



Domaine : Langues et Lettres Etrangères
Filière : Langue Anglaise
Spécialité : Langues, Cultures des Pays Anglophones et Médias

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

Title :

**Mulk Raj Anand's *Letters on India* (1942) as a Postcolonial
Response to Rudyard Kipling's *From Sea to Sea: Letters of
Travel* (1899) and Edward Morgan Forster's *Selected
Letters* (v1.1879-1920/v2.1921-1970)**

Presented by:
Saida Messaoudi

Supervised by:
Dr. Mouloud Siber

Board of Examiners:

Chair:	Dr. Nadia Gada	MCA	Department of English	UMMTO
Supervisor:	Dr. Mouloud Siber	MCA	Department of English	UMMTO
Examiner:	Mr. Boukhalfa Laouari	MAA	Department of English	UMMTO

Promotion : September 2016

N° d'Ordre :

N° de série :

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor **Dr.Mouloud SIBER** for his continuous support and constant help. Without his guidance and supervision, this dissertation would have been next to impossible. I would also thank him for his precious and useful comments throughout the process of accomplishing the memoire. I am also sincerely thankful to the members of jury, **Dr Nadia GADA** and Mr. **Boukhalfa LAOUARI** for their evaluation.

Finally, I would like to thank all those who helped me complete my work.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this Master thesis to my beloved mother,

Katia OUMEDJBER

who sacrificed her youth to grant me a chance to follow my studies

To my sisters and brother:

Tania, Anissia and Soufiyane.

To my lovely cousin **Ania** and dearest aunt **Zahra.**

To my friends **Lynda, Sassi, Thanina, Nacira, Hdjila,**

Nadia, Nawel, Ouiza, Souad and to all my dearest friends for their support.

Always offering help and inspiration.

Saida

Abstract

This research paper is a postcolonial study of Rudyard Kipling's *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel* (1899), and Edward Morgan Forster's *Selected Letters* (Vol. 1. 879-1920/ Vol. 2. 1921-1970) in contrast to Mulk Raj Anand's *Letters on India* (1942). Following Edward Said's postcolonial theory developed in *Orientalism* (1978) and *Culture and Imperialism* (1993), I have analyzed Anand's work as a response to the misrepresentation of India and its people in the "Orientalist" discourse of Kipling's and Forster's texts. Both Kipling and Forster stigmatize the Indian culture and people. They represent Indian customs and religions as barbarian and bloody. Therefore, they associate Indians with violence. Similarly, they argue that Indians suffer from a cultural trauma as an outcome of their religions diversity. Moreover, they presume that Indian political instability is due to Indians refusal to accept the British offer to enlighten them. They argue that Indians lack political expertise. Finally, they argue that the bad socio-economic condition of India is an outcome of the corrupted people and their rulers. In "resistance" to this misrepresentation, Anand argues that India is a continent with this diversity. He associates his countrymen with peace. In addition to this, he denies Indians' lack of political expertise by referring to Nationalism. Finally, he declares that the declining condition in India results from the "hegemonic" practices of the British administration and the capitalist system rather than Indians.

Content

Acknowledgement.....	i
Dedication	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Content.....	iv
I. Introduction.....	1
1. Review of literature.....	3-6
2. Issue and Working Hypothesis.....	6-7
II. Methods and Materials.....	9
1. Methods.....	9-12
2. Materials.....	13-14
III. Results and Discussion.....	16.-17
1. Chapter one: The Authors' Stances on the Indian National and Cultural Identity.....	17-29
2. Chapter two: The Authors' Stances on the Political Condition of Anglo-India.....	32-44
3. Chapter three: The Authors' Stances on the Socio- Economic Condition of Anglo- India.....	47-54
IV. Conclusion.....	56-57
V. Bibliography.....	58-59

Introduction

Postcolonial scholars such as Edward W. Said argue that colonialism can be linked to the period that characterized the relationship between Europe and the rest of the world from the 16th to the mid-20th centuries. It can be defined as a process of social, cultural, economic, and political exploitation of the East by a self ascribed dominant West based on a “hegemonic” power exercised by a dominant country over a foreign one. By assuming its racial and ideological “superiority” over the rest of the world, Europe presumes that its extending rule over other territories is part of its “Civilizing Mission”. This idea is reinforced by “Colonial Discourse” which develops a set of “binominal oppositions”¹ such as “Self /Other”, “Colonized/Colonizer”, “Civilized/Uncivilized” in order to legitimize their invasion of Eastern countries. In addition to this, the misrepresentation of the colonized nations prevalent in the European Literature reinforces the colonizer’s ideological belief in its cultural and racial superiority.

However, colonial discourse is based on racism and the discrimination of Eastern countries. This led to the emergence of the Postcolonial Literature which responds to both the stereotypical images drawn by Western writers and the Western hegemony. It aims to “destabilize” ideas of intellectuals who support the hegemonic practices of imperial powers. It creates spaces for the “Subaltern” to challenge the authorities, beliefs, and legacies of the colonizer who suppressed their culture and identity². Among the ideas that Postcolonialism challenges in relation to colonial literature is “the Orient”. The latter is a concept developed by Said in his *Orientalism: the Western Conceptions of the Orient* (1978) to mean the “other” or “subaltern”. He writes that: “Orientalism as a western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient”³. This concept is used to define the relationship between Europe and the rest of the world which is based on cultural, social, political and economic differences. In other words, the Orient is a concept that includes a set of stereotypical representations that are told from the perspective of West on the East. Such a description becomes the source of the

inaccurate and underrepresentation of the East by associating it with a lack of modernity and civilization in contrast to a presumed “enlightened” Europe. Therefore, “Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an ethnological and epistemological distinction made between “the Orient” and (most of the time) the Occident”⁴. Such ideas of Europe’s superiority were propounded in travel writing which rose as a dominant literary genre mainly during the nineteenth century. Based on the accounts of missionaries and travelers to ‘exotic’ lands, these travelogues became a means to justify the invasion of countries like India.

Two literary figures emerged as witnesses to the expansion and the rise of the Britain to the status of a world centre. Taking advantage of the circumstances during that period featuring the Industrial Revolution and the declining power of other imperial powers such as France, Britain extended all over the five continents mainly during the 19th century. Among its important colonies which provided it with cheap labor and raw materials, Britain saw in India its most important colony and the key to the rest of Asia. As a result, British authors such as Edward Morgan Forster and Rudyard Kipling used both fiction and non-fiction to ideologically support Britain’s presence in India. They had the task to uphold and justify the presence of Britain in India throughout their respective literary works⁵. Nevertheless, Mulk Raj Anand is a former colonized writer and is seen as one of the founding fathers of Indian English fiction along with R. K. Narayan and Raja Rao⁶. He was a nationalist literary figure who was influenced by the ideas of Mahatma Gandhi. His works can be seen as a rebellion against the colonial discourse⁷.

Review of Literature

We can say that the fictional and non-fictional works of Anand, Kipling and Forster received much criticism. To begin with, the works of Kipling received much criticism. In their joint article entitled “Native Misrule and ‘Oriental Despotism’ in Alexandre Dumas’s *Adventure in Algeria* (1846) and Rudyard Kipling’s *From Sea To Sea: Letters of Travel* (1899)”, Mouloud Siber and Bouteldja Riche argue that “Kipling contrasts native misrule with

enlightened British encroachment in India”⁸. They assert that Kipling supports the Britain’s policy for it is supposed to bring order to India. Therefore, Kipling believes in the so called “White Man’s superiority” which ought to bring prosperity to the land. He deploys such argument in his work to maintain the Indians in a lower position by defining them as ignorant and backward.

Another criticism was elaborated by David Cody in his article entitled “Kipling: A Brief Biography” where he analyzes some aspects of Kipling’s imperialist attitudes towards the colonized nations. In his analysis of Kipling’s “The White Man’s Burden” (1899), he argues that:

[It]was, so far as culturally patronizing imperialist of Kipling’s stripe were concerned, a genuine burden –Kipling’s viewed his imperialism, predicated on deeply– held political, racial, moral, and religious beliefs which sustained a feeling of innate British superiority⁹.

In other words, Kipling’s work is initially based on the different cultural and religious creeds which ideologically support Britain’s invasion of India. He contrasts a presumed Britain’s superiority to the presumed Indians’ backwardness. Thus, Kipling holds a patriotic feeling and a strong belief in his country’s civilizing mission in India.

In his doctoral thesis, Siber elaborates a critical analysis of both Kipling’s and Forster’s works. Entitled “*Rudyard Kipling, Edward Morgan Forster, William Somerset Maugham, and Joseph Conrad: The British Imperial Tradition and the Individual Talent*” (2012), the thesis studies major aspects of imperialism in the works of four canonical British writers who supported Britain’s imperial practices in its colonies. These writers sought to uphold the imperial tradition of European superiority to justify their invasion. According to Siber, Kipling is a “conservative”¹⁰ who is less concerned with changing the declining social, political, and economic situation in India. He argues that Kipling “upholds the inferiority of the Indian subject people as opposed to the superiority of the English ruling class”¹¹. In other words, Kipling defines the Indians as being backward and lacking expertise in handling their issues. Such a

description might be linked to *Hegel's dialect of Master/slave*. In other words, Kipling associates the relationship between Britain and India to that of a colonizing *master* who is supposedly superior and a colonized *slave* who needs to be enlightened. In his analysis of Kipling's fiction, Siber argues that in Kipling's works "The East provided the setting for much of his [Kipling's] early fiction. In *Kim*, the British imperial system is depicted as a highly organized political structure"¹². This view implies that the European society is an organized political system in contrast to the Indian one. Kipling presumes that the Indians' inability to rule themselves results from their backwardness. In addition to this, Siber asserts that "Kipling endorses the British rule in India in order to show that it should be continuous and eternal"¹³. So, Kipling believes that Britain should settle in India to fulfill the terms of its enlightenment project. Therefore, Kipling provides stereotypical images as part of colonial discourse to legitimize their invasion of India to make its presence everlasting.

The same thesis analyzes the works of Forster. Siber centers his analysis on various aspects of inferiority that Forster attributes to the Indians based on gender, culture...etc. He writes that "For Forster, civility for the Indians is something that belongs to the realm of fancy"¹⁴. In other words, he attributes a stereotypical image to the Indians based on their state of degeneration to justify the humanizing mission of his country. As a colonialist writer, Forster believes in the doctrine of the White Man's superiority as part of colonial discourse. In his analysis of *Hill of Devi*, Siber argues that Forster questions Indians' capacity to progress without Britain's help¹⁵.

Another criticism was provided by Mohamad Jane Allam who studied Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924). He argues that the novel explores the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized stressing the religious differences in the country¹⁵. In other words, Forster bases his imperialist ideology of superiority upon the social, political and religious differences within the Indian society under the pretext of a civilizing mission in the colony.

In a book entitled *E.M. Forster, Mulk Raj Anand and Gabriel Garcia Marquez: A Postcolonial Reading of Inherited Dichotomies* (2011), Surish Ranjan Basak elaborates a Critical reading of Forster's and Anand's fiction. He argues that Forster "who witnessed the height of colonialism as well as its declining hours, can be a good model of a transitional from Colonialism to Postcolonialism"¹⁶. In fact, Forster was a witness of Britain's raising and declining. In his analysis of *Two Leaves and a Bud*, Basak narrates "the story of a Punjabi peasant who is brutally exploited in a tea plantation and killed while trying to save his daughter from being raped by a colonial official"¹⁷. Thus, the brutality and primitiveness associated with Indians is no other than that of the British official.

The same critic analyzes the works and style of Anand. Basak claims that "Anand is one of the once upon a time colonized writers who got the best of enlightenment and then redirected their writings equally against the new and old masters"¹⁹. This means that Anand uses the ideas of Enlightenment mainly freedom to respond to colonial discourse propounded in the writings of Orientalist writers. In fact, Anand redirects the knowledge he acquires during his days in Britain against both the British administration and the Indian corrupted princes.

