

**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research  
Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou  
Faculty of Letters and Languages  
Department of English**



**A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Master in English**

**Option: Cultural and Media Studies**

***Title***

***Louis Rousselet's India and its Native Princes : Travel in Central India and in the  
Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal (1875) and Rudyard Kipling's From Sea to  
Sea; Letters of Travel (1899) : A Postcolonial Comparative Study***

**Submitted by :**

**Lynda HALOUANE  
Celia KHERRAZ**

**Supervised by:**

**Doctor SIBER Mouloud**

**Panel of Examiners :**

**SIBER Mouloud, M.C.A ,Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou, Supervisor.  
GARITI Mohamed, M.C.B, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou, Chair.  
KHELIFA Arezki, M.A.A, Mouloud Mammeri University of Tizi-Ouzou, Examiner.**

**Academic Year: 2014-2015**

## **Dedication**

To my lovely mum and dad who encouraged me to follow the path of knowledge and studies;

To my sisters Lydia and Rosa;

To my little brother Ferhat;

To my lovely friends Yasmine, Dyhia and hayet who provided me with moral support during the accomplishment of this dissertation;

To my cousin Redouane for his precious help;

To my cousins Lina and Fatma and to my sweetie aunts Saliha, Malika and Tassadit.

## **Celia**

To the memory of my grandmother, and to my dear parents who never stopped encouraging me;

To my brothers and sisters Louiza, Khelifa, Dihia, Menad and Rachid;

To my little niece Lea and nephew Aksel and to my stepbrother Djamel;

To my best friends Karima, Wissam and Soumaya;

To all those who supported and encouraged me.

## **Lynda**

## **Acknowledgement**

We would like to express our highest gratitude to our supervisor **Dr. Mouloud SIBER** for whom we owe this interesting theme. We would like also to thank him for his guidance and help and implication despite the difficulties faced during this academic year. We have been very lucky to have him as a teacher and supervisor.

We would not miss to thank the panel of examiners **Dr. GARITI Mohamed** and **Mr. KHELIFA Arezki** for accepting to examine and to correct our work.

## Abstract

This research paper is a postcolonial comparative study of Louis Rousselet's *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the presidencies of Bombay and Bengal* (1875) and Rudyard Kipling's *From Sea to Sea; Letters of Travel* (1899). To achieve our work, we have relied on Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1977). We have first studied the similarities of the two writers in their mis/representation and stereotypical description of Indians and the denigration of their culture and religions. The two authors describe India and Indians in the same way. Yet they differ in the celebration of their two respective Empires. After the analysis of Rousselet's and Kipling's Works in the light of Said's *Orientalism*, we have reached the conclusion that the two authors are Orientalists and stand for a French and British intervention in India. The two authors otherize Indians as well as their culture and support imperialism as a civilizing mission.

## Contents

Dedication.....	i
Acknowledgments.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Contents.....	iv
<b>I. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Issue and Working Hypothesis.....	4
Endnotes.....	5
<b>II. Methods and Materials.....</b>	<b></b>
1. Methods.....	6
1- Edward Said's <i>Orientalism</i> .....	6
b- Homi K. Bhabha's <i>The Location of Culture</i> .....	7
2. Materials .....	7
a. summary : <i>Indian and its Native Princes : Travel in Central India and in the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal</i> .....	7
b. Summary : <i>From Sea to Sea : Letters of Travel</i> .....	8
Endnotes.....	9
<b>III. Results and Discussion.....</b>	<b>11</b>

1. Mis /Representation of Indians in Rousselet's and Kipling's works ...	12
Endnotes.....	23
2. India Culture as Depicted in Rousselet's and Kipling's Works .....	25
Endnotes.....	35
3. Rousselet, Kipling and French-English Ideological Rivalry in India.....	38
Endnotes.....	49
<b>IV. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>V. Bibliography.....</b>	<b>53</b>

## **I. Introduction:**

During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, many countries have been subjected to the Western colonization. The colonizing countries justified their conquests as the “White Man’s Burden”<sup>1</sup> which aims to civilize the so called non-civilized people. To legitimate their colonization, the Europeans established a discourse based on binary opposition and dichotomies such as “self/other”, “colonizer/colonized”, “civilized/uncivilized” and the “Occident/Orient”. The misrepresentation of the dominated nations is shown through literary works with the use of Colonialist and Orientalist Discourse. In *Orientalism* (1978), Edward Said argues that Orientalism is a European tradition which aims to celebrate European culture. He says: “the Orient is almost a European invention”<sup>2</sup>. The Orientalist Discourse is meant to define the Orient as the opposite of the Occident but also to define the Occident as including all superior nations. Said advocates that “the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality and experience.”<sup>3</sup> Said’s analysis of Orientalism covers many European Orientalists, but the French and English seem to be central. Among other authors, Louis Rousselet and Rudyard Kipling can be seen as representatives of French and English Orientalists, respectively.

Rousselet’s works like *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and in the Presidency of Bombay and Bengal* (1875) has received a number of critiques in which it is question of the French defeat in India and his attitude towards this situation. In “L’être de L’Inde” (1992), Christian Petr speaks about the profound disappointment of French scholars of the nineteenth century toward the position held by France in India<sup>4</sup>. He notably cites “Joseph Méry, Alfred Assolant, Louis Rousselet, Henri Tessier, Judith Gautier”<sup>5</sup>. Petr argues that these writers “Pleurèrent la perte de l’Inde tout en espérant, sans se faire trop d’illusion, que leur pays [France] avait encore un rôle à jouer dans la région, ne serait-ce qu’aidant l’Hindoustan à se libérer des Anglais...”<sup>6</sup>, “These writers wept for the loss of India, without

losing hope that their country can still play an important role in the region by, for instance, helping the Hindustan to free itself from the English domination”(Translation ours ). In this quotation, Petr explains how the French authors lamented the French failure in India but at the same time they highlight the rare French implication there. They even hope that France will still be able to play a role in India.

In a prominent book about Rousselet, Patrick Chezaud depicts Rousselet as a colonialist writer who is convinced of the European superiority over other nations and who is greatly influenced by the Indian culture.<sup>7</sup> For him, “C’est un certain type d’objectivité qui contribue à sauver Louis Rousselet de la capitulation par la culture de l’autre et de la dilution dans l’étrangeté”<sup>8</sup>, “It is a certain objectivity that contributed in saving Rousselet from falling victim of the culture of the Other and being assimilated into strangeness” (Translation ours). He discusses the position of Rousselet about the British domination in India and shares his disenchantment. Chezaud says about India that it is :

Intégralement dominé par la Grande-Bretagne, soumis à la loi du progrès occidental, administré directement ou par délégation, selon les préceptes rationnels d’une société héritière des lumières rationalistes, au profit des intérêts économiques et géopolitiques de l’Empire.<sup>9</sup>

Completely dominated by Great Britain, subdued to the law of occidental progress, under direct or indirect rule, according to the rational precepts of a society which inherited the rationalism of enlightenment, and which serve the economic and geopolitical interests of the Empire.(translation ours)

This quotation denotes that for Chezaud, India benefits from the British enlightenment and that the British Empire serves its economic and geopolitical interests through the domination of India. It also denotes that Indians have not asked for this British enlightenment, but it has been imposed on them.

Kipling received many critiques and has been considered as a pro-imperialist to such an extent that he was completely baptized the “Poet of empire.”<sup>10</sup> Edward Shank states in this context that “[Kipling is] the icon of British imperialism.”<sup>11</sup> Kipling’s support for the British colonialism is reflected in his works such as *From Sea to Sea, Letters of Travel* (1899). This



travelogue has been subject to a great deal of criticism which agrees that it reflects Kipling's imperialist strain. To begin with, Angus Wilson in the *Strange Ride of Rudyard Kipling: His Life and Works* (1977) claims that during his journalistic mission in India for the *Civil & Military Gazette*, Kipling expressed his dream of imperialism and "had begun to formulate the English imperial dream that was to grow until it became the center of his life"<sup>12</sup>. Wilson supports that through his work, Kipling calls for a complete British dominance in India and the other British colonies and notes their need for British rule instead of self-government.

Another critical attention to Kipling's work is by Mouloud Siber and Bouteldja Riche in "Native Mis/Rule and 'Oriental Despotism in Alexandre Dumas' *Adventures in Algeria* (1846) and Rudyard Kipling's *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel* (1899)". They support that Kipling and Dumas celebrate the British Empire in India and the French empire in Algeria, respectively. Siber and Riche argue:

The imperialist/Orientalist objectives of Gazette pushed him to publish lengthy articles on his experience throughout India. These articles are compiled in this volume *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel* where Kipling disseminates knowledge about India and reproduces imperial ideology.<sup>13</sup>

In other words Kipling stands for British governance through misrepresenting "native India."<sup>14</sup> Similarly, Dumas stands as the spokesman for the Imperialist French Empire; "he [Dumas] constructs Orientalist attitudes on Algeria and Algerians [...]. The literary mission was also imperial since it aimed at disseminating knowledge about Algeria and supporting ideology."<sup>15</sup> According to Siber and Riche, Kipling celebrates the British Empire in India and misrepresents the Indian governance in an attempt to justify the British conquest and to legitimize the British rule and governance.

It is clear that the two works have been approached through different perspectives. Yet, the two works have not been studied together. Therefore, the aim of our research is to study and to compare Kipling's work to Rousselet's work through a Postcolonial perspective in terms of similarities and differences.

## 1. Issue and Working Hypothesis

The aim of our research paper is to compare between Rousselet's *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and in the Presidency of Bombay and Bengal* (1875) and Kipling's *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel* (1899) in terms of similarities that consist in the misrepresentation of Indian people and the denigration of their culture. We also aim to study the two works in terms of their difference in celebrating their distinctive Empires namely, French and British ones. First, we intend to study the extent to which the two texts misrepresent and otherize India using stereotypes inherent to the Orientalist Discourse to justify their quest and domination. Second, we wish to study the claim that the two authors do not only misrepresent and otherize the Indians at a personal level but also at the cultural one. Notwithstanding their fascination for some elements of Indian culture, they continue to degrade it. This ambivalent position is only meant to reinforce their discourse which constitutes their means to justify and to celebrate the European supremacy, notably the French and the British ones.

The third claim we wish to analyse is that their engagement in the celebration of the French and British Empire gives voice to their differences. The two works bear the marks of the ideological/political conflict that occurred between the French and the British over the territory of India. We should argue that Rousselet favors the French Empire to improve and develop India and wonders how it would be under a French domination while Kipling stands for a complete British dominance and governance in India and celebrates the already British-ruled States.

To deal with this issue, we will base our study on Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978) with supporting elements borrowed from Homi K Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* (1994). In his theory, Said argues that Orientalist Discourse is used to otherize the "Orient" so as to celebrate the Occident and justify the European colonization. Orientalist discourse also aims

to stress the supposed colonized inferiority versus the supposed European superiority. According to Said, travel literature contributes to the reinforcement of the stereotypes made about the Orient and the celebration of the European culture and Empire<sup>16</sup>.

In addition to an introduction, methods and materials, and a conclusion, the discussion of this research paper is divided into three sections. The first section focuses on Rousselet's and Kipling's misrepresentation of the Indian people. The second studies the authors' denigration of the Indian culture. The third section examines the celebration of the two competitive French and British Empires over the Orientalized India almost under the British control.

### **Endnotes:**

<sup>1</sup> Rudyard Kipling, *The Collected Poems Of Rudyard* "The White Man's Burden" (Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1994), 334.

<sup>2</sup> Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 2003), 1.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid 1.

<sup>4</sup> Christian Petr, "L'être de L'Inde"(1992), in *Cahier Octave Mirabeau* (1893), 5.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid 5.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid 5.

<sup>7</sup> Patrick Chezaud, *Louis Rousselet, L'Image de la Culture de L'Autre* (Paris : Gérard Monfort, 2005), 120.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid 121.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid

<sup>10</sup>Edward Shanks, *Rudyard Kipling: A Study in Literature and Political Ideas* (University of California: Macmilan & Company Limited, 1940), 79.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid 61.

