

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA  
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH  
UNIVERSITY MOULOU D MAMMERI OF TIZI-OUZOU

Department of English



A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the  
Requirements for a Master's Degree in English  
Option: Literature and Civilization

Title:

A Todorovian Reading of Edward Morgan Forster's  
*A passage to India (1924)*

**Submitted by:**

Athmane AFETTOUCHE

**Supervised by:**

Professor Mouloud SIBER

**Panel of Examiners:**

Mouloud SIBER,

Professor, Mouloud Mammeri University,

**Supervisor;**

Nadia NAAR\GADA

MCA, Mouloud Mammeri University,

**Chair;**

Boukhalfa LAOUARI

MAA, Mouloud Mammeri University,

**Examiner.**

Academic Year: 2021-2022

**In memory of my father Mohammed  
and uncle Rabeh**

## **Acknowledgments**

The warmest reward in my life is by far the achievement of this master's dissertation. I owe its completion to the kindness, patience, and generosity of many people. In the beginning, I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Mouloud SIBER, for proposing me the topic of this research and allowing me to make use of his ideas. I have been among the luckiest to have him as a teacher and supervisor. I am deeply grateful to him for sparing me much of his valuable time to read generously my dissertation and for providing me with feedback. I am not exaggerating at all if I say that his assistance enlightened my academic and personal life. I would also like to salute the continuous respect he gives me since the beginning of this research. I will always be indebted to him. Similarly, I am profoundly grateful to the members of the panel of examiners, namely Doctor Nadia NAAR\GADA and Mr. Boukhalifa LAOUARI for devoting much of their precious time reading and examining my work. Special thanks go to my teacher Professor Bouteldja RICHE for inspiring and making me love research. I would also like to express my gratitude to my former high school teacher, Ali ABERRANE for providing me with valuable books and advice that helped me throughout my Licence and Master's studies. The continuous help and encouragement I have received from him as a young student have never stopped bringing light to my life. I thank the library staff for providing me with the necessary sources for my research. I express my finest gratitude to my mother, nephews, and sisters Siham, Souad, and Souhila for their emotional and financial help. Their encouragement, trust, sympathy, and endless love have made me feel to be the most protected and beloved son, uncle, and brother in the world. My heartiest thanks go to my companion Samira, whose love never ceased. To all my classmates, in particular, Sara AFLIHAOU, many thanks. My eternal consideration is for my late father and uncle Rabeh, for the kind memories they left. To finish, I must specify that I am alone responsible for any mistake or error this present dissertation may contain.

## **Declaration**

*This dissertation follows my class's methodology courses during the academic year 2021/2022. Therefore, it embodies some differences of form with other previous Master's dissertations carried out in our department. Indeed, it follows the guidelines set up by the American Psychological Association (APA) instead of the Chicago style.*

## Abstract

The present dissertation has examined the characters' features and the dominant sentiments in Forster's *A passage to India* (1924). The ultimate goal of the research is to understand the features of the English and the Indians as well as to study the emotions by which the 1920s colonial India is characterized. To that end, I have borrowed four theoretical concepts from Todorov's essay entitled *The Fear of Barbarians: Beyond the Clash of Civilizations* (2010). The notions are 'Barbarian', 'Civilized', 'Resentment', and 'Fear'. Todorov's essay has proved to be adequate for my research on twofold levels. First, it helps to distinguish a collection of elements that an individual can utilize to evaluate a community's behavior as barbarous or refined. Second, it shows the motivations that set people together by a common feeling. The major section of the dissertation is the 'Result and Discussion'. The latter has been divided into three chapters. The first one is entitled 'Historical Context and Biographical Elements'. It has analyzed the major events that shaped India since the establishment of the British East India Company. It has also studied the biography of Forster in the light of his tolerant and liberal attitude. The second chapter is entitled 'A passage to India and 'Barbarism'\ 'Civilization' in the Todorovian sense'. It has sought to display the motives making Mr. Heaslop and some members of the Anglo-Indian community fall into the category of the barbarian. Besides, it argues that the notion of 'civilized' can be epitomized by Dr. Aziz, Mr. Fielding, and Mrs. Moore. The third and last chapter is termed 'The Sentiments of Fear and Resentment in the Narrative'. It has attempted to prove that the root of the Indians' shared resentment is due to the English incivilities. It is mostly embodied by Mahmoud Ali, followed less intensely by other characters. Furthermore, it denotes that the English terror is motivated by the Indians' resentment. At last, I have come to the conclusion that the conflictual connection between the Indians and the British goes to a very long time ago. What also comes from our analysis is that Forster's liberal and loving personality have influenced the shape of the novel. Indeed, he appears to side with the Indians and severely criticizes his own people; that is, the English. I also deduce that on the one side, the world conventionally calls the 'Civilized' can in fact be the 'Barbarian'. On the other side, the 'Civilized' are not those possessing wealth, power, or whatsoever. They, in fact, are those with the ability to respect others. Last, the West fear the resentment of those they used to rule, like India.

**Keywords:** Barbarian, Civilized, Fear, Forster, Resentment, Liberalism.

## Contents

Acknowledgments.....	I
Abstract.....	III
Contents.....	IV
<b>I. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Review of Literature.....	2
Issue and Hypotheses.....	4
<b>II. Methodology.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>III. Results and Discussion.....</b>	<b>11</b>
Chapter one: Historical Context and Biographical Elements.....	12
Chapter two: <i>A Passage to India</i> and 'Barbarism'\ 'Civilization' in the Todorovian Sense.....	25
Chapter three: The Sentiments of Fear and Resentment in the Narrative.....	38
<b>IV. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>V. Selected bibliography.....</b>	<b>52</b>

## I. Introduction

*“Man is a rational animal”*  
Aristotle.

If we follow the logic of the saying, we come to realize that what distinguishes humans from animals is tight. While they use their instinct, which makes them clever in a certain way, we use our intelligence. Intelligence has allowed humankind to survive throughout time and greatly contributed to technological, artistic, and scientific flourishing. Civilization, which can also be labeled as a more complex aspect, encapsulates two aspects different from one another. Yet, it can be used interchangeably. Civilization(s) in plural refers to either former cities, present grouped communities, or periods of times constituting our history. As an example the Aztec, Muslim and/or Hindu civilizations for instance. However, when utilized in singular, civilization means a set of behaviours and attitudes making a person refined. Subsequently, if abhorring the norms of the latter, we will censure ourselves from embarking on Noah’s boat toward enlightenment, hence becoming no different from the animals.

However, “Reasoning” and “Civilization” may not be the only dominant features of human beings. Besides men’s intelligence and ability to progress through time, their emotions are crucially important. As a simple definition, feelings, essentially, may correspond to the reaction of people to an external stimulus, which can be desired or unwanted, pleasurable or not. However, they can be more than responses. In fact, they can be factors that enable researchers to study a particular area, and judge its people. As a consequence, Post-Cold War thinkers and philosophers rely on the definition of the term civilization in determining the root of the conflicting relationship and the nature of international relations. The emotion one has regarding another person can tell a lot. In that sense Moisi (2009), Salter (2002), Huntington (2002), and Nussbaum (2018), just to cite a few, have all relied on one or several emotions to study the world political order.

Next to the geopolitical questions, the notions of civilization\barbarism and emotions are adequate grounds to tackle works of literature. Particularly works produced, during the climax of the imperialism period, by travel writers on the colonies. One may rightly ask why? One reason is that, ironically, civilizing the ‘rest’ of the world was the mission the supposed ‘civilized’ West has charged itself. In that sense, many writers have used the colonial discourse in their texts. It is to justify the imperialist expansion of their countries to the lands of the alleged “Barbarians”. Some other authors, however, stood out the best they could far from those imperialist writers. It is what E. M. Forster attempted to accomplish in many of his letters, interviews, essays, and his Indian novel: *A passage to India* (1924). Therefore, for this Master’s dissertation, we have chosen to study Forster’s *A passage to India*, by appealing to Todorov’s theory elaborated in his *The Fear of Barbarians: Beyond the Clash of Civilizations*.

### **Review of Literature**

I am not the first and certainly not the last one to do a work on this English classic: Forster’s *A Passage to India*. Hundreds if not thousands of researchers worked on it relying on diverse literary theories. They have proposed a variety of sights at the motivations leading to the writing of the travel writers, particularly post-colonialism, structuralism and feminism. As an illustration, Tavassoli and Mirzapour (2014) in their article named “*Postcolonial-Feminist Elements in E. M. Forster’s A passage to India*”, make sure their readers understand from the beginning, that their point of view is a bit different from the simple Feminism or the Postcolonial Theory we are familiar with. The theory does not investigate solely the aftermath of two cultures’ clashing when one of them empowers and deems itself superior to the other, but as the title suggests, Postcolonial-Feminist “*critiqued post colonialism's narrow concept of power and domination*” (P.74). It means that the theorists complained about the lack of consideration accorded to women in postcolonial works. Tavassoli and Mirzapour (2014) argued:

It can be inferred that Third-world women are subjected to both the inferior and marginalized views of first world feminist, and patriarchy of their own society. This subjection to discrimination as a colonial subject on the one hand, and as woman on the other hand, causes their “double colonization.” (P.71)

Therefore, they have studied *A Passage to India*'s women as victims of both the colonizer and the colonized patriarchy.

Another critic named Baker (2006) wrote a research paper entitled “*Rethinking identity: The Coloniser in E. M Forster’s A passage to India.*” He has conducted it on the basis of postcolonial theory based on Albert Memmi’s work *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, they shown evidence of how the newcomers are being brainwashed as soon as they set their feet in India. The critic asserted that “*they acquire process of ‘formatting’, which the newcomers have to go through so that they end up like the other colonial settlers in terms of their ideologies and practices.*” (P.69)

Another postcolonial reading of Forster’s novel is completed by Jajja. The article is entitled *A Passage to India: The Colonial Discourse and the Representation of India in Stereotypes*. In it, Jajja introduced the author as an imperial writer who “*reinforces the colonialist ideology of superiority and its [his] narrative strengthens the stereotypes and the East-West division, invented by the West about India and the Indians*” (P.47). He has considered the work as many saw Conrad’s novella *Heart of darkness* (1899) as a stereotyped representation of the colony. Jajja (2013) asserted that the choice of words in the description of both India and Indians prepares the readers to face ugly images of the country and its people and has considered it “*derogatory and humiliating*” (p.39). He reinforced his idea and wrote that “*The Indians are portrayed as lazy, with parasitic tendencies*” (p.40). From his point of view, we understand that he condemned the work as any travel writing read before, that presented stereotyped images of nations for political and economic ends.

Forster’s novel has also been the subject of another research carried out by Mouloud Siber (2012). In his doctoral thesis labeled *Rudyard Kipling, Edward Morgan Forster, William*

*Somerset Maugham and Joseph Conrad: The British imperial tradition and the individual talent*, the authors relied on the Postcolonial approach as developed by Edward Said in his *Orientalism* to study the stereotyped image of the Orientals. Furthermore, he has explored the two mentalities of Forster and Kipling. The Former, he argued, was liberal advocating “*co-existence and tolerance*” and saw the necessity to bypass the boundaries set by the imperial tradition to establish a friendship “*so vital for the Raj*” (P.278). On the other hand, Kipling is said to be, like Benjamin Disraeli, a conservative who believes in the importance of the British Empire as a ‘whole’. Siber (2012) argued that Kipling is interested in maintaining the Raj because he is “*heir to the rights and duties of the Victorians*” (P.273)

Moreover, from the point of view of Linjia (2022), in his paper entitled “*On Colonialism of A passage to India: Natural Ecology Perspective*”, Forster’s novel is “*an excellent example to illustrate how the colonists took action to expand their aggressive ambitions in the colonized countries for their own economic profits and political hegemony*” (P.104). He maintained that the British presence on Indian soil is enough to make the Indians alienated and suffer from constant suspicion. As a consequence, he concluded that the novel is evidence of the destruction Britain has brought to India both on the sociological and psychological levels.

