

Introduction

Kipling and His works:

Born in Bombay, India, on December 30, 1865, Rudyard Kipling made a significant contribution to English Literature in various genres including poetry, short story and novel. His birth took place in an affluent family with his father holding the post of professor of Architectural Sculpture at the Bombay School of Art and mother coming from a family of accomplished women. Kipling spent his early childhood in India where an 'aya' took care of him and where under her influence he came in direct contact with Indian culture and traditions. His parents decided to send him to England for education and so at the age of five he started living in England with Madam Rosa, the landlady of the lodge he lived in, where for the next six years he lived a life of misery due to the mistreatment-- beatings and general victimization-- he faced there. Due to this sudden change in environment and the evil treatment he received, he suffered from insomnia for the rest of his life. His parents removed him from this rigid environment and placed him in a private school at the age of twelve. The English schoolboy code of honour and duty deeply affected his views in later life, especially when it involved loyalty to a group or a team.

Returning to India in 1882, he worked as a newspaper reporter and part-time writer and this helped him to gain a rich experience of colonial life which he later presented in his stories and poems. It was a happy homecoming. Ensnconced in his own office, he became the assistant editor for the Anglo-Indian Civil and Military Gazette and later The Pioneer. Thus, Kipling began his career as roving reporter, traveling to various parts of India and the United states. In 1886, he published his first volume of poetry, *Departmental Ditties* and between 1887 and 1889 he published six volumes of short stories set in and concerned with the India he had come to know and

love so well. He wrote dozens of essays, reviews and short stories like *The Man who would Be King* (1888), *Gunga Din* (1890), *Plain Tales From the Hills* (1888), *Wee Willie Winkie* (1888) and *American Notes* (1891).

In addition, when he returned to England, he found himself already recognized and acclaimed as a brilliant writer. Over the immediately following years he published some of his most exquisite works including his most acclaimed poem *Recessional* and the most famed novel *Kim*. In 1907 Kipling won the Nobel Prize in literature in consideration of the power of observation, originality of imagination, virility of ideas and remarkable talent for narration which characterized his writings. In 1892 Kipling married Caroline Starr Balestier, the sister of an American publisher and writer, with whom he collaborated a novel, *The Naulahka* (1892). Death of both his children deeply affected his life. Both these incidents left a profound impression on his life, which his works published in the subsequent years after their deaths displays. As he grew older, his works display his preoccupation with physical and psychological strain, breakdown and recovery. In 1936, plagued by illness, he passed away into the world beyond, leaving behind a legacy that will live for centuries to come.

Kipling's works span over five decades; with Tennyson and Browning still writing and Hardy and Yeats unheard of, when his first work schoolboy Lyrics hit the press. He wrote during the period now known as the Victorian Age. Though Kipling works achieved literary fame during his early years, as he grew older his works faced enormous amount of literary criticism. His poems dealt with racial and imperialistic topics which attracted a lot of critics. Kipling enjoyed early success with his poems but soon became known as a masterful short story writer for his portrayals of the people, history, and culture of his times. In his essay titled *Rudyard Kipling*, George

Orwell called him “the prophet of British imperialism in its expansionist phase” (qtd in Reid et. al. 14). Kipling, through his works, often focused on the British Empire and her soldiers though today that perspective of imperialism and ‘taming the natives’ has limited his popularity.

Kim, which helped Kipling to earn fame in literary horizon, was published in 1901. Kimball O’Hara is the orphan son of an Irish colour-sergeant and a nursemaid in a colonel’s family. Grown up as a child of the Lahore bazaars, carrying with him an amulet and some papers attesting to his origins, Kim meets a Tibetan Lama, who is in search of the River that could cleanse his sins, and attaches himself to the old man as a disciple. Taking help from the English curator of Lahore Museum, they start their adventurous journey through India. In the meantime, Kim becomes involved in a British Secret Service plan to defeat the Russians spies whose aim was to provoke the natives of Punjab against British rule. Working for the British Secret Service, he carries a vital message to Colonel Creighton, head of the Service and an ethnographer. Later Kim meets the other members of Creighton’s team in the Great Game, Lurgan Sahib and Hurree Babu. Recognized by his father’s old regiment, he is dispatched to school at St. Xavier’s, where his education as a white boy is to be completed. The Lama manages the money for his education. In his holiday, Kim rejoins the Lama in an expedition to the hill country where they meet the Russian spies, from whom the boy somehow steals incriminating papers, but not before the foreigners slap the Lama. Kim finds himself caught up between the life of an adventurer and the values of contemplation. But the story ends with Kim’s returning to the Great Game.

As a work of art is open to any angles of interpretation, *Kim* also faces a number of criticisms from different perspective. Some argues that the novel 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, commenting upon *Kim* as it deals with spiritual aspect of India, writes, “*Kim* is the greatest novel about India by an Englishman ... that novel is a valid depiction of India chiefly because of its emphasis on the religious side of life” (qtd. in Greenberger 167). Edmund Wilson, who labels Kipling as an arch priest of racism and authoritarianism, argues how Kipling shows racism in *Kim* by saying, “Kim turns his back on the black man and identify with the white conqueror” (qtd. in Reid et al. 14). Fred Reid and David Washbrook, commenting on *Kim*, place *Kim* in an ambivalent position and writes, “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 bazaar-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).

Forster and His works:

Edward Morgan Forster was born in 1879 into a cultured upper-middle-class family, but his father, an architect, died the following year. His early childhood was spent in the caring, protective company of three women: his mother, maternal grandmother and his great aunt, Marianne Thorton who was to exert the greatest influence on his life. Forster became very conscious of his ancestry which seems to have left its influence in his judgmental attitudes and moral seriousness.

Forster attended Tonbridge Public School from 1893 to 1897. Forster was a day-scholar, and he was not happy as a student of this school. The position of day-scholars as distinguished from boarders in English schools has been traditionally bad, and in *The Longest Journey* Forster records the snubbing day-scholars and his own

pleasant experiences. Forster was not happy at Tonbridge and later attacked English Public School for producing boys who had ‘undeveloped hearts’. Matters improved considerably when he went to King’s College, Cambridge. He spent four years at King’s College, reading first classics and then history. In one of his books, he comments by saying, “As Cambridge filled up with friends, it acquired a magic quality. Body and spirit, laughter and seriousness, life and art— these pairs which are elsewhere contrasted were there fused into one. People and books reinforced one another, intelligence joined hands with affection, speculation became a passion, and discussion was made profoundly by love”. After Cambridge, he spent the next few years traveling, mostly in the ancient classical world, writing and teaching.

In addition, it was through tutoring Latin for university entrance exams that he met Syed Masood in 1906. It is also said that *A passage to India* is dedicated to him and it was through him that E. M. Forster developed his life-long interest in India. He visited Masood on his visit to India in 1912-13 and, encouraged by him, began his first draft of the novel.

Forster is a rare and special man. He is rare because he is in part of a late Victorian and an Edwardian and in a part modern. Forster’s life, then, extends over a very long period (1879 to 1970) marked by rapid social and cultural changes. Yet it is his aesthetic response that makes him very rare and special writer. Vasant A. Shahane, commenting on Forster, writes, “Humanism, liberalism, intellectualism, freedom and acute sensitivity – such are the qualities of the temper of the twentieth century to which Forster has given his allegiance as man and writer”(6).

His first novel, *Where Angels Fear to Tread* appeared in 1905. In the following year, he lectured on Italian art and history for the Cambridge Local Lectures Board. *The Longest Journey* appeared in 1907 followed by *A Room with A*

view (1908), based partly on the material from extended holiday in Italy. Forster also wrote during pre-war years a number of short stories, which were collected in *The Celestial Omnibus* (1914). Most of them were symbolic fantasies or fables. *Howards End*, appeared in 1910, is a story that centres on an English country house and deals with the clash between two families: one interested in art and literature, the other only in business. *Maurice*, which was revised several times during his life, finally published posthumously in 1971. Forster wrote two biographies *Goldsworthy Lowes Dickenson* (1934) and *Marianne Thornton* (1956). *The Hill of Devi*, a portrait of India with commentary, appeared in 1953.

Forster's *A Passage to India* has been recognized as major work of British fiction. Begun in 1912, worked on intermittently and often despairingly for more than a decade and published in 1924, it is Forster fifth novel, and probably his greatest work which helped him kiss the zenith of literary arena. With the publication of *A Passage to India*, Forster achieved international recognition, and critics and commentators in England and America readily acknowledged the artistic talent he displayed in his presentation.

A Passage to India is a novel with an unsolved mystery particularly owing to its cave incidents. There have been many explanation but none quite satisfy; even E. M. Forster admitted in a letter to his friend William Plomer that: "when asked what happen there, I don't know" (qtd.in Messenger 6).

The major concern in the novel is ever widening gap between India and Britain as well as efforts to bridge the gap. *A Passage to India* begins and ends with a question-- whether English and the Indians can be friends or not-- and at the end of the novel, the answer appears to be 'no'. The novel, in a dramatizing the repercussions following Aziz's attempts to be decent to English, his subsequent arrest,

trial and final anti-English sentiments, is largely constructed around this question. Throughout the novel the barriers to inter-racial friendship in a colonial context are explored. The main theme of the novel is the clash between imperialism and growing sentiment of nationalism in India, and the collision of the cultures of East and the West due to cultural discrepancies.

Since a work of art is open to any interpretations, *A Passage to India*, too, has succeeded in attracting the attention of a chunk of critics from different perspectives. Contemporary critical responses to the novel are somewhat mixed. Soon after its publication, I.P. Hartley discovered the novel's cosmic significance. *A Passage to India*, he writes, "is much more than a study of racial contrasts and disabilities. It is intensely personal and... intensely cosmic". (qtd. in Shahane 6). Elizabeth Macleod Walls says that the 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 the 1920s. The crux of Forster's effort is an interrogation of hegemonic rhetoric; *Passage* is an attempt both to criticize and, more covertly, to stifle the authoritative voice of British rule. (57)

Moreover, contemporary approaches emphasized the elements of social realism and Indo-English relations in *A Passage to India*. Shahane, presenting the annoyance of a civil servant, E. A. Horne on Forster's portrayal of Anglo-Indians, writes, "the Hindus and the Muslims in the novel were 'real enough', but that the Anglo-Indian were very 'unreal': 'what planet do they inhabit'?... 'They are not even good caricatures'" (7).