<sup>12</sup> Angus Wilson, *The Strange Ride of Rudyard Kipling: His Life and Works* (New York: The Viking Press, 1977), 137.

<sup>13</sup>Siber M and Riche B, "Native Mis/Rule and Oriental Despotism in Alexandre Dumas's Adventures in Algeria (1846) and Rudyard Kipling's From Sea to Sea, Letters of Travel (1889), in *Asian Journal of Humanity, Art and Literature 1,9-14* (Asian Business Consortium, 2014), 72.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid 72.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid 72.

<sup>16</sup>Said, *Orientalism*,99.

## **II-Methods and Materials:**

### **Methods:**

#### **1-The Theoretical Framework:**

Our study of the colonial discourse and the celebration of the British and French Empires in the two works will be based on Said's *Orientalism*. Our choice is motivated by the fact that Said studied all the aspects of the colonial discourse and the Western representation of the Orient. For Said, 'Orientalism' is "a western style of dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient."<sup>17</sup> He introduced this concept to qualify the obstination of the Occident to compare between the East and the West in order to show the Western superiority. In this sense, Siber considers that "Orientalism is defined as the discourse that deals with the Orient in order to dominate it."<sup>18</sup> As far as Said is concerned, he argues that the literature of Orientalism emerged with the emergence of the British and French colonial Empires, and it came to justify colonization and legitimize it<sup>19</sup>. However, he asserts that these two Empires were in constant rivalry over territories. We borrowed from this affirmation our idea of demonstrating the presence of this clash ideologically in the two works under study.

Said argues that "[the] Orient is an integral part of European *material* civilization and culture. Orientalism expresses and represents that part culturally and even ideologically as a mode of discourse with supporting institutions, vocabulary, scholarship, imagery, doctrines[...]."<sup>20</sup> This quotation summarizes what representation is; the representation of the Orient by the Occident. Yet, to be more explicit said explains the way representation stands for misrepresentation as he says: "My whole point about this system is not that it is a misrepresentation of some Oriental essence [...]but that it operates as representations usually do, for a purpose, according to a tendency, in a specific historical, intellectual, and even economic setting"<sup>21</sup>. As a matter of fact, the Occident deployed an undefined number of intellectual and political means of propaganda in order to denigrate the image of the Oriental.

Travel literature written by the scholars who traveled to the East participated in this propaganda. According to Said, travel Literature reinforces the Orientalist discourse that aims to stigmatize the colonized in order to dominate and control him and to justify the European encroachment in other territories<sup>22</sup>. He insists on the role of scholars who traveled Eastward in depicting the Orient as a backward place and call them “pilgrims”<sup>23</sup>. Said argues that among the different European Orientalists, the French and English are central to the Orientalist discourse just as France and Britain are central to the colonization process.<sup>24</sup>

## ***2-The Location of Culture:***

To support this idea of ‘misrepresentation’, we will rely on Bhabha’s *The Location of Culture* in which he explained the way the colonial discourse functions. With concepts like “the colonial stereotype”<sup>25</sup> or “colonial subject”<sup>26</sup>, Bhabha explains how the colonial discourse is used to stigmatize the dominated people and portray them in a negative way. For him, everything is made to prove the superiority of the white men over the blacks, the colonizer over the colonized, the European over the African or the Asian by using stereotypes. Bhabha defines the stereotype as “a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always ‘in place’, already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated.”<sup>27</sup> Bhabha clarifies the way Orientalism makes the distinction between the colonizer and the colonized in order to excuse the European intrusion in their countries. In fact, the sole objective of the colonial discourse is justifying colonization. It portrays the colonized people as primitive and inferior in order to affirm that they need to be enlightened and civilized.

## **2-Materials:**

### ***a- India and its Native Princes:***

*India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal* is a book written by Rousselet and published in 1875 [1882]. The book recounts the travel of Rousselet in India that lasted for six years and which enabled him to discover the

‘magnificence’<sup>27a</sup> of India, to use his own word. Rousselet chose in accomplishing his journey to come across roads that were not or little explored because he did not want to follow the path of his predecessors. His travel started from Bombay. Then, he traveled north to reach the state of Gujarat. There, he explored the cities of Surat, Baroda, Broach and Ahmadabad. His next step was the state of Rajasthan. He was particularly interested in the cities of Udaipur, Jodhpur and Jeypore. After that, he visited Agra, Gwalior and Sanshi and from there he reached Bhopal. He returned to Agra. Thus he described a triangle in central India. From Agra he went to Delhi and then to Calcutta. On his way to Calcutta, he explored the Bengal and the cities of Locknow, Allahabad and Benares.

Throughout his travel, the adventurous young man faced heavy technical constraints that he overcame with the help of the British and Indian authorities. Rousselet was particularly interested in the architecture and the ancient ruins and admired the beauty of the temples. After visiting the ruins of Dabbhooe, he decided that he should reproduce all these masterpieces by photography. He applied himself to learn this new art which is photography. From that point, Rousselet photographed the region. Regardless of the fact that he was fascinated by the Indian culture and archeology, he described India from an Orientalist perspective. The writer paid great attention to the sovereigns of central India: the Maharatta, the Guicowar, the queen of Bhopal, the Rama, the Maharajas, the Rajahs and their systems of governance. The writer also spoke about the different religions and faiths of the people he encountered in central India. He even gave detailed historical accounts of the different cities he visited.

#### **b- *From Sea to Sea:***

*From Sea to Sea, Letters of Travel* is a book written by Kipling and published in 1899. The book is a set of letters and articles written for the *Civil and Military Gazette* that relate the long journey of Kipling through South East Asia. His travel started in India, the British

colony where Kipling was born. The author is critical in his description of Indians, but he acknowledges the improvements brought by the British settlement in the peninsula. The second step of his travel brought him to Burma which is also a British colony. His criticism towards the Burmese was subtle in a sense that he did not provide direct criticism but insinuated that they were for example, lazy people. However, he was very injurious towards the Chinese that he met at Hong Kong because he considers that they did not have the privilege of being civilized by Britain. This is what led him to suggest overtly: “Let us annex China”<sup>28</sup>. Japan was his last station in Asia before starting for the United States. He was very pleased with Japan and the Japanese. He admired the beauty of the landscape and the cleanliness of the towns and people. He did not omit to talk about the positive Western influence over Japan. Kipling does not lose hope that one day Japan will ask for the British annexation.<sup>29</sup>

## Endnotes:

<sup>17</sup> Said, *Orientalism* , 3.

<sup>18</sup> Mouloud Siber, *Rudyard Kipling, Edward Morgan Foster, William Somerset Maugham and Joseph Conrad: The British Imperial Tradition and the Individual Talent* (Doctorate Thesis, Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou, 2012), 14.

<sup>19</sup> Said, *Orientalism*, 98.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, 2.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid, 273.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid, 99.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid, 166, 168, 169, 170, 177, 192, 223.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid, 4.

<sup>25</sup> Homi. K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 74.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, 40, 75, 76, 78, 87, 124, 234.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, 94.

<sup>27a</sup> <sup>32</sup> Louis Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal* (London: Bickers & Son, Leinster Square, 1882), 26, 28, 63, 68, 78, 219, 247, 283, 493, 507.

<sup>28</sup> Rudyard Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel* (New York: Doubleday & Mc Clure Company: New York, 1899), 219.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, 258



### III- Results and Discussion

Our dissertation studied the Orientalist discourse in Kipling's *From Sea to Sea*, *Letters of Travel* (1889) and Rousselet's *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal* (1875[1882]). To achieve this study, we decided to rely on Said's *Orientalism*. This choice is motivated by the fact that Said had theorized all the aspects that concern Orientalism. We also used concepts from Bhabha's *The Location of Culture* to support the main theory. The two authors are great supporters of Imperialism and the European colonization of India. And in order to justify it, they misrepresent Indians and their culture in order to serve their Orientalist designs. However, they diverge when it comes to the celebration of their respective Empires.

The implementation of Said's notion of misrepresentation showed that both authors depicted Indians in a very negative way. By attributing Indian people a number of stereotypes, they aimed at legitimizing colonization. The same thing has been deduced from the study of Bhabha's notion of 'colonial stereotypes'. The two notions converge in revealing the real motives of the Orientalist discourse whose objective is to prove the superiority of the colonizer over the colonized. Throughout the two books, the reader realizes that the objective of the two authors is to display the European superiority over India and its people.

The same notions helped us to decipher their will to denigrate Indian culture. As a matter of fact, the diversity of Indian culture was viewed as an occasion for criticism and defamation. Rousselet and Kipling used all the possible means in order to prove the inferiority and the primitiveness of this culture and its backwardness. All this is made in order to prove the superiority of the European culture and to provide an alibi for colonization.

Said's discussion of the conflictual relation between France and Britain in matters related to the Orient helped us in the analysis of Kipling's and Rousselet's attitudes towards the British and French implication in India. He explains how the nationality of the authors is

important in shaping their ideas. This led us to notice that their position differs because of their different nationalities. Both are engaged in the celebration and the promotion of their respective Empires. Kipling celebrates the British Empire while Rousselet celebrates the French Empire. However, while Kipling was fully enjoying the British presence in India, Rousselet was lamenting the French defeat there.

### **a. The Mis/Representation of Indians**

The stereotypes have been the plinth of colonial and Orientalist discourse. Orientalists have been ingenious in promoting the Orientalist stereotypes and reinforcing the colonialist discourse. Said argues that the image of Orientals is a “whole complex series of knowledge manipulations by which the Orient was identified by the West”<sup>30</sup>. In other words, all the images of Orientals are a complete creation of the West to justify its colonization. In *The Location of Culture* (1994), Homi K. Bhabha criticizes the colonialist discourse that associates the Orientals and the colonized with a set of stereotypes like laziness, savagery and inferiority that are used by the colonizer as means of colonialism which serve the Westerner’s political and ideological purposes. Bhabha refers to these stereotypes as a “theory of colonial discourse”<sup>31</sup>. The Orientalist stereotypes are extremely persistent and reinforced in travel literature. The Orientalist writers degraded the image of Orientals as a means to glorify the Europeans’ superiority. Rousselet and Kipling are not an exception; both attribute Indians stereotypes and degrade them to glorify Europe.

Among these attributes and stereotypes, laziness is the most recurrent in Rousselet’s and Kipling’s works. To speak about laziness in Rousselet’s work or more precisely about idleness is to evoke the fact that he describes Indians as indifferent to time and that its majority is spent in parties and excursions. Rousselet describes Indians as lazy people who have no occupation but attending festivals since every celebration is succeeded by another, from the Holi carnival that marks the arrival of spring to the festival of Gouri or the feast of

Arwandlh. When Rousselet speaks about the different Princes and Rajahs he met, he focuses his description on their enjoyments instead of their achievements since for him Indians like their Princes give more attention to enjoyment than to work. Rousselet argues that Indians' backwardness is due to their laziness. This idea is reinforced by his mania to refer to the medieval period each time he finds something different from Europe or Paris. For instance, at the court of Baroda, where he spends a whole winter, he declares that he "passed at the court an existence similar to that of European society in the Middle Ages"<sup>32</sup>. This quotation suggests that the cultural level that Indians had reached is only similar to the "backwardness" that Europeans experienced in the Middle Ages. When he arrives at Bhopal, he adds: "The houses at their fantastic outlines; our own costumes even, all glittering with gold, all seemed the effect of some dream which had transported us back to the Paris of Middle Ages."<sup>33</sup> This denotes that Bhopal's degree of development allows him to travel through time to the Paris of the Middle Ages. It also denotes that Bhopal echoes the backwardness of Paris of the Middle Ages. Said argues that according to Orientalist writers, the Orient "has remained fixed in time and place.[...] the West is the actor and the Orient a passive reactor."<sup>34</sup> This denotes that despite the European effort to civilize the Orient, it remains in its backward stage. In this sense, Rousselet compares India of the 1886 to the European backwardness of the medieval period.