### **Issue and Hypotheses**

It will require me more than an ordinary life to go through all that has been written about Forster’s *A Passage to India*, for it has received a great bulk of criticism. From the above review of the literature, we can easily deduce that it has arisen great interest mainly to postcolonial theorists. The latter, through their several research papers, found that Forster’s *A passage to India* worked either beneficially for the Indians’ cause or believed it was a trap, to attract the readers’ sympathy towards the British, thus justifying their presence and policies. It has also served as a corpus to better understand travel writing and its importance in drawing destructive reflective images of nations using the colonial discourse. Nevertheless, to my best knowledge,

no one has examined the characters in the light of the notions of ‘barbarism’ and ‘civilization’ as elaborated by Todorov. In addition, none or few have considered Forster’s novel as a way to defend the Indians against the British abuse. Moreover, the importance of emotions has been neglected by previous researchers.

As a consequence, the present research seeks to, globally, understand the characters’ features and the dominant sentiments in Forster’s *A passage to India*, in the light of Todorov’s conceptualization of ‘Barbarism’, ‘Civilization’, ‘Resentment’, and ‘Fear’. In the first place, attention is given to the historical context and biographical elements. The historical context provides a general background of the conflicting relationship linking the Indians with the British. The biographical study examines the personality of Forster, mainly grasping his perspective in the writing of the novel. Next, it studies in depth the characters making Forster’s novel. By that, we explain the reasons behind considering a group of characters to fall into the category of ‘Barbarian’ and another into the ‘Civilized’ ones. We shall try to understand emotions’ role in shaping the plot. By that, we mean to argue how the colonizers’ cruelty toward their oppressed provoked their resentment. Interchangeably, the fury of the colonized gives rise to the colonizers’ fear.

The dissertation’s introduction gives a general insight into the main claim of this research. It explains the nature of the characters and the dominant emotions making Forster’s *A passage to India*. The second part entitled ‘Methodology’ explains Todorov’s key concepts as elaborated in his essay *The Fear of Barbarians: Beyond the Clash of Civilization*. The main part is the ‘Result and Discussion’ section. It is divided into three chapters. The first one examines the historical context of the novel, which gives a general background on the history of British colonized India to clear the way for the readers to the second and particularly the last chapter. It looks into the major events that constitute colonial India’s history. It furthermore includes a biographical study of Forster. It has the objective of facilitating the reader to the hypothesis that

Forster is a liberal. The second tries to demonstrate the elements that constitute the British' personalities and the Indians. It shows how some British epitomize the features of the 'barbarians', and others alongside Indians represent the 'civilized'. The third chapter aims at seeking to determine the reason that stimulates the Indians to adopt a commonly shared sentiment of resentment. The latter is what provokes the fear that distinguishes the British.

## **II. Methodology:**

A Todorovian reading is found to be correct to tackle the novel. Indeed, Todorov (2010), in his *The fear of barbarians: Beyond the clash of civilizations*, has studied a set of concepts that are relevant in the understanding of the world order, politics, and civilizations. They are more important in the comprehension of the twentieth century's most discussed topic: Imperialism. Indeed, before Todorov studying the topic, the strings between the colonized and colonizer have motivated a great number of critics, such as Edward Said, Homi K. Bhabha, and Frantz Fanon to investigate them. Another element no less important is the fear surrounding Western countries caused by nations they consider inferior. Next to it, the latter countries are characterized by a sensation of resentment. To that end, the dissertation is an attempt to understand and apply Todorov's key concepts in the context of Forster's *A passage to India*. It helps to understand these elements of societies and the relationship between the 'self' and the 'other', by studying aspects of the novel such as the characters. Historical background and the author's biography are equally important to the comprehension of the research context. To fulfill our aim, we borrowed some concepts from Todorov's theory predominantly and some other scholars. What comes next is the definitions.

### **1. Resentment**

Todorov explains resentment as an "*attitude [resulting] from a humiliation, real or imaginary, allegedly inflicted on it by the countries with the most wealth and power*" (P.05). In fact, Todorov has divided in his essay the world's countries into groups and named one of them the "Countries of Resentment". They are easily found in Asia and in Latin America. The sensation, he argued, targets for the most part the countries that either colonized or are still colonizing them. In fact, they are "*held responsible for private misery and public powerlessness*" (Todorov, 2010, P.05). Taking into consideration his short definition, we conclude that the first and foremost basic element that simulates the sensation of resentment is

humiliation. It is by referring to this definition that we can understand and analyse the majority of the Indians that constitute Forster's novel. They are indeed frustrated and dominated by the lack of consideration given to them and by the cruelty of the British. In this sense, Moïsi (2009) demonstrated this emotion to peak when an individual is convinced that *"someone from the outside has intruded into the private realm of your own life and made you utterly dependent"* (P.50). These two feelings, which work interchangeably, may lead to violence.

## **2. Fear**

Fear is not simply an emotional tracer because in Todorov's essay, it is used to name another group of countries characterized by this sensation of fear. Todorov argues that they are the same *"that make up the West and that have dominated the world for several centuries"* (P.05). Indeed, they are *"Western, and in particular European"* which *"fear the physical threats that might come from the 'countries of resentment"* (P.05). It is a sensation resulting from the perception of vulnerability and loss of centrality of a country that once used to be at the top. Most of the countries that were or still are imperial fear the hope and awakenings that submerge their former colonies. Economically speaking, the development and advancement of the countries of resentment would mean the breakdown of the countries of fear.

## **3. Barbarian**

The concepts is characteristics an individual should possess to become a 'barbarian' can be summarized in what follows:

Those who do not acknowledge that others are human beings like themselves, but consider them as similar to animals and thus consume them, or judge them as being incapable of reasoning and thus negotiating (they prefer to fight), and unworthy of living freely (they remain in subjection to a tyrant); they frequent only their blood relations and are unacquainted with the life of the community as ruled by common laws (Todorov, 2010, P.16).

Todorov underlines a different form of it: *"institutional discrimination towards others because they do not belong to my linguistics community, or my social group, or my psychological type"* (P.18). One of its uses is to *"help disguise might as right, or camouflages [the] will to power as humanitarian intervention"* (P.19). The imperial countries use the notion of the 'Barbarian' to

hide and legitimate their will of domination and colonization of weaker countries allegedly to civilize, educate or practice trade with them. The developed countries once in power adopt a sense of “*murderous rivalry that makes [them] refuse to grant others the right of access to the same joys and the same goods that we ourselves hope to enjoy*” (P.21). People who just take and do not give, close themselves within their milieu and do not acknowledge anything outside their existence can be associated with barbarity as defined by the theorist.

#### **4. Civilized**

The word ‘civilized’, in the same context, means exactly the opposite of a ‘barbarian’. For Todorov “*a civilized person is one who is able, at all times and all places, to recognize the humanity of others fully.*” (P.21). In that sense, in order to become civilized, he shows, one should cross two stages. The first is accomplished when one tolerates that the ‘other’ lives in a way that is not necessarily the same as theirs and the second is to agree, despite the differences in one’s culture, to be part of the same humanity as any person. It is, in other words, the will to destroy the ‘us’ and escape egocentric, ethnocentric, and xenophobic mentalities. Politeness, openness towards the other, and all the same, recognizing the “*plurality of groups, of human societies and cultures, and putting yourself on an equal footing with others is part of civilization.*” (P.23). Another feature of the civilized is their fight for a correct judicial system working for the benefit of all the citizens without distinction of race, religion and/or sex.

To sum up, the notion of ‘barbarian’ and ‘civilized’ is used in one chapter. Taking into consideration what has been observed above, the notion of ‘barbarian’ can be applied to designate the Anglo-Indians. Mr. Heaslop and the club members embody the attributes of the concept. Their jingoist, racist and stereotyped frame of mind condemned them to bear the title of “heathen”. Next to them, the tolerant and loving personalities we could identify with Dr. Aziz and his two friends, namely Mrs. Moore and Mr. Fielding, put them in the category of ‘civilized.’ Another chapter uses the conceptions of ‘Resentment’ and ‘Fear’. Because of the

long years of abuse and humiliation the Indians endured, resentment is the sensation they commonly feel. It is manifested initially by Mahmoud Ali and followed afterward by Mr. Zulfiqar and Dr. Aziz at the end of the novel. The last concept is “Fear”. Following Todorov’s formulation of the term and considering the Mutiny of 1857, the Anglo-Indian fear the resentment of the “Indians. The reason is simple: a strong Indian attack can potentially put an end to the British Raj.

**Synopsis:**

Forster’s *A passage to India*, focuses on the relationship between British occupiers and the Indians in colonial India. The Anglo-Indian community is infested with racial discrimination. The local population suffers from segregation and unequal rights. The protagonist Dr. Aziz visits, with the company of two newly arrived English ladies, the famous Marabar Caves. Dr. Aziz is surprised by an accusation of attempted rape charged against him by his guest Miss Quested. His well-mannered English Friend, Mr. Fielding, tries to convince his fellow countrymen of Dr. Aziz’s innocence, but in vain. His custody provokes the Indians’ rage against the colonizers. A sort of riot preliminary is sensed causing the English to fear for the Raj’s improbable survival of a second mutiny. However, the tension drops a notch as Miss Quested withdraws her charges, proving Aziz’s innocence. Yet, the latter who is known for his readiness to befriend Englishmen grows less enthusiastic after the incident. Dr. Aziz sees the true devilish nature of the English and decides to move to a non-British state, Mau, and write poetry. The novel ends with the one last conversation between Mr. Fielding and Dr. Aziz, who promises him the Anglo-Indians are soon to depart.

### III. Results and Discussion

Forster's *A passage to India* has been the subject of this Master's dissertation. In order to understand the characters and the conflicting tension between them, we have looked at it using a Todorovian perspective. In fact, while reading the novel, we sense that Forster has put an emphasis on two major ideas which triggered our attention. The first is the manners he accredits to his characters. Mr. Heaslop and his fellow countrymen from the club are seen to carry chauvinist, transcendent, ill-tempered and racist frames of mind. On the other hand, Dr. Aziz and his two English friends are bearers of loving, tolerant, forgiving and down-to-earth personalities. The second key idea is the two sentiments that are most relevant to the plot's major events. One is typically related to the Indians, with some close exceptions, whereas the other is assumed by the Anglo-Indians. In order to achieve a better comprehension of the two elements, we need to deepen our analysis.

In the first chapter, we have studied the historical background of the novel as well as the biographical elements. The story revealed that the tensional relationship relating Indians with English goes back a very long time. The British have failed to respect the Indians' sacred religions and values. The Indian Mutiny of 1857 was the first major outcome of that detrimental relationship. It is worth saying that the rebellion almost ended British dominance of India. Next to it, the study of the author's biography shows that his liberal and humanistic side took over in his novel. Subsequently influencing his writing to side with the Indians. The second chapter has studied the attitudes of the characters and comes to the conclusion that the majority of the Anglo-Indians, like, Mr. Heaslop, Mr. McBryde, and others are close-minded, jingoist, and frequently humiliate and torture the Indians. Their behaviors and actions let them therefore to fall into the category of the 'barbarian.' Nevertheless, Dr. Aziz, Mr. Fielding, and Mrs. Moore are possessors of well-tempered, open, and amiable features. As a consequence, they belong to the group of the 'Civilized.' In the third and last chapter, relying on the concepts of

‘Resentment’ and ‘Fear’, it appears that the Indians are infuriated against the British humiliation, unconsciousness, and devilish manners. The Indians are left with no option but force. We have discerned this attitude mainly with Mahmoud Ali and other Indians. Secondly, the resentment of the Indians is provoking the terror of the Anglo-Indians. They were primarily terrified by the idea of another susceptible mutiny.

## **Chapter One: Historical Context and Biographical Elements**

Many literary figures and historians agree commonly that for a reader to extend their understanding of any written text, especially that of a novel, one should learn about its historical context, look for biographical elements inside the narrative and seek its interpretation. Our purpose in this chapter, thus, is to provide a historical background for Forster’s *A Passage to India* by emphasizing the major events that affected the country and shaped its writing. It is worth reminding that India’s civilization is one of the oldest that ever existed, and it is, even with today’s technology to read sculptures and translators to decipher ancient books impossible to capture all of its history in one set of writing. The biography of the author is judged equally important, for it contributes to look through the motivations that push a writer to produce a text.