Another criticism is provided by Ms KP Suchitra who believes that "Mulk Raj Anand is the angry young man who cannot tolerate the exploitation of one man by another man, or of one class by another class. He is the sworn enemy to all kinds of exploitation"²⁰. Therefore, Anand is a writer whose nationalist perspective urges him to never tolerate the submission of one class or individual to a claimed superior other. Besides, Khagendra Sethi who analyzed some of Anand's works including *Untouchable* and *Letters On India* where he claims that Anand focuses on the suffering of the poor consequent to the exploitation of Capitalism. In his analysis of *Letters On India* (1942), he argues that "Anand has taken the position that while the British intellectuals accused the German fascists of all kind of crimes, they did not apply the same yardstick to what they were doing in India"²¹. In other words, Anand is making an ironic judgment on Britain's policy that blames Germany for its extremist methods but ignores what they were doing in India.

Issue and Working Hypotheses

Following my reading of the previous criticism, I noticed that critics focused their investigations on examining each author's ideology in relation to the British Empire and the Orient. Yet, they overlooked studying them together and taking into consideration the possibility of establishing a postcolonial study. Therefore, the aim of my research is to compare and contrast the three writers through their personal letters and travel writings in order to establish a "dialogic" relationship between them.

My research aims to reveal the inherent ideas that Anand uses in *Letters on India* (1942) to "resist" and "respond" to the Orientalist discourse propounded in Kipling's *From Sea to Sea* *Letters of travel* (1899) and Forster's *Selected Letters* Vol.1 (1879-1920) and Vol.2 (1921-1970). Therefore, in my first step I will reveal each author's attitude towards colonialism. As a matter of fact, I intend to study the authors' views in relation to the Indians' cultural identity. More precisely, I will analyze the ways Anand responds to Kipling's and Forster's misrepresentation and denigration of the Indian culture and national identity.

In my second step, I am going to undertake a study related to the authors' view on the political condition of India during the "British Raj" featuring the rise of Nationalism. In fact, both Forster and Kipling argue that India is a land of despotism and tyranny because of the Indian's political backwardness and their refusal to embrace the enlightening project of Britain. However, Anand advocates that Britain restricts the political and civil rights of Indians.

My third step is related to the authors' stance in relation to the socio-economic conditions in India. My point here is that both Kipling and Forster relate the declining socio-economic conditions of Indians to their refusal to accept the terms of the enlightening project of Britain as well as the declining morals of both Indian government and countrymen. Anand, however, criticizes this view and condemns Britain's unlawful practices in India.

To deal with this topic, I thought it quite useful to use Edward Said's theories of Orientalism and resistance to it included in his *Orientalism: the Western Conception of the Orient* (1978) and *Culture Imperialism* (1993). My choice is motivated by the fact that Said studied all aspects of representation of the Orient and resistance to Colonial Discourse. The two works analyze the relationship between the West and the East. Through *Orientalism*, I intend to explore the misrepresentation of the Indians in Kipling's and Forster's travelogues. I will analyze the ideas advanced by Kipling and Forster to justify their country's invasion of India. After that, I will use Said's theory of resistance to study the way Anand responds and revises those stereotypes by challenging the imperial doctrine of "Anglo-centric" superiority.

In addition to an introduction, methods and materials, and a conclusion, the discussion of this research is going to be divided into three chapters. The first chapter focuses on the cultural differences between Britain and India and the way each author either celebrates or denigrates the Indian culture and identity. The second chapter analyzes the political situation during Britain's control over India featuring the rise of nationalism. The last chapter analyzes the socio-economic context within the periphery.

Endnotes

- ¹Edward W.Said, *Orientalism:the Western Conception of the Orient*(New York:Penguin Books,1995),7.
- ²Gayatri Spivak, *Can the Subaltern Speak*,(Mackmillan ,1988),1.
- ³Said, *Orientalism*,1.
- ⁴*Ibid*.
- ⁵Suresh Ranjan Basak, *E M Forster? Mulk Raj Anand and Gabriel Garcia Marquez:A postcolonial Raeder of Inherited Dichotmies*(Germany:LAP Lambert AcademicPublishing,2011),3.
- ⁶*Ibid*,73.
- ⁷ *Ibid*,73.
- ⁸Mouloud Siber and Bouteldja Riche, ‘Native Mis/Rule and ‘Oriental Dispotism’ in Alexandre Dumas’s *Adventures in Algeria*(1846)and Rudyard Kipling’s *From Sea To Sea: Letters of Travel*(1899)(Asian Journal Humanity, Art and Literature,voll,2014),73.
- ⁹DavidCody.RudyardKiplingABriefBiography’www.victorianweb.org/authors/kipling/rkbio2.html2012
- ¹⁰Mouloud Siber, *Rudyard Kipling ,Edward Morgan Forster ,William Somerset Maugham and Joseph Conrad: The British Imperial Tradition and The Individual*(Doctorate Thesis ,University Mouloud Mammeri of Tizi ousou,2012),43.
- ¹¹*Ibid*,41.
- ¹²*Ibid*, 215.
- ¹³*Ibid*,216.
- ¹⁴*Ibid*,50-51.
- ¹⁵*Ibid*,41.
- ¹⁶Muhammad Jane Alam, ‘Racial tension in *A Passage To India*’(Bangladesh: Darul Ihsan University,2015),569-570.
- ¹⁷Basak,E.M Forster, *Mulk Raj Anand and Gabriel Garcia Marquez A Postcolonial Reading of Inherited Dichotomies*,6.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid*,40.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid*.
- ²⁰ Ms.KP.Suchitra, ‘Post-colonial Reading of MRA’s *Coolie*’.vol1,issue6,(Karpagam University India, November 2014),187.
- ²¹ Khagendra Sethi, ‘Sketching Mulk Raj Anand as a Postcolonial Writer’, Vol.2,Issue 4,(India:Ravinshaw University,2015),478.

II-Methods and Materials

1-Methods

a-Said's *Orientalism: The Western Conception of the Orient* (1978)

The present dissertation explores major traits of resistance in Anand's *Letters on India* (1942) towards the "Orientalist Discourse" developed in Kipling's *From Sea to Sea; Letters of Travel* (1899) and Forster's *Selected Letters* Vol.1 (1918-1920) and Vol.2 (1921-1970). Therefore, I thought it quite well to rely on Edward Said's *Orientalism: the Western Conception of the Orient* (1978) and *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) to elaborate a Postcolonial comparative study between these literary works to explore each writer's attitude towards Britain's occupation of India. My choice of Said's works as frame theories is motivated by the fact that the works can be considered as sequels exploring Said's ideas in relation to colonial discourse and resistance and opposition to it. In fact, Said analyzes major aspects that reflect the way the Oriental authors resist and respond to the stereotypical images attributed to them in "Orientalist literature"²².

My reference to colonial discourse and the celebration of the British Empire in Kipling's and Forster's works will be based on Said's *Orientalism*. My choice is motivated by the fact that Said has studied major aspects of colonial discourse and the Western "misrepresentation" of the Orient. His work is mainly centered on the negative images attributed to the Eastern countries. According to him, 'Orientalism' is a "western style of dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient"²³. In other words, Orientalism is a method of distorting and subjugating the colonized people under the claim of civilizing and introducing them to the so called modern and enlightened world. This claim had shaped Said's definition of the concept. He aimed to explore the Westerners' misperception of the rest of the world. In his view, Orientalism is a method of discrimination based on distinction made between Europe and the Orient to justify the invasion of other lands²⁴. This distinction, which mainly creates a gap between Europe and the rest of the world, is mainly centered around socio-economic, cultural,

and political differences. Those differences serve the West to support its occupation of other territories.

It is in this sense that Said presents his ideas. He argues that “Orientalism is defined as the discourse that deals with the Orient in order to dominate it”²⁵. In fact, Said asserts that the Orientalist discourse has two aims. It either prepares the ground for military intervention in other lands or justifies the occupation of those territories and the horrors committed there under the claim of civilizing and humanizing the colonized people.

In addition to this, Said argues that the colonizer dominates the colonized people and imposes the Western culture and language in an attempt to substitute the native identity with another one fully handled by the colonizer. This implies the Westerners attempt to prove the idleness and degeneration of the Orient as well as the state of progress in the West. Moreover, Said argues that “Orientalism expresses and represents the Orient culturally and even ideologically as a mode of discourse with supporting institutions”²⁶. In other words, literature is used as a means to justify Europe’s encroachment in those territories. Such argument is supported by colonial institutions that keep the Orient under their control. Moreover, Said argues that Europe provided stereotyped images of the Orient. He states that “The Oriental is irrational, depraved (fallen), childlike, “different”, hence the European is rational, virtuous, mature, normal”²⁷. In fact, colonial discourse creates images about India to justify Britain’s presence in the land.

In addition to this, Said’s *Orientalism* analyses the works of some European canonical figures who supported their respective countries. Their literature was mainly the product of the era which witnessed their countries’ extending policy over other lands. Their literature resulted from their travel to other lands. According to Said, travel literature reinforces the Orientalist discourse which aims to stigmatize the colonized in order to dominate and justify the European encroachment in other territories²⁸. For him, Western literature based its description of the native

lands and people on false assumptions accusing the colonized for being uncivilized, barbarian, timeless ...etc. this description is contrasted to that assumed by Europe as civilized, enlightened, familiar...etc²⁹.

To sum up, Said's work revolutionized the field of Postcolonial Studies by defining the relationship between Europe and the rest of the world on the basis of the Orient. The latter distinguishes between a presumed "superior" West and an accused "inferior" East.

2-Culture and Imperialism

Said's *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) can be seen as a sequel to *Orientalism* (1978). I will focus on its third chapter entitled "Opposition and Resistance" where Said analyzed major strategies adopted by Postcolonial writers to "respond to" the misrepresentation of the colonized nations. In fact, Said's Postcolonial Resistance Theory aims to "respond" to the imperial misrepresentation of the colonized's culture, political awareness, socio-economic conditions, etc. Said argues that his purpose by constructing a Postcolonial Resistance Theory is to examine the interacting relationship between the colonizer and the colonized³⁰. In other words, Said intends to present ideas deplored within Postcolonial Literature to respond to the stereotypical image attributed to the Orient within colonial discourse.

To begin with, John Yang advocates that:

Resistance theory in Postcolonial Literature refutes the very notion that ideas of representation also connotes further subjugation [...]Resistance literature uses the language of Empire to refute its dominant ideologies .In other words, the colonized nation is "writing back", speaking either of oppression and racism of the colonizers or the inherent cultural "better-ness" of the indigenous people ³¹ .

The quotation implies that Said's Resistance theory challenges the misrepresentation of the Orient and can be used in a process of "writing back" to the oppressive and racist practices of the colonial administration .According to Said, the resistance theory is an outcome of the oppression of Imperialism .He states that:

Debates in the third world countries about colonialist practices and the imperialist ideology that sustained it is extremely lively and diverse .Large groups of people believe that the bitterness and humiliation of the experience which –virtually enslaved them nevertheless

delivered benefits –Liberal ideas, national self consciousness, and technological goods that over time seem to have made imperialism much less unpleasant³².

In other words, the hegemonic practices of the colonizer mainly its enslavement and humiliation of the colonized incited them to challenge and revise these stereotypical images.

As a postcolonial scholar, Said presents the “Culture of Resistance” which he believes “has often taken the form of what we can call nativism”³³. In other words, the notion of “resistance” to the misperception of colonial literature rises from a patriotic feeling that postcolonial writers share. Thus, the theory that Said constructs is related to ‘Nationalism’. He argues that “One of the first tasks of the culture of resistance was to reclaim, rename, and reinhabit the land”³⁴. In other words, to respond to the misperception of colonial discourse, the colonized writers need to revive their history to be able to free their country. In addition to this, Said states that “Decolonization is a very complex battle over the course of different political destinies, different histories and geographies”³⁵. In fact, the main idea in the “culture of resistance” is related to the idea of “raison d’être”³⁶ meaning that the colonized has the right to reclaim control over his land. According to Said, there are three main topics in the decolonizing theory of resistance which include “the insistence on the right to see the community’s history as a whole [...], the idea that resistance is an alternative way of conceiving human history[...]and a pull away from separatist nationalism towards a more integrative view of human community and liberation”³⁷. In other words, Said’s theory of resistance includes three major topics which are the revival of the colonized’s history, the right of freedom and equality ,and the right to learn about one’s history.

To sum up, Said’s theory of resistance is based on the revival of native culture and history, the rise of Nationalism and nationalist literature, and a dependency on the concepts of national identity and “raison d’être.”