Rousselet uses the situations he experienced in his travel to express his ideas about the supposed Indians' laziness. According to him, Indians are loafers and lazy workers, so they cannot achieve any work without the help of others. They used to do the work of one or two persons in group. He says:

Every house has an establishment of a dozen servants. Who share amongst them the work that could easily be done by two or three; but it is impossible to dispense with them.<sup>35</sup>

This quotation suggests that an Indian is unable to achieve a task without help and support. For Rousselet, because of their laziness, the Indians' work is never well done or achieved; they do not take into consideration the importance of work, and they perform the tasks given to them haphazardly. There is another situation that permitted the author to express his stereotypical ideas about Indians. He talks about one night when a wild beast attacked his camp because the soldiers who were supposed to mount the guard were all asleep. He says:

I walked toward the lazy men to recall them to their duty, when I saw, at a short distance from me, an animal rise to its feet, and move away slowly; it was a cheetah which had approached our fires in the hope of surprising one of our dogs. I allowed it to do off in peace and awoke the guards with a sharp reprimand for their negligence.<sup>36</sup>

What this quotation denotes is that Indians are lazy, and one cannot rely on them. They always need someone to supervise them and to take decisions for them. Said argues that "the essence of Orientalism is the ineradicable distinction between Western superiority and Oriental inferiority"<sup>37</sup>. Rousselet's descriptions of Indians are stereotypes made to place the Occident higher than the Orient.

Like Rousselet's work, Kipling's travelogue reflects the preconceptions and the misperceptions of Indians, describing them as inferior to the English and incapable of anything. Laziness is among the main features and stereotypes that the author attributes to the Indians in order to justify British colonization. According to Kipling, India has all the British support for its development, but Indians do not take advantage of the British help. He states:

The great **big lazy** land that we nurse and wrap in cotton-wool, and ask every morning whether it is strong enough to get out of bed, seems like a heavy soft cloud on the far-away horizon; and the babble that we were wont to raise about its precious future and its possibilities, no more than the talk of children in the street who have made a horse out of pea-pod and match-sticks and wonder if it will ever walk (emphasis added).<sup>38</sup>

This quotation informs us about Kipling's skepticism about Indian's ability to assume their future. For him, because of the Indians' laziness, the great but big lazy country can never achieve its development and progress despite the effort furnished by the British government.

This idea is also shown when he laughs at a sentence he reads in a newspaper: “there is no Indian nation, though there exist the germs of Indian nationality.”<sup>39</sup> Kipling argues that Indians will never reach any degree of development and that their ‘backwardness’ is due to their idleness and inertia. The writer describes the native state of Jodhpur as a primitive one because of its lazy and incapable people. He says:

They lie in long chairs in the verandah and tell each other interminable stories, or stare city wards and exchange their opinion of some dilatory debtor. They are all waiting for something [...] some of them, in old days, used to wait as long as six weeks.<sup>40</sup>

The author argues that Indians remain at a backward stage because of their time unawareness; they spend days and weeks waiting for something they ignore and lie in their long chairs instead of working in order to end their primitiveness. Kipling points at the Indians’ lack of time awareness as one of the main causes of their backwardness, and hence their underdevelopment. According to Mouloud Siber, the colonialist discourse attributes this backwardness to the Buddhist practices which stagnate their development. He says “The Indians’ religious beliefs and practices obstruct their development in according more importance to the metaphysical and neglecting space and time.”<sup>42</sup>

According to Kipling, a few states reached some degree of development as Jeypore and Udaipur, and they owe this to the British enlightenment. However, the native states that did not have the chance to benefit from the British assistance are still primitive. He says:

Jeypore is a show-city and is decently drained; Udaipur is blessed with a state Engineer and a printed form of Government; for Jodhpur the dry sand, the burning sun and an energetic have done a good deal, but Boondi has none of these things.<sup>43</sup>

Kipling justifies the British colonization and the Indians’ stereotypical attributions by comparing between the Native state of Jodhpur before colonialism, the British-ruled state of Jeypore and Boondi, the primitive, native state. Chris Kortright argues that the colonized’s lack of development and modernization is placed on the colonized’s failure by the colonizer, in order to compete with the colonial state and to justify his action.<sup>44</sup>

Kipling does not only compare between the native states and the states under British control to highlight the British superiority and Indians' inferiority, but he also points at the Burmese's laziness. When he arrives to Burma, he is struck by the fact that people there do not work. Kipling wonders how the Burmese get a living. He declares that he "made two notable discoveries [...]. The first was that the Lord of Earth is Idleness."<sup>45</sup> He adds: "there is something wrong with these people. They won't work [...]. How in the world do they get a living?"<sup>46</sup> This quotation denotes Kipling's determination to prove the supposed Orientals' laziness to legitimize the British control in India. The professor that accompanies him is more virulent about them; he compares them to beasts that eat and sleep. "When the Burman wishes to work he gets a Madrassi to do it for him."<sup>46</sup> According to Kipling, the Burmese are not self-reliant, so they never work and use others to do their jobs. The author is wondering how they get the money to live on and to employ servants. Kipling is injurious toward the Burmese since Britain took control of Burma in 1886 and considered it as a British Indian province until its gained its independence from the British rule in 1948.<sup>47</sup>

As can be noticed from above, laziness is one of the pivotal stereotypes prevailing in Rousselet's and Kipling's colonial texts. This attribute is made for the sake of promoting and highlighting the European superiority. According to Albert Mimme, the colonizer asserts that the colonized's laziness is not a stereotype that the colonizer attributes to them, but it is the nature of the colonized. Mimme says:

The colonizer establishes the colonized as being lazy. He decides that laziness is **constitutional** in the very nature of the colonized. It becomes obvious that the colonized, whatever he may undertake, whatever zeal he may apply, could never be anything but lazy (emphasize added).<sup>48</sup>

Through this quotation, Mimme affirms that the colonizer ascertains the colonized's laziness as a "constitutional" and a hereditary gene that cannot be changed. On the other hand, Kortright argues that the European creation of the colonized's idleness is "is a useful myth on many levels; it raises the colonizer and humbles the colonized. It becomes a beautiful

justification for the colonizer's privilege."<sup>49</sup> In other words, Kortright denotes that this image of the lazy colonized becomes the excuse for the colonizer since without this image "the action of colonialism would appear shocking."<sup>50</sup>

Laziness is not the only stereotype attributed to the colonized in general and the Orientals in particular. Colonialist discourse portrays the Europeans as an 'educated' and 'civilized' race that brings civilization and enlightenment to the 'savages' and 'barbarians'. Europeans justified their quest to enlarge their territories and power as having duty over the primitive savages. The civilizing mission or "the white man's burden", to borrow Kipling's words, is a complete European fabrication of the colonial rhetoric. Colonialist discourse uses it to depict the colonized as a primitive savage that needs to be enlightened by the Europeans. Bill Ashcroft et al state:

The term 'savage' has performed an important service in [...] imperial/colonial ideologies As Marianna Torgovnik notes, terms like 'primitive, savage [...] all take the West as norm and define the rest as inferior, different, deviant, subordinate, and subordinateable.'<sup>51</sup>

Rousselet's and Kipling's works consider Indians as "savages" and "barbarians" who need to be enlightened by the Europeans to improve their way of life and end their primitiveness

Rousselet's work describes some native Indian groups as savage and primitive who need the intervention of Europe in order to end their primitiveness. He describes "The aboriginal inhabitants of the mountains"<sup>52</sup> as primitive going nearly naked, covering themselves with ashes and maintaining a primitive life in these mountains, but the author argues that the European presence in the region started to enlighten and to bring civilization to them. He says: "They go nearly naked, and even their women have usually no covering than a scanty piece of linen about the loins.[...] The presence of Europeans has somewhat civilized them."<sup>53</sup> This indicates Rousselet's justification of the need of European presence in India that achieves its civilizing mission and duty. When Rousselet arrives to the country of the Bhils, he asks for Thakour's escort to pass through the country of the "savages", "barbarians" and

“brigands” Bhils that constitute one of the most important Indian races. He is upset by the primitiveness and barbarity of this tribe. He describes them as savages who wear only a “*Langouti*”<sup>54</sup> and who are indifferent to the food that constitute their nourishment and eat everything that gets within their reach. In other words, Rousselet portrays the Bhils as savage beast who scatter “terror amongst merchant and agriculturalists.”<sup>55</sup>

Rousselet’s work also describes Indians as savages and barbarians, who fought against each other for ‘insignificant’ reasons. The author argues that wars and conflicts are very frequent between the different Indian groups; what shocks the author is the number of deaths and the Rajahs’ indifference. According to him, the Indian Rajahs were always in conflicts and declared wars for pleasure. He says: “I had to listen to the complaints of the chief, who regretted the old times when he was able to wage war for his pleasure.”<sup>56</sup> This denotes that for the Indian Rajahs, wars and conflicts are sources of pleasure. The author also asserts that the diversity of religion, tribes and even opinions in India is a source of bloody clashes and murders. In the province of Udeypoor the Raja organizes an excursion to the Mausoleum of Shah Allum, the author and his companion killed some peacocks, and Captain B tells them about their imprudence to kill the bird that is a source of conflict between the populations of the region. Some Indians ask for the British authorities’ help to exterminate those peacocks because of the devastation they cause. Others consider it as the emblem of the goddess Srawati, and its chase is prohibited throughout Rajpootana. Thus, they would kill those who chase the peacocks.

Rousselet’s attributes of the Indians’ savagery go further; he claims that Indian Rajahs organize different animals’ fighting as well as soldiers’ fighting for their leisure time. The author’s stay in Baroda was longer than expected. At the end of June of the year of his stay in Baroda, the Guicowar starts to plan for the celebrations he promises for the author. The author dismisses the different celebrations that amuse and divert the Rajahs as “cruel sport, in which



the lives of men are endangered.”<sup>57</sup> The Guicowar organizes different fightings for his leisure time and for the author’s honor. The first is an elephant fighting and the second a rhinoceros one. According to the author, the two fightings are bloody, and putting in confrontation two animals is no longer a source of pleasure. But what dumbfounds the author is the soldiers fighting which is called “*Nucki-ka-kousti*”<sup>58</sup> and means “fight with claws,”<sup>59</sup> but they replace the claws with horn because it is considered “as too barbarous for modern times.”<sup>60</sup> However, according to him, the fight is still too horrible, and it is not a source of advertisement to look at two men killing each other. He describes the Guicowar as having a great source of pleasure. He says:

I was only once present at a combat of this kind, for my heart was so moved by the horrible spectacle that I refused to go again. The wrestlers, intoxicated with *bang*\_ liquid opium, mixed with an infusion of hemp\_ sing as they rush upon one another; their faces and heads are soon covered with blood, and their frenzy knows no bounds. The king, with wild eyes and the veins of his neck swollen, surveys the scene with such passionate excitement that he cannot remain quiet, but imitates by gestures the movements of the wrestlers.<sup>61</sup>

Rousselet asserts that the Indian law court is no longer a court of justice but a barbarous one. He is horrified by the way people are judged and sentenced. In a conflict that occurred between the Guicowar of Baroda and the Wâghur rebel, the king sentenced the later to death without permitting him to defend his cause. The author argues that “the punishment is one of the most frightful that can possibly be imagined.”<sup>62</sup> The rebel has been fastened to the elephant’s hind leg and has been drawn all around the city’s streets, but he has not been killed by the injuries caused by the shock. After this torture, his head is placed under the elephant’s leg that crushes it. According to the author, Europeans consider this hideous public execution cruel and inappropriate, but Indians consider it tolerable and suitable because of their indifference to men’s life and their barbarity.