There are also some critics who are of the view that the novel represents the homo-erotic desire of Forster. Forster uses the racial and political prohibitions of the friendship of Fielding and Aziz to signify a wider, universal oppression of homosexual love, so that the novel transcends contemporary politics. Parminder Bakshi writes along the same line:

From the beginning, he sought to moderate the political tones in his narratives; however, the political issues of the time proved to be show powerful that they completely subsumed homo-erotic desire in the text [...] the disguise of Forster's narrative is almost too perfect to allow the author maneuver the theme of homo-erotic love... Forster constantly strove in *A Passage to India* to put politics in perspective and carefully negotiate a space for homoerotic desire. (Davies et. al. 35)

Similarly, some Indian critics have also commented upon the novel. Nirad C. Chaudhuri says that *A Passage to India* is primarily political novel with Indo-English racial overtones. He overemphasizes its political aspects when he says, "*A Passage to India* has possibly had an even greater influence on British imperial politics than on English literature" (qtd. in Shahane 7). Bhopal Singh, another commentator, writes, "*A Passage to India*...is a clever picture of English men in India, subtle portraiture of the English, especially the Moslem mind, and a fascinating study of the problems arising out of the contact of India with the West" (qtd. in Bakshi 33). In addition, Nihal Singh comments on the novel by saying that the book shows "how the British in India despise and ostracize Indians, while on their part the Indians mistrust and misjudge the British and how the gulf between the two is widening and becoming unbridgeable" (qtd. Bakshi 33).

A Passage to India has been regarded as exceptional in Forster's oeuvre in being primarily a historical novel. Since it was published in 1924, it has been popularized in literary-critical practice as comment on British Raj. Commenting on the same vein of thought, Rose Macaulay writes, "Never was a more convincing, a more pathetic, or a more amusing picture drawn of the Ruling Race in India" (qtd. in Bakshi 33).

This dissertation is a comparative study of *Kim* (1901) by Rudyard Kipling and *A Passage to India* (1924) by E. M. Forster.

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

The second chapter deals with the theoretical analysis that is to be applied in this research work. It will discuss on Said's theory of *Orientalism* and Bhabha's notion of ambivalence and mimicry. On the one hand, it will focus upon Said's premises that how the West dominates and controls the East by not only producing colonial discourses about the East but also making them separate and outside the norms of the so-called civilized European centre through which they justify their occupation and domination in the Orient and subdue the colonized as subservient people, and on the other hand, it will demonstrate Bhabha's notions that how discourse of colonialism leads to ambivalent position due to its dynamic nature which further disrupts the clear-cut superiority of the colonizer.

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

Last but not least, the fourth chapter will focus on the conclusion of the dissertation on the basis of textual analyses.

Politics of Representation: A Postcolonial Study

West's Othering of the East: Streamlining Postcolonial Theory

The emergence of literary theory has brought a major breakthrough in the field of literary studies. Despite the complaints that the theories have supplied readers with readymade angles of interpretation undermining readers' independent and automatic response to text, they have provided ample of opportunities to view a text from different perspectives.

Michel 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 construes the term discourse because discourse is, for him, related to the production of any information, which provides knowledge. Advocating Foucault's view on discourse, Nigel Rapport and Joanna Overing, in their book *Key Concepts in Social and Cultural Anthropology*, write:

In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972) Foucault set forth a programme for what he called 'the pure description of discursive events'. This was important ... because there were inexorable links between forms of communication, knowledge and power. Discourse was a key determinant of social life and exchange, for particular cultural discourses maintained both conventional ways of knowing the world and a network of power relations among those who did the knowing. (119-20)

Foucault establishes a mutually constituting relationship between power and knowledge, so that knowledge is inextricable from the regimes of power. Knowledge is formed within the practices of power and is constitutive of the development, refinement and proliferation of new techniques of power. The discursive formations have enabled institutions to wield power and domination by defining and excluding 'the other'. For this purpose, certain set of standards and their dichotomies are produced and imposed on society as definitive of human existence and are operated in such a way which have real effects on society's institutions. Discourses, according to Foucault, are produced in which concepts of madness, criminality, and sexual abnormality and so on are defined vis-à-vis sanity, justice and sexual normality. Such discursive formations massively determine and constrain the forms of knowledge, the types of normality and the nature of subjectivity, which prevail in a particular period. Foucault writes, "The production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed by certain numbers of procedures whose role is to ward off its danger, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality" (qtd. in Gandhi 77). Foucault argues that the rules and procedures, which determine what is considered normal or rational, have the power to gag what they exclude. He opines that meaning of any discourse depends on who controls it.

For Foucault, text is also a form of discourse. In his notion, discourses including texts are the embodiment of power. Considering text as a form of discourse does not mean that it is displaced from the center of interest. Moreover, the text, in this context, becomes even more powerful, because the language used to produce it not only reflects the reality but also creates text's own reality by which it can achieve more power and authority over the reality itself. Commenting upon the same line of thought, Said says, "such texts can create not only knowledge but also the very reality

they appear to describe” (*Orientalism* 94). During the course of time, such texts, or what Foucault calls a discourse, produce a tradition of knowledge, according to Said, “Whose material presence or weight, not the originality of a given author, is really responsible for the texts produced out of it” (*Orientalism* 94). Here, text is governing the reality, not the reality governing the text. Commenting upon the same vein of thought, Ziauddin Sardar, in his book *Orientalism*, writes:

In time such knowledge and reality produce a tradition, which then shapes all further learning about the Orient. Moreover, this knowledge tradition is so integrated with structures of economic and political power that it became handmaiden to colonialism; indeed, it articulated the forces of colonial aspirations and justified colonialism in advance.

(69)

So, texts are the discourses through which speaks the power of ruling culture-- the power to govern and control. This concept of discourse as the form of power has been used by some critics to study and analyze literary texts. Edward Said, too, has a similar view in this regard. For Said as for Foucault, “text is important because it inhabits an element of power with a discursive claim on actuality, even though that power is invisible and implied” (*The World* 183). The job of a critic is, therefore, to explore the discursive power embedded in the text. For this, 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 Michel Foucault’s notion of a 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 a 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'. For said, Orientalism is not only a discourse, which produces knowledge of the East, but also it is:

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 over it: in short Orientalism as a Western styles for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. (*Orientalism* 3)

Said extended the theory of discursive formation to study the dichotomies or cultural forms and political strategies of the expansion of empire. Said contends that Orientalism depends on culturally constructed distinction between the Occident and the Orient and it is inescapably political. In *Orientalism*, Said maintains 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. Said quotes Anwar Abdel Malek as characterizing the notion of the Orient as orientalized by Orientalists:

The Orient and Orientals (are considered by Orientalism) as an “object” of study, stamped with an otherness as all that is different, whether it be “subject” or “object”- but of constitutive otherness, of an essentialist character.... This “object” of study will be [...] passive, nonparticipating, endowed with a “historical” subjectivity, above all, non-active non-autonomous, non-sovereign with regard to itself [...].
(*Orientalism* 97)

The Orient is governed and dominated by discourse produced by Orientalists rather than material, military or political power because discourse makes possible Orient as ‘subject class’. Orientalists fabricate some sorts of statements about the Orient and during the course of time the very statements turn into discourse and become the touchstone for measuring the Orient. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, in their book *Key Concepts in Post-colonial Studies*, write, “Discourse ... is a system of statements within which the world 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”(42). Having a feeling that we are number one, we are bound to lead, we stand for freedom and order, the Westerners construct the non-Western as inferior, conservative, passive and childlike entity that can be loved and abused, shaped and contained, managed and consumed.

Westerners valorize Western European culture by discriminating it from Eastern culture and literature which they regard inferior and subordinate than Western

one. Said is of the view that the discourses of the Westerners about the Orient is a part of the European effort to rule distant lands and people; the Orient. Ziauddin Sardar's view resembles Said's, and Sardar seems to be right when he writes, "the Orient of Orientalists is a constructed artefact through which the West explains, expounds, objectifies and demonstrates its own contemporary concerns" (13-14). Said says, "an unbroken arc of knowledge and power connects the European or Western statesman and the Western Orientalists; it forms the rim of the stage containing the Orient" (*Orientalism* 104). This is to say that Orientalists discourse fashion their modes of thought and working style developing confidence in them, which in turn increases their power and authority over the Orient.

Leela Gandhi, in the line with Said, writes, "colonial/Orientalist discourses are typical of discursive activity whenever they claim the right to speak for the mute and uncomprehending, Orient and in so doing, relentlessly represent it as the negative, underground image or impoverished 'Other' of Western rationality" (77). She opines that Orientalism becomes a discourse at the point at 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 colonial government by endlessly confirming the superiority 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 words, 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). At the very outset, by instinct and by intellect, what the Westerners believed was that civilization, science and progress emanated from the West and that the natives were primitive and barbaric. It was white man’s burden to civilize them, to educate them and to make them human. Unlike Orientals, they believe ‘we’ are true human being; so ‘we’ have the right to govern, to rule and even possess ‘them’. In this regard, Said refers to Abdel Malek as calling this situation:

The hegemonism of possessing minorities and anthropocentrism allied with Europocentrism: a white middle class Westerner believes it his human prerogative not only to manage the non-white world but also to own it, just because by definition, it is not quite as human as “we are”.
(*Orientalism* 108)

Westerners believed that there was a hierarchy of race and ‘we’ by the right of race belonged to the superior position. Whenever the Westerners find the Easterners’ rebellious character or their (the Orientals) attitude of opposing any sort of discrimination of the West against the East, they (the Westerners) come up with the myths that the Easterners are irrational, barbaric, irrelevant and eccentric, and they deserve to be punished and ruled. If this is put into Said’s words, it seems, “when “they” misbehaved or become rebellious, because “they” mainly understood force or violence best; “they” were not like “us” and for that reason deserved to be ruled” (*Culture and Imperialism* XI). So, this becomes the white man’s duty to maintain law and order in the East. Said, too, shares the similar opinion about this colonial attitude in his *Orientalism* where he writes:

When Orientals struggle against colonial occupation, you must say [...] that Orientals have never understood the meaning of self-government the way “we” do. When some Orientals oppose racial discrimination [...], you say “they’re all Orientals at bottom” and class interest, political circumstances, economic factors are totally irrelevant. (107)

Regarding the very idea of Orientalists’ way of conceiving the idea of the Orient, Said takes the example of a branded Orientalist James Balfour, who depends upon, rather than upon the Orient and the Orientals, the knowledge of the Orientalist about the East and also upon how the Orient has been portrayed in the texts of Europeans. Balfour’s Orient is not the Orient as it is, but the Orient as it has been orientalized. Said says, “British knowledge of Egypt is Egypt for Balfour” (*Orientalism* 32). So, willful misunderstanding and knowledgeable ignorance have remained the guiding spirit of Orientalism, it has survived defiantly and remained dominant when alternative information has been readily available. Orientalism is composed of what the West wishes to know, not of what can be known. Said quotes Balfour which shows how not only the Orientalist like him but also the generations of Orientalists form imaginative opinion about the Orient and take it for granted:

Western nations as soon as they emerged into history show the beginning of those capacities for self-government...having merits of their own.... You may look through the whole history of the Orientals in what is called, broadly speaking, the East, and you never find traces of self-government. All their great centuries ... have been passed under despotisms, under absolute government. All their great contributions to civilization ... have been made under that form of government.