### **A. Historical Context**

We choose to start with the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, for it is her signature that allowed a group of traders known as the British East India Company (BEIC) to cross seas and moor in the subcontinent to carry on trade. Historically, Britain did not explicitly colonize India. When the (BEIC) first arrived, it was mainly to take part in the spice trade. However, the company’s power grew to make its shareholders powerful. The company could even take land and wage wars as Queen Elizabeth I’s charter granted in 1600 stating: “[...] *in defence of our realm, or for offence of our enemies, or that it shall be found needful to join to the navy of us, our heirs and successors, the ships of our subjects to be also armed for the wars*” (400 Years, 2018). Based on the charter and the political involvement of the Company, by 1750, the (BEIC) won

more territory by expanding its field of trade to textile, cotton, silk, and saltpeter. It inevitably became more economically and politically influential. It shifted from trade to ruling, paving the way for the British Raj. Nevertheless, Indians did not remain passive but defended themselves and their land when the British started to head north. The Indians were superior in number, but the British had quality, meaning the Sepoys, the Indian soldiers in the service of British-India's army were well trained, organized, and better armed. Consequently, all the fought battles resulted in catastrophic defeat for the Indians. In 1798, things became serious as Marquess Wellesley came to the scene and decided to conquer as much Indian territory as he could (400 Years, 2018). The Company faced opposition to its monopoly. The *Regulating Act* of 1773 and the *India Act* of 1784 were passed to guarantee government intervention in the decision-making of the Company. It weakened the company's commercial and political control to become a simple regulating agency for the British government by 1834.

Despite the importance of the company in shaping India's history, the Indian Rebellion of 1857 was to frame the company's achievements. The Mutiny is of extreme importance to this research because it was in that sociological, economic, and political aftermath that Forster chose to set his novel. 'Nemesis' of the Mutiny came unnoticed. Dalhousie's Doctrine of Lapse broke with the Hindu law asserting that a ruler could appoint a successor without being of his blood. As a consequence, the company could annex all states without a natural or adopted heir. Dalhousie believed that the British rule was better than the Indians stimulating resentment and alarm among the princes and old aristocrats, for "*There would be no dynastic security for any prince, however loyal and accommodating*" (James, 1997, P.234). The taken states, thereafter, had their royal households reduced, and their armies dispersed all over the land creating severe unemployment. Furthermore, the company sought to change Hinduism and Islam into a unified Christian faith by allowing Hindu widows to remarry for example. In addition, the company mixed the nutriment of its Sepoys with pig and cow bone; not taking into account their culture

and religious beliefs. On the contrary, Dr. Aziz with his guests at the Marabar caves conforms to the British standards by bringing “*Alcohol*” and adapts himself to “*Professor Godbole and his food*” (Forster, 2005, P.119). Accordingly, the Indians desire change because they feel their religion and social status were systematically assaulted. The officials had not enough for they favoured Christian Sepoys and taught Indians to scoff at their parents’ “*creeds*” (James, 1997, P.237). These acts combined with other forms of attempts to westernise the Hindus led to the Mutiny.

The officials were furious; ergo, the next day they started penalizing harshly the Sepoys who were suspected of taking part. The punishment is aimed at humiliating them and the latter is behind the “*violence*” (Todorov, 2010, P.17). The mutiny started killing randomly Europeans causing panic and alarm similar to that felt by the officials approaching Aziz’s trial and their women “*dared not return to [their] bungalow in case the ‘niggers attacked’*” (Forster, 2005, P.170). Both sides do not deprive themselves of mass murder. The prisoners captured by the British were hanged from trees and their corpses were shown and massacred. James (1997) reports:

In one village, where it was feared that three fugitives from Delhi, a doctor, his wife and child, had been murdered, eleven suspects were rounded up. One boasted that he had raped the woman and killed the child; each was coated with pork fat and had pork thrust down his throat before being hanged. (P.251)

The passage illustrates the intensity of violence the British are capable of and justifies the similar response of the Indians as a result of their resentment. The Indians, too, were responsible for slaughters, arguing that they were defending their land, and it was urgent to fight for their rights. In *A passage to India*, Mahmoud Ali believes that India could be much better if its people did not put off doing what is right for them and their nation. Yet, Britain triumphed on the battlefield and by 1860, the British East India Company was abolished and the governance of India was passed to the British crown, with Queen Victoria becoming the new Empress of India in 1867.

For any actions undertaken, there are consequences. The obvious aftermath of the Mutiny was the British questioning their presence, role, and conduct in India. Many politicians were in fact, aware of the Officials' wrongdoings and that they were not innocent of what had happened. Therefore, officials had to find a solution. Renouncing India is nonsense, particularly to the leader of the conservative party, Benjamin Disraeli, who was very enthusiastic about maintaining the Empire on which "*the sun never set*" (Willis, 1989). He declares in a speech delivered at the Crystal Palace in 1872 what follows:

Tory party [...] is not a confederacy of nobles, it is not a democratic multitude [...] I have always been of the opinion that the Tory party has three great objects. The first is to maintain the institutions of the country [...] because we believe that they embodied the principles on which the community like England can alone safely arrest. [...] In my opinion, and in the opinion of wiser men than myself, the liberty of England depends much upon the landed tenure of England. [...] If the first is to maintain the institutions of the country, the second is, in my opinion, to uphold the empire of England. If you look to the history of this country since the advent of Liberalism - forty years ago - you will find that there has been no effort so continuous, so subtle, supported by so much energy, and carried on with so much ability and acumen, as the attempts of Liberalism to effect the disintegration of the empire of England. (History hub, 2019)

If we consider his speech described as "*the famous declaration from which the modern conception of the British Empire largely takes its rise*" (Eldridge, 1973, P.173). The first thing he does is to introduce his party as a non-democratic one. He states in a debate over the Second Reform Act: "*We do not however, live – and I trust it will never be the fate of this country to live – under a democracy*" (Willis, 1989, P.4). Together with his definition, he underlines three important tasks his party works to achieve. The first one is to conserve the old institutions, laws, principles, and religion undertaking no modifications or extensions. He, in addition, does not trust the multitude to be in the capacity to make the right decisions. Therefore, he advocates taking off their task of choosing. Another very important issue is his will of keeping the Empire as it is, for he has seen power, liberty, richness, and the well-being of England to be absorbed in the landed tenure and the Indian Subcontinent is a massive land. Yet, despite Disraeli being Queen Victoria's favorite prime minister, for her conception of the Empire was shared and

defended by him. His imperial ideas have faced severe counterattacks and are said to be “*not only unoriginal and impracticable but lacked historical insight*” (Eldridge, 1973, P.174).

In view of what has been said above, we may conclude that liberalism, the opponent party, fights for Britain’s colonies’ freedom. William Gladstone, leader of the Liberal party, was not quite liberal as he seems to be. He was for a cool treatment of the colonies and not asking for something the English could not give (Willis, 1989). Gladstone’s government was not working on the disintegration of the Empire but rather to reduce Britain’s expenditure in defense of its colonies as well as granting them the autonomy of free trade and home rule. It is for that particular reason that Willis (1989) called him a ‘conservative-liberal’. Since giving up India was not considerable, the British adopted some policies that would “*preserve British power, produce a just and stable administration, and do as little as possible to alienate the population*” (Gilmour, 2007, p.17). Before the rebellion, local states were seen as in need of annexation or reform. Yet, in 1858, the states’ leaders marked themselves as allies like the Nawab Bahadur is before Aziz’s trial in Forster’s novel. Queen Victoria promised that she desired no further extension of her territories. Dalhousie’s policy is reversed and the government promised not to interfere in the customs of religion.

Alongside the religious tolerance, nothing is more apparent than condescension, fear, and resentment. The idea of superiority is nourished when “*they had after all defeated an enemy that vastly outnumbered them*” (Gilmour, 2007, P.19). The particular climate is well described in Forster’s novel where the reader encounters the British confined in their Club with no Indians allowed into it even as guests. Besides, condescence is felt in almost all the Anglo-Indian characters except a few but it is particularly clear with the City magistrate Mr. Heaslop, who incarnates unkindness, rudeness, and snobbery. He considers his job to be way beyond befriending or smiling at the Indians but limits it to keeping peace and restoring justice. Forster as a visitor to India in 1912-13, spent little of his time in the company of the Anglo-Indians,

and he saw them in their Club, playing billiards and polo. At the end, he marked them as “*philistine and insensitive*” (Gilmour, 2007, P.241). Due to the humiliation and abuse the Indians underwent, a sort of grievance toward the English was born. It can be discerned with Mahmoud Ali, the Nawab Bahadur renouncing his English-conferred titles and Aziz’s attitude towards the colonizers at the end of the novel. In that sense, the British are terrified to stimulate another uprising like that of 1857 that would put an end to the British Raj without engaging a ‘Pour Parler’

Over and above that climate of political and sociological confusion, started another era of a political and cultural movement aiming to free India from British rule. Initiated by Mahatmas Gandhi, the movement led to one of the most horrible acts committed by the British, which Theresa May called “*shameful scare on British-India History*” (Brut India, 2019). It was the year 1919, the Great War has just ended and the rise of nationalism was at its highest point, causing serious fear to Britain which feared for its Empire and decided to turn all its focus on India. Gandhi was back from London and South Africa, full of wisdom and knowledge of many cultures. Between 1915 and 1918, he launched a tour using the train and visited hundreds of India’s unknown and remote villages delivering speeches to the inhabitants. He not only spoke to them but listened to them, which was something people were not used to. He was actually preparing his people for what was to come next by introducing them to the ‘Satyagraha’, which means to tolerate sufferance for what is known to be morally good. The sufferance can be in form of hunger strikes, like that undertaken by Chandrapore’s women until Dr. Aziz is acquitted. With that in mind, things were moving very quickly and non-violent marches were scheduled for the end of March 1919.

In 1919, the government came out with the ‘Rowlatt acts’ which consisted of a committee responsible for investigating sedition. The act gave British officers even more rights than they already had, and they could, for instance arrest anyone for a maximum of two years, when

suspected of sedition, without trial. Furthermore, the police had the right to conduct a search without a warrant and detain a suspect for no obvious reasons (Ibid). Gandhi was furious about it and saw it to be an injustice that could eradicate Satyagraha. Despite the Rowlatt acts, the first Satyagraha started in March as planned by refusing the closing of some food vendors' businesses (James, 1997). As a response, which was totally unexpected by the Indians, the police and British troops fired on the pretended mobs. The Indians, all the same, unsurprisingly reacted very violently and the situation got worse with Gandhi's arrest on April 10, for it resulted in severe disturbances and mass demonstrations. Although Gandhi wanted to ease the tension of the riots, all went unsuccessfully.

Another key figure alongside Gandhi was Brigadier-General Reginald Dyer. For Dyer, one more mutiny like that of 1857 was regenerating and all was a conspiracy in his eyes. He believed as his fellow officer O'Dwyer that "*their aim [The Hindus] was a full-scale uprising coupled with attempts to lure Indians soldiers into a mutiny*" (James, 1997, P.471). In April, Dyer received orders to go to Amritsar and what he found was an agitated city of 150.000 probably due to Gandhi's arrest. He was greeted with slogans like 'The British Raj is at end'. He could not let this happen and thought that if he could punish some of the rioters, it would make them understand that British rule is still the strongest. On the 13th of the same month, he heard of a meeting the Indians held in a closed area in Jallianwala Bagh that attracted between fifteen and twenty thousand persons. Dyer, well-armed, went to meet the assembly and because the entrance was too narrow for the cars, he decided to deploy his army by foot to face the 'mob', and without any warning ordered them to shoot at the crowd. In this sense, Mr. Turton, in Forster's novel, corresponds to him because he "*wanted to flog every Indians that he saw*" (Forster, 2005, P.172). He threatens Indians that if they wanted war, the British were ready. Forster "*received with shock the news of the massacre*" and "*denounced British conduct in*

*Egypt*” (P. xv). The kind of violence the Indians underwent gave birth to an emotion Todorov qualifies as ‘resentment’.