Similarly, Kipling depicts Indians as savages and barbarians who need the British enlightenment to end their primitive situation. Kipling describes the aborigine Bhil as savages who speak in a strange and frightful way. He says: “Now the little Bhil is an aborigine, which

is humiliating to think of. His tongue which may frequently be heard in the city seems to possess some variant of the Zulu click, which gives it a weird and unearthly character.”<sup>63</sup> He compares their language to the South African Zulu language that suggests primitive civilization, and their bubbling makes the Bhils strange and outrageous. In fact, the colonial discourse depicts the language of the colonized as a mere bubbling. Siber argues that “the language of the subject people is dealt with in terms of inferiority. It is considered as a mark of their supposed primitive states.”<sup>64</sup> Kipling also considers the Bhils as a problem that disturbs the serenity of the state, and suggests that their extermination is “necessary to maintain a healthy current of human life in the Hilly Tracts”<sup>65</sup>. He also argues that sparing their lives is a philanthropic act.

In order to justify the British imperialist domination and praise the British duty which aims to end the supposed Indian savagery, Kipling depicts the Indian savagery through the hundred conflicts and wars that resulted in an unlimited numbers of deaths to which the Indian kings and Rajahs are not concerned. The author argues that family conflicts among Indian Rajahs occur for irrelevant reasons. Kipling claims that Indian Rajahs are indifferent to people’s life, and the hundred struggles are always horrible and fierce and cause many casualties, which does not affect the Rajahs’ serenity. When the author speaks about Jey Singh, he describes him as an “accomplished murderer”<sup>66</sup> who has spread his terror during the forty-four years of his reign. Kipling says: “wisdom remained with him. He led armies, and when fighting was over, turned to literature.”<sup>67</sup> This quotation indicates that the Indian Rajah Jey Sing is completely indifferent to the terror and the barbarity of the wars he wages and the human loss it causes. In this context, Siber and Riche argue that the French and the British colonialist writers “emphasize the misrule and tyranny”<sup>68</sup> of the Oriental rule and rulers to justify the European presence and occupation. They also argue that Kipling participated in the

construction of the British imperial ideology through pointing out the Indians' political "despotism"<sup>69</sup> and "incapacity for self-government and self-determination."<sup>70</sup>

Kipling does not only consider the Indian kings and Rajahs barbarians because of the irrelevant wars they wage but also because of the terror they spread for power and control. He argues that the Indian Rajahs' positions and supremacy is not the result of their achievements or the grandeur of their reign, but it is rather the result of the savagery and terror that they use to assert their power. Kipling describes Udai Singh as a savage murderer who "came to the throne of Chitor, through blood and misrule."<sup>71</sup> When the Englishman of Kipling's work visits the different edifices, towers and armies sculptured figures of Chitor, his theory was that:

To attain power, wrote the builder of old in sentences of fine stone, it is necessary to pass through all sorts of close-packed horrors, treacheries, battles and insults, in darkness and without knowledge whether the road leads upward into a hopeless *cul-de-sac*.<sup>72</sup>

The above quotation shows that through the Englishman, Kipling points to the supposed savagery and barbarity of the different Indian kings that use terror to attain power. He adds:

[...] in some small measure, understand what must have been the riotous, sumptuous, murderous life to which our Governors and Lieutenant-Governors, Commissioners and Deputy Commissioner, Colonels and Captains and the Subalterns have put an end.<sup>73</sup>

Through this quotation, Kipling denotes that the British presence in the Indian "primitive" states has put an end to the primitiveness, the barbarity and the savagery of Indians, and the imperial agency improves the native India. It also denotes Kipling's justification and legitimization of the British imperialist intervention in India.

Like Rousselet, Kipling stresses the absence of the Indian law court before the British intervention in India. He argues that Indians solve their problems and conflicts through blood and revenge. The author narrates the conflict that occurred between the *bhumia* of Jhaswara and the *jaghirdar* of Mahometan for a piece of land. The author argues that the English judge sentenced the *bhumia* to four years of imprisonment and adds that the Rajpout should be on

securities. Otherwise, the *bhumia* “will certainly kill the *jaghirdar*.”<sup>74</sup> After the four years of imprisonment, the *bhumia* has been released and went to the *jaghirdar*’s birthday that has been pronounced Khan Bahadur (an important officer) for bloody revenge. *Bhumia* killed his enemy brutally by smoothing his head so that it rolled upon the ground. Through this narration, Kipling contradicts himself and argues that despite the British intervention, some other Indians remain savages and barbarians.

Rousselet and Kipling depict Indians as savages that need the European enlightenment. Cynthia Sugars notes: “A dependence on the stereotype of the Native savage is central to the civilizing rationale of Western imperialism.”<sup>75</sup> This quotation denotes that the Europeans classify the colonized as savages to create an imperialist ideology, to launch and to legitimize the colonization of countries. Bill Ashcroft et al. argue that the colonizer asserts the primitiveness and the savagery of the colonized as the nature of the later. They say: “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’.”<sup>76</sup>

Colonialist discourse attributes the colonized a set of stereotypes and describes them as lazy, primitive and savages to establish a relation of dominance. The colonialist discourse based the representation of the colonized on an imperialist binary opposition in order to place the West in a superior position over the Orientals to justify their imperialist dominance. Bill Ashcroft et al state: “the binary is very important in constructing ideological meanings in general, and extremely useful in imperial ideology.”<sup>77</sup> The colonized and Orientals are also portrayed as a problem that needs to be solved by the Europeans. Said says: “Orientals were rarely seen or looked at; they were seen through, analyzed not as citizens, or even people, but as problems to be solved or confined.”<sup>78</sup> The sole objective of this negative representation is to show the benefit of Colonization. Kipling wants to show the good brought by the British colonization, and Rousselet aspires to display the benefits brought by the contact of the

Indians with the European civilization. Kortright argues that the European colonizers needed to create images of the colonized to give meaning to their “subjugation”<sup>79</sup>, and these created images became “the identity of the colonized”.<sup>80</sup>

## Endnotes

<sup>30</sup>Said, *Orientalism*, 12.

<sup>31</sup>Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 94.

<sup>32</sup>Louis Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal* (London: Bickers & Son, Leinster Square, 1882),99.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid 466.

<sup>34</sup>Said, *Orientalism*, 108, 109.

<sup>35</sup>Louis Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal*, 36.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid 150.

<sup>37</sup>Said, *Orientalism*, 42.

<sup>38</sup>Rudyard Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 12.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid 257.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid 110-111.

<sup>41</sup>Siber, *Rudyard Kipling, Edward Morgan Foster, William Somerset Maugham and Joseph Conrad: The British Imperial Tradition and the Individual Talent*, 237.

<sup>42</sup>Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 148.

<sup>43</sup>Chris Kortright, *Colonization and Identity* (the Anarchist library: Anty copyright, 2003), 15.

<sup>44</sup>Ibid 218.

<sup>45</sup>Ibid 219.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid 205.

<sup>47</sup>“British Military History,” Online resource 1930-1950 British Army, British Indian Army and Britain’s’ Allies: viewed on 12 July 2015 <http://www.britishmilitaryhistory.co.uk/documents.php?nid=13>.

<sup>48</sup>Albert Mimme, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Trans. Howard Greenfield (UK: Earthscan Publication Ltd), 125.

<sup>49</sup>Chris Kortright, *Colonization and Identity*, 14.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid 14.

<sup>51</sup>Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, *Post-Colonial studies: The Key concept* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), 192.

<sup>52</sup>Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal*, 61.

- <sup>53</sup> Ibid 61.
- <sup>54</sup> Ibid 143.
- <sup>55</sup> Ibid 143.
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid 212.
- <sup>57</sup> Ibid 103.
- <sup>58</sup> Ibid 108.
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid 108.
- <sup>60</sup> Ibid 108.
- <sup>61</sup> Ibid 108.
- <sup>62</sup> Ibid 119.
- <sup>63</sup> Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 54.
- <sup>64</sup> Siber, *Rudyard Kipling, Edward Morgan Foster, William Somerset Maugham and Joseph Conrad: The British Imperial Tradition and the Individual*, 18.
- <sup>65</sup> Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 73.
- <sup>66</sup> Ibid 12.
- <sup>67</sup> Siber and Riche, Native Mis/Rule and 'Oriental Despotism' in Alexandre Dumas's *Adventures in Algeria* (1846) and Rudyard Kipling's *From Sea to Sea, Letters of Travel*, 72.
- <sup>68</sup> Ibid 75.
- <sup>69</sup> Ibid 75
- <sup>70</sup> Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 11.
- <sup>71</sup> Ibid 84.
- <sup>72</sup> Ibid 93.
- <sup>73</sup> Ibid 21-22.
- <sup>74</sup> Ibid 101.
- <sup>75</sup> Cythia Sugars, *Strategic Abjection Windigo Psychosis and the "Postindian" Subject in Eden Robinson's "Dogs in Winter"* (Canadian Literature 1819, 2004), 89.
- <sup>76</sup> Ashcroft, et al, *Post-Colonial studies: The Key concept*, 37.
- <sup>77</sup> Ibid 19.
- <sup>78</sup> Said, *Orientalism*, 41.
- <sup>79</sup> Kortright, *Colonization and Identity*, 14
- <sup>80</sup> Ibid 14.

## **b. India Culture as Depicted in Rousselet's and Kipling's Works**

Orientalist discourse misrepresents the Oriental and the colonized as lazy and primitive people but also stigmatizes their culture, including their customs and religions. The British domination over India gave way to a torrent of injurious qualifications and attributes from the European intellectuals of the epoch. Said argues that the European colonizer depicts his “culture as superior with the all non European people and culture”<sup>81</sup>. In addition, the diversity of the Indian culture gave material for more denigration and defamation. Rousselet's and Kipling's works go in this sense. Both of them draw a negative image of the different Indian customs and religions. The two authors portray the Indian culture as primitive, superstitious and strange just because it is different from the European one. In *Primitive Culture: Researches in to the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art and Custom* (1871), Edward B. Tyler defines culture as “Culture or Civilization, taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society”<sup>82</sup>. Tyler defines anthropology as a “science of culture”<sup>83</sup>. that aims to analyze the social elements created by human civilization, and according to him culture is in a constant evolution and the difference in knowledge, customs and beliefs is a prove of the different degrees of advancement of different societies <sup>84</sup>. Rousselet and Kipling degrade the Indian customs, rituals and religions and argue that the Indian culture is primitive and does not evaluate through time despite the European effort.

For Bhabha, “the objective of the colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origins, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction”<sup>85</sup>. Thus, Rousselet and Kipling are two authors who are committed to the defense and the promotion of colonization. Their writings are meant to ‘represent’ Indians as primitive people who need civilization and enlightenment.

They display a harsh criticism of the different customs and religions they encounter during their travels. Their criticism is motivated by their will to prove the need of the Indians for the European culture and civilization. Rousselet and Kipling take the liberty of representing Indian people as well as their culture and religion in a very negative way. The sole objective of this representation is to show the benefit of colonization. Rousselet aspires to display the benefits brought by the contact of the Indians with European civilization, and Kipling wants to show the good brought by the British colonization.

The two authors, despite their will to denigrate the culture, have difficulties in hiding their admiration of this astonishing land. This ambivalence of their position can be explained by the fact that Kipling was born in India and Rousselet as an amateur of archeology admires Oriental architecture. Kipling does not deny his love and admiration for India, but India without its people. Rousselet, on his side, is able to satisfy his great interest in archeology through the different ruins he encounters during his travel. However, this ambivalence does not attenuate their colonial discourse. As Bhabha explains: “It is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency; ensures its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures; informs its strategies of individuation and marginalization [...]”<sup>86</sup>. This means that the little concessions that the authors made in their representation contribute only to reinforce the stereotypes.