Conqueror has succeeded conquer; one domination has followed another; but never in all the revolutions of fate and fortune have you seen one of those nations of its own motion establish what we, from a Western point of view, call self-government. (*Orientalism* 32-33)

Balfour's opinion, here, shows as if the West is a self-government producing factory and self-government is a stuff, which should be imported from the Occident to the Orient. Said says such types of opinion and knowledge are formed to dominate and to rule over the Orient. Having such knowledge about the Orient, according to Said, manifests West's desire "to dominate it, to have authority over it. And authority here means for "us" to deny autonomy to "it"-- the Oriental country-- since we know it and it exists, in a sense, as we know it" (*Orientalism* 32). This shows how Western discourse about the non-Western displays West's will to govern the other and how it shares colonial perspective. Through discourse, they exercise institutionalized power over the other. Westerners try to make believe that West is the source of life. 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 described it is [...] unutterably corrupt, degenerate, irredeemable" (*Culture and Imperialism* XIX). What the Orientalists cannot and do not understand is that non-Western worlds also have their own lives, histories and cultures with integrities equally worth representing the Western one. Said, in *Culture and Imperialism*, presents Joseph Conrad's view in *Nostromo*, and also shows how the novel offers a profoundly unforgiving and equally severe view of Western imperialist:

We Westerners will decide who is a good native or a bad, because all natives have sufficient existence by virtue of our recognition, we

created them, we taught them to speak and think, and when they rebel they simply confirm our views of them as silly children, duped by some of their Western masters [...] that independence is to be wished for them so long as it is the kind of independence *we* approve of.

(XVIII)

What Said means to say is that colonial relation is maintained and guided by colonial discourse, so much so, that such a discourse, licensed with power becomes the sole force of colonialism. Colonial discourse is greatly implicated in ideas of the centrality of Europe. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin write, "Colonial discourse is ... a system of statements that can be made about colonies and colonial people, about colonizing powers and about the relationship between these two"(42). They further say it is the system of knowledge and belief about the world within which act of colonization take place. The Orientalists use the method of inclusion and exclusion while creating discourse about the Orient. They include those things, which serve their vested interest of dominating the East, and exclude those, which blur their interest. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin seem to be right, when they, in *Key Concepts in Post-colonial Studies*, present Orientalists' way of forming colonial discourse to dominate and rule over the Orient:

Rule of inclusion and exclusion operate on the assumption of the superiority of the colonizers' culture, history, language, art, political structures, social conventions, 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'. (42-43)

Said argues that knowledge of the Orient, generated out of strength, in a sense creates the Orient, the Oriental and his world. While creating the Orient, in each case the Oriental is contained and represented by dominating frameworks. What they create about the Orient is that the Oriental is child-like, irrational, barbaric, and quite contrarily they present European as rational, mature and virtuous. Said, citing Cromer's, an Orientalist, view about the Orient, in *Orientalism*, writes, "I content myself with noting the fact that somehow or other the Oriental generally acts, speaks, and thinks in a manner exactly opposite to the European"(39). On the one hand, there are Westerners, who are rational, peaceful, liberal, logical, and capable of holding real values, and on the other there are Orientals, who are none of these things. Said is of the view that the relationship between the two-- the Occident and the Orient-- is not fair and on equal level. He says the essential relationship, on political, cultural, and even religious grounds, is seen to be between a strong and a weak partner.

The Orientalist developed a habit of travelling the Orient either in the name of pilgrimage or in the form of voyage and randomly came up with a set of fake and hollow stereotypical images, and in the course of time, these stereotypes became accepted as self-evident truth in collusion with political and economic imperialism. Moreover, these stereotypes, which are replete with the notion that the West is superior and the East is inferior, become the yardstick by which Orientals' cultures and civilizations were measured. The conceptual category of 'the West' was pitted against the concept of 'the Orient' and the Orient came to signify all that the West was not and some of what the West actually desired. Ziauddin Sardar, commenting upon the same vein of thought, writes in his *Orientalism*, "The representation of

cultures and civilizations to the East of the West that Orientalism came to signify were based on constructed ignorance-- that is, they were deliberately concocted and manufactured as instruments to 'contain' and 'manage' these cultures and civilizations" (4).

Sardar further argues that the Orient is a realm of stories. The Orient's actuality, according to him, has always been encapsulated in forms of storytelling as fact, fiction and fable. He is of the view that the Orientalist vision is based on two simultaneous desires-- the personal quest of the Western male for Oriental mystery and sexuality and the collective goal to educate and control the Orient. Sardar's argument seems right when we eye Flaubert's view on Oriental woman, as cited by Said in *Orientalism*, "Looked at from another angle Kuchuk [Flaubert's mouthpiece character for Oriental woman] is a disturbing symbol of fecundity, peculiarly Oriental in her luxuriant and seemingly unbounded sexuality" (187). Orientalism, according to Sardar, thus, serves as both the external individual and collective desire to possess the Orient and the internal desire to appropriate and govern the Orient.

In addition, whatever the Orientalist did-- from visiting the Orient to making reports on the Orient-- to have the discourse about the Orient, these were not disinterested reports, or literary deceptions, but consciously deployed ideology to explain the innate superiority of the Europe over the Orient. One thing is for sure that Orientalism, as Sardar argues, is not a construction from experience of the Orient. It is the fabrication of pre-existing Western ideas overwritten and imposed upon the Orient. Sardar writes:

The supposed knowledge derived from the Orientalist vision is based not on accuracy and utility but by the degree to which it enhances the self-esteem of the Westerner. It achieves this by making fiction more

real, more aesthetically pleasing than truth. Orientalism is thus a constructed ignorance, a deliberate self-deception, which is eventually projected on the Orient. (4)

Said says when the Orientalist, under the guise of travelers and explorers, went to the foreign land, they did not return empty handed, but with a number of imaginative, fake and amorphous ideas about the Orient, and they further shaped them in travel literature. They piled books upon book of stereotypical images to enhance the library of Oriental discourse. The Orientalists, as Said argues, randomly and haphazardly produced a set of fake and hollow observations of the Orient and these fake observations changed into a document of useful knowledge for anyone who are eager to deal with the Orient. So, Orientalism is concerned with the study of non-Western civilizations, identifying, editing and interpreting these civilizations and the transmission of this tradition from one generation to another through an established chain of teachers and students. Said says the more Europe encroached upon the Orient the more Orientalism gained in public confidence. Said writes, "Since one can not ontologically obliterate the Orient [...], one does have the means to capture it, treat it, describe it, improve it, radically alter it" (*Orientalism* 95). The travelers, without reaching to the fact of matters, distorted the Orient and the Oriental's cultures and civilizations as per their wishes and also as per whatever they have studied about the Orient in the shelves of European libraries. So, as Said writes, the Orientalists', who were involved traveling all over the Orient, "brotherhood would be based, not on blood lineage, but upon a common discourse, a praxis, a library, a set of received ideas, in short, a doxology, common to everyone who entered the ranks" (*Orientalism* 121). Said says that the Orientalists have a habit of presenting the Orient by a series of representative fragments, fragments republished, explicated, annotated, and

surrounded with still more fragments. According to Said, every interpretation, every structure created for the Orient is a reinterpretation, rebuilding of it, because whatever interpretation they make or create about the Orient they do it from the already available materials of European libraries.

Similarly, the Orientalists were trained ethnographers, who with their own set of rules, proscriptions and assumptions descended to the East to form a set of fabricated knowledge about the Orient. Ethnography is, say Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, that field of anthropological research based on direct observation of and reporting on a people's way of life. They say that historically, ethnography concerned itself principally with recording the life and habits of peoples from societies which do not belong to the observer's own, but from distant locales which are geographically or culturally remote from the West, and seem as different from the normative European cultures. So the Orientalist does have all the qualities of ethnographer-- going to the Orient and recording data about the Orientals. They are of the view that when the ethnographers started their journey of the Orient, they constructed the Oriental's cultures, "through a notion of exotic, which differentiated them from the European, or of the primitive, which saw them in a Darwinian way as stages in the 'development' of man, ideas that were clearly useful to colonial discourse in constructing a hierarchy of cultures" (*Key Concepts* 85). They say that the discourses the ethnographers created are perfect examples of the power of Western discourse to construct its primitive 'others'. There are still other who are the proponents of ethnography. In this regard they quote Hammersly and Atkinson who defend ethnography by saying that ethnography is simply a social research method by which ethnographer "participates, overtly or covertly, in people's daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking

questions; in fact collecting whatever data are available to throw light on the issues with which he or she is concerned” (*Key Concepts* 85). But these all activities match up with the Orientalists. So, Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin posit that the activities they used are not neutral and value free act, and argue that:

None of these activities- watching, listening, asking or collecting, is a neutral, value free act, nor does it exist beyond the assumptions and prescriptions of the discourse of the participants own culture. Not even the concept of knowledge itself can be value free, because *what* is known depends upon *how* it is known, that is, cultural knowledge is ‘constructed’ rather than ‘discovered’ by ethnography. (85-86)

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, superstitious and irrational. By this means, Imperial powers justify their occupation and seek to dominate and subdue their colonized or subservient peoples.

Having analysed 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.

Bhabha's notion of ambivalence and mimicry

Bhabha sees a fundamental flaw in Saidian notion of Orientalism despite being exemplary in its protest against the representational violence of colonial discourse, because it ignores the dynamic of power in colonial discourse. Bhabha posits that Orientalists' stereotype is ambivalent and dynamic, and is an unstable category, which marks the conceptual limit of colonial presence and identity.