Taking into consideration what has been said and explained above, our readers are now equipped with enough historical background that makes the details of the plot explicit. In fact, it is in that unhealthy political atmosphere surrounded by racial fear, distrust, and anger, that Forster resumed the writing of his Indian novel in 1922. The humanist side which the author is known for aroused in himself and his readers’ sympathy for the Indians. The liberalist side could not stay still facing the injustices, atrocities, and humiliation the British Raj brought all along, especially due to the unfulfilled British promises to grant India its independence in return for fighting on the Allies’ side in WWI. In fact, India’s contribution to the imperial effort was manpower and acted mainly as a producer of raw materials like cotton, tea, rice, and wheat, which were of great help to Britain (James, 1997). Forster depicts this complicated British-India tension in his novel. He depicts the pre-World War I India in which he examines the several existing tensions between Anglo-Indians and the Indians, by stressing one particular question: can Englishmen and Indians be friends or not?

### **B. Biographical elements in Forster’s *A passage to India* (1924):**

Edward Morgan Forster was born on January 01<sup>st</sup>, 1879, in London, England. His father, worked as an architect and died when he was one year old. So he was raised mainly by his mother and aunt for whom he wrote many letters that were published afterward and were a great source to pick out Forster’s ideas and adventures. They, indeed, played a major role for biographers in deciphering Forster’s world. His late father left him a legacy that allowed him to live a decent life and write at his ease without thinking of earning a living.

Aspects of Forster’s personality that distinguished him were his tolerance, moral feelings, liberal character, sympathy, and friendship with people. Indeed, he adopted another perspective on life that can be summed up in two words: liberalism and humanism. In that sense, he did not

care about people's beliefs, race, or origins. In *A passage to India*, this is epitomized by his most sympathetic English character Mr. Cyril Fielding, who seems to be in total harmony with the Indians and spends more time with them than with his fellow Englishmen in their luxurious bungalows and club. Forster wanted to people to get to know each other through experience, face-to-face meetings, dialogues, and tolerance. It is through Mr. Fielding that he has conveyed this message. Since his arrival to Chandrapore as a principal of the government college, Mr. Fielding loves teaching the Indians and mingles himself with them; he goes to their homes and defends Dr. Aziz when accused by Miss Quested of sexual harassment. The author said in an interview given to the BBC that anyone who cared to read his books would see what high value he attached to personal relationships and tolerance. He is, in that sense, described as a very kind man who loved easily and adored helping others. Virginia Woolf in her diary describes him as:

He is fantastic & very sensitive; an attractive character to me, though from his very qualities it takes as long to know him as it used to take to put tone's gallipot over a humming bird moth. More truly, he resembles a vaguely rambling butterfly (quoted in Bell, 1977, P.295)

Alongside liberalism and humanism with which he faced the world and the Indians, he wanted to claim his satisfaction with liberalism through his novel. For many scholars, he “*was instinctively against authority of any sort*” (Forster, 2005, P. xii). In this respect, Siber (2012) wrote that Forster heartened “*co-existence and tolerance between them [Indians and British]*” (P.278). Forster, on nationalism, said that if he had to choose between betraying his country or his friends, he wished he could have the courage to betray his country (Write Like, 2021). As a consequence, he did not take too well the British administrator's behavior and attitudes during his visit to India. He shows this discontent using his Anglo-Indian characters namely Major Callendar, the Turtons, the Burtons, the McBrydes, and Mr. Heaslop, who are radical chauvinists. He does not hide his positions concerning his country's actions and was reported to be shocked by the Amritsar Event of 1919, and spontaneously denounced the cruelty which

resulted. He said about the English to be “*well-developed bodies, fairly developed minds, and undeveloped hearts*” (P. xii)

In 1906, he met the man who suggested the book and to whom he dedicated it, Syed Ross Masood, an Indian Muslim aristocrat living in England. They first met when Masood wanted to learn Latin and Forster happened to be his tutor. A strong friendship started immediately between them. Without his Indian friend, he could not have learned anything about India, for before knowing him, Forster thought it to be “*a vague jumble of rajahs, sahibs, babus and elephants*” and he “*was not interested in such a jumble*” (P. x). The author taught Masood Latin, and the latter introduced him to the Indian culture, religions, and values. It is worth saying that most of the books written about Asians or Africans were written mainly by European writers, and usually aimed at mystification. Forster with his humanistic trait and with the help of his Indian friend succeeded in shaping another perspective of the country and its inhabitants. He even manages to reverse the situation by denouncing British misbehaviours. He says through his narrator “*by what right did they claim so much importance in the world, and assume the title of civilization*” (P.204)

In 1912, Forster visited India for the first time. When he came back, he could not realize what he saw or what he did not; he was not able to clear his mind and have a straight idea of it. India, as he perceived it, was a ‘muddle’; nothing was in its place and nothing made sense. In fact, readers, critics, and researchers, almost a hundred years later, still cannot figure out what really happens to Miss Quested in the Marabar caves. Is it really Dr. Aziz who, a tourist, Mohammed Latif, or does it just happen in Adela’s mind? No one knows. Miss Quested withdraws her charges against Aziz saying that it is not him. The readers, thus, are left to their imagination. Forster himself cannot reveal what really happens at the caves. In another book of his *Alexandria: A History and a Guide*, he wrote about messy India saying

There was no place for anything, and nothing was in its place. There was no time either. All the small changes of the north rang false, and nothing remained certain except the dome of the sky and disc of the sun [...] One confusion enveloped Ujjain and all things. Why differentiate? I asked the driver what kind of trees those were, and he answered 'Trees'; what was the name of that bird, and he said 'Bird'; and the plain, interminable, murmured, 'Old buildings are buildings, ruins'" (Forster, 2005, P. xi)

The novelist, later on, after his visit and studies about India, becomes a connoisseur in India's religion, art, literature, and architecture. His expertise is noticeable to Pankaj Mishra in the dozen essays he wrote and published about India's theme. In *A passage to India*, we can notice such knowledge through his proximity to Hindu rituals, beliefs through Godbole, the Hindu Brahmin character that is troubled to explain and carry Hindu meaning. Also, we can anticipate his closeness in the last section devoted mainly to the description of the festival that celebrates Lord Krishna's birth, offering his reader a chance to contrast the reason and form of the festival to those known in England. In a letter dating from 1921, explaining what he found most important about the festival, he wrote "*they [Hindus] loved all men, the whole universe, and scraps of their past, tiny splinters of detail, emerged for a moment to melt into the universal warmth*" (Forster, 2005, P.271)

In an interview with the BBC held in 1958, Forster said a few words about himself and the context of his works. What many people retained from the author's speech were the following words: "*I am quite sure I am not a great novelist, because I've only got down on paper really three types of people, the person I think I am, the people who irritate me, and the people I'd like to be*" (Write like, 2021). Indeed, we can see the three types of people in the novel's story. The first character in whom he can see himself is Mr. Cyril Fielding. Despite Mahmoud Ali believing him to be like every Englishman, he proves to be, among all the British of Chandrapore, the only one who succeeds in building and sustaining a prosperous relationship with the Indians. He befriends Dr. Aziz, just like Forster, did with Masood, by sharing their deepest secrets. Dr. Aziz, on the one hand, shows the picture of his late wife. The act makes them "*friends, brothers [...] they trusted one another, affection had triumphed for once in a*

way” (P.112). Next to it, Mr. Fielding welcomes with pleasure a question that would upset a great number of people from Dr. Aziz, when he inquires why Mr. Fielding did not marry. Mr. Fielding answers with an open mind saying: “*I have more or less come through without it*” (P.109).

Forster also mentions the people who irritate him, and they are many in the novel. The Anglo-Indians, as he likes to call them, or the English expats, are portrayed in the narrative to be mostly jingoist, disrespectful, and unpleasant. Forster, during his stay in India, spent most of his time with the Indians rather than the English. He frankly put on paper what he saw. Mr. Heaslop is a nice young man, but when he comes into contact with the former expats in India he adopts their superiority complex and considers himself such to gain their esteem. Indeed, Mr. Turton says of Mr. Heaslop to do his job “*very well... then he turned to Ronny’s other merits, and in quiet decisive tones said much that was flattering*” (Forster, 2005, P.22). Major Callendar, as a second example, is a cruel, intolerant man, who dislikes the Indians and considers them to be good for nothing, except to serve him. His hobby is bothering his Indian subordinates as he does with Dr. Aziz at his dinner with Hamiddulah and Mahmoud Ali “*in order to show his power*” (Forster, 2005, P.13). Additionally, those who consider themselves better use bribes for favors as Mrs. Turton does and some are caught having affairs like Mr. McBride and Miss Derek.

The last category is the people he would like to be. We see through Mrs. Moore this kind of person because from the very beginning, she shows signs of genuine humility and respect. She makes the effort of taking her shoes off before entering a mosque when “*so few ladies take the trouble*” (P.17) and accepts to have a conversation with Dr. Aziz and keeps saying well about him. Her good and understanding heart allows her to connect with India and Indians successfully and to adopt a blind-race openness that could solve many problems. She also gets multiple times into quarrels with her son, who incessantly tries to stop her from mingling with

the Indians or staying by herself with them. Nevertheless, she does not listen and wants to see the real India through Indians, just as Forster has done. It is obvious that she does not testify for Aziz's innocence, but she does not help Adela either. It is worth saying that it is her name chanted during the trial that helps Miss Quested to see clearly and say the truth in the end.

Regarding what has been said, we can easily conclude that Forster is a man with a big heart. His ability to love people and the Indians, in particular, is indeed present in the novel. We see it through his characters. In fact, he makes Mr. Fielding, the closest character to his personality, the best friend of the Indians. It is by this character that he conveys all the messages of liberty and openness. Next to him is Mr. Moore sympathizing with Dr. Aziz. She is ready to sacrifice her relationship with her son, but never testify against the doctor. On top of that, he gives almost all his British characters' the most detestable attitudes. They are simply doomed with their incapacity to love and to see the good in others. Our readers by now should have a hint on how the characters are divided, with a group of civilized that reflects Forster's mentality and with another that he completely diverges from barbarians.

## **Chapter Two: *A passage to India* and 'Barbarism'\ 'Civilization' in the Todorovian Sense**

Knowing who you are, who you are not, and whom you are against are vital elements for possessing an identity (Huntington, 2002). The backbone of possessing an identity is the difference that lies between one group of people with another one. Cultures may diverge in religion, ancestry, customs, history, music, literature...etc. To simply put it, identity gains its strength when contrasting itself with one whose owner is known as the 'other'. The latter is seen to carry inferior and archaic cultural elements and is marginalized because of his difference. This is the case of the Western culture which claims itself to be the haven of democracy, liberty, and knowledge, with a total uncaring of the 'others'. The ideology is used to justify the European colonization which they name either 'civilizational missions' or 'humanitarian interventions'. The alleged Western superiority has provoked numerous counter-attacks from the educated elites of the former colonized countries. They realize the true intention behind the conquests. Therefore, they claim equality with the rest of the civilizations as did many postcolonial thinkers such as Said in his *Orientalism*. This postcolonial dichotomy is questioned by Todorov. He views the people who do not consider the other's humanity and importance equal to theirs to be 'barbarians'. On the opposite, people acknowledging the humanity of everybody else despite their differences are considered 'civilized'. After a close examination of the personalities, attitudes, and conduct of the British Officials and the Indians inside Forster's *A passage to India*, we believe most of the British, that is, Mr. Heaslop, the Turtons, Callendars, McBrydes, embody the sense carried by the concept of 'barbarian'. Next to it, Dr. Aziz, Godbole and his two English friends, namely Mrs. Moore and Cyril Fielding, encapsulate the meaning of 'civilized'.

### **A. What is a 'Barbarian' for Todorov?**

To start with, barbarity has a relative and absolute meaning. The relative one is given to a group of people who cannot speak someone else's language. Its root goes back to the Greeks

who consider anyone who cannot speak or badly speaks the Greek language to be a 'barbarian'. The linguistic barrier stops the non-Greek from acquiring the philosophy and logic elaborated in Greece. The fact of misunderstanding someone's words differentiates him none from an animal. In Forster's novel, Mrs. Turton, for example, cannot mix herself with the Indians during the bridge party simply because she is certain they are unable to speak her language. That makes them unworthy of the attention of the British. In fact, she is seen as astonished when an Indian woman addresses her using English; the Collector's wife then says: "*Fancy, she understands!*" (P.38). The absolute meaning of barbarian, Todorov explains, is all "*those who do not acknowledge that others are human beings like themselves but consider them as similar to animals and thus consume them, or judge them as being incapable of reasoning and thus of negotiating*" (P.16). A barbarian, considering the logic of the definition, does not have a sense of brotherhood only with the members of their community. We see, for instance, the amount of panic Adela's incident provokes in English society. Any outsider is, therefore, identified as a subordinate, and as a consequence, does not deserve the same rights or treatment. Taking into account the liberal attitude of Forster and his love for the Indians, we assume his Anglo-Indian characters are shaped, if not purposely, then surely around that notion of barbarism. Based on that, we suppose the expats with the most experience in India have acquired a chauvinist frame of mind making them unkind and disagreeable towards the Indians, considered as the 'others'.