The first custom that the two writers vehemently criticize is the Sati sacrifice. The word Sati derives from the Sanskrit and means “faithful wife”<sup>87</sup> and consists in the immolation of a wife with the body of her husband. Rousselet gives us a brief historical account of that custom in these terms:

Everyone has heard of the Indian custom of Suttee [sati], which formerly obliged a woman to be burnt alive with the dead body of her husband. By what fatal chance could so **barbarous** a custom have become implanted in such a humane religion as that of the Vedas, and among so gentle and tolerant a people? The Brahmins derive its origin from the sacrifice of Sati, the wife of Siva, who burned herself alive to avenge an insult offered to her husband by her father Daksha.(emphasis added)<sup>88</sup>



Rousselet qualifies the sati sacrifice as the “most hideous”<sup>89</sup> one, and he is shocked by the fact that Indians are proud and boast of this ‘hideous’ practice. He is shockingly surprised by the fact that “the Rajpout proudly calls the attention of the European visitor to the fact that five-and-twenty women were burnt on the funeral pile of the Rana Sengram Sing.”<sup>90</sup> The author goes further and imagines the sati’s ceremony and describes it to highlight its horror. He says:

During the narrative of the Sesoudia who accompanied us, I pictured to myself the scene in all its terrible reality [...] The body of the prince is laid in the centre; and the victims, their heads adorned with jewels and made with terror or fanaticism, arrange themselves in a circle round it, the favourite [sic] wife being privileged to support the head on her knees. The names creep up gradually, and through the smoke one can see the group of wretched women. The chanting of the priests and the clashing of the cymbals drown their cries; and soon nothing is left of so much life and beauty but a mass of smouldering ashes.<sup>91</sup>

Through this quotation, Rousselet highlights the horror of the sati sacrifice and the horror of its public ritual that is savage.

Rousselet talks in quite an ambivalent manner about the two mausoleums Oumra Sing and Sangram Sing, that are erected in Oudeypoor, and with his ordinary admiration of the Indian architecture, yet, he is again shocked by the victims of the sati he witnessed there. He says that “Their grandeur is imposing; and it is impossible to imagine anything more striking than these two huge structures of white marble, crowned with two domes gracefully resting upon an attic of sculptured pilasters.”<sup>92</sup> Nevertheless, he retracts himself when he sees the figures of the women that were victim of the sati sacrifice. He says in a most depressing way:

Nothing could be more romantic than to wander, on a lovely morning of an Indian spring, through this labyrinth of tombs and verdure. And yet what horrible memories hover over the Field of Immolation! Not one of these buildings but was the scene of a bloody sacrifice, and is the memorial of a **barbarous** custom. (Emphasize added)<sup>93</sup>

The use of the adjective ‘barbarous’ tells a great deal about Rousselet’s abhorrence for this strange custom that condemns women to die with their husbands.

According to Rousselet, despite its horror, the sati sacrifice may appear a clemency when it is to compare it to the horrible manner in which women that lost their husbands are treated. According to him, “the religious law was inexorable for her.”<sup>94</sup> In fact, the widow is obliged to shave her hair and to wear very bad clothes. She does not have the right to wear gold and silver, and she is reduced to work very hard. Rousselet almost regrets that the British Government had forbidden the sati as it constituted the only chance to escape from that miserable life. He expresses himself in these terms:

The widow formerly had a means of escaping this life of torture; she could sacrifice herself as suttee burn herself alive on the body of her husband: but, after the English prohibited these sacrifices, the poor woman had no other refuge from the severities of her people than the life of a courtesan of the bazaar.<sup>95</sup>

This quotation summarizes the despairing situation in which widows are confronted in India because of their customs and religions. Through his harsh description, Rousselet calls for the European intervention to end the barbarous practice and thus to civilize the ‘primitive’ Indians.

Kipling shares Rousselet’s position toward the sati sacrifice. He tells a story of a dying king who consented to go to a palace outside the town with his favorite wives where he could die in peace. The king does so to protect his wives from going in the street unveiled when he would die and thus become a Sati. Kipling says:

The place in which he lay [*sic*] was very near to the City ; and there was a fear that his womankind should, on his death, going [*sic*] mad with grief, cast off their veils and run out into the streets, uncovered before all men. In which case nothing, not even the power of the Press, and the locomotive, and the telegraph, and cheap education and enlightened municipal councils, could have saved them from the **burning-pyre**, for they -were the wives of a King.<sup>96</sup>

The author tries to explain that even the British Government in India cannot save those women from immolation if they go outside uncovered. He explains that all the enlightenment brought by Britain is not enough to end that bloody custom. He seems astonished by this and wonders “why a frantic woman must of necessity become a sati.”<sup>97</sup> This quotation denotes

Kipling's call for the abolition of the sati, but it also indicates that even its abolition will not prevent those women to burn themselves.

Kipling is, in one sense, wondering whether Indian women really want the abolition of the sati. For him, the prohibition cannot always protect women from fire because in some cases they go themselves to the burning fire with the husband. It is the case of that dancing-girl in Udaipur who followed her king through fire and "stole a march in the next world's precedence and her lord's affections"<sup>98</sup>, in Kipling's words. Kipling wonders whether the sati has really been abolished in the lonely hills where the British Government has not a great influence. Harold Fisher argues that the prohibition of the sati sacrifice has been a great dilemma for the British government that associates this sacrifice with horror<sup>99</sup>. The British government considered its abolition and the saving of thousand of widows from the barbaric practice as a "morale duty"<sup>100</sup>, but its abolition could "jeopardize the stability of British rule in India"<sup>101</sup>. Fisher argues that the dilemma has been solved with the 1829 Abolitionary Act<sup>102</sup> for the "sake of the colonized people."<sup>103</sup> Despite its abolition, they continued to practice it. Barbara D. Metcalf et al argue that the conservatives led by Radha Kanta Deb opposed its abolition not only to see the practice continue but also to "oppose the colonial interference in the Indian domestic and family life."<sup>104</sup>

The Sati sacrifice is not the only Indian custom that the two authors criticize and qualify with horror. When the two authors speak about Chitor, they stress the Johur sacrifice which consists of the sacrifice of great number of kings and women in order to satisfy the "bloodthirsty"<sup>105</sup> Goddess Kangra Ranee. Rousselet describes the legend of Johur sacrifice in which twelve princes were crowned kings and sacrificed themselves joyfully on the third day in order to save their kingdom from Muslim invasion. Rousselet is surprised by the joyfulness with which the Princes volunteer and the disputes that occur between them to be the first to die and perform the sacrifice for Chitor. After convincing his twelfth son to escape in order to

perpetuate his dynasty, the Rana sacrificed himself and immolated thousands of women with the jewels of the crown; he was free to die with satisfaction. The Rana accomplished his vengeance by letting a devastated city where nothing could be found but mere ashes. This genocide was perpetuated because of the beauty of one woman: Pudamane. This denotes the extent to which Rousselet is critical of the Johur sacrifice.

As for Kipling, he highlights the second Johur sacrifice which is even greater in atrocity than the sacrifice of Pudamane. He states that thirteen thousand people were sacrificed before opening the gates of the town to the invaders. Kipling says in almost a sarcastic way: “out of this carnage was saved Udai Singh, a babe of the Blood Royal, who grew up to be a coward and a shame to his line”<sup>106</sup>. This prince fell later as a slave for a woman and another Johur was performed to stop the conquest of Akbar because the Goddess of Chitor accepts only Royal Blood. The irony is that Akbar did not destroy the monument which represents the victory against the Muslims that was achieved thanks to the first Johur sacrifice. Kipling considers the Johur sacrifice as an insignificant massacre that has been perpetuated as a tradition in Chitor.

The two authors refer to the Johur sacrifice, used by Indians to face the invaders of Chitor, to prove that they are vulnerable and that their culture contributes to that vulnerability. Instead of fighting and facing the invaders to defend their city, they fight with superstition and sacrifice themselves and destroy the city.

Rousselet does not only criticize the sati and Johur sacrifice but he also describes “a singular custom”<sup>107</sup> that resembles the ancient ceremonies in honor of Bacchus (God of wine in Roman mythology), and imitates the chorus of the ancient Silenus in every aspect. He describes it as a “cortège of a drunken and vociferous crowd of half-naked men and women”<sup>108</sup> and “naked children”<sup>109</sup> who go in procession around a fat and drunk merchant riding a donkey. To make it more vulgar, he adds that it is “swollen by all the vagabonds on

its route, and assailed by a shower of harmless projectiles, such as sacks of purple powder or rotten fruit”<sup>110</sup>. This ceremony reminds Rousselet of the middle ages in Europe because of its grotesque aspect. He says that this custom:

presents a remarkable analogy to the ceremonies of the Greeks, the Romans, and the Persians, and even with the grotesque maniac's festival which was perpetuated down to the Middle Ages in France and England.<sup>111</sup>

It is not the first time that Rousselet compares India and its customs to the middle Ages. This comparison aims to show that Indians had just reached a degree of development that is comparable to Europeans in Antiquity and in the middle ages. The end of this ceremony is made around a fire where the idols are burnt and where a crowd of women perform dances all night that “terminate in orgies of the wildest description.”<sup>112</sup> the author compares the Indian ceremony to the European one during the middle ages as a way to denigrate the Indian culture and to highlight the supposed European superiority. Thomas R. Metcalf argues that Europeans create a nation of an “other”, they used to define their culture and nation as “superior” and all the non European nations as “primitive” and “backward”, he calls this alternity “the creation of doubleness”.<sup>113</sup>

The two authors associate the sati and Johur sacrifices with savagery and barbarism. Kortright argues that the European colonizer used to denigrate the colonized’s cultural values as a technique to control and to “civilize” the indigenous people.<sup>114</sup> He also argues that the “native culture turns against its members and is used to devalue and define the identity of the native population.”<sup>115</sup> Regarding the Indian culture as primitive implies that the authors consider Indians’ need for European civilization.

India, with all its religious diversity, offered an immense potential for study. Rousselet’s curiosity was satisfied with that huge number of divinities and religions. His ambiguous position is very apparent when he describes the different Indian religions he gets knowledge of and associates them with primitiveness and lack of civilization. He says: “their religion is perfectly primitive.”<sup>116</sup> To begin with, Rousselet is very injurious towards the

Muslims. His first allusion to the Muslim community in Bombay was accompanied with a comment on their chief Aga Khan, who is according to Rousselet the direct successor of “Hassan Shah, ‘the prince of the Assassins.’”<sup>117</sup> This suggests that all the members of the community are assassins and violent people. He adds that these people, despite their conversion to ‘Islam’, had kept “the superstitions of their primitive religion.”<sup>118</sup> Superstition and violence are the two main features that Rousselet attributes to the first Muslim community he encountered in India.

He considers that when the Muslims first came to India, they only had bad intentions. He says: “When the Mahometans first invaded India, they only thought of pillaging and destroying, without for a moment considering how they were to replace the magnificence they were overturning.”<sup>119</sup> In fact, the writer declares that the intentions of the Muslims are devoid of scruple or hesitation. He adds that the Muslims built their mosques on the ruins of the Indian temples they have destroyed. For Rousselet, the Muslims copied the style of the Indian temples to which they add a Minaret, and these result in splendid Mosques. For him, these splendid Mosques are not the result of the genius of the ‘Mahometans’ but of the Indians. The author criticizes the fact that Muslims do not build Mosques by their own and that they copy the style of the Indian temples<sup>120</sup>.

After criticizing the architecture, Rousselet attacks the social life and the religious ceremonies. He first accuses them of making too much reference to their Imams in their public festivals which is very contrasting with their monotheistic religious principles. This is what the following quotation explains:

Notwithstanding the rigorously iconoclastic sentiments of their creed, it is easy to observe the natural taste which the Mahometans of India have for emblematic ornaments in their public festivals, where it is no rare occurrence to see them figuring by hundreds.<sup>121</sup>

As a proof for this assertion, Rousselet emphasizes the Moharam Festival as celebrated in Bombay and in Bhopal. In Bombay, they make temples with paper and precious metals to

imitate the tombs of their Imams, and they throw them to the sea. According to Rousselet, this is a reproduction of the ceremony conducted by their ancestors to celebrate the new year. Concerning the Bhopalese, Rousselet was disappointed “to find a repetition of these ceremonies at Bhopal, where the Musulman population belongs to the [Sheit] sect, and holds the Shute heretics and their superstitions in abhorrence.”<sup>122</sup> He says that the festival is celebrated in “great pomp”<sup>123</sup>, but the women were excluded from the celebrations. Through this harsh criticism of Islam, Rousselet aims at proselytizing Indians to the colonized’s faith by stressing the supposed primitiveness of the local religion as a means of domination and control. In his essay “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus”, Louis Althusser calls this way of domination and control as the religious ideological state apparatus. According to him religion is an ISA (Ideological State Apparatus) which “functions as an ideological instrument of the state to ensure the ‘subjection’ of the individuals to the established order”<sup>124</sup>. In other words, for Althusser, religion becomes a “material”<sup>125</sup> and a means of control.