Homi K. Bhabha, exploring the dynamics of power in colonial discourse, says that Said, while analyzing the West's stereotypes of the East, insufficiently admits the capacity of Eastern peoples to assert their own influence within colonial relationships. Bhabha is of the view that Orientalist or counter-Orientalist opinion can have a co-existence within a literary text/colonial discourse. Exposing Bhabha's stance in this regard, Mark Hawkins-Dady, in *Reader's Guide to literature in English*, writes:

In a series of widely influential article, Bhabha has also explored the dynamics of power in colonial discourse. Bhabha began by responding to the tenets of Said's *Orientalism*: in Bhabha's view, when Said analyzes the West's delineation of "Eastern" stereotypes, he insufficiently acknowledges the capacity of Eastern peoples to assert their own influence within colonial relationships. [. . .] Bhabha argues that while the West may assert its power over the East, its own authority is disrupted in the act of occupation. Contesting the notion that metropolitan cultures are simply imprinted on local cultures, Bhabha suggests that cultural meanings are negotiated, subjected to the pressures of other knowledges and, in the process, changed "hybridized". In Bhabha's view, colonial "transparencies", which authoritatively regulate spaces and places, are unsettled by the

inscrutability of native signs. These signs disrupt the demand of colonial authority to unify its message. Because local "knowledges" can disarticulate colonial "knowledges", the colonial stereotype is more than an effect of domination: it is an ambiguous, contradictory mode of representation. (615)

Bhabha reiterates that the discourse of colonialism does two different things at a time: on the one hand, it keeps the barbaric and so-called uncivilized East mainly outside Western culture and civilization, and on the other hand, it tries to bring the Oriental subjects under control by bringing them inside Western understanding through the slow but steady abolition of their radical otherness. This is the position where Bhabha sees ambivalence in colonial discourse. Bhabha argues that colonial stereotypes are considerably more ambivalent and dynamic, that is, it does have indeterminate and explosive structure. Homi Bhabha argues that the negative Orientalist stereotype is an unstable category which marks the conceptual limit of colonial presence and identity. It is fundamentally threatening as the banished or underground "Other" of the European self, and insofar as it embodies the contradictory expulsions of colonial fantasy and phobia, it actualizes a potentially disruptive site of pleasure and anxiety. In Bhabha's words:

Stereotyping is not the setting up of a false image which becomes the scapegoat of discriminatory practices. It is a much more ambivalent text of projection and introjection, metaphoric and metonymic strategies, displacement, overdetermination, guilt, aggressivity; the masking and splitting of 'official' and phantasmatic knowledges....
(qtd. in Gandhi 78)

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. Adapted into colonial discourse theory by Homi Bhabha, "it describes the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between colonizer and colonized. The relationship is ambivalent because the colonized subject is never simply and completely opposed to the colonizer" (Ashcroft et al. 12). Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin along the same lines of Bhabha say that in Bhabha's theory, ambivalence disrupts the clear-cut authority of colonial domination because it disturbs the simple relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. Therefore, ambivalence is an unwelcome aspect of colonial discourse for the colonizer. They, commenting upon the same vein of thought, bring Bhabha's stance to the fore to demonstrate the underlying problem in colonial discourse and write:

The problem for colonial discourse is that it wants to produce compliant subjects who reproduce its assumptions, habits and values-- that is, 'mimic' the colonizer. But instead it produces ambivalent subjects whose mimicry is never far from mockery. Ambivalence describes this fluctuating relationship between mimicry and mockery, an ambivalence that is fundamentally unsettling to colonial dominance [. . .], it is not necessarily disempowering for the colonial subject; but rather can be seen to be *ambi-valent* or 'two-powered'. The effect of this ambivalence [. . .] is to produce a profound disturbance of the authority of colonial discourse. (13)

To produce compliant subjects who can reproduce colonizer's habits, values and assumptions, the colonizer, through colonial discourse, encourages the colonized

to 'mimic' the colonizer. Mimicry, an important term in post-colonial theory as well as in Bhabha's view of the ambivalence of colonial discourse, describes, say Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, the ambivalent relationship between colonizer and colonized. When colonial discourse, through the adoption of the colonizer's cultural habits, assumptions and values, encourages the colonized subject to mimic the colonizer, the result of this mimicry is never a simple reproduction of those traits; rather, the result is a 'blurred copy' of the colonizer that can be quite threatening. This is because mimicry is never far from mockery, since it can appear to parody whatever it mimics. Mimicry, therefore, locates crack in the certainty of colonial dominance, an uncertainty in its control of the behaviour of the colonized. Bhabha argues that the process by which this mimicry is to be achieved indicates the underlying weakness of imperialism. For this, Bhabha quotes Macaulay who, in his *Minute* (1835), suggests a method that European learning should be imparted by "a class of interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern- a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect" (87). The method itself is not free from flaw, because the person who is Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, opinion and intellect himself is hybridized man owing to his double identity of being half Indian and half English at the same time. So, whatever he mimics, that is, the mimicry of European learning is hybridized and therefore, ambivalent. The consequence of suggestions like Macaulay's, for Bhabha, is that mimicry is the process by which the colonized subject is reproduced as "almost the same, but not quite" (86). This identity of colonized subject-- almost the same, but not quite-- is what the ambivalence of mimicry, and it is this identity, which disrupts the clear-cut authority of colonial domination. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, commenting upon the same line of thought, write, "The threat inherent in mimicry, then, comes not from an

overt resistance but from the way in which it continually suggests an identity not like the colonizer. This identity of the colonial subject-- 'almost the same but not white'-- means the colonial culture is always potentially and strategically insurgent" (141).

Bhabha defines colonial mimicry as:

The desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as *a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*. Which is to say, that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an *ambivalence*; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference. (86)

By postulating that the effect of mimicry on the authority of colonial discourse is profound and disturbing, Bhabha further writes:

The authority of that mode of colonial discourse that I have called mimicry is therefore stricken by an indeterminacy: mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal. Mimicry is, thus the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which 'appropriates' the Other as it visualizes power. Mimicry is also the sign of inappropriate, however, a difference or recalcitrance which coheres the dominant strategic function of colonial power, intensifies surveillance, and poses an immanent threat to both 'normalized' knowledges and disciplinary powers. (86)

Mimicry can be both ambivalent and multi-layered. The copying of the colonizing culture, behaviour, manners and values by the colonized, says Bhabha, contains both mockery and a certain menace, so that, "mimicry is at once resemblance and menace" (86). Mimicry reveals the limitation in the authority of colonial discourse, almost as

though colonial authority inevitably embodies the seeds of its own destruction. The menace of mimicry does not lie in its concealment of some real identity behind its mask. But Bhabha writes, "The *menace* of mimicry is its *double* vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority" (88). So, menace, as Ashcroft et al. argue along the same line of Bhabha, does not necessarily emerge from some automatic opposition to colonial discourse, but comes from this disruption of colonial authority, from the fact that its mimicry is also potentially mockery. Bhabha says, "It is from this area between mimicry and mockery, where the reforming civilizing mission is threatened by the displacing gaze of its disciplinary double" (86).

Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin say that ambivalence gives rise to a controversial position in Bhabha's theory, that because the colonial relationship is always ambivalent, it generates the seeds of its own destruction. It is because of the 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 the colonizer-- this would be too threatening.

Robert Young has suggested that the theory of ambivalence is Bhabha's way of turning the tables on imperial discourse. Young says, the periphery, which is regarded as "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, as Ashcroft et al. postulate, 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 from its position

of power, so that authority may also become hybridized when placed in a colonial context in which it finds itself dealing with, and often infected by, other cultures. In this regard, Ashcroft et al. along the line of Bhabha write, "the very engagement of colonial discourse with those colonized cultures over which it has domination, inevitably leads to an ambivalence that disables its monolithic dominance" (14).

So, when colonial discourse encourages the colonized to mimic the colonizer's cultures, behaviour and manners to produce compliant subjects who can reproduce colonizer's values and assumptions among the colonized, the mimicry of such habits and values is not only hybridized but also leads to ambivalence. This situation produces ambivalence of mimicry-- almost the same, but not quite-- which not only ruptures the discourse but also becomes transformed into an uncertainty, which fixes the colonial subject as a 'partial' presence. Here, partial means, for Bhabha, both 'incomplete' and 'virtual' quality of colonial subject. This is the position where mimicry is at once resemblance and menace, and is, therefore, always potentially destabilizing to colonial discourse, and locates an area of considerable political and cultural uncertainty in the structure of imperial dominance. Bhabha says "*Mimicry repeats rather than re-presents*" and in that very act of repetition, originality is lost and centrality decentred (88). What are left, according to Bhabha, are the trace, the impure and the artificial.

Hybridity at best can be understood by referring to Bhabha's notion of ambivalence and mimicry. For Bhabha, it is the 'cultural cross-overs' of various sorts emanating from the encounter between the colonizer and the colonized. Hybrid cultures do exist in colonial society where people occupy an 'in-between' space by the 'mimicry' of the colonizer. Hybridity, Bhabha argues, subverts the narrations of colonial power and dominant cultures. Hybridity has been most recently associated

with the work of Homi K. Bhabha, whose analysis of colonizer/colonized relations, say Ashcroft et al., "stresses their interdependence and the mutual construction of their subjectivities" (118). Bhabha contends that all cultural statements and systems are constructed in a space that he calls the 'third space of enunciation'. Cultural identity always emerges in this contradictory and ambivalent space, which for Bhabha makes the claim to a hierarchical 'purity' of cultures untenable. It is due to this identity produced out of the ambivalence, the claim of colonial discourse that colonizers' culture, values, behaviors and manners is superior receives a big blow and their superiority is blurred; because at the very engagement of colonial discourse with those of colonized cultures over which it has domination, inevitably leads to an ambivalent situation that disrupts its assumption of so-called superiority. So, hybridity, according to Bhabha, subverts and disrupts the discourses of colonial power and dominant cultures, since it creates the ambivalent situation in the relationship of the colonizer and the colonized. The colonizers, once they arrive in an alien land, feel the necessity of establishing new identity since they are displaced from their own point of origin. In a colonized society, there emerges a binary relationship between the peoples of two cultures and such relation produces an ambivalent situation. Beerendra Pandey, commenting on the same vein of thought, writes in *Journal of Philosophy: A Cross-Disciplinary Inquiry*, "Bhabhian ambivalence goes beyond the binary of West/East, which is understood no longer as existing in a hierarchical relation but on the lines of Derridean supplementarity"(49). Hybridity, rather than indicating corruption or decline, may be the most common and effective form of subversive opposition since it displays the necessary deformation of and displacement of all sites of discrimination and dominance. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, commenting upon the same line of thought, write:

Theories of the hybrid nature of post-colonial culture assert a different model for resistance, locating this in the subversive counter-discursive practices implicit in the colonial ambivalence itself and so undermining the very basis on which imperialist and colonialist discourse raises its claims of superiority. (121)

Thus, colonial discourse does have ambivalence. In Bhabha's theory, ambivalence disrupts the clear-cut authority of colonial domination because it disturbs the simple relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. That the colonized subject mimics the colonizer never leads to the consequence of simple reproduction of those traits, but it leads to a situation in which whatever is mimicked not only becomes hybridized but it also leads to ambivalence, which continually suggests an identity not quite like the colonizer. The very identity-- almost the same, but not quite-- leads to the ambivalence of mimicry which not only locates crack in the certainty of colonial domination but also disrupts the notion of the monolithic power of the colonizer by demonstrating the conflict within imperialism that inevitably causes its own downfall.

This is to say that Said's project has been exemplary in its protest against the representational violence of the colonial discourse. Said demonstrates how the Orient and the Orientals have for centuries been stereotyped by the West and how this stereotyping facilitates the colonization of vast areas of the globe by the Europeans. Said is of the view that colonial power is buttressed by the production of knowledge about the colonial cultures that endlessly produce a degenerate image of the East for those in the West. Said postulates that the Westerners construct the non-Western as inferior, barbaric and violent. Presenting Said's view, Beerendra Pandey writes, "the binary opposition that Orientalism fabricates between the Orient and the Occident is through the configuration of an unequal dichotomy: that of the margin and the centre

respectively"(Journal of Philosophy 48). At the same time, Saidian notion of Orientalism has a fundamental flaw in its insistence that the Orientalist stereotype invariably presupposes and confirms a totalizing and unified imperialist discourse. The flaw occurs, broadly speaking, because it fails to accommodate the possibility of difference within colonial discourse. Said pinpoints the massive negative representations about the Orient, but these representations are not invariable and incontrovertible owing to the dynamic and vibrant quality of colonial discourse. To be more precise, Orientalist or counter-Orientalist opinion can have a co-existence within a literary text/colonial discourse-- a possibility that Bhabha sees. Beerendra Pandey, in *Journal of Philosophy: A Cross-Disciplinary Inquiry* writes,

Bhabha argues that the discourse of colonialism keeps pulling in two different directions at a time, i. e., keeping the barbaric East essentially outside Western culture and civilization, and yet endeavouring to bring the Oriental subjects under control by bringing them inside Western understanding through the gradual abolition of their radical otherness.