The Westerners, according to Todorov "*are convinced that they have eternal possession of truth and justice*", hence becoming "*really dangerous on the day they decide that the whole world needs to benefit from the advantages proper to their society*" (P.13). This is the argument colonizers tend to use in defense of their occupation ideology. Mr. Heaslop has acquired this thinking, believing peace and order are mainly kept by them adopting, as a consequence, a Eurocentric and egocentric inclination. In return, politeness, kindness, love, and friendship are excluded from their ways of treating Indians guessing they have more important things to do.

In fact, they do not believe Indians to be naturally on the same level. Such a way of thinking is shown in the presumption of McBryde believing that all the Indians are criminals by heart if they live in certain zones. The theory goes “*All unfortunate Indians are criminals at heart, for the simple reason that they live south of latitude 30. They are not to blame, they have not a dog's chance*” (P.157).

Egocentrism is not the sole feature of barbarism. A group of people confining themselves to live in groups is also a strong indicator. It means, in practice, that they are incapable of forming relations, accepting diversity, or blending in with the ‘other’. In that context, the English officials, with some exceptions, are rarely or never seen outdoor the civil station or accepted anyone outside their community into their club, not even as occasionally. In that sense, after the coincidental meeting of Dr. Aziz and Mrs. Moore at the mosque, he escorts her to the gate of only-English Chandrapore’s club. Mrs. Moore expresses her wish that Dr. Aziz is a member, ignoring the segregation to which the Indians are victims but the doctor says that “*The Indians are not allowed into the Chandrapore Club even as guests*” (P.20). The first chapter of the novel gives us a clear description of the fictive Chandrapore. The civil station where the light-skinnes live is not the same in terms of luxury, comfort, and decoration in comparison to the places inhabited by the Indians, proof of their segregated mentalities. Furthermore, the terms they use such as ‘us’ (P.42) show their isolation from the indigenious. They, in fact, advocate some security distance between them. They judge the result of a close relationship with the Indians gravitates toward a tragic end. Mr. McBryde discusses with Mr. Fielding and says that he has “*never known anything but disaster result when English people and Indians attempt to be intimate socially*” perhaps “*Intercourse, yes. Courtesy, by all means,*” but “*Intimacy – never, never*” (P.153). Coming together would deteriorate the traditional hierarchical order that is between the colonized and the colonizer. It explains an incident involving Mrs. Turton who refuses categorically to shake hands with any Indian. Showing through it her denial to set herself

on equal footing with the Indians. Besides, culturally speaking, the nutriment the English eat in India, despite the long years spent there, is still the “*food of exiles*” (P.43) proving their incapacity to function effectively outside their own culture which proves their egocentrism and isolationism

Todorov focuses on another trait of barbarism no less important, consisting of the heathens’ determination to humiliate and get revenge. According to Todorov, a barbarian is not satisfied being simply in powerful positions unless they humiliate the ‘others’. Displaying the enemy shamefaced to the gaze of all is desired. In that sense, we see the City Magistrate shouting at his servant to bring him his files, which he does not necessarily need. He also fines him eight *annas* to allegedly teach him a lesson. Speaking of servants, the Anglo-Indians are only used to the imperative mood when they address their Indian subordinates. They barely learn the words they use only to give orders. As an illustration, Major Callendar likes to denigrate his subordinates; he does so with Dr. Aziz. As a matter of fact, he belittles him on every occasion by calling him when he is at dinner with his friends to “*show his power*” (Forster, 2005, P.13). The same behavior is adopted by Mrs. Turton, next to him, encourages the officials to use the army’s forces against the Indians to set the records straight and show the English are still in control of the country. In that sense, she argues that “*a show of force will do no harm*” (Forster, 2005, P.202). Furthermore, she wants the rioters to suffer and to be ashamed. She says:

they ought to crawl from here [Chandrapore] to the caves on their hands and knees whenever an Englishwoman's in sight, they oughtn't to be spoken to, they ought to be spat at, they ought to be ground into the dust, we've been far too kind with our Bridge Parties and the rest. (Forster, 2005, P.204)

From the two passages above, we clearly identify the brutality of Mrs. Turton’s character. Her urge to use armed forces against the Indians and her readiness to make a group of people crawl seemingly several kilometres without remorse is evidence of her cruelty. We ascertain once more Major Callendar with the same characteristics in the following statement:

It's time they [Indians] did squeal. I've put the fear of God into them at the hospital anyhow. You should see the grandson of our so-called leading loyalist...His beauty's gone, five upper teeth, two lower and a nostril. . . . Old Panna Lal brought him the looking-glass yesterday and he blubbered. . . . I laughed; I laughed, I tell you, and so would you; that used to be one of these buck niggers, I thought, now lie's all septic; damn him, blast his soul--er--I believe he was unspeakably immoral—er--...I wish I'd had the cutting up of my late assistant too; nothing's too bad for these people. (P.203-204)

We have so far exposed the Anglo-Indians with a considerable number of uncivilized manners and vicious deeds. Some of them represent even a threat to the safety of the Indians like Mrs. Turton and Major Callendar. However, what is the reason behind their chauvinistic, condescending, segregating, and isolating mentalities? We are of the opinion that it is because they are predisposed to be the sort. The field of psychology introduced a phenomenon under the name of “*the self-fulfilling prophecy*” (Todorov, 2010, P.59), which means that when people are told false information and repeatedly hear it, they instinctively accept it as a reality by the power of belief. The codes or information are transmitted from “*specialists to apprentices*” (Todorov, 2010, P.32). An eloquent example is Mr. Heaslop. When he first arrives to India, he does not adopt a jingoist attitude. He becomes intolerant and unpleasant while living with the Indians. This is the result of the influence of by his elder peers like Major Callendar, and Mr. and Mrs. Turton. Mahmoud Ali is one morning offended by Mr. Heaslop in court. On the same day, he recounts the incident to Dr. Aziz saying: “*I do not blame him. He was told that he ought to insult me. Until lately he was quite a nice boy, but the others got hold of him*” (P.09). Indeed, the officials with the most experience have charged themselves to instruct him on how to be and not to behave in India. He, in return, fears going against his community's standards. In a slight quarrel with his mother over the idea of being agreeable with the Indians, he says: “*what do you and Adela want me to do? Go against my class, against all the people I respect and admire out here? Lose such power as I have for doing good in this country because my behaviour isn't pleasant?*” (Forster, 2005, P.45). The phenomenon touches the whole of the English who are living in India. Todorov (2010) writes that the ‘self-fulfilling prophecy’ “*can*

*be observed in the behaviour of groups within a wider community*” (P.59). It explains Hamidullah saying to his friends that all the English “*come out intending to be gentlemen, and are told it will not do*” [therefore] “*They all become exactly the same- not worse, not better. I give any Englishman two years [and] any Englishwoman six months. All are exactly alike*” (Forster, 2005, P.09).

### **B. What is a ‘Civilized’ in the Todorovian Sense?**

It has just been argued that some of the British Officials in Forster’s *A Passage to India* manifest traits of barbarity as Todorov conceives them. It has been observed namely with Ronny Heaslop, who stands for the colonizer’s psychology which, in return makes him arrogant and in need to show off. Moreover, Mr. Callendar’s condescendence and rudeness towards the Indians, and Mrs. Turton who preaches violence and represents the stereotyped, cruel English colonial wife. On the other part, in order to balance his characters, Forster introduces other persons personifying civilized virtues as conceived by Todorov.

First, what is to be ‘civilized’? Todorov simply defines it as follows: “*A civilized person is one who is able, at all times and in all places, to recognize the humanity of others fully*” though “*that other live in a way different from you*” one must agree to “*see them as bearers of the same humanity as yourself*” (P.21-22). From the above definition, we understand that refined people do not demonstrate their courtesy in particular spaces and times. In fact, they do not choose when to show it or hide it because it is naturally anchored in them. After Adela’s incident in the Marabar Caves, the British were “*kind to her, indeed over-kind, the men too respectful, the women too sympathetic*” (P.182). But what about their conduct with her on the other days? They were no more than formal. What about the accused Dr. Aziz, who had to endure all kinds of evil wishes from the English before being proven guilty or innocent? They are, thus, incapable of being other than what they are, that is, chauvinist and egocentric. Their superiority have made them lose the notion of equality, always assuming the position of the dominant figure. In

that sense, Mrs. Moore has been told that she is superior to everyone in India even if she does not want to be such. As a matter of fact, we see her trying to liberate her son from drowning deeper in that idea of supremacy. In a dialogue between Mrs. Moore and her son, the latter argues that they ought not to be pleasant in India, but must be dominant and authoritative, for “*India likes gods*” (Forster, 2005, P.45). Mrs. Moore, facing her son’s unmannerly behaviour, asserts that “*The English are out here to be pleasant [...] Because India is part of the earth [...] and God has put us on earth to love our neighbours and to show it*” (P.46)

**a. Dr. Aziz, a Warm-hearted Character:**

Indeed, tolerance, kindness, and affection can be seen all in a humble person. It is also the ability to love. Dr. Aziz, a Muslim Indian doctor managed to keep a strong friendship with two English people. One is Mr. Fielding, an official embracing no religion. The second is Mrs. Moore, mother of Mr. Heaslop and Christian by conviction. Yet, Dr. Aziz is “*the friend of any Anglo-Indian who attempts to mix with his people*” (Siber, 2012, P.279) by transcending the divisive cultures. He desires to be intimately in contact with the English. For that, he does his best to make his English guests at ease and provide them with everything they need during their trip to the Marabar Cave. His efforts are displayed in the fact of doing some things his religion goes against, even which is prohibited such as providing them with alcohol. The narrator reports that Dr. Aziz takes the trouble of thinking of every detail. He considers “*the question of alcohol: Mr. Fielding, and perhaps the ladies, were drinkers [...] the problem of Professor Godbole and his food, and of Professor Godbole and other people’s food*” (Forster, 2005, P.119). This is a proof of his openness and hospitality. The narrator again tells us that he was very appreciative of the trust Mrs. Moore and Miss Quested have put in him and is very happy “*they were dependent on him for a few hours*” and honored that “*an obscure man had been allowed to show courtesy to visitors from another country*” and “*any discomfort they endured would tear his own soul*” (P.132-133).

Putting aside his relationship with people, his vision of the world makes us assume that he is an open-minded universalist. In fact, civilization is closely related to culture which means the “*collective modes of living and thinking, to the forms and styles of organization of time and space, which include language, religion, family structure, ways of building houses, tools, ways of eating and dressing*” (Todorov, 2010, P.26). Therefore, no man can be considered as a civilized if he does not belong to a culture. On the other hand, there is the universality of values that the world accepts. They consist of culture, order, morality, and humanity. The universality of values, Todorov argues, must go alongside the plurality of cultures. He writes, “*We cannot advance on the road to civilization without having previously acknowledged the plurality of cultures*” (P.34). Unless people are tyrannical, none should impose its principles on others. Dr. Aziz understands that and in a conversation, he says: “*Miss Quested (...) You keep your religion, I mine. That’s the best. Nothing embraces the whole of India.*” (P.135). Nevertheless, his humble and undogmatic character is not Dr. Aziz’s only virtue. Once he has been proven innocent, he forgives his accuser for bringing shame to his name and children and tarnish his reputation. On top of that, he renounces taking the money Miss Quested paid as reparation for the false charges she puts him in. When all the reasons lead him to seek revenge, he remains tender even to the English saying that “*he knew at the bottom of his heart that they [English] could not help being so cold and odd and circulating like an ice-stream through his land*” (Forster, 2005, P.64-65). Therefore, Dr. Aziz proves to be civilized.