In contrast with these happy festivities, Rousselet witnessed a group of people who were performing “a species of *danse Macabre*.”<sup>126</sup> He says that sometimes “they brandished long sharp-pointed poignards [...] and occasionally one of these fanatics plunged his poignards into his body”<sup>127</sup>. The author was shocked by this performance and declares that “These wretched men, streaming with blood, were hideous to look upon”<sup>128</sup>. The author does no effort to hide his abhorrence of this custom or to use a less sharp language. It is evident that for a stranger, this may seem shocking, but these people have their reasons, and should not be condemned.

Talking about the situation of Muslim women in Bombay, he states that they have more liberty than the Muslim women in the East of India and dress like all Indian women. However, what distinguishes them from “their charming fellow-countrywomen, who carry cleanliness to excess, and spend much time in bathing”<sup>129</sup> is the fact that “they are never neat,

and often disgustingly dirty”<sup>130</sup>. But in Bhopal, it is a completely different situation. Despite the fact that the City is ruled by a queen, it has not improved the situation of women. They are generally kept in the harem and have no right in attending public meetings.

On his side, Kipling considers the Muslims as aborigines who belong to the lowest casts in Indian society. The state of Boondi received the greatest number of criticism because the majority of its inhabitants are Muslims. Talking about the different races and communities that constitute the population of Boondi, he says: “There are four or five thousand Mahometans within its walls, and a sprinkling of aborigines of various varieties, besides the human **raffle** that the Bunjaras bring in their train.(emphasize added)”<sup>131</sup> The author describes the Muslims as “raffle”, and it is a highly injurious term towards human beings who committed no mistake except being enslaved in their own countries. Kipling states that in contrary to the Hindu people who are mysterious and difficult to understand, the Muslims are easy to deal with. This stipulates that they are stupid. He also says that the Hindus and the Muslims are corrupt. He writes: “In Rajputana generally, the Political swears by the Hindu, and holds that the Mahometan is untrustworthy.”<sup>132</sup> Through this quotation, the author argues that the Muslims are dishonest and one cannot trust them or rely on their judgment. Metcalf argues that the British “had to make of Indians whatever they chose *not* to make of themselves.”<sup>133</sup>

In comparison with the Muslims, Kipling argues that the Hindus are more reliable, but this does not prevent him to highlight the primitiveness of their religions and the bloodthirstiness of their Gods. He says: “tangled tale of force, fraud, cunning, desperate lore and more desperate revenge, crime worthy of demons and virtues fit for gods, may be found”<sup>134</sup>. This quotation denotes that different bloody crimes are committed to satisfy the sloughterous Gods. When Kipling speaks about the Johur sacrifice that has been perpetuated



as a tradition in Chitor, he argues that it is the result of the bloodthirstiness of its Goddess. He says:

The Goddess of Chitor demands always that a crowned head must fall for the defence of her home is to be successful, Chitor fell as it had fallen before in *johur* of thousands, a last rush of the men, and the entry of the conqueror into a rooking, ruined slaughter-pen.<sup>135</sup>

This quotation denotes that Chitor has been destroyed and has fallen in Johur of thousands many times only to satisfy cruelty and bloodthirstiness of the Goddess that demands bloody sacrifices to defend her home.

Both authors portray the Indian culture and religions as primitive and barbarian as a way to legitimize the European intervention in India and to highlight the supposed European superiority. According to Said, Europeans used to depict “Oriental cultures not as they are but as, for the benefit of the receiver, ought to be”<sup>136</sup>. This denotes that European Orientalists describe all non-European culture in a way to serve their ideological purpose. Said also argues that the denigration of the colonized and his culture is a technique of domination and control; the European colonizer used to misrepresent the colonized, his culture and religion to justify his imperialist ideology.<sup>137</sup> Through their travelogues the two authors denigrates the Indian culture and religions. Majed Hamed Aladaylah argues that travel writers “tend to look at anything that differs from their culture as negative or inferior.”<sup>138</sup>

### **Endnotes:**

<sup>81</sup> Said, *Orientalism*, 7.

<sup>82</sup> Edward B. Tyler, *Primitive Culture: researches in to the Development of Mythology, philosophy, Religion, Language, Art and Custom* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed . 2 vols (London: John Murray, 1871), 1.

<sup>83</sup> Ibid 17.

<sup>84</sup> Ibid 24, 469.

<sup>85</sup> Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 94.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid 122.

<sup>87</sup> Oxford Dictionaries, S. V. “sati”. Accessed Jun 28, 2015, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/sati>.

- <sup>88</sup>Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal*, 99.
- <sup>89</sup>Ibid 180.
- <sup>90</sup>Ibid 180.
- <sup>91</sup>Ibid 180-181.
- <sup>92</sup>Ibid 180.
- <sup>93</sup>Ibid 180.
- <sup>94</sup>Ibid 600.
- <sup>95</sup>Ibid 600.
- <sup>96</sup>Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 63.
- <sup>97</sup>Ibid 63.
- <sup>98</sup>Ibid 64.
- <sup>99</sup>Harald Fischer and Tiné, Michael Mann, *Colonialism as Civilizing Mission: Cultural Ideology in British India* (London: Wimbledon Publishing Company, 2004), 68.
- <sup>100</sup>Ibid 68.
- <sup>101</sup>Ibid 69.
- <sup>102</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>103</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>104</sup>Barbara D. and Thomas R Metcalf, *A Concise History of Modern India* (New York : Cambridge University Press, 2006), 88.
- <sup>105</sup>Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal*, 207.
- <sup>106</sup>Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 83.
- <sup>107</sup>Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal*, 207
- <sup>108</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>109</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>110</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>111</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>112</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>113</sup>Thomas R. Metcalf, *The New Cambridge History of India: Ideologies of the Raj* (New York: Cambridge University Press), 6.
- <sup>114</sup>Kortright, *Colonization and Identity*, 15.
- <sup>115</sup>Ibid 15.
- <sup>116</sup>Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal*, 143.
- <sup>117</sup>Ibid.

<sup>118</sup>Ibid.

<sup>119</sup>Ibid 219.

<sup>120</sup>Ibid.

<sup>121</sup>Ibid.

<sup>122</sup>Ibid.

<sup>123</sup>Ibid.

<sup>124</sup> Madhu T. V, *Althusser's Conception of Ideology: A Critical Exposition. Indian Philosophical Quarterly Vol. XXII, No 4* (University of Hyderabad, Oct 1995), 345.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid.

<sup>126</sup> Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal* ,143.

<sup>127</sup>Ibid.

<sup>128</sup>Ibid.

<sup>129</sup>Ibid.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid.

<sup>131</sup>Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 154.

<sup>132</sup>Ibid 175.

<sup>133</sup>Ibid 10.

<sup>134</sup>Ibid.84.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid.

<sup>136</sup> Said, *Orientalism*, 204.

<sup>137</sup>Ibid 67.

<sup>138</sup> Majed Hamed Aladaylah, *Centering the Other: Making the Native Visible* in Revista de Divulgação Científica em Língua Portuguesa, Linguística e Literatura Ano 06 n.12 - 1º Semestre de 2010- ISSN 1807-5193( Al-karak University Coledge, 2010),7.

### **c. Rousselet, Kipling and French-English Ideological Rivalry in India:**

European colonization in India was not just British, but there were other nations like France that had interest there. Thus, the French and the British were conflictual over it. However, after the British victory over France in the Seven Years War (1756-1763) in India, France lost all its territories. Consequently, all its establishments in India were at the mercy of Britain. The Peace Settlement of 1763 granted back France some of its territories and remained in possession of its commercial installations in India. Yet, the treaty had forbidden to France to erect any political ambition among Indian princes<sup>139</sup>. Nevertheless, the French had never accepted that and always thought that India should be a French colony, so tensions continued between the two powers. These tensions are reflected in the literature of the epoch which contains their marks. Thus, Rousselet and Kipling are two writers who lived and wrote at this period when the confrontation between France and Britain over India was still vivid. The two writers share the same ideas about colonization, but when it comes to India, everyone wants to see his country triumph.

For Said, a writer can neither be indifferent to the political and ideological environment of his country nor avoid influence. Every writer or intellectual takes part in the political and ideological debates of his country, and his position is mirrored in his works. English or French writers of the 19<sup>th</sup> century do not ignore the fact that their respective countries are great colonial empires. To quote Said:

The two greatest empires were the British and the French; allies and partners in some things, in others they were hostile rivals. In the Orient, from the eastern shores of the Mediterranean to Indochina and Malaya, their colonial possessions and imperial spheres of influence were adjacent, frequently over-lapped, often were fought over.<sup>140</sup>

Said explains how Britain and France were in perpetual conflict over territories in the near and Far East and how the Anglo-French conflict in India is only a part of a greater conflict of interest between two colonial powers which want to control as much territories as possible.

Said makes a clear statement about the hostilities that were engaged between France and Britain before the complete British domination in India. He says “Britain and France fought each other in India between 1744 and 1748 and again between 1756 and 1763, until, in 1769, the British emerged in practical economic and political control of the subcontinent”.<sup>141</sup> As a result of the French defeat in India, Napoleon tried to seize Egypt as Said puts it: “What was more inevitable than that Napoleon should choose to harass Britain's Oriental empire by first intercepting its Islamic through-way, Egypt?”<sup>142</sup> Unfortunately, Napoleon was defeated in the battle of Abukir by the Admiral Nelson and failed to take his revenge.

The British and French historical conflict over territories was transformed into an ideological conflict between intellectuals, and it is reflected in their writings. Being part of that conflict, Rousselet and Kipling mirror that struggle in their writings. Rousselet's work does not make an exception. Throughout his text, he makes reference to France. He mentions twenty five times the name of “France” in his book written about India. Since the beginning of his travelogue, he starts his praising of the French Empire. The quotation that will follow speaks about the response given by the Guicowar of Baroda to Rousselet after knowing that he was a French traveler:

The king sent us his salams, and had heard with pleasure of the arrival of two French travelers (the Hindoos knowing only great countries of Europe, the nationality of Belgium was unknown to his majesty who had supposed it is only a part of France).<sup>143</sup>

These words show Rousselet's aspiration to prove that France has a great reputation in India and that it is considered as a great country. The Guicowar's reflection about Belgium as a part of France is a recognition of the expansionist designs of France over its neighbors. Indirectly, Rousselet makes us understand that imperial France has international reputation.

Furthermore, Rousselet talks about a French man whose name is “Monsieur Fantôme”<sup>144</sup>, he is “a descendant of the famous French adventurer Captain Fantôme, who rendered himself famous in the service of the Scindias during the wars at the end of the last

century”<sup>145</sup>. In fact, Captain Fantôme was the head of the Mahratta troops with which he defeated, on many occasions, the Mogul army. He even defended himself against the English army which besieged him and his troops. He says that the descendants of this captain “are very proud of the title ‘Frenchman’ although they are ignorant of the language”<sup>146</sup>. The presence of this cast in India is, according to Rousselet, evidence of the French implication in the Indian territory.

The author does not find an adequate manner to express his joy and his pride of hearing about princess de Bourbon who is a very wealthy and most important person in Bhopal after the Begum Secundar. The ancestor of this Princess was French. His name is Jean de Bourbon, and he found himself in the court of the Emperor Akbar in Agra. This latter “was taken with his graceful manners and intelligent appearance, and offered him an appointment in his army”<sup>147</sup>. Rousselet affirms that the descendants of this person form a clan of four hundred families and remained faithful to their Christian faith. Rousselet’s retrospective outlook aims at pointing at French success in creating a French-Indian colony indirectly, despite the British opposition. He adds that when he would be back in France, he would inform his countrymen that somewhere in the heart of central India there still exist people who are very proud of their French origins.