(49)

This is the situation where Bhabha sees ambivalence in colonial discourse. Pandey further writes, "The conflicting positioning divides the subjectivity of the Orientalised/colonized, that is to say, makes them move ambivalently between the polarities of similarity and difference"(49). Bhabha posits that colonial discourse does have indeterminate and explosive structure, and it is due to this indeterminacy, the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized becomes ambivalent which further ruptures the so-called superiority and monolithic dominance of colonial discourse. So, it is the ambivalent situation, which decentres colonial authority from its position of power.

The Representation of Indian life in Kipling's *Kim* and Forster's *A Passage to India*

As Said posits that text is a discourse through which speaks the power of the person who holds it, the Orientalist produces the texts about the Orient, in which the Orientals are represented in various derogatory ways in order to dominate and rule over them. But at the same time Bhabha argues that the discourse of colonialism does not function as per the plan of colonialist because of the dynamic and ambivalent nature of colonial discourse. So, it is in the light of Said and Bhabha I will study Kipling's *Kim* and Forster's *A Passage to India*.

Orientalism and Hybridity in Kipling's *Kim*

Philip E. Wegner says that 'mapping' and 'cataloguing' are the two, among others, forms of strategies through which Orientalists serve their purpose of knowing the distant territory-- the Orient. It is through this strategies they happen to be in the territory of the Orient and come up with mapping and cataloguing of the Oriental's surrounding and cultures, which not only serve their vested interest of acquiring knowledge about the Orient but also serve to maintain imperial order in their occupied lands; and Kipling, too, helps serve the very purpose, through the characterization and portrayal of Indian life and aspirations in his novel *Kim*, of the Orientalist. In *Kim*, Kipling fails to keep himself aloof from the very strategies of mapping and cataloguing of the Eastern cultures and surrounding. Mapping, movements and imperial power are always inextricably bound together.

Wegner writes, "The catalogue serves as equally significant role in the maintenance of imperial order. The catalogue is an index of knowledge, and knowledge in the imperial world system, as we already know from Said's *Orientalism*, is a form of power" (146). And there is a deep connection between British imperial power and the will-to-knowledge, which is, in *Kim*, evident from 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 lines of Kipling makes more clear:

In the entrance-hall stood the larger figures 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 labelled, made the pride of the Museum. (7)

The way Kipling has constructed Indian culture through the description of Museum fits nicely within the discourses of Orientalist, whose ultimate purpose is to offer the maps and a vast depot of objects of all kinds of the Eastern culture for those who wish to study the Orient. And the discourse of the Orientalist fits within the ideology of empire, because we already know from Said that the scope of Orientalism exactly matches the scope of empire.

Similarly, the “Great Game” too is no more than a process of mapping. Kim is trained at St. Xavier’s as surveyor and one of the first documents he presents to his employers is a “brown, yellow, and lake-daubed map” of the region surrounding the city of Bikaner (159). Because the imperial government wanted to monitor the action of the city, “the Colonel ordered him to make a map of that wild, walled city; [...].” (158). In addition, Kim’s meanderings through India quite literally map the horizons of British power. Said usefully summarizes those movements as follows:

Most of his voyages within the Punjab occur around the axis formed by Lahore and Umballa, an Indian Army (home British) garrison town on

the frontier of the united provinces. The Grand Trunk Road, built by the great Muslim ruler Sher Shah in the late sixteenth century, runs from Peshawar to Calcutta, although the lama never goes further south and east than Banares. There are exclusions made by Kim to Simla, to Lucknow, and latter to the Kulu valley; with Mahbub Kim goes as far south as Bombay and as far west a Karachi. (qtd. in Werner 143)

As Orientalists' activities match up with that of ethnographer-- going to the distant territories, which are geographically or culturally remote from the West and recording data about the life and habits of peoples of the very territories to form knowledge about them, we find same sort of activities in the characterization of Colonel Creighton. Since we already know Saidian notion that knowledge is not innocent but profoundly connected with the operations of power, the very knowledge they obtain from such activities works as power to form discourse about the Orient, which further serves as a means to dominate and rule over them. Such manifestation of the power-knowledge nexus can be found in the imposing figure of Colonel Creighton. Creighton embodies the notion that one cannot govern distant locale unless one know it, and to know it means to understand the way it operates. So, in order to fulfill the very motive of empires-- to know the Indian, Creighton is there in India. As the head of the British intelligence forces, Creighton is the very embodiment of the modern imperial presence in India. Moreover, he represents, for Kipling, the ideal type of colonial administrator, a man who is sensitive to the varied cultures and civilization of India. How Creighton represents the role model of an ethnographer, whose job is quite similar to that of an Orientalist, becomes obvious when we eye his first advice to Kim, "I have known boys newly entered into the service of the Government who feigned not to understand the talk or the customs of black men.

Their pay was cut for ignorance. There is no sin so great as ignorance” (112). Here, Creighton’s suggestion is that Kim must learn their languages, understand their religion and customs, if not for him, for British empire. With the figure of Creighton, we come to the heart of the disciplinary ideology that runs throughout the novel *Kim*: as the character himself notes, there is no line separating his role as knower and as ruler. Creighton further makes his stance clear by saying Kim, “You see, as an ethnologist, the thing’s very interesting to me. I’d like to make a note of it for some government work that I am doing” (107). Creighton’s ‘government work’, thus, manifests the double desire of Kipling in particular and the contemporary British empire in general-- to know India in order to restabilize imperial power.

Similarly the ‘Great Game’ itself represents the absent of presence of the empire’s massive structure through which Orientalist’s vested interests is served. Every event in the narrative-- from Kim’s chance meeting with the army of Red Bull, to his tenure at St. Xavier’s school, to his apparently aimless wanderings with the Tibetan Red Lama-- are finally linked directly to the interests of the British powers who control the Game. Indeed, all time and space in Kipling’s India are subsumed into the unfolding narrative of the Game. In Lurgan Sahib’s words, “the Great Game [...] never ceases day and night, throughout India” (164). So, behind any local manifestation of the Game lies the irresistible power of the empire-- a power that will ruthlessly crush even the minor challenge posed to it.

Kipling's sense of being an Orientalist comes to the fore at the very opening page of the novel, where we find Kim kicks Lala Dinanath’s boy off. It is not because of any reason that Dinanath’s boy has done any harm to Kim, but simply because Kim is English and the boy is a native. Guided by the instinct of superiority of race, Kipling writes, “There was some justification for Kim-- he had kicked Lala Dinanath’

s boy off the trunnions-- since the English held the Punjab and Kim was English” (1). Since the boy is native, an Englishman has the right to apply any sorts of extortion. Here, Kipling creates the hierarchy of race, in which English, by the right of race, belongs to superior position and the native becomes an object of ill treatment. Similarly, Kipling writes, “India is the only democratic land in the world” (4). Through this narrative, it seems that it is a de facto equality imposed upon the people by imperial fiat. This means Kipling sees democracy in India only under British rule, that is, in the presence of British Raj. Kipling, through this narrative, joins hands with the generation of Orientalists, who do advocate in favour of democracy under the rule of British Raj. This narrative confirms the necessity and desirability of colonial government in Kipling’s India. For Kipling as for the generation of Orientalists, it is India’s best destiny to be ruled by England. Kipling, here, becomes the spokesman of the British Raj in India and blissfully shutting his eyes to the social and political ferment.

When Kim, as has been sent by Mahbub Ali, goes to meet Colonel Creighton, he addresses him as “protector of the poor”, which is questionable because it resembles the colonial discourses, in which the native is depicted as poor and uncivilized and European as civilized and brave (37). And when there are poor natives, it becomes the white man’s burden to protect and rule over them.

Kipling, while portraying Indian life and aspirations, rather than the real depiction of India and the Indians, is concerned with how British imperial order might be maintained on the changing colonial periphery. Kipling, thus, produces utopian figure of India-- an India where conflict, disorder and finally historical change have been eliminated. Kipling’s view of politics fails to perceive any problems that may be qualitatively new, the result of social change and development. His view of Indian

society fails to perceive any principles of dynamism. Indian society is portrayed as rigid and deeply traditional-- a society of colorful but simple peasants, bold but arrogant warriors, superstitious women, wily Brahmins, and so on. Certainly, it is not part of imperialism's purpose to generate dynamism in Indian society. Said seems to be right when he writes, "Kipling India has essential and unchanging qualities, this was because he deliberately saw India that way" (*Culture and Imperialism* 134).

There is no hint, in *Kim*, that the government should be participatory or, in any sense representative. The people are assumed to be incapable of making their own political decisions and even of expressing their own political needs. This sort of portrayal is colonial at heart, because it ignores the potentiality of the native culture to bolster the Europeans' superiority over the Orient. Kipling succeeds in presenting the contrast between the East, with its mysticism and its sensuality, and the English, with their superior organization, their confidence in modern method, their instinct to crush native beliefs and cultures, as has been already demonstrated by generation of Orientalists.

Exploring Kim's relationship with the people of two communities-- the European and the Indian-- can help to unravel the deep-seated colonial discourses within the narrative of Kipling. Kim's allegiances to the Indians-- be it the Red Lama or Kulu woman or Sahiba or Mahbub Ali or Hurree Babu-- are deeply emotional, and in contrast, his relationship to two Englishmen who control the British espionage activities in India and take charge of his formal education is rational. In

JanMohamed's words:

The process of mutual adoption between Mahbub Ali and Kim is explicitly, if not legally, ceremonious; the relationship between the Tesho Lama and Kim, between a religious master and his disciple, is

that of a spiritual father and son; Hurree Babu acts and is accepted as Kim's elder brother; and the Sahiba becomes his mother. And these relations are deeply emotional.... (79-80)

According to colonial discourses, Europeans are rational and intelligent whereas Orientals are emotional and sensuous. Here, Kipling has dealt with the two in accordance with the demand of colonial discourses: Kim's allegiance to Indians is entirely emotional, whereas his relationship to whites is rational.