**b. Mrs. Moore’s Humbleness and Love for Others:**

Next to Dr. Aziz, we recognize in Mrs. Moore the same aspects of civilization beginning with her humbleness. Her will to see the real India and know the Indians is a proof of her down-to-earth character. She, accepts to honour all the Indians’ invitations. In the mosque episode, when Dr. Aziz rushes to ask her to take her shoes off when entering the holy place, he is startled that she already has done it. Naturally, he is accustomed to the non-respect of other English

officials or tourists who do not believe in his religion. That is probably why he does not kindly ask her whether she had her shoes on or not but rather orders her to take them off. The fact of accepting somebody's faith, culture, and customs equal, or at least not inferior to any other, enlarges the circle of humanity. Her simple act makes Dr. Aziz happy. Besides, ignoring the "codes" (Todorov, 2010, p.24) of a community people put their feet on makes them incapable of understanding those living there and will condemn them to be confined within a small group of their own and exclude others from it. Mrs. Moore is also recognized for her ability to love and attentiveness. In fact, in the Marabar's hill, we perceive her thinking of Dr. Aziz "*despite her fatigue, how very charming, how very good, he was, and how deeply she desired his happiness*" (P.138). Elsewhere, in spite of the fact that she feels unwell and is about to breakdown, she pretends that nothing is wrong as Dr. Aziz comes to her because "*She did not want him to think his treat was a failure*" P.137). Secondly, she surpasses the limitation of her own community's thinking. We have argued previously that most of the English Officials have shown themselves incarcerated in their unilateral, transcendent, and racist rationality. While almost everyone inside the Civil Station discredits Aziz's innocence, she is among the few coming from that community who strongly uphold that he is "*of course (...) innocent*" and says to Miss Quested that "*I will not help you to torture him for something he never did. There are different ways of evil and I prefer mine to yours*" (Forster, 2005, P.192-193). It shows once more her love for others. She does not want to appear as an ideal and angelic woman with no imperfections. She even says it admitting that she too has an evil side inside of her. Yet, she does not accept taking part in a trial that would ruin an innocent man's life.

We take this opportunity to annex another reflection. In fact, Mrs. Moore has been the subject of many critics and analysts who have argued that she might have won the title of 'the novel's heroin' if she had not fled India without giving her version of the facts, which may be of great assistance to prove Dr. Aziz's innocence. But, if we take into consideration the political

atmosphere of British India, we can see that the chances of a Muslim Indian man winning a case against an English woman accusing him of assault is frail or even impossible. The dominant racial prejudices among the English community blind them. As a consequence, it is nearly impossible for them to accept a defeat against an Indian. In fact, even after Miss Quested confesses her abuser is not Dr. Aziz, the officials “*still believed he was guilty, they believed it to the end of their careers*” (P.247). We suggest, therefore, that Mrs. Moore leaving India at a crucial time is not cowardice because it can be interpreted that she has a feeling that the trial would not end in the interest of Aziz, and she cannot afford to see him imprisoned vainly.

**c. Fielding’s Openness and Virtuous Manners:**

Next to Mrs. Moore, Mr. Fielding is another English character who appears sympathetic and good-hearted. The first trait that differentiates him from the rest of his community is his open-mindedness. He spends most of his time with the ‘Indians’ rather than in the club, which shows his down-to-earth attitude. He is not at ease with the English formalities and their inquiries over people’s personal businesses. In fact, he confesses to Dr. Aziz, he says that he is “*out of club gossip*” (p.110). Concerning his informal lifestyle, Dr. Aziz in visit to bungalow comments on Fielding’s room saying that he thought “*Englishmen kept their room so tidy. It seems that this is not so*” (P.59). Sticking to Aziz’s visit to Fielding’s house episode, the latter speaks from his bathroom, something the English are not likely to do for the amount of intimacy involved. Furthermore, his difference with his fellow English is that while the expatriates never miss a chance to mention the number of years they spent in India, he never shows any importance to the time. The Anglo-Indians speak of it as an exploit a soldier experiences back from the war alive. But Fielding who travels light enjoys every moment spent there. Besides minding his own business and sense of informality, he understands Indian character. A culture, Todorov explains:

that encourages its members to become aware of their own traditions, but also to be able to distance themselves from those traditions, is superior [more civilized] to that which contents itself

with pandering to the pride of its members by assuring them that they are the best in the world and that the other human groups are not worthy of interest. (P.34)

The idea discussed above focuses on the necessity to understand and accept the differences in other cultures. We speak about flaws, not judgingly but rather bearing in mind the possibility of not recognizing oneself in someone else's philosophy or thinking. When Dr. Aziz wants to inform his English friends about his knowledge of India's history, architecture, and the source of his mosque's water, he gets it all wrong and Fielding knows it. In this incident, "*Ronny would have pulled him up, Turton would have wanted to pull him up, but restrained himself. Fielding did not even want to pull him up*" (Forster, 2005, P.65).

Like Mrs. Moore, Mr. Fielding is the second English man who sides with Dr. Aziz when others stand against him. The detail that separates them, as little as it may be, is that Fielding is not only convinced of Aziz's innocence but fights hard to prove it. He bets everything that Aziz has never committed any perversity. He never gives up his devotion to saving his friend from prison. It costs him access to the Club and almost his job. He is even suspected of preparing a coup with Armitrao and Mahmoud Ali, to encourage seditious movement and suspected of being a Japanese spy. Furthermore, his name gets dirty like that of Aziz, but he never gives up. It is easy, we presume, to say 'I will sacrifice myself for the sake of others', but Todorov states that "*To sacrifice oneself for one's nearest and dearest is an attitude that everyone can understand, even if not everyone is ready to assume it*" (P.78).

Furthermore, despite the rage he may feel for what Aziz and he go through and for almost bringing chaos to the city and provoking riots, he is not overwhelmed by a desire for revenge. He rather expresses mercy to Miss Quested. He protects her against potential attacks, lodges her, and asks Aziz to let her off paying. It is not the first time he chooses to forgive instead of begrudging. He does it the moment he sends Dr. Aziz, a second invitation though the latter simply ignores the first.

To sum up, we have attempted to demonstrate the two categories of characters in Forster's *A passage to India*. The first one is the bearer of the characteristics of 'barbarian' because of their denial of the humanity others and for giving themselves the right to rule, humiliate and punish anyone outside their community. We have exemplified it using Mr. Heaslop, Major Callendar, and Mrs. Turton. The second category is the characters with the most sympathetic traits and features. They are, simply put, the opposite of 'barbarians'. They refuse to decline the humanity of others, making them merciful, thoughtful, and loving. They are following Todorov's point of view as he calls them 'civilized' and are represented by Dr. Aziz, Mrs. Moore, and Cyril Fielding. In actual fact, one must clarify that our hypothesis is conducted based on the attitudes and actions shown by the characters mentioned through our reasoning. In other words, "*no individual, let alone any people, can be entirely 'civilized'... [Or] 'barbarian'...*" (P.22). On the same level, Walter Benjamin, who is cited in Todorov's theory is quoted saying "*There is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism*" (P.45).

We are aware that by saying someone is a 'barbarian', we refuse to admit the little humanity their soul may contain, and that we pass judgments. Indeed, we seek to demonstrate that people are not barbarians by birth, nor civilized by the way, but it is their actions that motivate us to assume they are close to wearing one of the titles. The 'other' in the colonial discourse is portrayed as a primitive, incapability of reasoning and of self-rule, hence the ideological justification for their colonial power (Siber, 2012). The Westerners' aim is to indoctrinate their subjects that their enlightenment and survival depend mainly on the West. That is why it is considered to be a 'White Man's Burden'. In fact, the idea of the superiority of race, religion, culture, and works of art in the West is disillusioning them. It makes them assume that anyone outside their space falls into the category of the uncivilized. Though it can be said that nothing is more natural for a community to have an arbitrary inclination toward

certain elements over others, such as religion, music, food ...etc, it cannot be declared at any level to be better or superior to the religion, music, or food of other groups. Todorov argues that humanity is to stagnate *“If we refuse to take into consideration visions of the world that are different from ours» and the consequence of it to be “cut off from universality, and end up nearer to the pole of barbarism” (P.34).* The culture that encourages its people to open themselves to others without marginalizing their own, tends to be more civilized than that which is *“pandering to the pride of its members by assuring them that they are the best in the world and that the other human groups are not worthy of interest” (P.34).*

Subsequently we do not desire to make the same mistakes as demonizing the English in order to qualify the Indians as finer. It is certainly not our ‘holy grail’. Our idea is, as a consequence, coherent with that of Todorov, which is to explain that *“no culture is barbarian in itself, no people is definitively civilized; all can become either barbarian or civilized” (P.51).*

### Chapter Three: The Sentiments of Fear and Resentment in the Narrative

*“One cannot fully understand the world in which we live without trying to integrate and understand its emotions”*  
Dominique Moïsi, *The geopolitics of emotion: How cultures of fear, humiliation, and hope are reshaping the world.*

The paragraph by Moïsi (2010) demonstrates the importance of in understanding the world. It shows their significance in using them not only to understand the psychological side of humans but also to recognize the nature of the relationships that bind nations. They also can impact countries' policies, like ratifying or abrogating a law. A look at today's world, reveals that it is overwhelmed with emotions. There is the anxiety of being attacked, the hope of a better future, the bitterness of historical injustices, or the fear of the 'other', just to name a few. History teaches that peace and war are both partly the results of emotions: mainly resentment and fear.

In order to analyze the conflicting relationship that connects the Indians with the British in Forster's *A passage to India*, these two concepts are primordial. First, resentment is the feeling Todorov associates with the countries which suffered more the humiliation inflicted by neo\colonialism. Their loss of identity, political, religious, and traditional landmarks, is believed to be explicitly the result of the colonizers' oppression. Thus, the abused individuals usually interiorize their pain until they can no more. They become dangerous, for they have nothing worth their attention and protection. Therefore, they often resort to violence, as their sole option, since they have everything to gain and nothing to lose. It is what makes their strength. This situation is confirmed by the 1857 Indian Mutiny, in which poorly armed and unorganized mutineers face for two years the well-sophisticated British Army. The violence can be related to Todorov who builds his notion on a sentiment emerging from intimidated people who blame the colonizers for their distinct and invisible agonies. In Forster's narrative, it is seen in different episodes and through many character. Each with a particular level, namely Mahmoud Ali, Mr. Zulfiqar, and Dr. Aziz at the end of the novel.

The second emotion is fear. It is no less important regarding the amount of research that is based on it. Moïsi (2018), Nussbaum (2018), and Huntington (2002) are three scholars who, directly or indirectly, associate the sentiment with the countries constituting the West. For them, as Nussbaum (2018) said, fear “*too often blocks rational deliberation, poisons hope, and impedes constructive cooperation for a better future*” (P.01). In other words, countries that are convinced of their supremacy and power, panic when suspecting a revolt from their subjects. One explanation for this is related to the idea that their interests lie in their land tenure. Their colonies provide them with human resources, military manpower, raw materials, space dedicated to scientific experiments ...etc. In short, they contribute to the economic enrichment and social comfort of the colonizers. Yet, all that is doomed to collapse if the countries of resentment become aware of their misfortune and decide to alter it into a better one. Hence creating an atmosphere of panic and anguish similar to that present at the Civil Station. We distinguish the sentiment of fear almost with all the Anglo-Indians, that is, Mr. Heaslop and his fellow countrymen. With that said, it is in the light of these conceptions as elaborated by Todorov that we tackle Forster’s *A passage to India*.

#### **A. Resentment**

A group of people living desperately in their homeland under the will of a stranger must be a burden. In fact, it is an awful sensation when we think of it. This was the case for Indians in British India. The first reason for resentment, Todorov underlines, is the extreme divergence of two cultures occupying one single country. We see through the narrative of Forster’s *A passage to India* the imposing differences between the two groups of inhabitants: the British and the Indians. Todorov concludes that the variability in culture, religion, values, and principles can lead to either “*envy, or rejection, or both at once*” or “*inspires contempt, or condescension*” (P.04). The former is the characteristic we can discern in the Indians. They are angry and want to put an end to the denigration and snobbery of the British occupiers.

