the end of colonial rule but he insists on friendship between Dr. Aziz and Mr. Fielding.

Works Cited

Andrew, St. John, "In the Year 57': Historiography, Power, and Politics in Kipling's Punjab." *The Review of English Studies* 51.201. (Feb., 2000): 62-79.

Armstrong, Paul B. "Reading India: E.M. Forster and the Politics of Interpretation." *Twentieth Century Literature* 38.4 (Winter 91): 365-385.

- - - . “Play and Cultural Differences.” *The Kenyon Review*13.1 (1991): 157-71.

Aschroft, Bill, Griffiths, Gareth and Tiffin Helen. *The Postcolonial Studies Reader.* London: Routledge, 1991.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture* London: Routledge, 1993.

Brook, Gary. “Langue, Truth, And Logic on E.M. Forster’s Passage to India.” *Studies in the Novel* 10.2 (Summer 78): 251-64.

Chaudhari, Nirad C. “Passage to and From India.” *Encounter* 2.6 (June 1954): 20-22.

Feeley, Margaret Peller. "The Kim that Nobody Reads." *Studies in the Novel* 13.3 (Fall 81): 266-81.

Foucault, Michael. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason.* New York: Vintage, 1973.

Hawkins, Hunt. “Forster’s Critique of Imperialism in *A Passage to India*.” *South Atlantic Review* 48.1 (Jan. 1983): 54-65.

Jan Mohamed, Abdul R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature." *Critical Inquiry* 12.1 (Autumn, 1985): 59-87.

Kanwan, Dr. G.R. EM Forster *A Passage to India.* New Delhi: Surjeet Publications, 2005.

Kaufman, Esther, “Kipling and the Technique of Action.” *Nineteenth Century Fiction* 6.2 (Sep. 1951): 107-20.

Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim.* London: Macmillan, 1981.

Monk, Leland. “Apropos of Nothing: Chance and Narrative in Forster’s *A Passage to India*.” *Studies in the Novel* 26.4 (Winter 94): 392-402.

Pandey, Dr. Beerendra. *Kim and Rudyard Kipling.* Kathmndu: M.K. Publishers and Distributors, 2008.

Park, Clara Claiborne. “The River and the Road.” *American Scholar* 66.1 (Winter 97): 43-63.

Rao, U.R. E.M. Forster *A Passage to India.* New Delhi: Rama Brothers India Pvt. Ltd., 2006.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism.* London: Routldege, 1978.

Said, Edward. *Cultre and Imperilaism.* New York: Vintage 1994.

Varley, H.L. “Imperialism and Rudyard Kipling.” *Journal of the History of the Ideas* 14.1 (Jan 1953): 124-35.

Walls, Eliabeth Macleod. “An Aristotelian Reading of the Feminine Voice –as Revolution in E.M. Forster’s *A Passage to India*.” *Papers on Language and Literature* 35.1 (Winter 99): 56-73.

Weghner, Philip E. “Life as He Would Have It.” The Invention of India in Kipling’s “Kim.” *Cultural Critique* 26. (Winter 1994): 129-159.