As Orientalists use the rule of inclusion and exclusion while creating discourses about the Easterners, Kipling has also used the same method. They include those things, which serve their interests, whereas exclude those, which blur their interests. Kipling, while portraying Indian life and culture, hides the reality of contemporary imperial history, that is, the conflict between the two-- 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 Wegner, it seems:

By imaginatively holding the incommensurable social realities of the Indian ruled and the British rulers 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 not 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 words of Edmund Wilson, "large social forces, or uncontrolled lines of destiny, or antagonistic impulses of the human spirit, struggling with one another" (qtd. in

Wegner 130). On the way to his journey with Teshoo Lama, with whomever Kim happens to meet appears satisfied with British rule in India. The India articulated by Kipling is no more than a fanciful construct, a willful denial of the historical development that so distressed him: the nascent Indian nationalist movement. John McClure seems to be right when he writes:

Kipling simply wipes out, erases from his picture of India, all those groups and forces that were making life there in his time difficult for any imperialist, country-born or not.... In order to paint a picture of a harmonious India reconciled to imperial rule Kipling has no alternative but to exclude the Indian nationalists.... (qtd. in Wegner 140)

However, while the India created by Kipling in *Kim* is indeed a fictional invention, this does not mean the struggles of the natives are completely missing from the text: for the very narrative action of *Kim* represents a strategic attempt to contain those anxiety-producing conflicts that threaten British rule in the turn of the century India. Kipling does not deny the existence of an anti-imperial presence, but rather engage in a careful negation of it.

The crucial absent historical “referent” in *Kim* turns out to be what Said calls the “clear demarcation” point in the history of empire: the Great Mutiny of 1857 (qtd.in Wegner140-41). The short lived upheaval of 1857-- which was a revolt of soldiers against the narrow-minded and intolerant British officers-- had by Kipling’s time come to stand in for whole frightful possibility of a widespread revolt against British rule. The appearance and subsequent neutralization of this event, thus, marks key moment in the narrative. Early in their wanderings, Kim and the Red Lama encounter an old soldier who relates his version of this explosive historical moment:

The Gods, who sent it for a plague, alone know. A madness ate into all the Army, and they turned against their officers. That was the first evil, but not past remedy if they had then held their hands. But they chose to kill the Sahib's wives and children. Then came the Sahibs from over the sea and called them to most strict account. Some such rumor, I believe, reached me once long ago. They called it the Black Year. (52)

Though he has represented the Great Mutiny of 1857 and his implicit portrayal of this uprising, to some extent, can be taken positively, he has given it the name of madness of army, which is questionable. Here, 'mad' has come to represent the Indian Army-- the other --which directly fits to the discourse of colonialism, in which we find that whenever the Westerners find the Orientals' rebellious character or their attitude of opposing any sort of discrimination of the West, the Europeans come up with notion that the Orientals are irrational, barbaric and eccentric, and they deserve and understand the language of force or violence. Kipling has done the same. By placing the act of army under madness, Kipling not only nullifies both the autonomous rational subject and the ordered society but also posits that such act should be strictly controlled. Wegner seems to be right when he writes, "by inscribing the mutineers under the sign of madness, Kipling denies the Indian people even the possibility of an autonomous subjectivity" (141). So, India and the Indians remain in Kipling's narrative the constructs of imperial system.

In spite of his great effort to represent Indian life and culture through the perspective of Orientalism, Kipling fails to maintain colonial superiority throughout the novel *Kim*, because as Bhabha says a colonial writer writes from the perspective of the colonizer but in so doing the colonized voice or perspective, one way or the other, is also represented. When Orientalist and counter-Orientalist voices can co-

exist in a literary text, the superiority or clear-cut authority of one culture inevitably blurs. Kipling's *Kim* falls under the very situation. Through the valorization of Kim's subjectivity, Kipling fails to maintain colonial superiority, because Kim, the protagonist of the novel, as has been characterized, neither belongs to the West nor to the East.

Despite being successful in separating the two worlds--the West and the East--through the configuration of an unequal dichotomy, Kipling delves into the possibility of a syncretic self-- the boy Kim-- who might pass between them. He occupies both the identity of European and Indian, but not fully either of them. Kim feels ease at having double identity. He delights in changing his appearance and identity, in becoming other. Abdul R. JanMohmed argues about Kim by saying that "he is a world of infinite concrete potentiality [...]. Endowed by the narrator with special talents, he can do anything and become anybody" (78). The rapidity with which Kim slides between the two selves is to be noted. He transforms himself from a common street urchin to the lama's dedicated chela to a star student at St. Xavier's to a significant new player in the Game. And in the land of many religions, he changes from Hindu to a Muslim, from a Muslim to a Buddhist, from a Buddhist to a Christian and further keeps it rotating. Along the way he adopts innumerable minor identities and disguises, further proliferating the play of subjectivities. Jan Mohammad writes, "Kim and his celebration of Indian cultures seem like perfect embodiments of Kipling's syncretic desires" (78). Kim does not belong to either side completely due to his entirely decentered and malleable self. Because of the indecipherable subjectivity of Kim being white or native, Kipling fails to place Kim under pure British subject. In this regard, JanMohamed writes, "The underlying problem is that the birth of a genuinely syncretic subject necessarily implies the death of an

exclusively British subject. Consequently the novel equivocates: while Kim insists that he is an Indian, the narrator adamantly asserts Kim's British origins" (79). Kim, being an Irish orphan, has been brought up entirely within various native cultures: he looks, behaves and speaks like an Indian. But despite having all this, Kipling nullifies Kim's every affinity to Indian culture by trying to locate him, totally under white subject. Kipling writes:

Though he was burned black as any native; though he spoke the vernacular by preference, and his mother-tongue in a clipped uncertain sing-song; though he consorted on terms of perfect equality with small boys of bazaar; Kim was white- the poor white of the very poorest. (1)

Kipling's negation of Kim having not any concern to Indian culture further pushes him in the whirlwind of lack of fixed identity, because on the one hand, he accepts the truth that Kim looks behaves and even speaks like an Indian but on the other hand, he insists Kim being white. The fluidity of Kim's subjectively leads him nowhere, but makes him move ambivalently between the two poles-- the European and the Indian. It leads him to be a free-floating subject, neither fully of one pole nor the other. Kim's stance comes to the fore from Mahbub Ali's statement when he declares, "Therefore, in one situate as thou art, it particularly behoves thee to remember this with both kinds of faces. Among Sahibs, never forgetting thou art a Sahib; among the folk of Hind, always remembering thou art—" (134). So, the stable centre of identity that defines the self lacks in Kim. Kim occupies, as stated by Mehbub Ali, no single identity, but rather a multiplicity of sometimes contradictory subject spaces. Due to contradictory position, Kim can neither be fully equal to Mahbub Ali and Hurree Babu nor to

Colonel Creighton. He occupies both position of the contemporary imperial order: he lives at once in India and empires, the colonial periphery and the centre.

This position of Kim is what ambivalent position of Bhabha in colonial discourse, which ruptures the monolithic authority of the colonial discourse.

On the other hand, Hurree Babu is a mimic man, who believes more in imitating Western attitude, habits and manners. Commenting upon Hurree Babu Wegner writes, “The one Indian character in narrative who attempts to pass as a European, Hurre Babu, who [...] adheres to British protocols of behaviour, clearly comes off as no more than a weak parody of Colonel Creighton” (154). His name itself is enough to suggest that he is mimic man. Conversion of Mohendro Lal Dutta, M. A. of Calcutta into Hurree Babu and particularly the tag of ‘Babu’ he receives show his willingness to act, behave, and even speak like an Englishman. Babu is a tag, which was attached, in colonial period, to those who used to mediate between the native and the English officer for his personal interest in particular and for the interest of empire in general, and Hurree Babu is no more than this. Looking at the words of Russian spy will make Hurree Babu’s stance obvious, “He represents in petto India in transition- the monstrous hybridism of East and West...” (223). Being a mimic man, he is torn between two cultures-- the East and the West. He is torn between the natural cowardice of his cultural background and the bravery demanded of a Sahib, between the natural superstition of his religion and the rationality required of a ruler. As he himself states, “I am unfortunately Asiatic, which is a serious detriment in some respect. And *allso* I am Bengali- a fearful man” (209). His confession of being unfortunate to be an Oriental and regret for being Bengali, a sign of fearful man suggests that how he is eager to be an English man. But he cannot be an Englishman, because for Bhabha to be Anglicized is not to be English.

Orientalism and Nationalist Movement in *A Passage to India*

Forster, in *A Passage to India*, represents Indian life and culture ambivalently. Forster, while representing Indian life in the novel, is caught between colonialism and resurgent nationalism. He simultaneously does two things in the novel: stereotypes Indian life and culture, and advocates Indian Nationalist Movement with the critique of British Raj. Binita Parry rightly comments on the novel, saying *A Passage to India* "can be seen as at once inheriting and interrogating the discourses of the Raj" (qtd. in Davies et al. 13-14). Similarly, Gillian Beer finds in the novel "a radical questioning . . . of British rule in India" (qtd. in Davies et al. 14). So, this dissertation will be focusing on how Forster stereotypes Indian life and culture even as he fosters Indian Nationalist Movement.

Forster's self-validating sense of Western superiority, in his dramatisation of cultural discrepancies between the East and the West, comes to the fore in his discursive strategies. He 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 embodied, and that it is natural for them to take it as their duty to legitimize those 'truths'. Thus, Forster's representation and the British colonial power, in a sense, become one.

In the novel, Anglo-Indian characters, with the exception of Mr. Fielding, Mrs. Moore and Adela Quested, have been portrayed as if they are the gift of the West to the East, as an emissary of justice and civilization. Being loyal to the government, to perform the duty, to work for the cause of Western imperialism, for them, is far more

important than anything else. Ronny's statements to his mother Mrs. Moore show how the virus of Western superiority catches him up:

We're not out here for the purpose of behaving pleasantly! [. . .] We're out here to do justice and keep the peace [. . .] I am out here to work, mind, to hold this wretched country by force. I'm not a missionary or a Labour member or a vague sentimental sympathetic literary man I'm just a servant of the Government . . . We're not pleasant in India, and we don't intend to be pleasant. We've something more important to do.
(49-50)

Ronny's argument, mixed with arrogance, asserts not only the Anglo-Indian commitment to administering, controlling and governing India; "this wretched country by using force" but also establishes the notion that the British, by the right of the race, deserve the privilege of being the ruling class in India, and by this token, in almost all over the non-Western countries. Most of the Anglo-Indians including Ronny himself in the novel cannot come out of the prison house of colonial mentality.

Having been looked at another incident in the novel, it shows how Anglo-Indians are suffering from the fever of prejudices and hostilities and also how they are sceptical towards the natives. Aziz's request to Mrs. Moore to take off her shoes in the Mosque on the religious ground simply becomes, for Ronny, a matter of suspect and an insult to the English. Ronny says, "He called to you in the Mosque, did he? How? Imprudently? What was he doing there himself at that time of night? – No, it's not their prayer time.... So he called to you over your shoes. Then it was imprudence. It's an old trick. I wish you had had them on" (31).

Similarly, Ronny's statement that "Englishmen like posing as gods" shows Anglo-Indians' snobbery and their strategy of exclusion of the native Indians (49).