Resentment to Todorov is an emotion that Indians must have felt. Ingredients of an irritated nation, as listed in the theory, are present in India. The second reason provoking anger is the humiliation the Indians undergo. We have seen in the historical background how the Indians are underestimated and humiliated before the 1857 Indian Mutiny. Basically, while the British are inclined to believe to be sent by God and their conquest to be blessed by Christ, the Indians' religions are judged valueless and senseless. The English make no effort to consider the Indians' faith and values before passing any law. One eloquent example of that is the Dalhousie doctrine of lapse and the British law allowing Hindu widows to remarry, which is considered a great sin. Next to that, we have seen in the previous chapter the effort Dr. Aziz, Mr. Fielding, and Mrs. Moore made to keep away chauvinism and regionalism thinking from reaching them. Furthermore, the English Westernize and Christianize the Indians' culture and religion. Their aim was a unilateral identity. The operation is given the title of '*communitarianism*' (Todorov, 2010, P.72). The term comes to life when a community refuses to identify itself with the other communities that constitute a nation, hence creating a breach between them. We are used to see the majority discriminating against the minority. Yet, the case is different with India since the English culture and religion constitute the minority but, at the same time, it is in possession of power. The English do not want to open up to Indians' cultures, religions, customs, and rituals, and on top of that, attempt to brainwash its younger Sepoys to join Christianity and mock their ancestors' "*creed*" (James, 1997, P.237). In Forster's novel, the English "*always stick together*" (Forster, 2005, P.220) as a group segregating the Indians. During the Bridge party, in which the Indians are invited for the first time, they are seen crowded alone, separated from the Anglo-Indians. They do not dare come near the English and the latter do not want to. Subsequently, they "*stood massed at the further side of tennis lawns, doing nothing*" (Forster, 2005, P.35). In that sense, Todorov argues that "*a necessary condition for the eruption of violence is [...] the reduction of multiple identity to single identity*"

(P.65). Prohibiting the Indians from practicing their religion and rituals, learning from their ancestors, speaking their languages, and commemorating their past played a major role in fuelling their anger. The Indians want to be accepted as they are without recourse to modifications, or reductions to please the others. It explains the response Dr. Aziz gives when advised to clean up the remnants between his teeth before meeting his superior. He says: "*I am an Indian, it is an Indian habit to take pan. The Civil Surgeon must put up with it*" (P.13)

In addition, humiliation, Moisi (2009) explains, is when a person is convinced that others have intruded into the private kingdom of their lives and makes them utterly independent. This sensation, he continued, leads to irrationality and violence. Once more, the Indian First War of independence is the best example. In fact, Dr. Aziz hates, like any repressed human, the sensation of being belittled. More than that, he can stand some of the British capricious behaviours but not indignity. In a conversation with Mr. Fielding, he says: "*If they [the English] will let me get on with my profession, and not be too rude to me officially, I really don't ask for more*" (P.150). We can deduce from Aziz's statement that he gets used to the idea of being ruled by the English. Nevertheless, he still wants to preserve some of his dignity, which the British missed understanding. On the same level, Todorov argues that "*the colonized Indians complained, not about the technological advances that were imported, but about the personal humiliations that they underwent, since they were treated as beings of a lower category*" (P.43).

Humiliation causes resentment. So does 'appetite'. We use the word appetite figuratively. Todorov makes use of it to designate the population who "*missed out on its share of wealth*" (P.04). Subsequently, they feel sorry for themselves and the nationalists for their country. People who have less will increasingly become aggressive towards those who have more. As a consequence, they are eager to do anything in their power to alter the course of the events. Mahmoud Ali is the representative figure of the repressed Indians. For him, any misfortune that affected his country is the cause of the British ruse. Mahmoud Ali is a pessimistic man who

does not believe an Indian can befriend an Englishman. Too big is the damage to be repaired by a simple friendship. Dr. Aziz's incident reinforces his opinion of the English for he shares the humiliation. The feeling of denigration is accentuated when he sees the photograph of Dr. Aziz's late wife shown and his private papers carried by a police officer. Furthermore, he sees his friend's trial as a farce, a camouflage of the justice that ruins his country. He is of the opinion that the judicial system present in India is corrupted and works only for the interest of the British. He is sure that his friend is to be judged guilty. Hence considering the trial a waste of time. He does not miss the chance to express his mind out loud even at the risk of losing his career. In an infuriated tone, he addresses Mr. Das, an Indian judge, saying "*I am not defending a case, nor are you trying one. We are both of us slaves*" (P.211). His anger is uncontrollable. Even the narrator associates it with madness saying that "*He was almost out of his mind*" and that he "*had been enraged, his nerves snapped; he shrieked like a maniac*" (P.210-211). For that, he wants his friend's trial to be fair from any risk of loss. It is why dragging "*everyone was precisely the barrister's aim*" (p.163).

Another reason for his pessimistic attitude is the result of a long experience dealing with English officials in Court. Being a lawyer, he knows how the Indians are treated. Furthermore, a barrister means a man of law. His education assures him to spot the true intentions of the English and the sad truth that they do not do his nation a service by colonizing it as some people may believe but serve only Britain's interests.

Next to that, we observe the "*temper of Chandrapore is altering*" (P.201). The fury increases among Indians and is expressed by demonstrations and acts of vandalism. Going to the court, Mrs. Turton is attacked by "*a tap of silly anger on its paint*" (P.201). The narrator informs the reader that no way of communication is left intact as all the "*wires had been cut*" (P.220). Furthermore, they all gather unified in front of the City Magistrate's Court. The mass is constituted of some young students all excited and ready to face whatever comes. They were

*“hysterical”* and called out that *“the English were cowards”* (Forster, 2005, P.202). The peak of their anger is expressed in the days following the trial. When the crowd takes action against the English. The narrator says that the English regaining the civil station *“could have been killed off easily”* (P.219). The ‘mob’ becomes blinded by resentment. *“Forward, forward [...] Down with the Collector, down with Superintendent of Police”* (Forster, 2005, P.221). Their anger is expressed in the words used by Mahmoud Ali in his address to the crowd motivating them. He even exaggerates the information that Nureddin, Mr. Zulfiqar’s grandson, is being tortured at the civil hospital. In fact, his aim is to set in motion a demonstration that aim to eliminate the idea that Indians are cowards. The news *“lashed the crowd to fury”* (P.221). The rioters regain better tempers only when Nureddin is seen unhurt.

Mahmoud Ali and the other characters are inspired by reality. Forster uses them to show his own resentment and discontent with Britain’s way of ruling India. Travel writers like Kipling, from colonial countries, adopting a jingoist and conservative attitude, write either to justify the colonizer’s presence or to portray a stereotyped image of a given country. Forster is found to denounce his own nation’s colonial policies and the boundaries set up to prevent the cultures from mingling. He appears to be more sympathetic to India and Indians than to his own race. The personalities he gives to his characters proves his point of view. If we take a closer look, we will find Mr. Heaslop holding the position of the city Magistrate and to be a well-educated man but he behaves in a jingoist and racist manner which he gets from his colonial culture. Mr. McBryde, the superintendent of police, also claims the inferiority of the dark-skinned in comparison to light-skinned ones, is caught having an affair with Miss Derek despite being married. Mr. Turton, Chandrapore’s governor is an intrusive man alongside his wife’s readiness to torture and humiliate. The last one is Mr. Callendar, the civil surgeon is depicted as a racist, ridiculous, and has an intolerant temper. Despite their power and education and allegedly civilized manners, none of them honour their status with moral. Forster, in another

part, uses not only his English characters to show his resentment but also his support for the Indians. Mr. Fielding is the first character with the most biographical embodiment. We understand that his good treatment of the Indians permits him to sleep well and “*travel light*” (P.257). Besides, he is very confident from the very beginning that Dr. Aziz is innocent and challenges his own people to prove it. Next to Mr. Fielding, Mrs. Moore is another English who strongly believes in Aziz’s innocence and shares the anger with the Indian. The narrator reveals that “*Mrs Moore showed no inclination to be helpful. A sort of resentment emanated from her*” (P.187). Above all that, Forster’s use of frequent words taken from the Indians’ language justifies his inclination to the Indian’s cause. Huntington (2002) asserts that “*power*” (P.91) is expressed through the people’s culture and its resistance. In that sense, Forster chooses to instruct the reader more about the geography, history, and rituals of India. The third part of Forster’s *A passage to India* is entirely devoted to the Hindu culture.

Both Mr. Fielding and Mrs. Moore recognize Dr. Aziz as incapable of such an abominable act because he is full of gentleness and humanity. Yet, when love, hospitality, tolerance, and co-existence are not enough, the opposite can be the sole salvation. Even Aziz’s good heart is shattered. The English humiliations, transcendence, and devilish attitude have awakened the aggrieved man in him. The trial changes him. Despite being acquitted, “*victory gave no pleasure [because] he had suffered too much*” (P.220). Add to that, he is disappointed that justice is at such a low level. He knows that he would never have won against Miss Quested if she had not taken back her accusation. The reason for that is that an “*Englishwoman’s words would always outweigh his own*” (P.221). Therefore, he does not believe anymore in a plural India. At least with the English. He says to Mr. Fielding at the end of the novel that “*India shall be a nation! No foreigners of any sort! Hindu and Moslem and Sikh and all shall be one! Hurrah! Hurrah for India! Hurrah! Hurrah!*” (P.306). He pronounces the word ‘hate’ only two

times throughout the story and promises Fielding a near revolution that would put them out of India. He writes:

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

### **B. Fear**

We have demonstrated in the previous section the source of resentment felt by the Indians inside Forster's *A passage to India*. In this section, we deal with the second emotion which is fear. In fact, while, as explained, the Indians who possess less are enraged against those who have more, the latter "*will become increasingly worried about preserving and protecting their advantages*" (Todorov, 2010, P.2). The Indian mutiny of 1857 is once more mentioned, for it was the first act that showed "imperial insecurity", to borrow an idea from Siber (2012). He said that

Insecurity was related to the fear of Indians uprisings as the direct result of the Indian Mutiny and its domino effect upon other British colonies, intercourse with the subject people and idea of inefficiency of the imperialists due to cultural exhaustion in the West. The fear of Indians uprising is the direct outcome of the Indian mutiny of 1857 (P.244)

The Mutiny teaches the officials that it is wise to do their best to keep away another one from rising. The Raj they have built in more than 250 years would probably not stand another uprising for the Indians must have learned from the past and will not repeat the same mistakes already committed. If they decide to overthrow the Raj. Nothing would stop them and the English realize it. Mr. McBryde says to Mr. Fielding: "*you must take it from me that the general situation is going to be nasty at Chandrapore during the next few weeks, very nasty indeed*" and concludes on the next page with an invocation: "*Lord help us, the Lord help us all...*" (P.160-161). The Anglo-Indians are traumatized by the 1857 Rebellion. Because of it, they grow suspicious of everything and everyone. In fact, they are more scared of the unknown than the obvious. Mr. Heaslop is very curious to know everything that happened between his mother and Dr. Aziz in their unexpected meeting in the mosque. He wants mostly to know if he tolerates

them or shows any sign of discontent. All of the Anglo-Indians wish to be told what the Indians speak and think of them during their absence. For them, all the Indians are “*sedition at heart*” (P.36). Therefore, they live in extreme alertness, they do not know who they can and who they cannot. Any miscalculation is a potential risk for the Raj.

“*Fear*” Todorov argues “*becomes a danger for those who experience it*” (P.06). After Adela’s charges against Dr. Aziz, the officials do not want to waste any minute doing nothing. They are so scared that they choose an Indian judge to, allegedly, get rid of any suspicion of personal involvement since the city Magistrate is Miss Adela’s fiancé. In fact, that is not exactly what works through their mind. Appointing an Indian judge is to “*silence the seditious creed of the Indians*” (Siber, 2012, P.245) for they would believe him to be just in his decision. In addition, they think that if an Indian dares to insult Miss Quested in such a way, all the other women seem like potential victims. We notice it because of the number of women that attend the meeting of the English. The narrator comments on it saying that the “*Club was fuller than usual*” (P.170), proof that they do not feel safe. Solutions to the traumatic situation are proposed, and if they differ in their natures, their motivation is the same: fear. Some advocate for military intervention, like Mrs. Turton, to end the English restlessness and worrisome. Mr. Turton thinks that armed forces intervention would irritate further the Indians. In that sense, he advises his people to stay calm and “*assume every Indian is an angel*” (P.173). Furthermore, they look for any evidence or witnesses that would end the trial as soon as possible. They do not even bother themselves to check their validity. A vivid example of that is McBryde’s pseudoscientific truth. Conversing with Mr. Fielding, he claims that the psychology of an Indian criminal differs from that of another. In that sense, even if Dr. Aziz does not express any sign of guilt, Mr. Fielding must not sympathize with him or assume he is innocent. Next to it, they brought Dr. Aziz’s late wife’s picture to make him look like a womanizer, and as consequence, justify his accusation of attempted rape. Dr. Panna Lal is to commit perjury. Major Callendar

says that “*they paid the other Indian [Professor Godbole] to make [Mr. Fielding] late*” (P.175). Their reason for gathering evidence out of nowhere is that if they miss this case when it has infuriated the citizens who were already starting to vandalize, the Raj will likely be destroyed.