While Rousselet has no other alternatives to praise France than to talk about its reputation in India, Kipling fully enjoys the British achievements. Said argues that the English writers are fully implicated in the debate around the Empire and hold different positions, as this following quotation demonstrates:

I doubt that it is controversial, for example, to say that an Englishman in India or Egypt in the later nineteenth century took an interest in those countries that were never far from their status in his mind as British colonies. To say this may seem quite different from saying that all academic knowledge about India and Egypt is somehow tinged and impressed with, violated by the gross political fact- and yet *that is what I am saying* in this study of orientalism.<sup>148</sup>

All the difference is made by the position taken by the writer. He may be a great supporter of colonization and thus will use the colonial discourse to justify it or maybe an anti-imperialist. In the case under study, Kipling is a great supporter of the British Empire mainly in India.

When Kipling speaks about the English successor of Jey Singh in Jeypore, colonel Jacob, Kipling qualifies him as a man who is “educated and enlightened by all the lamps of British progress”<sup>149</sup> and who “converted the city of Jey Singh into a surprise”<sup>150</sup>. Kipling’s bewilderment in the colonel has no limits. He says about him:

How much colonel Jacob has done, not only for the good of Jeypore city but for the good of the State at large, will never be known, because the officer in question is one of the not small class who resolutely refuse to talk about their own work.<sup>151</sup>

The writer makes of Colonel Jacob a philanthropic and modest person who refuses to talk about the good he does for Indians even though he “is generally regarded as one of the chief proponents of the revival of building crafts in Jaipur.”<sup>152</sup> This colonel stands for the success of the British enterprise in India.

The comparison between native and British states constitutes one of the most prominent techniques used by Kipling in order to emphasize Britain’s achievements in India. Thus, he keeps comparing between Jodhpur, which is under British control and native-ruled Udaipur. He notes the difference between them in relation to the presence or absence of development. It is the perfect manner for him to show the benefits of the British colonization. Kipling talks about Ajmir which belongs to Jodhpur and affirms that since it is a British territory it became “the headquarters of many of the banking firms who [sic] lend to the Native States”<sup>153</sup>. Then, Kipling ironically says: “the complaint of the Setts today is that their trade is bad, because an unsympathetic Government induces Native States to make railways and become prosperous”<sup>154</sup>. He deplores the fact that Indians are ungrateful and do not recognize the British effort to enlighten them. However, Kipling contradicts himself by reporting the words of a man who apparently has a lot of money and who acknowledges the

progress brought by the British. The man says that “time was when Jodhpur was always in dept and not so long ago, either. Now, they’ve got a railroad and are carrying salt over it, and, as sure as I stand here, they have a surplus.”<sup>155</sup> Actually, Kipling wants to demonstrate that the prosperity of Jodhpur is the result of the British occupation. Where the British are present, there is progress. Colonial discourse holds all its meaning through Kipling’s constant attempts to paint the British occupation in India as a work of great humanity and indulgence.

Talking about the great achievements of the British in Jodhpur, always in order to promote the empire, Kipling describes the work of a British called George Stephenson. The latter was the state engineer who delivered the city of Jodhpur from the problems of water by establishing a system of irrigation to bring water from a tank. But the inhabitants of the city were, according to Kipling, very ungrateful and said that “the Sahib wanted the water to run uphill and was throwing money into the tank”<sup>156</sup>. The allegation of this quotation is that Indians accuse the British agents of corruption. Furthermore, they start projects in order to steal money. Again, Kipling deplores the Indian ungratefulness as if they should rejoice for being enslaved and for their confiscated territory.

Kipling’s confidence is not shared by Rousselet. As the latter advances in the description of his journey, his tone becomes more pessimistic. He moves from the description of the French reputation in India to an effusion of sorrow and regret. At his arrival to the French colony of Chandernagore, he could not repress his feeling of delight:

A few steps from the station we perceived with emotion the tricolour flag proudly waving above the trees: soon we were in the midst of fellow-countrymen and friends, and, and for the first time in the course of four years, heard the sound of the French tongue pronounced by French lips.<sup>157</sup>

However, just after recovering from the first emotions caused by the presence of the French flag, happiness left place to strong feelings of disillusionment and regret. He says: “What! Does this spot of earth of a few square miles, this heap of low, dirty huts, invaded by water and vegetation represent all our Indian empire in the north?”<sup>158</sup> The writer seems staggered by



this discovery. He does not understand why a great imperial country like France had lost such a territory as India. At the same time, Rousselet seems astonished by the smallness of that territory as if he expected a bigger portion of land and has a difficulty to accept the role of subaltern that his motherland plays there. Rousselet, like all French intellectuals who travel to the Orient, specifically India, has this feeling of loss. Said says that “the French pilgrim was imbued with a sense of acute loss in the Orient”<sup>159</sup> because “[he] came there to a place in which France, unlike Britain, had no sovereign presence.”<sup>160</sup> This feeling is accentuated by the fact that France has lost all its territories in the Orient because of Britain. The desire of France to compensate its losses in the Orient is so great that Said declares that “France seemed literally haunted by Britain.”<sup>161</sup>

It is not surprising to see Rousselet’s grievance while asking this question: “Why does France persist in retaining this insignificant spot of ground? Is it to remind us of what we might have been in India, and of what we are.”<sup>162</sup> This quotation tells all about Rousselet’s dissatisfaction with the position of his country in India. That little spot of land accounts for the French failure in India. They should have been the dominant force there; instead they possess a small territory where they do not have the right to keep more than fifteen soldiers. His dissatisfaction turns into anger. For him, it is not acceptable to continue to humiliate the French flag in Chandernagore. It has to be noted that the flag is an important mark of sovereignty for any given country. It should reflect its grandeur not its failure. Unfortunately, it is not the case of the tricolor flag in India. He writes:

Would it not be better to efface all these melancholy souvenirs, and to withdraw our flag from a locality in which it only receives humiliations? Unless indeed, the tribute of three hundred cases of opium, representing from two hundred thousand to three hundred thousand francs, which England pays us on the condition that we shall not interfere with her monopoly, be deemed a sufficient compensation for these humiliations.<sup>163</sup>

Rousselet's claims are very strong, indeed. He accuses Britain of paying for its monopoly in India. He affirms that Britain pays for France three hundred thousand francs so that France stays away from British affairs.

While French writers are lamenting the loss of India, the British celebrate their established rule. Britain was the biggest power in India, and the British intellectuals are proud of it. Said remembers us that Kipling is among the most important writers who "sung so memorably"<sup>164</sup> the British Empire. His prose as his poems testifies to his admiration of Britain and the British Empire. In an article entitled "Rudyard Kipling and his Imperial verse: Critical Dilemmas", John A. Stotesbury refers to a poem called "The Glory of the Garden" in which Kipling beautifully sings England and the Empire. He says: "For the Glory of the Garden, that it may not pass away! / And the Glory of the Garden it shall never pass away!"<sup>165</sup> It is worth noting that the "Garden" stands for England as well as for the Empire<sup>166</sup>. He calls for the preservation of the greatness of Britain and its big empire in India as well as in the whole world. In these two verses, we may understand that the glory of England is tied to the preservation of its Empire.

Kipling is firmly convinced of the nobility of the British mission in India. Therefore, in order to put stress on the British efforts there, he glorifies the British-ruled states while he criticizes the native ones. He always finds something to reproach for the native authorities. As he speaks about Udaipur, he says that the only drawback that the Maharaja has is his lack of education. He even acknowledges that he is "a thoroughly good man."<sup>167</sup> Unfortunately, he "was not brought up with kinship before his eyes; consequently he is not an English-speaking man."<sup>168</sup> Not being able to speak English is a very serious problem for Kipling because one cannot be admitted in the very restricted circle of 'civilized men' and so cannot govern. It is as if he calls the Maharaja of Udaipur to give up his authority to the British. This is, of course,

part of Kipling's desire to denigrate the local chiefs and to justify their occupation by the inability of Indians to govern themselves.

The feeling of loss and frustration from Rousselet is opposed by a sensation of pride from Kipling. What is striking in his work is the number of times he says "British India"<sup>169</sup> or "the British Government"<sup>170</sup>. The writer keeps recalling us that India is a British colony. He even uses the possessive pronouns "our" or "my" while talking about India: "our India"<sup>171</sup>, "oh, India, oh, my country!"<sup>172</sup> in order to emphasize the idea of possession. Kipling likes India and considers it as his home where he feels secure. This security is the result of the British colonization. When he travels in other Asian countries, Kipling feels sad, and he says: "I want to go home! I want to go back to India! I am miserable".<sup>173</sup> He feels miserable in those areas that are not under the British domination.

Kipling is astonished by the fact that some Indians want to get rid of the British occupation. For him, it is an honor to be under British rule. He says "Oh dear people, stewing in India and swearing at all the governments, it is a glorious thing to be an Englishman."<sup>174</sup> He celebrates his Englishness by adding that "Into this land [India] God put first gold and tin, and after these the Englishman, who floats companies, obtains concessions and goes forward."<sup>175</sup> This sentence proves Kipling's intention to paint the British hegemony over India as a divine blessing.

Kipling has inexhaustible ways to praise the British Empire in India. For example, he advises the traveler to India to visit first a native state and then a British one in order to notice the difference. Here is, for instance, the adequate manner to visit Jeypore:

Escape from the city by the Railway Station till [...] you come upon what seems to be the fringe of illimitable desert [...]. Here, if you have kept to the road, you shall find a dam faced with stone, a great tank, and pumping machinery fine as the heart of a municipal engineer can desire pure water, sound pipes, and well-kept engines. If you belong to what is sarcastically styled an "able and intelligent municipality" under the British Rule, go down to the level of the tank, scoop up the water in your hands and drink, thinking meanwhile of the defects of the town whence you came. The experience will be a profitable one.<sup>176</sup>

Kipling's attempt is to show the enormous difference between native states and the ones that are under the British control.

Kipling's pride with his country was not always opposed by depressing ideas from Rousselet. Sometimes, strong patriotic feelings push him to invoke France with a tone close to arrogance. As a matter of fact, towards the end of his travelogue, his tone changes again and he starts celebrating France, as if he regrets that he let himself sink into unnecessary lamentations. Thus, the celebration of the French empire takes big proportions when we come to the retrospective glance that Rousselet made of his travel. For him, his journey which started as a simple personal expedition "was destined soon to assume a very different character; one, indeed, more in accordance with the high position of an accredited representative of a mighty Power"<sup>177</sup>. He then explains what according to him are the reasons of this change in a less ambiguous manner:

In the first place, if we go back to the year 1863, when I undertook my journey, it will lie remembered that France had then, in the eyes of strangers, arrived at the apogee of her glory and power, and that her name might be said, without boasting, to have filled the universe.<sup>178</sup>

Now, we understand that this 'mighty Power' is France. The writer attributes all the kindness and the hospitality of the Indian Princes to his French nationality. They welcomed him "to testify, by the honors they lavished upon this Frenchman, the first who ever visited their court, their esteem and respect for the name of France".<sup>179</sup>

Rousselet earnestly evokes the fact that some French adventurers gave assistance to a native Prince who wanted to get rid of the British occupation in his territory. He proudly says that those adventurers had "transformed the Mahratta army into those well-organized battalions before which the English were frequently obliged to retreat".<sup>180</sup> This statement brings evidence about Rousselet's support to those Indian people who want to chase Britain

out of India and his pride to see French people help them in this task. This leaves little doubt about his desire to see Britain evicted from India and possibly become a French colony.