The very attitude of Anglo-Indians towards the Indians prevents the Bridge party from becoming a successful one, which was arranged "to bridge the gulf between East and West" (28). The failure of bridge party shows that there can be no bridge or communication between the English and the Indians so long as the English persist in their blind arrogance. Furthermore, Mrs. Callender's words, "The Kindest thing one can do to a native is to let him die" show how Anglo-Indians are caught up with the disease of lack of sympathy, tolerance and intelligence towards the natives (28). They feel contempt and hatred towards the natives, who, they think, belong to an inferior race; they are also afraid of being polluted by what seems to them to be the vulgarity and the muddled ways of the Indians if they meet them too often. The Anglo-Indians display a blind arrogance towards Indian civilization and do not believe in any real personal or close social intercourse between the Indians and the British. Their view of Indo-English relations is purely officious, and their task only a matter of administering a subject race in a wretched country.

Moreover, Mr. Turton's experiences of being in India say that only disaster has resulted out of any attempt to be intimate with Indians. He says:

I have had twenty-five years' experience of this country . . . twenty-five years' seemed to fill the waiting-room with their staleness and ungenerosity – 'and during those twenty-five years I have never known anything but disaster result when English people and Indians attempt to be intimate socially.... The whole weight of my authority is against it.

(161)

For this, Turton blames newcomers with their modern ideas for putting aside the simple rule that different races should never be intimate socially. But the prime reason behind this failure of intimacy between the two-- the English and the Indians-- can be

taken from McBryde, who holds a racial theory about the natives, that is, "All unfortunate natives are criminals at heart, for the simple reason that they live south of latitude 30" (164). Of course, there cannot be any sort of intimacy between the two for the Orientalists like Turton and McBryde, who like to be so-called gentlemen and stamp the natives with the tag of criminals. It is this colonialist administration with all its strategies of exclusion and separatism that prevents any mingling of races in Indian soil. And liberal minded white people like Fielding, Mrs. Moore and Adela Quested have to pay the penalty for the deeds of the Orientalists like McBryde and Turton.

The process of Western self-projection and self-legitimizing and the process of othering through the medium of discourse become a fundamental colonialist concern. In this process, Forster's Anglo-Indian characters are also Western Orientalists by profession and they are there in India to justify the ways of Western colonial mission to the East. Caught up by the virus of superiority of the West, Ronny does not like any sort of intimacy with the Indians. His hatred towards the Indians comes to the fore when he asks Adela not to go to Marabar Caves with Aziz. He says, "I won't have you messing about with Indians any more! If you want to go to the Marabar Caves, you'll go under British auspices" (80). It is due to this hatred towards the natives he, in the middle, ruins the tea party at Fielding's bungalow. Ronny completely ignores whatever the natives say because, "he never dreamt that an Indian could be a channel of communication between two English people" (82). What Ronny is always occupied with is the British cause in India; that they are there for the purpose. Every time he tries to justify British presence in India. He even welcomes the riots like that of Mohurram festival just because it gives him an opportunity to prove that "the British were necessary in India; there would certainly have been bloodshed without them. His voice grew complacent again; he was here not to be pleasant but to keep the peace . . .

" (93). After all, the notion becomes established that only the British are able to keep the communal riots from becoming even worse than they are. So, Ronny's statements, here, show as if India cannot be peaceful without the presence of English rulers, and whenever there is a communal riot, it becomes the white man's burden to maintain peace and order in the East. Ronny Heaslop, thus, becomes the perfect image of the Anglo-Indian officials to which every white official was supposed to follow, which becomes apparent from the statement of Mr. Turton about Ronny that, "he's the type we want, he's one of us" (26).

As Orientalists have the habit to misread the Orient and the Orientals on 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 the 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 exquisitely dressed, from tie-pin to spats, but he had forgotten his back collar-stud, and there you have the Indians all over: inattention to detail; the fundamental slackness that reveals the race" (30). But what the reality is that Ronny's criticism of Aziz's dress, the collar climbing up his neck, has been a result of his 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 Orientalists.

The bridge party ends in a failure because for Anglo-Indians, Indians are never to become socially equals to the white peoples. Collectively the Indians are seen as unreliable, suspicious, emotional, uncivilized, childish and unapproachable lacking the manners and morals, which are no more different than the Western discourses of the East. Indians are not allowed into the Chandrapore Club even as guests which is

the well-designed discrimination over the natives and also solidifies the notion that 'we' are not to come to term with 'them' socially. Indians, for them, are not worth trying for any communication. Because Indians are incapable of understanding, any attempt to establish communication inevitably leads to failure.

Following the Marabar disaster, English officials, blazed with anger and arrogance, decide to take a united stand against the Indians by huddling together tightly in their club to pounce on the barbarous natives. Forgetting their individual differences, they become one white race; "All over Chandrapore . . . the Europeans were putting aside their normal personalities and sinking themselves in their community" (162). Fielding and Mrs. Moore remain exception. Whenever any issue like this is found to allege any native, they take it as a fine opportunity to fix the natives, to dominate them, to control them and to suppress them. It becomes obvious from Major Callendar, who arrogantly resents, "It's not the time for sitting down. It's the time for action" (183). Any kind of delay in showing action will be an indicative of weakness on the part of colonial administration and due to this, colonial institution will be under immense threat. Consequently, all the white people stick together more firmly than ever in a union. From all this, we can come to the conclusion that one of the images that the novel presents is of British colonial institution in India based on force, fear, hatred and racism. And the discourse Forster designates to these Anglo-Indian characters is no less forceful, no less powerful and no less violent than the discourses produced by the generation of Western Orientalists.

Forster's sense of being an Orientalist comes to the fore when we eye 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 ignored, 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, being full of their own affairs" (18). Paul B. Armstrong, observing these events, rightly comments, "Appropriating his object while denying his status as a fellow human subject, they act as if he were invisible" (368). The way the two 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 attitude of ignoring the existence of a human race, simply because he does not fall in their category. When Indians are seen, they are often simply ignored because a lack of recognition is implicit in Anglo-Indian claims of privileged knowledge of native behaviour.

Similarly, "I know them as they are", McBryde tells Fielding "The psychology here is different" (166). McBryde promulgates psychological laws which justify his right to treat Indians as objects of his administrative power. As laws which claim to know others better than they know themselves, these readings deprive others of the right to comment on or to shape a description which will have power over them. Identifying the nexus between knowledge and power, Aziz, towards the end of the novel, calls the "pose of 'seeing India' . . . only a form of ruling India: no sympathy lay behind it" (301). As Said says knowing other not only means identifying other but also showing dominance over other, 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 Orientalists have the habit of generalizing Eastern culture and civilization, Forster does not succeed in keeping himself aloof from the very tradition of Orientalism. Tony Davies seems to be right when he writes, "the novel seems unable entirely to 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 belief 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 tumour, a mental malady that makes him self-conscious and unfriendly suddenly; he trusts and mistrusts at the same time in a way the Westerner cannot comprehend. (272)

Here, Aziz is no longer the subject of the narrative but the object of an explanatory commentary that views him from outside-- views not only Aziz himself, as a typical specimen of 'the Oriental,' but the entire East-West dichotomy from outside. Davies writes, "if 'the Oriental' is to operate convincingly as an explanatory category, it requires another, 'the Westerner,' to operate as its antitype" (16).

A Passage to India has another side as well which deals with the positive aspect of Indian life and culture: Forster fosters Indian Independence. We can see a number of incidents evident in the novel through which Forster speaks of the spirits of Nationalist Movement.

Hunt Hawkins, commenting on the novel, writes, "The chief argument against imperialism in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* is that it prevents personal relationships" (54). So, Forster presents the critique of British rule because it prevents relationship to foster between the colonizer and the colonized. The Anglo-Indians, as Forster presents them, act on emotional perceptions rather than rational and open-

minded examination of facts. The central question of the novel is posed at the very beginning when Mahmoud Ali and Hamidullah ask each other "whether or no it is possible to be friends with an Englishman" (12). The question asked in the beginning gets its answer by Forster himself on the last page is "No, not yet . . . No, not there" (317). Forster confesses that such friendship is made impossible, on a political level, by the existence of the British Raj. The main cause behind the failure of friendship is the imbalance of power between the two-- the English and the Indians. Hawkins writes, "Forster shows how intolerance results from the unequal power relationship between English and Indians" (56). Having realized that friendship between the two is not possible because the relationship between them is that of the ruler and the ruled, Forster anticipates India's decolonization. Forster also takes officialism as an obstacle of relationship because it corrupts man with power. When Englishman comes out from England, he is at first friendly towards the Indians, but as soon as he finds his role in British Raj, he begins to treat the Indians unfairly. Forster tells us that "every human act in the East is tainted with officialism" and that "where there is officialism every human relationship suffers" (184& 207). So, people cannot establish a friendship of equals when the British Raj is based on an inequality of power. The relationship between the English and the Indians are ultimately subordinate to the political reality. This truth is demonstrated when Mrs. Moore tells Ronny how Aziz privately criticized the Callendars to her at the Mosque. She is shocked when Ronny says he will report this news to Major Callender. He justifies himself by saying, "If the Major heard I was disliked by any native subordinate of mine, I should expect him to pass it on to me" (33). So, the final relationship between England and India is that of ruler to subordinate; and in order to maintain their status, the English must betray any friendship with the Indians and pool their information. So, realizing that any

relationship based on inequality of power inevitably leads to failure, Forster advocates Indian independence. His very idea that inequality of power dismantles relationship matches up with Indian leaders of the time, particularly with Gandhi. Hawkins, commenting upon the same vein of thought, writes, "His particular argument against the Raj, its disruption of friendship, was shared by the Indian leaders of his day. In a 1921 letter explaining the purpose of the Non-Cooperation Movement, Gandhi wrote: we desired to live on terms of friendship with Englishmen, but that friendship must be friendship of equals both in theory and practice, and we must continue to non-cooperate till . . . the goal is achieved" (60-61). Such friendship was impossible without the end of British Raj. Therefore, the Raj, for Forster, must end. So, Forster not only presents the critique of British Raj but also represents the spirit of nationalist movement.

Jenny Sharpe, in her *Allegories of Empire*, sees "the role of the Jallianwala Bagh massacre in *A Passage to India*, not so much as a historical fact but as a ghostly presence that guides its plot. The reaction on both sides of the colonial divide after the accusation of rape in fictional Chandrapore bears a close resemblance to the chain of historical events at Amritsar" (135). Hawkins, commenting on the same line of thought, writes, "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 uprising in the Amritsar of Punjab, which the British brutally suppressed. At the town of Amritsar, General Dwyer ordered his troops to fire on an unarmed crowd and later he issued an order requiring Indians to crawl through a street where an English girl, Miss Sherwood, had been attacked. The presence of this incident can be found when we see Forster's narrative. Forster has placed events in Chandrapore in the context of more recent

atrocities. The references to 'special train', 'calling the troops' and 'clearing the bazaars' refer to the popular unrest in the Amritsar of 1919. In the novel, Mrs. Turton's angry demand that the Indians "ought to crawl from here to the caves on their hands and knees whenever an Englishwoman's in sight" recalls General Dwyer's notorious 'crawling order' (211).