Another element proving their fear is that, while Indians join the rank of the English like Dr. Panna Lal, the British start to lose their people. The Nawab Bahadur, a rich philanthropist and a former loyalist renounces his British-conferred title to become Mr. Zulfiqar. Renouncing British-conferred titles is employed as a “*form of protest after the Amritsar massacre*” (P.365). Mr. Fielding alongside Mahmud Ali and Armitrao are seen to cooperate to ensure a maximum victory. The British thought Mr. Fielding “*had done his country and the empire incalculable disservice*” (P.202). In addition, Mrs. Moore, despite her son’s arguments to be on his side, refuses to testify against Dr. Aziz. She afterward becomes a spiritual presence, Esmoor, allowing Miss Quested to come to her senses and tell the truth. In practice, that would discredit the English trustworthiness. Mr. McBryde acknowledges it. He must have sensed that Fielding is to let them off and warns him saying “*if you leave a gap in the line. These jackals’ [...] are looking with all their eyes for a gap*” (Forster, 2005, P.160).

The Indians behave in the exact opposite; they unite their forces and alter their behavior. Once the local population know about Aziz’s arrest, a general turmoil is sensed. The Indians, like a time bomb, go from passive to active in no time. They can explode at any time against their oppressors. Subsequently, an atmosphere of uncertainty and anguish immediately invades the ruling class. As a result, no official is allowed to go out unless for urgent ends. All are advised that it is more than necessary to act as if nothing is out of the ordinary, and the women are ordered to quarantine. The narrator reported that “*There was a sudden rackets-dacket on a temple bell*” (Forster, 2005, p.161) as to announce the beginning of an event and that “*fear is everywhere*” and “*the British Raj rests on it*” (Forster, 2005, P.163). We have seen the general turmoil that follows the trial episode. It is at that time that the worst anguish is felt by the Anglo-

Indians. As a matter of fact, once Miss Quested declares Dr. Aziz is not her aggressor, her community is bewildered about what to do next. It is worth saying once more that the option of losing the case against Dr. Aziz is not estimated. Subsequently, Mrs. Turton is out of herself, looking desperately for alter Indians witnesses and shouting that “*we’re none of us [the English] safe*” (Forster, 2005, P.216). They discreetly re-join their bungalows and confine themselves, “*fearing an attack*” (Forster, 2005, P.223) from the full scale riot.

It can also be claimed that deracinating is another fear-provoking element in the Anglo-Indians. In fact, Todorov explains that “*A particular individual may recognize herself as belonging simultaneously to Mediterranean, Christian and European culture*” (P.54). One reason this happens is that individuals can judge their culture as unable to provide all the comfort needed allowing as a result, extra beliefs, values, languages, and other ingredients of a foreign culture to be annexed to theirs. We agree then that plurality of identities and cultures is a normal phenomenon. Nevertheless, radicals like Anglo-Indians cannot understand this aspect of culture. They perceive it as an attack on the integrity of their community. An eloquent example of cosmopolitanism is again seen in Mr. Fielding. The English expect him to follow obediently their standards but unsuccessfully. Indeed, he misses to “*toe the line*” (Forster, 2005, P.160) with the English, as Mr. McBryde expects him. The narrative voice told through the in chapter VII of Forster’s *A passage to India* that he has already “*seen too many cities and men*” (P.56), making him unable of racial distinctions between him and the Indians. In fact, he is a patriot who got on very well with Englishmen in England. However, in India, the English distinguish him as “*a disruptive force, and rightly, for ideas are fatal to caste, and he used ideas by that most potent method-interchange*”. The reason that leads them to this conclusion is that Mr. Fielding recognizes the world as “*a globe of men who are trying to reach one another and can best do so by the help of goodwill plus culture and intelligence*” (P.57). That means in practice that Mr. Fielding does not mind mingling himself with the Indians. For the Anglo-

Indians, his good relationship with the Indians is problematic for constituting a developing threat to the English and the Raj. We understand once more by the narrator that the cause behind Mr. Fielding having no racial feelings is because he grows in an atmosphere where the herd instinct does not flourish. As a result “*he had found it convenient and pleasant to associate with Indians*” (P.58). The English need not more than one man like Mr. Fielding to awaken their sense of insecurity.

In conclusion, the third and last chapter of this Master’s dissertation has aimed to show that the Indians are aggrieved and the English afraid. In fact, despite the multicultural dimensions of the Indians and their long history, resentment was what united all of its people. The emotion, as Todorov argues, is typical to the countries which felt their lives ruined by a colonizer that keeps them from developing and flourishing. In fact, after years of colonization since the arrival of the British East India Company, the indigenous have undergone consecutive waves of assaults and humiliations. They have witnessed their land confiscated, their wealth stolen, their resources exploited and their religions insulted. They lived under the rules of the English for several centuries. All of these factors stimulated anger and questions about their future. The rage conducts them to commit what the English thought them incapable of: *revolt*. The Indian Mutiny was the first outcome of the fury. The humiliation Dr. Aziz endures through his arrest is felt by all the Indians inside Chandrapore. His fight and embarrassment are shared by every Indian. The English are traumatized by the Mutiny. The Raj is in all probability to collapse in 1857 if the Indians were armed and organized the way the English were. Despite winning, the English know that another uprising is to be more dangerous than the previous one. Therefore, they live in constant fear and suspicion of the Indians. The sentiment is expressed by all the Anglo-Indians living in Chandrapore, except Mr. Fielding and Mrs. Moore. As a matter of fact, they all work restlessly to avoid any other escalation. Todorov suggests that the fear of the colonizers is due to their awareness of the risk they endeavor.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Throughout this master's dissertation whose title is *A Todorovian Reading of Edward Morgan Forster's A Passage to India (1924)*, an attempt is made to explore the nature of the English and Indians' psyches and the dominant sentiments. We have relied on Todorov's theory as elaborated in his *The Fear of the Barbarians: Beyond the Clash of Civilizations (2008)*. The theory has helped to better understand the conflicting relationship between the British and Indians. It has also contributed to trace the root of the Indians' resentment and the English fear. After reading the novel, I have reached the conclusion that, in view of the English actions and conduct, they may assume the title of 'barbarous.' Yet, I want to specify that I do not deny their human side. I believe their actions are, to some extent, justified by the context. To perpetuate the tradition of the imperial standards was their aim. Taking into consideration the mannered behaviours of Dr. Aziz and his two English friends, they can be labelled as 'civilized'. The second conclusion I have come to is that the resentment of the English is due to the devilish behaviour of the English. On the contrary, their resentment provokes the fear among the English. They are aware of the risk that the Indians represent for the empire. They already had to deal with it during the Mutiny of 1857. The Raj is not to stand another strike.

The first section of the first chapter let us deduce that the clash between the Indians and their colonizers takes root back in time. The English have shown no sign of determination to peacefully cohabit with the Indians. Their jingoist, racist attitudes and assumed condescendence prevent them from fraternizing. The second section has made us aware of Forster's advocating liberalism. His biography and writings have shown his tendency to abhor the lack of human consideration in the relation that ties the English and the Indians. From the second chapter that has studied the character's attitudes and behaviours, we have come to realize that Mr. Heaslop and his Anglo-Indian fellows, epitomize the barbarian individuals according to Todorov's perception of the concept. On the other hand, Dr. Aziz and his English friends, namely Mr.

Fielding and Mrs. Moore are all able to love, forgive, and be tolerant. Therefore, we ascertain their civilized standing. For the last chapter, we believe now that the English stimulated the Indians' anger and awakened their sense of rebellion in them. Their unconsidered manners with the Indians could not end with other consequences, for the violence of the colonizers generates the violence of the colonized, as Frantz Fanon views the matter.

Our late teacher Ibrahim HENNA, taught us that a reader can never fully understand a work of literature. The more you read the same novel, he said, the more you discover it for the first time. It is why I suggest, for the future literary studies to reconsider the novel using Moïsi' *The geopolitics of emotion: How cultures of fear, humiliation, and hope are reshaping the world* (2019). I believe the study will clear a path to comprehend better how India has gone from one of the poorest, primitive, superstitious country to become a powerful economic, artistic, and intellectual country in the XXI<sup>st</sup> century.

## **V. Selected Bibliography**

### **1. Primary sources**

Forster, E. M. (2005). *A passage to India*. (O. Stallybrass, Ed.). London: Penguin Books.

### **2. Secondary sources**

#### **Critical theory/ Literary criticism**

Bell, A. O. (Ed.). (1977). *The Diary of Virginia Woolf (Vol I)*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Cavaliero, G. (1979). *A Reading of E. M. Forster*. London: Macmillan Press.

Eldridge, C. C. (1973). *England's Mission. The Imperial Idea in the Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1868-1880*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gilmour, D. (2007). *The Ruling Castes: Imperial Lives in the Victorian Raj*. London: Pimlico.

Huntington, S. P. (2002). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. London: The Free Press.

James, L. (1997). *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*. New York, N.Y: St. Martin's Griffin.

Lago, M. (1995). *E. M. Forster: A Literary Life*. Cambridge: Macmillan.

Moisi, D. (2009). *The Geopolitics of Emotion: How Cultures of Fear, Humiliation, and Hope are Reshaping the World*. Washington, D.C: Doubleday.

Morris, I. (2010). *Why West Rules for Now. The Patterns of History, and What They Reveal About the Future*. London: Profile Book.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2018). *The Monarchy of Fear: A Philosopher Looks at Our Political Crisis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Salter, M. B. (2002). *Barbarians and Civilization in International Relations*. London: Pluto Press.

Todorov, T. (2010). *The Fear of Barbarians: Beyond the Clash of Civilizations* (A. Brown, Trans.) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Willis, M. (1989). *Gladstone and Disraeli: Principles and Policies*. New York, NY. Cambridge University Press.

### **Journal Articles and Dissertations**

Baker, A. M. A. (2006). Rethinking Identity: The Coloniser in EM Forster's A Passage to India. *Nebula*, 3(2), 68-85.

Jajja, M. A. (2013). A passage to India: The colonial Discourse and the Representation of India and Indians as Stereotypes. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 29(1), 39-48

Linjia, G. (2022). On colonialism of A Passage to India: Natural Ecology Perspective.

Siber, M. (2012). *Rudyard Kipling, Edward Morgan Forster, William Somerset Maugham and Joseph Conrad: The British Imperial Tradition and the Individual Talent*. [Doctoral thesis]. Mouloud Mammeri University.

Tavassoli, S., & Mirzapour, N (2014). Postcolonial-Feminist Elements in E. M. Forster's A Passage to India, 17(3). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12323/3239>

Wolpert, S. A. (2022, September 8). British Raj. *Encyclopedia britannica*. Retrieved from: <https://www.britannica.com/event/British-raj>.

### **YouTube videos:**

400 Years (2018, December 12). *Roots of the Empire Part 2 || 400 Years: Britain and India || Episode 3*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/slrK-xR8p80>

Brut India (2019, April 16). *100 years on, Britian Regrets Jallianwala Carnage*. [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/qWymv6fd4OY>

DW Documentary (2018, January 31). *Mahatma Gandhi – Dying for Freedom* [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtu.be/hpZwCRInrgo>

Write Like (2021, Mars 21). *E. M. Forster Documentary* [Video]. YouTube.

<https://youtu.be/pqlmaOzShhs>