2-Materials

Summary of Anand's *Letters on India*(1942)

Mulk Raj Anand's *Letters on India* was published in 1942. The book is a series of letters exchanged between Anand and an English friend called Mr. Brown who wanted to know more about India. Throughout these letters, Anand describes the miserable situation in his country under the British rule. For instance, he analyses the social, cultural, political, and economic conditions in his land during the presence of the British Empire as a means to challenge the Anglo-centric view about his country as a land of backwardness, tyranny, and exoticism.

Summary of Forster's *Selected Letters*

Selected Letters are a collection of E.M. Forster's personal letters sent to his friends and family. They are included in two volumes. The first one dates from 1879 to 1920 while the second one from 1921 to 1970. In fact, these letters can serve as autobiographical accounts of Forster, for they cover an important period of his life featuring his two travels to India. Forster set out his journey to India with his friends Dickinson, R.C. Trevelyan, and Hannington. He began his journey in Muslim India by spending a few weeks in Aligarh. Then, he moved to Old Delhi, the center of Muslim Separatist Movement. Later on, he joins his friends in Lahore then continues his journey by visiting Simla in November. He made a brief visit to the Himalaya. Later on, he was received as a guest by the Maharaja of Chhitarpur. He argues that he enjoyed the time he spent in Dewas. He continues his trip by visiting Allahabad, Benares, Bankipur, and made a tour through Jeypur and Jodhpur. He ends his journey by visiting Boombay and finally Hyderabad. Describing his journey there, he refers to India as a land of exoticism. Though in many times he appreciates the beauty of Indian nature, he contrasts it with the indigenous way of life which seems to be barbarian. He contrasts most of what he experiences with the civilized life of British.

Summary of Kipling's *From Sea to Sea; Letters of Travel*

Kipling's *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, published in 1899, is a series of letters and articles written for the *Civil and Military Gazette* that recount Kipling's long journey throughout South East Asia. His journey started in India, the British colony where he was born. Kipling is critical in his description of natives. He only acknowledges the progress brought to the land thanks to Britain's guidance and supervision. The following step of his journey leads him to another British colony which is Burma. He is critical of the Indians' laziness. Yet, he is very skeptical in his description of the Chinese whom he met in Hong Kong because they are not privileged to be enlightened by the British Empire. His next visit takes him to Japan where he is actually pleased by what he sees. He admires the beauty of the landscape.

Endnotes

²²Said, *Orientalism*, 2.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Siber, 'Rudyard Kipling, Edward Morgan Forster, William Sommerset Maugham and Joseph Conrad: the British Imperial Tradition and the Individual Talent', 14.

²⁵ Said, *Orientalism*, 2 .

²⁶Ibid, 51.

²⁷Ibid, 99.

²⁸Ibid, 1.

²⁹ Ibid, 2.

³⁰Edward W. Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 194.

³¹www.postcolonialweb.org/politicaldiscourse/yang/1.html. Representation and Resistance: A Cultural, Social and political perplexities in Postcolonial literature John Yang, Brown University 1999.

³²Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 272.

³³ Ibid, 332.

³⁴Ibid, 273.

³⁵Ibid, 260.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid, 261.

III Results and Discussion

Belonging to either the Empire or the Center, the three authors engage in a “dialogic” relationship concerning their views of Britain’s colonization of India. This is reflected throughout their respective literary works in which they justify their varying stances concerning the cultural, political and socio-economic conditions in India. In fact, both Kipling’s and Forster’s travelogues reflect their disfiguration of India to which they refer as a land of tyranny and exoticism. Their description of the land is to be linked to colonial discourse and Said’s ideas about the relationship of power between the colonizer and colonized. Therefore, both Kipling and Forster attempt to glorify their respective country’s humanistic mission in India.

The study reveals that Kipling’s and Forster’s travelogues legitimize the conquest of India under the pretext of English superiority. As Orientalist authors, they attribute a number of stereotypical images to Indians to justify the colonization. In fact, they stigmatize and depict the Indians as being primitive, lazy, and backward .Furthermore, they stigmatize the Indian culture stating that the barbarity of Indian traditions and the diversity of religion and language prevent the country from reaching a status of order. In fact, they state that the absence of a national identity is due to the cultural trauma. In addition to this, they argue that the Indian’ political backwardness results from their refusal to benefit from Britain’s offer to modernize them. They associate the Indians with a lack of political expertise in handling any trouble .They also blame them for their declining social condition. Besides, they argue that their corruption prevents them from achieving anything.

However, my reading of Anand’s *Letters on India* under Said’s theory of resistance reveals that he responds to these ideas. Consequently, he celebrates Indian culture and deploys irony to criticize the British. He advocates that the diversity of religions and languages is what makes India a nation. He argues that these differences are suppressed when it comes to supporting the goals of the Nationalist movement. He associates the Indian culture with peace and the British

one with violence. Moreover, he emphasizes the idea that the colonial administration prohibits any form of expression mainly in relation to politics. Therefore, he denies his fellow countrymen's political backwardness and emphasizes their role in the success of the nationalist movement. Finally, he argues that the declining situation in Indian society derives from the Capitalist system as well as the practices of the British administration which brought a new social system.

Chapter One: The Authors' Stance on the Indian National and Cultural Identity

Orientalist discourse does not only attribute negative traits of backwardness and incivility to the colonized people but also stigmatizes aspects of their national and cultural identity. It places the Western culture as superior in contrast to the indigenous Eastern one as inferior. According to Said:

Orientalism is [...] a collective notion identifying "us" as Europeans as against all "those" non-Europeans, and indeed it can be argued that the major component in European culture is precisely what made that culture hegemonic both in and outside Europe: the idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures³⁸.

This implies that Orientalism is a method of discriminating the non-Europeans on the basis of an ideological superiority. It is a set of descriptions that identify "civilized" Europeans in contrast to "indigenous" people. Indeed, it is a method of dominance exercised by a "metropolitan center"³⁹ over other territories to gain territorial and cultural domination. Such ideas were mainly recurrent in the nineteenth century travel writings. The latter reinforced the Western assumption that its conquest of the land is to civilize and humanize the assumed indigenous people. P Sharp states that Western travel writing is "formed around various discourses of otherness"⁴⁰. Hence, these narratives disclose representations that presume the "superior" position of Europe in contrast to the "indigenous" Orient to legitimize the conquest of these lands. According to Said, the Westerners "bestow on themselves a kind of burden of taking light and civilization to the Orientals"⁴¹. In other words, Europeans presume that they degraded their position to a lower

stance to civilize the colonized. Similarly, they argue that their civilizing mission is kind of a gift to the colonized people. Such pretexts are part of the colonizer's ideology of racial superiority.

Privileging their cultural identity as superior one, British authors aimed to define and reinforce their colonial hegemony of racial and cultural dominance. By disclosing stereotypical images of the East, Britain displays a harsh criticism on its colonized people to denigrate their cultural identity. It is in this sense that Forster's and Kipling's travelogues are conducted. The two writers portray the Indian culture as a "superstitious", "strange", "inferior" and "childlike"⁴². They both degrade the Indian customs, rituals and religion and argue that the Indian culture is "static" and barbarian despite Britain's effort to modernize the land. According to Said, "the Oriental is contained and represented by dominating frameworks"⁴³. In other words, stereotypical images are created by European writers to legitimize their conquest of other lands by contrasting their description of the Empire to the Center. This goes hand in hand with John McLeod analysis of the colonizer's ideology of superiority. He asserts that "If the Occident is rational, sensible, and familiar, the Orient is irrational, extraordinary and abnormal"⁴⁴. Yet, the Orient encompasses much of Europe's greatest and richest colonies. In fact, these colonies provided Europe with raw materials and cheap labor. They became a market for Europe's products.

For Said, the culture of imperialism mainly in relation to Europe's civilizing mission subordinated the colonial power by banishing the colonized's cultural identity "except as a lower order of being"⁴⁵. Therefore, Kipling and Forster degrade the Indian culture by defining it as a degenerated and barbarian one. They represent the Indians as primitive people who bewitch the enlightening mission. Similarly, they harshly criticize the diversity of Indian culture and religion by claiming them to be the source of troubles and conflicts. They presume that it leads to a cultural trauma. Moreover, they portray the Indian religious practices as barbaric and bloodthirsty ones. In addition to this, they insist upon the absurdity of Indian language. Indeed,

such a description follows the European belief in their racial and cultural superiority which is used as a pretext for their attempt to eradicate the Indian culture.

However, this adopted doctrine of superiority influenced Indian postcolonial writers such as Anand whose work consists of a series of letters exchanged with a British friend Mr. Brown who wishes to know more about India. Therefore, these letters revise these colonialist descriptions of India included within Kipling's and Forster's respective literary works. According to Spivak, Post colonialism upholds the mission of contrasting the stereotypical image attributed to the Orient by giving voice to "voiceless subalterns"⁴⁶. Thus, Anand takes responsibility in rehabilitating his cultural identity by setting it off against the British colonial ideology of superiority. In other words, the colonizer's 'cultural hegemony' tends to eradicate the Indian customs and traditions by implying their state of being 'bloody'. In fact, colonial discourse stereotypically depicts the Indian culture leading the Indians to perceive themselves as "barbarians" who seek out the help of a presumed "enlightened" Britain. Therefore, Anand attempts to truthfully represent his fellow countrymen and denies the false accusations made on their behalf. His main objective is to respond to the hegemony of colonial discourse and provide the reader with a relevant and realistic representation of Indian cultural and national identity. According to Said:

The idea that resistance is an alternative way of conceiving human history .This is done by breaking barriers between cultures writing back to the metropolitan culture, disrupting the European narratives of the Orient and replacing them by a new narrative style .The effort to enter into the discourse of Europe and the West, to mix with it, transform it, to make it, acknowledge marginalized or suppressed history is called **The Voyage In**⁴⁷ (**emphasis added**)

In other words , Said develops the concept of "voyage in"⁴⁸ to define the methods adopted by the colonized writer to respond to the misrepresentation of their culture .To do so, they proceed in a process of "writing back"⁴⁹ to the colonizer in order to revive their culture and history. According to Said,"Orientalism is a style of thought based upon an anthological and epistemological distinction made between "the Orient" and (most of the time) the Occident"⁵⁰.

One of the Orientalist ideas adopted by Kipling and Forster in their denigration of the Indian culture and identity is their focus on religious differences as the source of conflicts and bloodsheds. Thus, Kipling and Forster denigrate the Indian culture on the basis of a presumed British cultural superiority in contrast to the Indian one. The sole objective of this misrepresentation is to show the benefit of colonization. Narrating his journey in India, Kipling focuses on the religious differences in the country in order to demean the Indian cultural identity and raise the British one. According to Chris Kortright, such comparison “raises the colonizer and humbles the colonized .It becomes a justification for the colonizer’s privilege”⁵¹.

In his description of Muslims, Kipling stereotypes them mainly as they constitute the majority of the state of Boondi. He states that: “There are four or five Mahometans within its walls and a sprinkling of aborigines of various varieties, besides human **raffle** that the Bunjaras bring in their train”⁵²(emphasis added). The use of the word “raffle” is part of colonial discourse. This implies that Kipling views the Indians as inhuman .Moreover, he states that contrary to the Hindu people who are mysterious and difficult to understand, the Muslims are easy to deal with. This comparison aims to show the Indians as backward and totally different from the “enlightened” British. According to Metcalf, the British “had to make of Indians whatever they chose not to make of themselves”⁵³. In fact, the two authors portray Indians as “problems” that require the intervention of Britain, namely its so called enlightening culture, to be solved. Among the examples that Kipling provides in his description of religion diversity as a source of quarrels and cultural trauma is that of the conflict between the Bhumia of Jhaswara and Jaghirdar of Mahometan whose presumed religious differences caused a fight between them. To settle the situation, an English judge was needed. He sentenced the Bhumia to four years of prison and the Rajpout to serve in the securities. After his release from prison,the Bhumia went to his enemy and brutally murdered him during a party⁵⁴. Kipling claims that the presence of Britain prevents each religion from exterminating the other. He intends to show the inherent brutalities in the

Indian culture by identifying the land as one of violence and fanaticism. He, therefore, promotes Christianity as a religion of peace and order. He focuses on religious differences between the Indians resulting in bloody quarrels and disputes among them to justify Britain's policy of annexation of other territories. He privileges his country's assumed policy of settling peace in India. Yet, the conflict was about a piece of land and had nothing to do with religion. To reinforce their presence, British sorted out to this idea as part of colonial discourse.