Similarly, Frances B. Singh comments on the novel, saying, *A Passage to India* "breathes a Gandhian spirit" (275). In response to Amritsar massacre, Gandhi launched the Non-cooperation Movement. The main motto of this movement was not to support British government from different actions like surrendering the British titles, abandoning English materials by using native things as much as possible, going on fasts. Having a close look at Forster's narrative will provide us with the events desired by Gandhi. During Aziz's trial, the Nawab Bahadur abandons his title to become plain Zulfiqar. It seems, "He further announced that he should give up his British-conferred title and live as a private gentleman, plain Mr. Zulfiqar" (230). Similarly, the students at Government College go on strike, and the Mohammedan ladies swear "to take no food until the prisoner was acquitted" (209). So, through all these incidents-- renouncing of Nawab Bahadur title, strike of students and fasting of the Mohammedan women, Forster succeeds in capturing the very spirits of nationalist movement instigated by Gandhi.

As Gandhi had desired 'communal harmony' between the two-- Hindu and Muslim for Indian Independence, we can see such type of harmony, which was lacking in the beginning of the novel, between the two communities after Aziz's trial. The narrative goes like, "Another local consequence of the trial was a Hindu-Muslim entente." (260). Aziz's new appointment at Mau through Godbole's influence shows a turning of ill will into a goodwill, which became possible between the two-- Aziz the

Muslim and Godbole the Hindu-- only in the aftermaths of the trial. As a result of the trial of Aziz and his honourable acquittal, a new understanding and amity have been reached between Hindus and Muslims in Chandrapore. Though they may have their mental reservations about each other, the common stand against the British has brought them nearer. It also becomes clear from the words of Mr. Das, a Hindu that, "you are our hero; the whole city is behind you, irrespective of creed." (260). Aziz is of the view that "India shall be a nation! No foreigners of any sort! Hindu and Muslim and Sikh and all shall be one!" (315). Aziz's notion of state, here, is plural and inclusive: 'Hindu and Muslim and Sikh and all.' So, Aziz's inclusiveness suggests that he becomes influenced by Gandhi, whose goal of *swaraj* was also inclusive; that is communal harmony. Communal harmony was an indispensable condition for *swaraj*. Singh, advocating Gandhi's view, writes:

That *swaraj* lay in the resolution of Hindu-Muslim tensions and the transformation of the relationship into one based on friendship and co-operation. Communal harmony, therefore, was associated with independence. This association was the basis for his beliefs that India was a nation because many religious communities lived there, and that Indian nationalism had to take this pluralism into account when it formulated a concept of India. (267)

Aziz's concept of independence parallels Gandhi's in being a strategies for transforming ill will into affection and achieving that state of friendship which Gandhi regarded as one of the goals of *swaraj*:

Down with the English any how. That's certain. Clear out you fellows We may hate one another, but we hate you most. If I don't make you go, Ahmed will, Karim will, if it's fifty-five hundred years we shall get

rid of you, yes, we shall drive every blasted Englishman into the sea, and then'— he rode against him furiously— 'and then', he concluded, half kissing him, '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.

Singh writes, "Aziz' character ... though indebted to Young Party politics, seems to be restructuring itself on Gandhian lines at the end of the novel" (268). Forster replaces the separatist political ideology of Young Partymen with a Gandhian one stressing plurality and inclusiveness in Aziz. Singh writes, "to say that the Muslim Aziz accepts the drive of Gandhian *swaraj* is also to imply that he has rejected Muslim separatism in favour of Hindu inclusiveness and becomes a political Hindu" (269). Aziz's transformation into a political Hindu, a state which allows him to say "I am an Indian at last" and yet to continue writing Islamic poetry, brings into being the new Indian, a culturally composite being for the new India, a culturally composite country (288). Singh is of the view that, "the creation of this new Indian, Muslim in sensibility, Hindu in political outlook, is Foster's implicit contribution to the nationalist movement" (273). It is a personal rendering of Gandhi's idea of uniting Hindus and Muslims, a fictional counterpart to what Gandhi was trying to achieve through the medium of politics during the same period of time that *A Passage to India* was a work in progress. Singh writes:

In *Hind Swaraj*, Gandhi associated living in remote places with development of a sense of patriotism and nationalism that could blossom into a legitimate desire for Home rule or political independence. [. . .] Such places, he argued, by being untouched by

Western civilization, were the "real" India. By making those who went there shed their Western ways and live in a traditional Indian way, they freed one from one's previous dependence on the British and brought about personal *swaraj* or self-rule. This idea, that independence exists when and where Indians accept their Indianness, re-Indianize themselves by following their traditional civilization and rejecting modern innovations, is central to *Hind Swaraj*. (273)

After leaving Chandrapore, Aziz settles in Mau. Aziz says, "I shall go right away . . . I do want to get away from British India, even to a poor job" (262). Mau looks like the kind of place Gandhi had in mind as a developer of a nationalist consciousness and self-rule. Located deep in the "remote jungle where sahib seldom comes," it is free of some basic values of Western civilization. Mau is significant place also in a sense that Aziz's transformation takes place in Mau, a remote Hindu princely state that had once been home to Muslim saint who had freed prisoners and whose action is now commemorated during the Gokul Astami celebrations by both Hindus and Muslims by the ritual pardoning of one prisoner. The fact that in Mau a Muslim act for freedom has been incorporated into the days of Hindu festival that creates an even greater freedom makes it an excellent inspirational setting for Aziz's own transformation. Reason and form have no place in the Gokul Astami celebrations, which seem to be the most important fact of life in Mau; Aziz stops practicing Western medicine there. This acceptance of a totally indigenous atmosphere in which to function induces in Aziz the conscious feeling that he is an Indian at least. The sense of having an identity that owes nothing to the West and exists in the context of a traditional society is, thus, in keeping with Gandhi's ideas about *swaraj*. Singh writes, "The political potential of remote places that Gandhi noted was realized by Forster in the third section of A

Passage to India" (273). Aziz's going to Mau is, therefore, a political act, that is, by going to Mau, Aziz takes stand against the policy of separation which many Young Partymen advocated. In Mau, Aziz accepts the indigenous culture and traditions which have shaped India. Thus, Aziz's patriotic outburst at the end follows logically from Forster's presentation of Mau as a native, traditional and Hindu place.

Independently of Gandhi, Forster came to the same conclusion: that acceptance of indigenous tradition was the basis of independence. Showing Aziz secure in the overwhelming Hindu atmosphere of Mau makes him a stronger believer in new nationalism championed by Gandhi than were the Muslim politicians active during the *Passage* years, who were afraid that they would lose power once independence came because they would be in the minority. The confidence that Aziz manifests is what Gandhi hoped to instil among Muslim politicians. By bringing Aziz, a resident of British India, to Mau, Forster takes Gandhi's key idea-- Hindu-Muslim unity-- to a native state. Singh comments, "*A Passage to India* dramatizes the point of Gandhi's message to the Muslims that in India under *swaraj* there would be nothing to fear. The Muslim whom Forster created can be seen, therefore, as a symbol of those whom Gandhi also had hoped to create during the *passage* years" (275).

Thus, by portraying Indian life and aspirations ambivalently, Forster fails to maintain his Western superiority, with which he instigates the narratives but tends to blur as the novel proceeds, throughout the novel. In presenting the colonial discourse, he not only presents the voices of the colonizer but also demonstrates the outcry of the colonized with his sardonic commentaries on Anglo-Indians. He places himself in an ambivalent position by presenting stereotypical images of the Indians on the one hand, and anticipating Indian Independence on the other.

Conclusion

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, from 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 at 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. On the one hand, Kipling does not show the social and political ferment that had engulfed India during those days. In order to bolster the fiction of an uncontested British rule in India, Kipling had not any option left except obscuring the real conflicts raging within the historical context of India. On the other hand, Forster places all the Anglo-Indian characters in the position of power from where they not only describe and define the Indians but also impose the so-called truths-- the West is superior and the East is inferior, so that it is natural to rule over them. Forster's Anglo-Indian characters, though some are exceptions, are Western Orientalists by profession and they are there in India to justify the ways of Western colonial mission to the East. 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 selves-- 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 nowhere, but makes him move 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 Indians' 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 as being erotic. Foster's ultimate rejection of the idea that Dr. Aziz is a rapist shows that he does not participate in the Orientalist discourse of natives being rapists.

Thus, due to the ambivalent nature of colonial discourse as posed by Bhabha, we have ample of incidents evident in the texts through which their colonial as well as ambivalent stance towards the Indians can be noticed. 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.

Works Cited:

- Adams, Hazard. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Inc: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992.
- Armstrong, Paul B.. "Reading India: E. M. Forster and the Politics of Interpretation." *Twentieth Century Literature*. 38.4 (1992): 365-385.
- Aryal, Yubraj. Ed. "Journal of Philosophy: A Cross-Disciplinary Inquiry." 2.4 (2006): 47-50.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *Key Concepts in Post-colonial Studies*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Devies, Tony and Nigel Wood. Ed. *A passage to India*. New Delhi: Viva Books, 2003.
- Forster, E. M.. *A Passage to India*. New Delhi: A.I.T.B.S. Publishers, 1996.
- Gandhi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Greenberger, Allen. J. "Rudyard Kipling's India." *The Journal of Asian Studies*. 27.1 (1967): 166-167.
- Hawkins-Dady, Mark. Ed. *Reader's Guide to Literature in English*. London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1996.
- Hawkins, Hunt. "Forster's Critique of Imperialism in A Passage to India." *South Atlantic Review*. 48.1 (1983): 54-64.
- Jan Mohamed, Abdur R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The Function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature." "Race," *Writing and Difference*. 12.1 (1985): 59-89.
- Messenger, Nigel. "E. M. Forster's A Passage to India." *York Notes Advanced*. London: York Press, Delhi: Longman, 2001.

- Pandey, Beerendra. Ed. "Rudyard Kipling's Kim." Kathamandu: M. K. Publishers, 1997.
- Rapport, Nigel, and Joanna Overing. *Key Concepts in Social and Culture Anthropology*. London: Routledge, 2004.
- 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.
- Sardar, Ziauddin. *Orientalism*. New Delhi: Viva Books, 2002.
- Shahane, Vasant A.. "E. M. Forster's A Passage to India." *York Notes*. Essex: York Press, 1982.
- Sharpe, Jenny. *Allegories of Empire*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.
- Singh, Frances B.. "Passage to India, the National Movement, and Independence." *Twentieth Century Literature*. 31.2/3 (1985): 265-278.
- Walls, Elizabeth Macleod. "An Aristotelian Reading of the Feminine Voice-as-Revolution in E. M. Forester's A. Passage to India." *Papers on Language and Literature*. 35.1 (1999): 56-73.
- Wegner, Phillip E.. "Life as He Would Have It: The Invention in Kipling's Kim." *Cultural Critique*. 26 (1993- 1994): 129-159.