Despite his anger and disillusionment, Rousselet never denies that Britain had realized many improvements in India. He fully acknowledges the efforts furnished by the British authorities there, but he does this as a supporter and admirer of the European civilization and not as a supporter of the British Empire. In fact, Chezaud says that “Rousselet est un occidental, mais il n’est pas Anglais et ne ménage ni ses critiques, ni sa reconnaissance envers les autorités. Mais il est colonialist et convaincu de la suprématie de la civilisation Européenne,”<sup>181</sup> “Rousselet is a Westerner, but he is not British. Thus, he is free to criticize or to praise the British authorities. He is a colonialist who is convinced of the superiority of European civilization” (Translation, ours). To make things clearer, the ambivalent position of Rousselet towards the British encroachment in India is motivated by his support of the European civilization and progress. Naturally, Britain is part of that progress, so Rousselet is forced to accept the British achievements in India.

The French scholars who write about Rousselet’s work stress the freedom that characterizes the journey of the author that his French nationality granted. In fact, Rousselet as French, undertook his journey with more freedom. He was free to study India with more or less objectivity because his country was not involved there. G. Perrot, in an interesting article about the book, attests about Rousselet that:

[...] il a visité des contrées que, pour différentes raisons, les voyageurs anglais avaient plus ou moins négligées, et il a pu juger la situation du pays, les idées et le caractère des indigènes, l'administration et la politique de l'Angleterre dans l'Inde, avec une liberté d'esprit qu'un Anglais, trop intéressé dans la question, aurait difficilement conservée dans toute cette étude.<sup>182</sup>

He visited places that were, for different reasons, ignored by English travelers, and he was able to constitute an opinion about the character of the indigenous people, the British administration and the British policy in India with a certain freedom that was not allowed for a British who was more implicated in the question. ( Translation: ours).

As a matter of fact, the degree of implication of both France and Britain in India greatly influenced the objectivity of Rousselet and Kipling. What has been viewed as a disagreement for Rousselet has in fact, at a certain extent, helped him to achieve what Perrot calls “ ce que, depuis Jacquemont, on a écrit en France de plus sérieux sur l'Inde,”<sup>183</sup> “the most serious thing that was written in France about India since Jacquemont.” (Translation: ours).

All what has been said about the implication of the two authors in the celebration of their respective Empires is motivated by their strong national feeling. Said argues that the development of science in addition to the growing nationalist feelings greatly contributed to the reinforcement of the discourse of Orientalism. He quotes Lionel Trilling who says: “racial theory, stimulated by a rising nationalism and a spreading imperialism, supported by an incomplete and mal-assimilated science, was almost undisputed”<sup>184</sup>. Thus, Rousselet and Kipling have a sharp patriotic feeling that makes them support their countries in all circumstances.

Kipling's patriotism is well depicted in his poem “The Glory of the Garden” where he proudly sings the glory of England which is the result of big efforts. He says:

Our England is a garden, and such gardens are not made By singing:  
"Oh, how beautiful!" and sitting in the shade,  
While better men than we go out and start their working lives  
At grubbing weeds from gravel-paths with broken dinner knives. <sup>185</sup>

These verses convey Kipling's passion for England and for the British Empire. He pays tribute to the efforts consented by the British to achieve their position of superiority. For him, progress comes through hard working and sacrifices, not by laziness or idleness. Kipling considers that the hard working British are the opposites of the lazy people that belong the Empire.

To conclude what has been discussed in this chapter, we may say that Kipling and Rousselet belong to the category of intellectuals who support wholly their countries. Both are committed in the defense and the promotion of the imperialist designs of their respective

countries. Nevertheless, while Rousselet keeps lamenting the French defeat in India and the lost territory, Kipling enjoys the British supremacy over the Indian peninsula.

### **Endnotes:**

<sup>139</sup> R. R Palmer Joel Colton, *A History of the Modern World* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1991), 283-285.

<sup>140</sup> Said, *Orientalism* , 41.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid, 76.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid.

<sup>143</sup> Louis Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal*, 91.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid, 295.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid, 454.

<sup>148</sup> Said, *Orientalism* 11.

<sup>149</sup> Rudyard Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 12.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid, 12, 13.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid, 13.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid, 41.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid, 12.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid, 120.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Louis Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal* , 593.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid.

<sup>161</sup> Said, *Orientalism* , 169.

<sup>162</sup> Louis Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal* , 593.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid.

<sup>164</sup> Said, *Orientalism*, 218.

- <sup>165</sup> Rudyard Kipling quoted John A. Stotesbury, “Rudyard Kipling and his Imperial Verse: Critical Dilemmas” in *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (1995), pp.37-46, viewed 01 February 2015, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41273895> .
- <sup>166</sup> *Ibid*, 38.
- <sup>167</sup> Rudyard Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 66.
- <sup>168</sup> *ibid*.
- <sup>169</sup> *Ibid*, 121, 144, 214, 261, 262.
- <sup>170</sup> *Ibid*, 238.
- <sup>171</sup> *Ibid*, 239.
- <sup>172</sup> *Ibid*, 243.
- <sup>173</sup> *Ibid*, 236.
- <sup>174</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>175</sup> *Ibid*, 27, 28.
- <sup>176</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>177</sup> Louis Rousselet, *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal*, 613.
- <sup>178</sup> *Ibid*, 615.
- <sup>179</sup> *Ibid*, 616.
- <sup>180</sup> *Ibid*, 327.
- <sup>181</sup> Chezaud, *Louis Rousselet et L’Image de la Culture de L’Autre* ,118
- <sup>182</sup> G. Perrot, *Revue Archéologique, Nouvelle Série*, Vol. 29 (Presses Universitaire de France, Janvier à Juin 1875), pp. 268-271, viewed 08 July2015, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41734915>.
- <sup>183</sup> *Ibid*.
- <sup>184</sup> Lionel Trilling quoted in Said, *Orientalism*, 232.
- <sup>185</sup> Rudyard Kipling quoted John A. Stotesbury, “Rudyard Kipling and his Imperial Verse: Critical Dilemmas”.



#### IV. Conclusion:

This paper has attempted to study the Orientalist discourse in Rousselet's *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and the Presidencies of Bombay and Bengal* (1875 [1882]) and Kipling's *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel* (1889). The two works are vivid examples of the role played by travel literature in the promotion of the Orient as a backward place which needs civilization and enlightenment through Western occupation. It has also attempted to elucidate the intensions and the engagement of the two writers in the defense and the promotion of their respective Empires, namely the French and the British ones.

This paper has proved that the two writers meet in many points concerning the stigmatization and the depiction of Indian people as primitive and backward. They were attributed a number of stereotypes that make of them lazy, primitive, uncivilized and backward people. The two writers denigrate people that were different from Europeans, and their difference was viewed as strangeness and backwardness. The Orientalist discourses, as explained by Bhabha and Said, not only target the persons of the colonized people but also their culture. Thus, our analysis demonstrated that the two writers depict Indian culture as primitive and backward. They particularly targeted social and religious rituals like the Sati and Johur. Rousselet and Kipling focus on the negative aspects of the Indian culture in the design of demonstrating its need for western civilization.

The two authors meet in some points but diverge in some others. They share the same ideas about the depiction of the Orientals. They agree about the fact that Indians are backward and uncivilized. They also agree on the fact that their culture is primitive. However, they diverge when it comes to the celebration of their personal Empires. Kipling celebrates the British Empire and Rousselet the French Empire. Rousselet and Kipling may perhaps differ in techniques, but their objective is the same, to celebrate Western civilization and justify the British presence in India. Notwithstanding their natural admiration of India, their narcissism is

stronger. Orientalism as their frame of reference makes them promote the image of Europe and its destiny to enlighten the world with its civilization. They are convinced of the nobility of the civilizing mission and they write for its support. However, their nationality incites them to side with the interests of their imperial countries.

In this dissertation, we have tried to study the points that have not been discussed in the scope of previous works done on this topic. Besides, in an attempt to make Rousselet known to our readership, we have decided to compare him to a well known writer which is Kipling. But, because of the lack of time and scope, our paper did not encompass all the comparable elements in the two books. Our dissertation permitted us to study the depiction of Indians by Rousselet and Kipling in the light of the traditional Orientalism based on British and French colonial Empires. This opens a new possibility of studying the depiction of Indians and other Orientals from a neo-Orientalist perspective, focusing on the reproduction of stereotyped portrayal ideas in a world of globalization.

## V. Bibliography

### 1. Primary Sources

- Kipling, Rudyard. *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*. New York: Doubleday & McCulture company, 1899.
- Rousselet, Louis. *India and its Native Princes: Travel in Central India and in the Presidency of Bombay and Bengal*. Trans. Buckle Charles Randolph London: Bickers & Son, Leinster Square, 1882.

### 2. Secondary Sources

- Ashcroft, Bill et al. *Post Colonial Studies: Key Concept*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- "British Military History," Online resource 1930-1950 British Army, British Indian Army and Britain's Allies: viewed on 12 July 2015  
<http://www.britishmilitaryhistory.co.uk/documents.php?nid=13abha>.
- Chezaud, Patrick. *Louis Rousselet et l'image de la culture de l'autre*. Paris: Gérard Monfort, 2005.
- Fisher, Harold and Mam Michael. *Colonialism as Civilizing Mission: Cultural Ideology in British India*. London: Wimbledon Publishing Company, 2004.
- Joel Colton, R.R Palmer. *A History of the Modern World*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991.
- Kipling, Rudyard. "The White Men's Burden". *The collected Poems of Rudyard Kipling*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions, 1994.
- Kipling, Rudyard. "The Glory of the Garden". *A Kipling Treasury: Stories and Poems*. London: Macmillan, 1940.

- Kortight, Chris. *Colonization and Identity*. The Anarchist Library: Anti-copyright, 2003.
- Majed Hamed Aladaylah, *Centering the Other: Making the Native Visible* in Revista de Divulgação Científica em Língua Portuguesa, Linguística e Literatura Ano 06 n.12 - 1º Semestre de 2010- ISSN 1807-5193, Al-karak University Coledge, 2010
- Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Trans. Howard Greenfield Earthscan Publication Hd.
- Metcalf, Barbara D. and Thomas, A *Concise History of Modern India*. New York : Cambridge University Press,2006.
- Metcalf, R Thomas. *The New Cambridge History of India: Ideologies of the Raj*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford Dictionaries. S.V. “Sati”: viewed on Jun 28 2015. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/sati>
- Petr, Christian. “L’être de l’Inde”. *Cahier Octave Mirabeau*, 1893.
- Perrot. G, Revue Archéologique, Nouvelle Série, Vol. 29, Presses Universitaire de France, Janvier à Juin 1875, pp. 268-271 : viewed 08 July2015, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41734915>.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 1978.
- Shank, Edward. *Rudyard Kipling: A Study in Literature and Political Ideas*. University of California: Macmillan &Company Limited, 1940.
- Siber, Mouloud. Rudyard Kipling, Edward Morgan Foster, William Somerset Maugham and Joseph Conrad: The British Imperial Tradition and the Individual Talent, *Doct diss*. Mouloud MAMMERI University of Tizi-Ouzou, 2012.

- Siber, Mouloud and Riche, Bouteldja. Native Mis/Rule and ‘Oriental Despotism’ in Alexandre Dumas’s *Adventures in Algeria* (1846) and Rudyard Kipling’s *From Sea to Sea, Letters of Travel*. *Asian Journal of Humanity Art and Literature*, 2014.
- Stotesbury, John. A “Rudyard Kipling and his Imperial Verse: Critical Dilemmas” in *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (1995). viewed 01 February 2015, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41273895>
- Sugars, Cythian. *Strategic Abjection Windigo Psychosis and the “Postindian” Subject in Eden Robinson’s “Dogs in Winter”*. *Canadian Literature* 1819, 2004.
- T. V, Madhu. *Althusser’s Conception of Ideology: A Critical Exposition*. University of Hyderabad: Dept of Philosophy, 1995.
- Tyler, Edward B. *Primitive Culture: researches in to the Development of Mythology, philosophy, Religion, Language, Art and Custom* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed . 2 vols, London: John Murray, 1871.
- Wilson, Angus. *The Strange Ride of Rudyard Kipling: His Life and Works*. New York: The Viking Press, 1977.