On his side, Forster highlights the idea that each religious community is forbidden to approach the other. He exemplifies his stance by the ceremonies he took part in as a guest of honor. Despite their hospitality, he argues that any Indian was "forbidden to approach our table by his religion"⁵⁵. In other words, Indians do not tolerate any contact with other religions. Such point demonstrates Forster's will to describe Indians as being both self-centered and **timeless** regarding their view of other religions. They are stuck to one religion. According to Said, the Orient assumed an unchanging status concerning its view of other religions⁵⁶. According to Forster, religion plays a vital role in India since "The truth is that the fundamental in him[Indian] is religion"⁵⁷. However, that role turns out to be the source of problems which he presumes that Britain aims to end. According to Bill Ashcroft et al., the colonizer focuses on the primitiveness and savagery of the natives to demonstrate the colonizer's superiority. They states that "Through such distinctions it comes to represent the colonized, whatever the nature of their society structures and cultural histories, as 'primitive' and the colonizers as 'civilized'⁵⁸. Therefore, both authors stress on the Indians religion as a source of cultural trauma and conflicts to justify Britain's presence in India.

Challenging the idea of Indians' religious violence and bigotry provided in Kipling's and Forster's texts, Anand states that India is "a continent full of the most diverse races, religious creeds and languages"⁵⁹. As a continent, the interaction between religions is crucial for it denounces Indians 'self- centered identity. In his definition of culture, Edward B .Tyler argues

that “culture or civilization, taken in its wide ethnographic sense, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society”⁶⁰. According to this, culture is in a constant evolution. Anand’s response can be related to this definition, for he views such religious differences as an advantage for his country. He challenges the Anglo-centric view that the presence of multiple religious tribes weakens the nation. It rather makes it a place where different religious tribes and communities are able to co-exist in peace and harmony. To support his view, Anand ironically comments on the British society. He states “One might say: the British are not a nation, but [...] each ready to cut the throat of the other [...] but you know how false such a picture would be”⁶¹. In this quotation, Anand intends to challenge the Anglo-centric image of India by setting Britain in the same context and ironically challenges the image of Britain as a great nation which he regards as a mere myth behind which other vices are hidden. It is not by conquering other lands on the basis of ideological superiority that Britain could justify their conquest. According to Said, “culture is never just a matter of ownership, of borrowing and lending with absolute debtors and creditors, but rather of appropriations, common experiences, and interdependencies of all kinds among different cultures. This is universal norms”⁶². In other words, Said advances the idea that a mixture of cultures is beneficial. This is the case of India which as a continent presents a unique mixture of various religious communities such as Hinduism, Muslims...etc. Therefore, Anand cherishes such a mixture as part of his subversion and revision of the misrepresentation of Indian cultural identity in Kipling’s and Forster’s travelogues.

Besides, Anand criticizes Kipling’s and Forster’s belief in the violence of Indians as an outcome of their religious creeds. He argues that they are peaceful and united despite all attempts to divide them. He illustrates his point with the Armitzar episode of Indian history. Gandhi organized a peaceful resistance movement against the repressive bills of the British Government and called for a suspension of work for a day. Believing that the religious differences in India

would soon end the strike, things turned against what the British administration expected. In fact, a unity of Hindus and Muslims gathered in response to Mahatma Gandhi's call for a peaceful demonstration has frightened the British Administration. This suggests that the Muslims and Hindus put aside their religious differences when it comes to defend and support the goals of the Nationalist Movement. However, these peaceful protestors were treated with "savage methods of suppression"⁶³ by the government. General Dyer ordered the army to open machine-gun fire on the protestants in Jallianwalla Bagh square wounding 1200 men left without medical assistance and killing 379 others⁶⁴. Therefore, Anand ironically associates bloodshed with the British and peace with his fellow countrymen and women.

In addition to this, colonial discourse focuses on different religious creeds to distort Indian culture and justify the colonizer's imperial ideology of dominating those lands. According to Said, the colonizer always contrasts itself to define the Orient. He argues that "the European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self"⁶⁵. By contrasting the distorted image of India as a nation encompassing various religions to the united Christian Britain, Kipling and Forster glorify their country's civilizing mission. Yet, Anand insists on the idea that "It is not by insisting on the differences of the various religious creeds, castes, languages and religions that you get a true view of that country, but by emphasizing the central unity"⁶⁶. They justify their stance by claiming that they intend to unite the nation for they know what is good for them. According to Said, Europe defines the Orient as "a subject race, dominated by a race that knows them and what is good for them better than they could possibly know themselves"⁶⁷. In other words, Europe views itself as the elite nation in contrast to the "subordinate" Orient. Contrasting this idea, Anand argues that there is nothing called a superior or inferior culture. He states that Europe does not get the idea that "the world is round and of one piece"⁶⁸. According to Said:

The Orient is not only an adjunct to Europe, it is also the place of Europe's richest, oldest, and greatest colonies, the source of its civilizations and languages, its cultural contestants, and one of its deepest and most recurrent images of the Orient"⁶⁹.

One of these images concerns Kipling's and Forster's mark of the Indian culture as 'barbarian'. They display a harsh criticism of the different customs and religions they encounter in their travel. To support his view, Kipling vehemently criticizes the Indian traditions namely the **Sati** which he associates with savagery and barbarism. Kortright argues that the European colonizer used to denigrate the colonized cultural values and religious practices as a technique to control and to "civilize" the indigenous people. He writes: "native culture turns against its members and is used to devalue and define the identity of the native population"⁷⁰. In other words, Britain focuses on the diversity of Indian culture as an outcome of cultural trauma to demean it, and justify Indian' need for European civilization. Kipling criticizes the "Sati" sacrifice which he associates with barbarism and primitiveness. The word "Sati" derives from the Sanskrit language and means "a faithful wife"⁷¹. The sacrifice is a Hindu funeral custom which consists of the immolation of a wife with the body of her dead husband. To reinforce this idea, Kipling narrates the story of a dying king who feared for his beloved wives to be submitted to the Sati sacrifice. He was forced to isolate himself in a withdrawn palace to protect his wives from going in the streets unveiled when he dies and thus become Satis. Kipling says:

The place in which he lay [sic] was very near to the city; and there was a fear that this womankind should, on his death, going mad with grief, cast their veils and run out into the streets, uncovered before all men. In which case nothing, not even the power of the press, and the locomotive, and the telegraph, and cheap education and enlightened municipal councils, could have saved them from the burning-pyre, for they were the wives of a king⁷².

Thus, Kipling points out to the barbarian Indian culture as a colonial strategie. He tries to explain that the British Government cannot save those women from immolation if they were seen outside uncovered. He argues that the enlightenment brought to India is not sufficient to end that bloody custom. Discussing the Buddhist practice, Siber argues that "the Indians' religious beliefs and practices obstruct their development, for they accord more importance to the metaphysical"⁷³. In other words, the Indians' unawareness of those bloody practices prevents them from reaching the enlightened position of Britain. According to Kipling, the Indians are always busy wondering

about the metaphysical things surrounding them. He wonders whether Indian women really want to be freed from the Sati practice. For him, the abolition of this practice cannot always protect women from being burnt because in some cases some of them chose to go freely with their husbands. Therefore, Kipling criticizes the Indian women for their too loyalty and self sacrifice for their husbands' sake. He exemplifies his point with that dancing girl in Udaipur who followed her king through fire and "stole a march in the next world's precedence and her lord's affections"⁷⁴.

However, The Sati sacrifice is not the only Indian custom that Kipling criticizes and qualifies with horror. When narrating his days in Chitor, he refers to the Johur sacrifices which consists of the sacrifice of a great number of kings and women to satisfy the "bloodthirsty"⁷⁵ Goddess Kangra Ranee. This thirstiness is only satisfied with royal blood. Kipling states that thirteen thousand people were sacrificed before opening the gates of the town to the invaders. He also says that "out of this carnage was saved Udai Singh, a babe of the Blood Royal who grew up to be a coward and a shame to his line"⁷⁶. As the prince fell a slave of a woman, another sacrifice was performed to stop the conquest of the Maughul Emperor Akbar for the Goddess of Chitor accepts only Royal Blood to protect the city. In this sense, Kipling considers the Johur sacrifice as a massacre that was carried out following a bloody custom in Chitor. Therefore, Kipling highlights the primitiveness of Hindu culture which he criticizes for the bloodthirstiness of their Gods. He states that "tangled tale of force, fraud, cunning, desperate lore and more desperate revenge, crime worthy of demons and virtues fit for gods, may be found"⁷⁷. From this quotation, we can understand that different bloody crimes are committed to satisfy devil Gods. Describing the sacrifice, Kipling argues that it results from the bloodthirstiness of its Goddess. He states that:

The Goddess of Chitor demands always that a crowned head must fall for the defense of her home is to be successful , Chitor fell as it had fallen before in Johur of thousands , a last rush of the men , and the entry of the conqueror into a rooking , ruined slaughter –pen⁷⁸ .

This quotation suggests that Chitor has been ruined thousands of times just to satisfy the bloodthirstiness of the Goddess assuming that it would defend their home. According to Said, Europeans depict “Oriental cultures not as they are but as, for the benefit of the receiver ought to be”⁷⁹. The stereotyped description of Orientalism is a mean to serve the ideological superiority of European culture. Such link between Indian ceremonies and the bloodthirstiness and violence is part of colonial discourse which sets out to associate savagery with the colonized to stress the belief of declining morals in the colonies as well as the importance of the enlightenment project. Such idea is therefore carried out by Kipling in his description of Indians whom he vehemently criticizes and associates with immorality and backwardness.

Similarly, Forster criticizes another Indian ceremony that is the birthday of Lord Krishna. The latter is among the most worshiped deities in Indian culture. He is defined as a god-child, a hero, a model lover, and a supernatural being. To devoid the ceremony of any meaning, Forster associates it with thriftiness and extravagance. In fact, he questions the significance of such ceremony by describing the extravagant event he took part in as a guest of honor. He states: “This month, we celebrate the birthday of Lord Krishna and we have already chosen for him eight new suits touch 30\$ although he is only six inches high”⁸⁰. Thus, Forster aims to demonstrate the silliness and insignificance of these religious practices. His comment implies that he points out to the differences between his own “civilized” and “dominant” culture and the “indigenous” and “subordinate” native one. In his mind, this religious event demonstrates that the Indians refuse to benefit from Britain’s enlightenment. According to Said, Europeans always reiterate their superior culture in contrast to the backward native one⁸¹. In addition to this, Forster ironically comments the “Rain rituals” where people make merry with rain falling gently them⁸². He ironically questions the relevance of these practices and points out to the silliness of Indian rituals and the meaninglessness of these practices. Moreover in his description of Muslim prayers, Forster states that it is “impressive yet ridiculous to see hundreds of people squatting at

once with their faces on the ground”⁸³. In other words, Forster claims that the Muslim practices are absurd.

Moreover, Kipling and Forster stereotypically describe the religious and cultural setting in India. Kipling argues that cultural settings have lost what they intended to serve and do not resemble anything that is culturally valuable. On this matter, he states that “There is a short tower, falsely called a ‘memorial’, standing in a waste of soft, sour green”⁸⁴.

These ideas support the vision of “colonial Discourse” that the colonial lands do not privilege Indian cultural settings which have lost their values. Therefore, the colonizer focuses on rendering the native culture meaningless to advance the idea of the European cultural superiority. According to Said, “This Eurocentric culture relentlessly codified and observed anything about the non-European or peripheral world”⁸⁵. Therefore, Kipling and Forster believe that the Indian religious beliefs and practices obstruct their development and regard them as devoid of any meaning. In addition to this, they misappropriate Indian religious settings.

Challenging their ideas, Anand believes that these rituals are not devoid of meaning and that these cultural settings have not lost their purpose. He argues that these rituals and settings broadcast each religious community’s set of beliefs. According to Said, culture is something universal .He states that:

Culture is never a matter of ownership, of borrowing and lending with absolute debtors and creditors, but rather of appropriations, common experiences, and interdependencies of all kinds among different cultures .This is a universal norm⁸⁶ .

In accordance with this definition, Anand writes that the British:

won’t realize, in spite of Hegel, Marx and even Wells, that there is and always has been one world civilization, including Asia and Europe inhabited by various parts of the so human family⁸⁷.

He stresses the importance of these practices because culture encompasses a variety of beliefs, traditions, and customs, among others. It consists of a process of exchanging and borrowing

between different religious creeds. Therefore, the variety of Indian culture is beneficial for it renders it universal. Thus, it emerges beyond these accusations.

Another debating point is related to the Indians' manners and language. As Orientalist author, Kipling denigrates Indian languages and manners. To demonstrate his idea, Kipling describes the “**aborigine**” Bhil as savages who speak in a strange and frightful way. He says: “Now the little Bhil is **aborigine**, which is humiliating to think of. His tongue which may frequently be heard in the city seem to possess some variant of the Zulu click, which gives it a weird and unearthly character”⁸⁷(emphasis added). The concept aborigine is part of the imperial ideology to mean native or indigenous people. The use of the term aborigine is part of imperial ideology. Thus, Kipling compares the Indian language to the South African Zulu language in order to stress the primitiveness of the Bhil. In addition to this, such linking between African and Asian colonies aims to stress the usefulness of the Enlightenment Project. Thus, Kipling associates the inferiority of the Indians is associated with their language. He criticizes the language of Boondis. He states “They speak a pagan tongue in Boondi, swallow half their words, and adulterate the remainder with local patois”⁸⁸. Therefore, Kipling and Forster demean the Indian dialects and language as part of the European ideology of superiority.

Challenging such ideas, Anand argues that the diversity of Indian speech communities renders the country more interesting. He believes that the diversity of Indian dialects does not prevent the upraising of a national awareness to question the real aims behind the presence of the British Empire in India. To justify his stance, he exemplifies his point with the followers of the National Movement who were from various castes. This implies that the demand of freedom has no language. I have already shown how Muslims and Hindus put aside their religious differences as a response to Gandhi's call for a pacific protest. Arguably, language differences did not constitute an obstacle to mutual understanding.

To sum up, we can say that Kipling and Forster advance some ideas related to religious diversity, barbarity and absurdity of Indian traditions, misappropriation of cultural settings, and the absence of a national language to justify the presence of Britain in India. Challenging their ideas, Anand argues that the diversity of Indian culture renders the land wealthier and more prepared to face the common British enemy. His response mainly derives from the definition of culture and the emergence of Nationalism which successfully unified the country under the demand of freedom.

Endnotes

- ³⁸ Said .*Orientalism* ,7.
- ³⁹ Said, *Culture and Imperialism*,244.
- ⁴⁰ Joanne P, Sharp, *Writing Travel /Travelling Writing: Roland Barthes detours the Orient*,(Scotland, 1999),155.
- ⁴¹ Siber.”Rudyard Kipling, Edward Morgan Forster, William Somerset Maugham and Joseph Conrad :The British Imperial Tradition and The Individual Talent Tiziouzou,51.
- ⁴²Said . *Orientalism*,51.
- ⁴³Ibid, 52
- ⁴⁴John, Mcleod .*Beginnng Postcolonialism*,(UK: Manchester University Press,2000),28.
- ⁴⁵ Said, *Culture and Imperialism*,267.
- ⁴⁶ Spivak, Can the Subaltern Speak,Post Colonial Studies Reader:Key Concepts(Abingdon:Routledge,2007),1.
- ⁴⁷ Said .*Culture and Imperialism* ,260.
- ⁴⁸Ibid.
- ⁴⁹Bill Aschcroft ,et al .*Post Colonial Studies :Key Concepts* (Abimgdon ,Routledge,2007)
- ⁵⁰ Said .*Orientalism* ,20.
- ⁵¹Chris, Kortright .*Colonization and Identity*(The Anarchist Library :Anti copyright ,2003),15.
- ⁵²Kipling .*From Sea To Sea :Letters Of Travel* (Doublay and Mc culture Company ,1899),154.
- ⁵³ Thomas ,Metcalf, *The New Cambridge History of Modern India: Ideologies of the Raj*(Cambridge University Press,2008),22.
- ⁵⁴Kipling,From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel, 148.
- ⁵⁵Forster ,*Selected Letters* ,v 1,143.
- ⁵⁶ Said , *Orientalism*,48.
- ⁵⁶ Forster, *Selected Letters*,V2,36.
- ⁵⁸ Bil Aschcroft et al,The Postcolonial Reader
- ⁵⁹ Anand, *Letters on India*,18.
- ⁶⁰Edward B.Tyler ,*Primitive Culture :Researches in to the Development of Mythology , Philosophy, Religion , Language , Art and Custom* 2nded.2vols(London: John Murray,1871),1.
- ⁶¹ Anand , *Letters On India* ,37.
- ⁶²Said , *Culture and Imperialism*,262.
- ⁶³-Anand, *letters On India*,125.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid.
- ⁶⁵ Said, *Orientalism*, 3.
- ⁶⁶ Anand , *Letters on India*,115.
- ⁶⁷ Said, *Orientalism*,20.
- ⁶⁸ Anand, *Letters on India*,18.

⁶⁹ Said , *Orientalism*,1.

⁷⁰ Kortreight, *Colonization And Identity*,15.

⁷¹Oxford Dictionnaires,S.V.”sati”.Accessed July 28,2016,<http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/English/sati>

⁷²Kipling ,*From Sea to sea Letters of Travel* ,63.

⁷³Siber , “*Rudyard Kipling ,Edward Morgan Forster , William Somerset Maugham and Joseph Conrad :The British Imperial Tradition and Individual*,267.

⁷⁴ Kipling , *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*, 64.

⁷⁵Ibid,83.

⁷⁶Ibid.

⁷⁷Ibid, 83.

⁷⁸ Ibid,

⁷⁹Said , *Orientalism*,78.

⁸⁰Forster, *Selected Letters*, v2,10.

⁸¹ Said , *Orientalism*,

⁸² Forster,*Selected Letters*,v1,147.

⁸³Kipling, *From Sea To Sea: Letters of Travel*, 194.

⁸⁴ Ibid

⁸⁵Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, 262.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷Anand ,*Letters On India* ,18.

⁸⁸ Kipling , *From Sea To Sea :Letters Of Travel*,54.

⁸⁹ Ibid,195.

Chapter Two: the Authors' Stances on the Political Condition of Anglo-India

Colonialism, as the status of an extending rule of one country over another, is based on an ideology of power dominating the relationship between a colonizer and a colonized. In other word, Westerners presumed that their settlement in other territories is part of a civilizing mission. Yet, their real aim is to extend over the territories and exploit their resources and people. Said argues that Orientalism includes “a political vision of reality whose structure promoted the differences between the familiar (Europe, the West, “us”) and the strange (the Orient, the East, “them”)”⁹⁰. In other words, Orientalism is a mode of distinction between the colonizers who are able to rule others, for they are supposedly superior, and the colonized that seemed to need to be ruled.

This Orientalist discourse frequently attributes negative traits of political inferiority and backwardness to the colonized’ s political structures. Such descriptions are recurrent in travel writings which emerged as a dominant literary genre in the literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Aiming to reinforce and glorify the colonizer’s presence in the colony, Orientalist writers provided political descriptions of “exotic” areas and their country’s involvement there. As Orientalist writers , Kipling and Forster share a patriotic feeling that justifies their support of the British Empire’s extending rule over India .Their travelogues reflect their misperceptions of Indians describing them as politically inferior and incapable of ruling themselves .Their aim is to degrade the image of India while glorifying their country’s proclaimed mission in establishing democracy in India. They argue that the presence of Britain takes political stability to the land. According to Metcalf, Europeans had a necessity to create a nation of an ‘other’ beyond the seas. He writes:

To describe oneself as ‘enlightened’ meant that someone had to be shown as ‘savage’ or vicious. To describe oneself as ‘modern’ or ‘progressive’ meant that those who were not included in that definition had to be described as ‘primitive’ or ‘backward’⁹¹.

In other words, Europe created a contrasting image to its assumed one to justify its dominion over other territories as part of its colonial ideology.

However, Anand is critical of Forster's and Kipling's political misperception of India. Feeling the oppressive authority to which his fellow countrymen are submitted, he celebrates his country and responds to the misrepresentation of colonialist authors as well as the hegemonic practices of the British imperial system. He assumes the role of an advocate for the liberation of India from the British imperial system. He responds to the colonial discourse recurrent in Forster's and Kipling's travelogues when referring to India as a land of "tyranny"⁹². Throughout his letters to Mr Brown, Anand revises the false political image of India drawn by Forster, Kipling and others while providing an accurate description of his country's political situation. He suggests that the practices of the British administration have corrupted the country. In fact, in a status of colonization, only those who are supportive and benefiting from the colonizer's corrupted administration would speak otherwise. This is the cases of Britain's colonization of India since only the officials and some princes benefited from the presence of Britain as they lived a luxurious life at the expense of their people's suffering. In addition to this, Anand argues that Britain tended to moralize its imperial practices by making Indians believe in their inferiority and that the presence of Britain in India is presumed to be a so called "gift". Therefore, Anand centers his response upon the emergence of the National Movement and the countrymen and women who support it to emphasis the raising political awareness of Indians. Moreover, he criticizes the distinction between Indian and British ruled states by stressing the importance of nationalism and national Identity. He calls for the acceptance of the Indian Congress in the democratic process. His point is actually to question the unity that Britain is to transmit to India while making such a distinction.

To begin with, Kipling and Forster are known as the Britain's greatest supporters of its extending policy over other territories. They praise the efforts made by Britain to establish order

in the “indigenous” land. Yet, it is assumed that their civilizing mission is characterized by a set of images that show the Indians being freed from despotism and ignorance thanks to their presence. Therefore, their travelogues are to an extent a tribute to Britain which successfully rose to a status of world leader. They contrast the assumed superior position of Britain to that of a so called degenerated Indian. According to Said, “the relationship between the Occident and the Orient is a relationship of power, of dominion, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony”⁹³. In other words, the relationship between Britain and India is based on the ideology of power and the supremacy of European ideology. Kipling and Forster conduct their travelogues to meet up with the idea that “there are Westerners, and there are Orientals. The former dominate, the latter must be dominated, which means having their land occupied, their internal affairs rigidly controlled, their blood and treasure put at the disposal of one or another Western power”⁹⁴.

Therefore, the two authors stress on Indians’ inability to rule themselves and the state of chaos that surrounds the land when they do. They favor the intervention of the British Government in the political affairs of India and fully enjoy Britain’s achievement in taking political stability and order to the land. According to Thomas Metcalf, Europeans mainly justified their ideas that their enlightening project “included settled expectations of how a ‘proper’ society ought to be organized and the values, above all those of the right to property and to rule of law, that for the English defined as a civilized people”⁹⁵. In other words, Kipling and Forster justified their country’s annexation of India by claiming that they intend to organize a civilized society in the colony similar to that of Britain. Indeed, both authors stigmatize the Indian society and draw a contrasting image to British one to emphasize the idea of Indian backwardness and degeneration.

Among the prominent ideas that Kipling deploys in his analysis and criticism of the “backward” political situation of India is the comparison that he draws between British and Indian ruled states. He links any state of progress achieved in these states to the efforts and supervision of the British Administration. He highlights the assumed Britain’s superiority in

contrast to the presumed Indian inferiority. According to Said, Europe believed that the Orientals as “subject races did not have it in them to know what was good for them”⁹⁶. In fact, Kipling suggests that Indians are unable to progress and achieve political stability because they ignore what it could be good for them such as the presence of Britain. Therefore, he draws a comparison between Indian and British ruled states. He argues that a few states such as Jeypore and Udaipur reached a stage of development which they owe to the supervision of the British enlightenment. He suggests that these states are no more degenerated or inferior ones after accepting the terms of Britain’s enlightening mission. Unlike these states, Kipling stigmatizes Indian ruled states such as Boondi which did not take advantage of the British offer. He states:

Jeypore is a show –city and is decently drained; Udaipur is **blessed** with a state Engineer and a printed form of Government; for Jodhpur the dry sand, the burning sun and an energetic have done a good deal, but Boondi has none of these things⁹⁷. (emphasis added)

Kipling justifies the British conquest and the stereotypical description of India by contrasting Indian states like Jodhpur, the British –ruled one, Jeypore, and the primitive Boondi. He shows the presence of Britain as a blessing which only few states benefited from. According to Britain, the failure of the remaining states results from Indians’ laziness. According to Albert Memmi, the colonizer assumes that the lazy nature of the colonized implicates their inability to progress. He states:

The colonizer establishes the colonized as being lazy .He decides that laziness is constitutional in the very nature of the colonized .It becomes obvious that the colonized, whatever he may undertake, whatever zeal he may apply could never be anything but lazy⁹⁸.

Throughout this quotation, Memmi refers to the Western belief in the inferiority of the colonized nation as a result of their laziness to bestow any progress to their country. Kipling exemplifies this point by describing both the state of Burma and its inhabitants. When he arrives to Burma, he was astonished that people there do not work. He wonders how they live. He declares that “there is something wrong with these people. They won’t work [...]How in the world do they get their living”⁹⁹. This quotation stigmatizes Indian ruled states by suggesting that Indians are

unable to progress due to their laziness. A similar description is attributed to the Burmese who are not reliant on and use others to get their work done. Therefore, he wonders how they could get money and employ servants while they state that their situation is miserable. This description shows Indians to be living a luxurious life without working while they pretend to be poor. A similar image is to be found in the description of Jodhpur as a “primitive” state because of Indians’ laziness and their inability to reach any degree of development. He says:

They lie in long chairs in the verandah and tell each other interminable stories, or stare city wards and exchange their opinion of some dilatory debtors. They are all waiting for something [...]some of them, in old days, used to wait as long as six weeks¹⁰⁰.

In other words, both Kipling and Forster argue that Indians’ political backwardness results from their laziness since their discussions turn around debts not about how to achieve political progress and stability. Therefore, both authors show Indians to be extravagant ignoring political issues.

Besides, in his description of Indian-ruled state of Boondi, Kipling stigmatizes the Indian society for it reflects nothing of a so called glorious Britain. This is linked to the incompetence of Indian officials as well as the absence of the British administration. In other words, Kipling draws a stereotypical image about Indian rulers to insist on their political incompetence as well as lack of political expertise. According to Said, Europeans believed that “subject races did not have it in them to know what was good for them”¹⁰¹. Yet, this link that Kipling deploys only shows the brighter side of colonialism or the benefits of the British colonization while praising its rule as a so called enlightening nation. As a matter of fact, Kipling always finds something to reproach to Indian administration. His distinction between Indian and British ruled states suggests that the prosperity of India depends on the presence of Britain.

Challenging this idea of Britain’s enlightening mission and the link between it and the status of peace, Anand argues that the presence of the Britain in India to modernize the land is just a pretext for the invasion. He ironically responds to what he calls “the Cripps’s

offer”¹⁰² which presumes to grant the native administration with some authority. The Cripps’s mission dates back to September 1939 when the Viceroy of India declared that the colony was a belligerent one during the Second World War. Being a respected politician by the Indians for he sympathizes with them, the British Government actually used this mission as a colonial strategy. It set out to control the land. As a British official, Lord Cripps would ensure the continuing hold of India by Britain. Therefore, the decisions he would make would be direct orders from Britain’s parliament. In addition to this, Anand questions the idea of “what a post-war British Government may offer to a post –war India is too speculative a proposition to interest anyone but constitutional pedents”¹⁰². This statement shows a lot about Anand’s ideas for he questions the benefits of Britain’s presence in India though both are post-war countries ;thus ,suffered devastating consequences from the war. In addition to this, Anand criticizes the practices of the British administration which annulled the 1935 Indian Council¹⁰³. Therefore, this annul shows a lot about Britain’s true aim in India which is pure colonialism and withholding of power and not unifying the land. Similarly, the Indian National Congress questioned the real aims of the Britain’s struggle against Hitlerism . This struggle is actually not about settling peace in the world but about each country’s will to gain power. To calm the public opinion, Britain stated that “the war was really being fought for freedom and democracy”¹⁰⁴ However , Anand questions such idea of taking peace to the rest of the world whereas “these principles did not apply”¹⁰⁵ to India. Though Britain originally declared that its war against Hitlerism is about peace and democracy, it actually ruined down the political unity in India by focusing on the different opinions between Indians.

Similarly, Anand questions the idea of how a far distanced and great nation like Britain has thought to enlighten his country¹⁰⁶. He questions the turning of India as “a test case”¹⁰⁷ for British politicians. In other words , India became a zone of experiments for Britain to set up or banish laws, morals, values among other things. This implies that Britain viewed India as a country

which remains beneath expectations without Britain's efforts to modernize it. Anand criticizes these practices consisting of a distinction between Indian and British ruled states. He argues that "the British were mainly interested in the consolidation of their rule in India rather than becoming the standard bearers of progress"¹⁰⁸. In other words, Anand questions the supposed political unity that Britain is supposed to transmit to Indians. He argues that the aim of Britain is not to modernize the land but rather to ruin because if they were seeking to unify the country, they should have done so. According to Said, the relationship between Europe and the Orient puts always Europe "in a position of strength, not to say domination"¹⁰⁹. Thus, Britain was more interested in gaining territories and dominating the land than implementing political progress in India. Thus, it sets out to take advantage of the religious and political differences in the country and describing India as a chaotic country without their supervision.

Challenging this idea, Anand calls for the acceptance of the Indian Congress. He affirms that "Congress is [...]the united stand of the people of India behind the demand for national freedom"¹¹⁰. Throughout this quotation, Anand denies the presence of any plan to take progress to India nor to modernize it by the British. He argues that Britain took advantage of the permission granted to them by the Maughul Emperor Akbar, and set out to exploit the land's resources and raw materials. To justify his claim that Britain was mainly interested in consolidating its rule, Anand states that Britain rejected any proposal to create a Nationalist Government. He argues that "The Secretary of State for India turned down these proposals and dismissed the idea of a national government out of hand as completely unacceptable"¹¹¹. Therefore, any intention to achieve social and political unity "is deliberately arrested"¹¹². The previous statement is a metaphor suggesting that political freedom in India was restricted. It demonstrates that the colonizer deliberately sabotages the process of democracy in India. Therefore, Britain was not willing to make of India a democratic country. As a colonial country, it was more interested in power and dominion. Any idea about freedom was therefore restricted.

In his analysis of Cromer's ideas, Said argues that Europe opposed free native institutions and national sovereignty because "the European is a close reasoner, his statements of fact are devoid of any ambiguity; he is a natural logician"¹¹³. In other words, Cromer legitimizes the conquest by stressing on the natives inability to adhere any progress in the land in contrast to the logic and enlightened Britain.

Another point that raises dialogue between the three authors is related to the Indians' awareness of their country's political condition and whether they are able to fully grasp the political changes in India. In fact, Kipling's and Forster's description of India reflects their misperception of Indians describing them as politically inferior. According to Said, Europe advance that the opposition between 'our' world and 'theirs' always implies that 'our' world is superior to 'theirs' and that 'their' world depends on 'ours'¹¹⁴. In other words, the dependency of the Orient on Europe derives from their presumed political inferiority. According to Said, views on the Orient mainly described it as "nonpolitical"¹¹⁵ meaning that the colonized are unable to keep up to the political changes of the era. This idea legitimizes the invasion by focusing on the colonized's political inferiority. Therefore, Kipling's and Forster's travelogues degrade the image of India and glorify Britain's assumed holy mission of civilizing and enlightening India. For instance, Forster claims that "It is very easy to talk politics when you meet someone who knows less than you do"¹¹⁶. In other words, he presumes that Indians are politically backward. His ironic comment illegitimately differentiates between a British and an Indian understanding and up-dating of political changes. In this sense, West perceived the Orient as timeless. Thus, Forster demeans the Indians' ability to develop without the presence or supervision of Britain. Similarly, he describes the deteriorating political situation in Chhotapur and Simla. According to him, "Simla was deserted, though the government was there in theory, and there was none of the smart people whom I feared to meet"¹¹⁷. In other words, Forster describes Indians as unaware of political issues so he can talk anything without fearing one to argue with him. In addition to this,

Forster feels “sorry for the authorities”¹¹⁸ that Indians are unable to achieve progress. The same view was shared by Kipling who stresses the Indians’ political backwardness as a result of their lack of political expertise.. According to Kipling “the native is innately incapable of political and social progress”¹¹⁹. In other words, Kipling believes that it is an anomaly for an Oriental to be progressive because of their political inferiority.

As a response to Kipling’s and Forster’s idea, Anand advocates that the ideas advanced by them are just a myth. In fact, Britain’s colonization of India was under the doctrine of the White Man’s Burden which Said claims that “Indians ‘lie’ because they are not free, whereas he [...] can see the truth because they are free and because they are English”¹²⁰. He states that the British Empire only granted some freedom to those who supported its policies. He says that “Some of them are allowed almost full sovereign rights, to make laws and administer them, the real power of others is limited in various ways .But the final power is in the hands of a British resident”¹²¹ . Thus, the real power is in the hand of the British Administration. Indians were thus given minor roles in ruling their country .In addition to this, Anand states that “the native princes can put anyone into prison”¹²². Said argues that “Nationalism as a mobilized political force instigated and then advanced the struggle against Western domination everywhere in the non-European world”¹²³. This implies the absence of civil liberty. Following these ideas, Anand criticizes the idea of Indians’ political backwardness by referring to the rise of Indian Nationalist Movement lead by Gandhi and Nehru among others. He argues that Nationalism and the creation of a Nationalist Movement are evidences that prove that Indians are not politically backward. Led by Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and others, the Movement bounded the people together in asserting their resistance towards what they perceived as unjust¹²⁴ .Similarly, Said argues that “much but by no means all the resistance to Imperialism was conducted in the broad context of nationalism”¹²⁵. According to Anand, the members of National movement were united under the demand for self-government ¹²⁶ .In other words, the movement successfully united the Indians in

their demand for independence. Consequently, strikes spread all over the country and “has become the foremost weapon of this modern period”¹²⁷. For Anand and Indians, the movement “is the only hope today”¹²⁸. It was led by the Indian National Congress which is considered as one of the largest political parties in the world; and has launched several campaigns against the British government¹²⁹. Anand argues that the movement rose in response to the harsh practices of the British administration thanks to the growing political awareness of the people. According to him, the “Indian nationalism is the child of imperialism”¹³⁰ in the sense that the injustice of imperialism gave birth to a new political class that resisted the colonial discourse and hegemonic practices of the Britain. According to Said, nationalism resulted in a growing awareness of the colonized. It took the form of organized strikes led by doctors, lawyers and other educated classes who were fully aware of the colonizer’s policies and administration¹³¹. Others soon joined the movement thanks to the influence of the leaders’ speeches. This is indeed the case with India as people gathered around the speeches of Gandhi, Nehru and others. The people were mostly fed up with the cruelty of British officials and found in the movement a way to express their discontent and raising awareness.

Another dialogic point between the authors is related to the political will to take infrastructural development and security to India. Both Kipling and Forster are skeptical in their description of the infrastructure and security status in Indian-ruled states as well as Indians’ willingness to achieve them. According to Said, “Orientals were rarely seen or looked at; they were seen through, analyzed as citizens, or even people, but as problems to be solved”¹³². In other words, the objective of those stereotypical images of the Orient is to reflect the benefits of the presence of the British administration in India. Among the negative references to India both as a land and to its inhabitants is the focus on the state of insecurity that govern the land. In fact, Kipling has inexhaustible ways to praise the presence of the Britain in India and the status of order and progress that they take to the land. He always satirically represents India as a

dangerous land. For example, he advises the traveler to India to visit first an Indian ruled state and then a British one in order to notice the difference between the two. This difference is related to the political prosperity and the security that prevail in these states .He writes:

Escape from the city by the Railway Station till[...]you come upon what seems to be the fringe of illimitable desert[...].Here , if you have kept to the road, you shall find a dam faced with stone, a great tank, and pumping machinery fine as the heart of a municipal engineer can desire pure water, sound pipes, and well-kept engines. If you belong to what is sarcastically styled an “able and intelligent municipality” under the British Rule, go down to the level of the tank, scoop up the water in your hands and drink, thinking meanwhile of the defects of the town whence you came. The experience will be a profitable one¹³³ .

Speaking about Jodhpur, Kipling argues that its prosperity results from the presence of the British administration. Talking about the achievement of the British in the state, Kipling describes the work of a British man called George Stephenson, a state engineer who delivered Jodhpur from the problems of water by establishing a system of irrigation to bring water from the tank .Yet, the inhabitants were ungrateful. The reference to Indians ungratefulness is part of Britain’s means to refer to the Indians’ so called backwardness as a result of their refusal to accept Britain’s presence.

Similarly, he presumes that Indian-ruled states witness a security crisis consequent to the various conflicts and religious wars in an attempt to extend their rule over other territories. This results in an unlimited number of deaths with which the Indian kings and Rajahs are not concerned. When he speaks about Jey Singh, he refers to him as an “accomplished murderer”¹³⁴ who spread terror during his forty-four years of reign. In addition to this, Kipling describes the Udai Singh as a savage murderer who “came to the throne of Chitor , through blood and misrule”¹³⁵ . Contrasting the native misrule who throw their states into insecurity, Kipling speaks about the English successor of Jey Singh in Jeypore , Colonel Jacob, whom he qualifies as a man who is “educated and enlightened by all the lamps of the British progress”¹³⁶ . He says about him:

How much colonel Jacob has done , not only for the good of Jeypore city but for the good of the State at large , will never be known , because the officer in question is one of the not small class who resolutely refuse to talk about their own work¹³⁷ .

In other words, Kipling describes Colonel Jacob as a philanthropic and modest person who stands for the success of the British administration. Therefore, Kipling attempts to prove the difference between Indian and British ruled-states. He emphasizes the idea that Britain had settled security in its states contrary to native-ruled ones which remain in a state of anarchy. He is astonished by the fact that some Indians want to get rid of the British occupation which he regards as a privilege. He states: "Oh dear people, stewing in India and swearing at all the governments, it is a glorious thing to be an Englishmen"¹³⁸. This implies that the Babu's supremacy is the result of their savagery as they maintain their power by throwing the land in a state of insecurity. Moreover, Kipling stresses the absence of an Indian Court that would maintain order in India. He exemplifies his stance with the conflict between the Bhumia and Jaghirdar. According to Kipling, the quarrel was around a piece of land. Despite the intervention of a British judge who sentenced the Bhumia into four years of prison, the latter brutally murdered his rival¹³⁹. This description defines Indians as a lower order of being according to Britain. This image is part of colonial discourse which defines the colonized as inferior.

Challenging such ideas related to the progress and security brought to the land thanks to the presence of Britain, Anand argues that "One class of people emerges above all as a specially favored group in India, and that is the Indian Civil Service which helps to bolster up the regime [...]and maintaining order in this kingdom of hell"¹⁴⁰. This stimulates that only a minority of the people could benefit from the assumed enlightening project. He describes the British as a "rapacious foreigner"¹⁴¹ who throws the land in a hellish state of anarchy to justify its invasion and the bills that it passes. He ironically comments the idea that Britain's presence in India benefits the land. He states: "They tell you that they have done much for the good of the people [...] only 10 percent left over for the nation building services"¹⁴².

Besides, in response to Kipling's dealing with Indians as belligerent people, Anand associates peace with Indians and violence with the British mainly in their response to the uprisings or

protests. He argues that the struggle of workers organized under trade unions was “marked by police oppression, intimidation, shooting, lockout, and suppression of trade union, and the use of criminal law to hinder and thwart any show of resistance”¹⁴³. Thus, such practices imply that the British authorities are the source of insecurity in India subsequent to Indians’ uprisings including the 1857 Mutiny. Similar examples include the police beating up of several pacific protestors following the order 164b to ban the procession¹⁴⁴.

To conclude, both Kipling and Forster are among the greatest supporters of Britain’s policies in India. They misrepresent India to justify the invasion. They draw a comparison between Indian and British ruled states to show the benefit of the presumed civilizing mission of their country. They claim that the Indians are politically backward and lack political expertise in order to glorify Britain’s rule in India. Similarly, they presume that Indian ruled states are ruined by a state of insecurity resulting from their refusal to accept Britain’s offer to enlighten them. They always find something to reproach to Indian authorities. Challenging their ideas, Anand centers his response on the National movement and the rise of nationalism as marks of I fellow countrymen’ raising political expertise. He states that India is a united nation mainly under the idea of getting their independence. Moreover, he argues that India is a nation, and that the political differences reinforce the democratic process. He calls for the establishment of a Congress to unify the country under the demand of freedom. Challenging the idea of insecurity and the progress taken to the land, Anand associates Indians with peace in relation to their pacifist protests and Britain with violence because of its response to these uprisings. Finally, Anand argues that only a minority benefits from this assumed progress whereas the majority are deprived from their civil rights.

Endnotes

- ⁹⁰Said .Orientalism, 43.
- ⁹¹Thomas, Metcalf , *The New Cambridge History of India :Ideologies of The Raj*(Cambridge University Press,1995,6.
- ⁹² Siber and Riche n’ Native Mis/Rule and ‘Oriental Despotism in Alexandre Dumas’s *Adventures in Algeria*(1846)and Rudyard Kipling’s *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*(1899),71.
- ⁹³ Said , Orientalism,36.
- ⁹⁴ Ibid.
- ⁹⁵ Metcalf , *The New Cambridge History of India :Ideologies of The Raj*,1.
- ⁹⁶ Said ,Orientalism ,48.
- ⁹⁷ Kipling . *From Sea To Sea: Letters of Travel*,147.
- ⁹⁸ Albert, Memmi, The Colonizer and the Colonized .Trans.Howard Greenfield (UK:Earthscan Publication LTD),125.
- ⁹⁹ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel* ,205.
- ¹⁰⁰ Ibid ,110-111.
- ¹⁰¹ Said, *Orientalism* ,48.
- ¹⁰² Anand , *Letters On India* ,16.
- ¹⁰³ Ibid,80.
- ¹⁰⁴ Ibid,60.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid,1.
- ¹⁰⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid,117.
- ¹⁰⁸ Ibid,1.
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid,
- ¹¹⁰ Said , *Orientalism* ,48.
- ¹¹¹ Anand,*Letters On India* , 5.
- ¹¹² Ibid.
- ¹¹³ Ibid,8.
- ¹¹⁴ Said, *Orientalism*,7.
- ¹¹⁵ Ibid,45.
- ¹¹⁶ Ibid,49.
- ¹¹⁷ Forster, *Selected Letters*,vol.1,174.
- ¹¹⁸ Ibid,vol2,18.
- ¹¹⁹ Ibid.
- ¹²⁰ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letter of Travel*,205.
- ¹²¹ Anand, *Letters on India*,101.
- ¹²² Ibid,104.

- ¹²³Ibid,
- ¹²⁴Said, Culture and Imperialism,263.
- ¹²⁵Anand, Letters on India,90.
- ¹²⁶Ibid.
- ¹²⁷Ibid,114.
- ¹²⁸Ibid,115.
- ¹²⁹Ibid,116.
- ¹³⁰Said, Culture and Imperialism,269.
- ¹³¹Said, Orientalism,41.
- ¹³²Ibid.
- ¹³³Kipling, From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel,27-28.
- ¹³⁴Ibid,120.
- ¹³⁵Ibid, 12.
- ¹³⁶Ibid,83.
- ¹³⁷Ibid,12.
- ¹³⁸Ibid,12-13.
- ¹³⁹Ibid,236.
- ¹⁴⁰Anand, Letters on India,97.
- ¹⁴¹Ibid,58.
- ¹⁴²Ibid,97.
- ¹⁴³Ibid,125.
- ¹⁴⁴Ibid.

Chapter Three: The Authors' Stance on the Socio- Economic Condition of Anglo-India

Towards the mid-eighteenth century, Europe witnessed an economic transition from hand-made products towards mechanical ones. This process is referred to as the Industrial Revolution. It took place from the 1760s until the 1840s. Its center was Britain, but it spread latter on to the rest of Europe and the United States of America. According to Tim Macnese, the Industrial Revolution was led by Britain for many reasons. He argues that:

In early centuries, England has become the leading commercial power in the world. By 18th century, British trade overseas made England wealthy. During the wars of the century, especially the Seven Years War, England gained control of many overseas colonies. By mid-century, one of England's primary trade rivals, France, had lost control over India and Canada to the British. English sea captains commanded great trading ships, which could be found all over the world¹⁴⁵.

In other words, Britain's emergence as a leader of the Industrial Revolution is related to the fact that it benefited from the circumstances of that period. It successfully managed to impose itself as a powerful commercial trader by benefiting from the declining power of France. Consequently, France lost some of its colonies in favor of the Britain including Canada and India. In addition to this, it empowered its commercial exchange with other countries and constructed a strong commercial navy lead by skilled captains. Among the influential trading companies, we have the *East India Company*.

This revolution "was rooted in three different factors: coal, iron, and steam"¹⁴⁶. Those changes brought the continent to be a dominant one subjugating other territories under its domination. To secure its position as a superior power, Britain needed to explore other territories to provide both raw materials and cheap hand labor to keep on growing and maintaining its status. Therefore, it began invading other territories under the claim of civilizing the natives and taking progress to the lands. Those colonies became a market for Europe's counterfeiting products, yet a source of raw materials and cheap labor. As a leading country, Britain launched campaigns to invade other countries mainly in Africa and Asia. According, to Valerie Kennedy:

Colonialism is seen as the establishment of the settlements in a distant territory, usually but not always as the result of imperialism expansion, and as a process whereby settlers from the imperial power come to play a dominant and privileged role in the economic life of the territory¹⁴⁷

In other words, colonialism is defined as the establishment of economic field in the territory which is dominated by the colonial power. Therefore, the Industrial Revolution reinforced to spread of the British Empire to Asia, Africa and other areas. Britain's presence in India is related to *East India Company*. According to Anand,

The British came to India as merchants and traders in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries...Sir. John Mildenhall...presented himself before Akbar...asking for privileges for the East India Company¹⁴⁸.

In other words, the East India Company paved the way for the Britain's presence in India. It benefited from the permission granted to them by the Maughul Emperor Akbar to trade in the Surat Port.

Throughout their travelogues, Kipling and Forster argue that any progress occurring in India should be related to Britain's presence in the land. They argue that people are the source of their misery and declining social status, for they are barbarians and lazy refusing to take advantage of Britain's presence. In addition to this, they focus upon the corrupted morals within both system and society and praise their country's presence in the land, for they brought progress to it. On the other hand, Anand contradicts such descriptions of his land by arguing that Britain is the reason behind the difficult social and economic conditions of his people. In his letters, he argues that his land is an agricultural one. However, the coming of Britain only brought misery mainly to the peasants. In addition to this, he stresses the idea that the declining morals in the society including theft and bribery result from the colonial power's practices to secure its presence in the land. He argues that the relationship between India and Britain has always been dominated by this profit-making motive¹⁴⁹. He stresses the idea that only those who supported Britain's presence in India benefited from it.

To begin with, Kipling and Forster share a patriotic feeling as they support their country's economic policy in India. They argue that in order to achieve economic and social stability, Indians must fully embrace the British social and economic systems. Stressing the presumed primitiveness and underdevelopment of India, Forster makes an ironic comment on Indian life under a backward economic system. He suggests that "it is a curious life, reminding one in some ways of the eighteenth century"¹⁵⁰. In other words, Forster ironically draws a comparison between Indian life which he contrasts to the luxurious life of British. He wants to show that without Britain, India remains far behind their country. The curiosity which overwhelms him as a witness of Indians' life is in fact that the Indians are incapable of making any progress without the support of Britain. In other words, the colonial power justifies its practices in the colony by ascribing negative traits of incivility and backwardness to the colonized.

Forster deploys the position of Britain as a superior race which possesses the power and knowledge and needed to be transmitted to those underdeveloped lands to enlighten them. Forster's comment follows his belief that Britain's stance as a world leader ought to take its knowledge and to benefit these territories with its technological achievements. Otherwise, those lands would never advance. He states that he was "in a country that was flatter than anything you could imagine"¹⁵¹ According to Said, Europeans viewed the Orientals as "devoid of energy and "initiative"¹⁵². In other words, they associated the natives with laziness. Similarly, Forster ironically describes Indians as lazy and easily defeated. He states that:

As far as I can make out, the Indian is disappointed if he succeeds at producing the effects he aims at producing. He feels that the universe has played him false by responding truly"¹⁵³

According to Albert Memmi, the colonizer draws a stereotypical image of the colonized's laziness which stimulates their inability to progress. This privileges the presence of the colonial administration which sets out to modernize the land. He states that:

The colonizer establishes the colonized as being lazy .He decides that laziness is constitutional in the very nature of the colonized .It becomes obvious that the colonized, whatever he may undertake , whatever zeal he may apply , could never be anything but lazy¹⁵⁴

This implies that British officials presume that the laziness of the Indians is the source of their deteriorating social conditions. According to Kipling:

The great big lazy land that we nurse and wrap in cotton wool, and ask every morning whether it is strong enough to get out of bed, seems like a heavy so cloud on the far-away horizon ;and the babble that we were wont to raise about its precious future and its possibilities , no more than the talk of children in the street who have made a horse out of pea –pod and match-sticks and wonder if it will ever walk¹⁵⁵.

In this quotation, Kipling is skeptical in his description of Indians. He presumes that their laziness prevents them from achieving any economic or social progress. Moreover, in his description of the Indian ruled state of Jodhpur, he states:

They lie in long chairs in the verandah and tell each other interminable stories ,or stare city wards and exchange their opinion of some dilatory debtors. They are all waiting for something [...]some of them , in old days , used to wait as long as six weeks¹⁵⁶

In other words, Kipling argues that the Indians remain in a state of social backwardness as a result of their laziness and time unawareness. They spend days waiting for something to happen instead of working to end their misery and primitiveness.

A Similar description is provided by Forster who believes that Britain introduced railways and postal system in addition to other means to make their lives comfortable .Describing his journey , he states that ,”We left Aligarth[...]in a sort of a starved omnibus –I can’t describe it better –very narrow and hard and angular”¹⁵⁷. In other words, both authors blame Indians for their declining social conditions as an outcome of their laziness. Yet, the truth is that Indian had never a chance to prove that the British were wrong. In addition to this, the British were mainly interested in consolidating their rule in India rather than modernizing the land.

Contradicting this description, Anand argues that Britain’s policies mainly in relation to economics had deteriorated the social conditions of the Indians. He argues that the misery of his fellow countrymen is neither an outcome of their primitiveness nor laziness but from the economic administration of the colonizer. To prove his point, Anand refers to the misery of the Indian peasant whom he regards as “the most important man in India”¹⁵⁸. His choice is motivated

by the fact that Indian economy used to be agrarian before the coming of Britain and the implementation of an industrialized system. He enumerates the major problems from which the peasants suffer and the social condition of the country. Speaking of his country, Anand argues that “India [...] is not the wonderful country [...] but the background of a vast human tragedy”¹⁵⁹ because of the new economic order brought by Britain. In other words, India was tormented by the harsh social practices of the British administration that it is left in the worst possible condition. Moreover, he asserts that the colonial government has “created a vast body of rich landed proprietors deeply interested in the continuance of British dominion”¹⁶⁰. In other words, the new industrial system favored the colonizer and left the colonized in the worst possible condition.

Speaking about the peasants’ conditions, Anand argues that the peasant “is born, lives and dies in debt”¹⁶¹. To illustrate his opinion, Anand describes the miserable life of Uncle Chajju, a typical Indian peasant and citizen, who had to sell everything he possesses to pay his debts. He moves into the city believing that things would get better, but they got worse since he and his family were exploited¹⁶². Therefore, Anand criticizes the British authors who argue that the Indians’ laziness is the source of their misery. He also harshly addresses the British officials stating: “First you make the people poor, and then say how dirty and stupid they are”¹⁶³. In addition to this, Anand stresses the idea that Indians never became landowners even if they worked hard and for a long period in the land. He argues that “Individual, private ownership, [...] did not exist in India [...] there was no property in land in India”¹⁶⁴.

Besides, he advocates that the hard conditions of the people are related to the presence of Britain which brought chaos and social instability to India. He relates the hard conditions of his country by arguing that the relationship between Britain and India is based on the profit-making process. Speaking about Britain’s presence in India, he states that:

The British came to India as merchants and traders in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries[...]Sir John Mildenhall[...]presented himself before Akbar[...]asking for privileges

for the East India Company[...]Indeed ,this profit –making motive has ever since dominated the relationship of Britain and India¹⁶⁵.

In other words, Britain took advantage of the Indian Emperor Akbar who granted them a permission to trade in the Surat Sea. They established institutions that reinforced their position in the area. According to Said, the Orientalist discourse maintains the Orient as inferior. He claims:

There are Westerners, and there are Orientals. The former dominate, the latter must be dominated, which usually means having their land occupied, their internal affairs rigidly controlled, their blood and treasure put at the disposal of one or another Western power¹⁶⁶.

According to this, Britain took advantage of the declining power of India, and forced the Indian kings to grant them economic benefits in the region claiming that they need to secure their influential institutions and buildings from any possible threat.

This relationship of dominance derives from the Capitalist system .The term Capitalism was introduced by Carl Marx in his *Communist Manifesto*. It is a system where the majority dominates the minority. According to Anand, any profit made in India benefits only Britain. He states that “the chief aim of the British Capitalists was always to obtain easy profit”¹⁶⁷. In other words, Britain set out to drain the country from its raw materials. Thus, he ironically states that, “India is one of the richest countries [...] in natural resources [...] how tragic it is for it to be left as a dumping ground for other countries”¹⁶⁸. In other words, the real presence in India is to take profit of the land’s raw materials in order to uphold its position as a leading power. Thus, its conquest of India is related to Britain’s intention to secure its interests in India. In fact, the riches of India ensured that Britain’s position as a powerful empire is secured.

Another dialogic point between the authors is related to the management system and its link to declining morals of both Indians and administration. Although Britain presumes that it aims to benefit its colonies, it somehow denies its responsibility in India. It argues that the corrupted environment of the Indian administration prevents the people from benefiting from

these advantages. In his description of Indians, Forster stresses on their declining morality. He presumes that he feared for his own safety during his travelling ¹⁶⁹. This suggests that Indians are morally degenerate. According to Bill Ashcroft et.al:

The term 'savage' has performed an important service in [...] imperial /colonial ideologies as Marianna Torgovnik notes, terms like 'primitive ,savage[...]all take the West as norm and define the rest as inferior ,different , subordinate, and subordinate ,and sub-ordinateable¹⁷⁰.

In addition to this, he generalizes his description of Indians as thieves. He argues that "Malcolm's private servant the 'thief catcher', who is himself a thief and is paid to guard the house from his friends"¹⁷¹. This implies that Indians lack moral values and require the civilizing and humanizing mission of Britain. A similar idea is found in Kipling's description of Indian ruled states and their rulers. He argues that the elite Indian princes were corrupt. Their greediness prevents them from fulfilling their duties and rule as proper rulers. They place their own comfort, wealth, and luxurious life on behalf of their people's happiness. He states:

Let them live quietly and hide away their money under our protection, while we tax them till they know through their purses the measures of their neglect in the past, and when a little of the smell has been abolished, let us bring them back again to talk and take the credit of enlightenment¹⁷².

According to this quotation, Indian princes taxed their lands and sentenced their people to a miserable life. The money they accumulated is hidden within the British House of Treasury. If things had worsened and the corrupted princes intend to betray Britain, Britain is willing to expose their secrets.

Challenging these ideas of declining morals, Anand argues that the British administration caused this decline by creating a new socio-economic system which favors one minor group over the majority. According to Said, "the national bourgeoisies and their specialized elites [...] tended to replace the colonial force with a new class-based and exploitative one, which replicated the old colonial structure in new terms"¹⁷³. In other words, the rise of an exploitative class consisting of the bourgeoisie settled a colonial structure in the country.

To conclude, Kipling and Forster are proponents of Britain's economic exploitative policies in India .To justify their stance, they advocate that Indians are lacking moral values. Thus, they do not progress. Moreover, they state that the declining social conditions of the people results from the practices of Indian administration as well as their' laziness and refusal to accept the offer of Britain. Challenging these ideas, Anand argues that the capitalist system of Britain exploited the resources of the country. In addition to this, the declining morals of the Indians results from their misery as well as the temptations of the colonizer.

Endnotes

- ¹⁴⁵Tim,Macneese , *The Industrial Revolution* , (Milikan Publishing Company, St.Louis Missory,2000),1.
- ¹⁴⁶Ibid.
- ¹⁴⁷Valerie , Kennedy ,*Edward Said :A Critical Introduction* (Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publisher Ltd ,Cambridge,2000)18 .
- ¹⁴⁸Anand, *Letters on India*,18.
- ¹⁴⁹Ibid,
- ¹⁵⁰Forster, *Selected Letters*,Vol1,145.
- ¹⁵¹Ibid,53.
- ¹⁵²Said, *Orientalism*,38.
- ¹⁵³Forster, *Selected Letters*,53.
- ¹⁵⁴Memmi,*the Colonized and the Colonizer*,125.
- ¹⁵⁵Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*,12.
- ¹⁵⁶Ibid,110-111.
- ¹⁵⁷Forster, *Selected Letters*,v1,148.
- ¹⁵⁸Anand,*Letters on India*,29.
- ¹⁵⁹Ibid,35.
- ¹⁶⁰Ibid,30-33.
- ¹⁶¹Ibid,36.
- ¹⁶²Ibid,41.
- ¹⁶³Ibid,18.
- ¹⁶⁴Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁵Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁶Said, *Culture and Imperialism*,268.
- ¹⁶⁷Anand, *Letters on India*,73.
- ¹⁶⁸Ibid,75.
- ¹⁶⁹Forster, *Selected Letters*,173.
- ¹⁷⁰Aschcroft et al, *Post-Colonial Studies: the Key Concepts*(Abingdon: Routledge,2007),192.
- ¹⁷¹Forster, *Selected Letters*,150.
- ¹⁷²Kipling, *From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel*,189.
- ¹⁷³Said, *Culture and Imperialism*,260.
- ¹⁷⁴Ibid.

Conclusion

This dissertation has examined the ways Anand's *Letters on India* (1942) responds to the Orientalist discourse in Kipling's *From Sea To Sea: Letters of Travel* (1899) and Forster's *selected Letters* v1(1879-1920) and v2(1921-1970). Kipling's and Forster's travelogues reflect their misperception of India as a land of backwardness, tyranny and exoticism. Their description of the land legitimizes the British conquest. Challenging their ideas, Anand criticizes the practices of the British administration which deteriorates the living standards of the Indians. He questions the real aims of Britain behind its advanced project of enlightenment.

This memoir has proved that these authors diverge in different points mainly related to their cultural, political, and socio-economic views of the condition of India. As Orientalist authors, Kipling and Forster share a patriotic feeling that implies their belief in the superiority of the British Empire in contrast to the native Indians. They attribute a number of stereotypical images to the natives to justify the colonization. In fact, they stigmatize and depict the Indians as primitive, lazy, and backward. They stigmatize the native culture advocating the barbarity of Indian traditions and the diversity of religion and language as obstacles to order. They also argue that the natives' political backwardness results from their refusal to take advantage of the British Empire's offer to modernize them. They associate the natives with a lack of political expertise in handling any trouble. In addition to this, they blame the natives for their declining social condition. They argue that their corruption prevents them from achieving a more prosperous economy.

Challenging these ideas, Anand celebrates the Indian culture. He advocates that the diversity of religion and language is what makes India a nation. He argues that these differences are put aside when it comes to supporting the goals of the Nationalist movement. He attributes the native culture with peace and the British one with violence. Moreover, he advances the idea

that the colonial administration prohibits any form of political expression. He denies the natives' political backwardness and stresses the role of the nationalist movement. Finally, he argues that the declining situation in Indian society derives from the Capitalist system and the practices of the British administration in creating a new social system.

In this dissertation, I have tried to establish a “dialogic” relationship between the three authors based on their stances regarding the cultural, economic, social, and political conditions in India. For this purpose, I applied the postcolonial ideas of Edward Said. However, the very existence of “dialogue” between the three authors prompts an interesting reading of their works from a Bakhtinian perspective following Mikhail Bakhtin's *The Dialogic Imagination*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1-Primary Sources

Kipling, Rudyard, *From Sea to Sea :Letters of Travel* .New York :Doubleday& Mc company, 1899.

Forster, Edward , Morgan,*Selected letters* .Mary Lago and P.N. Furbank, volume1(1879-1920)/volume2(1921-1970)

Anand , Mulk ,Raj, *Letters on India* ,George Routeledge & Sons ,Ltd, 1942.

2-Secondary Sources

Said, W. Edward , *Orientalism* .London: Penguin Books,1978.

Said, W. Edward, *Culture and Imperialism* .New York: Vintage Books .1994.

Kortnigh, Chris, *Colonization and Identity*. The Anarchist Library: Anti –copyright,2003.

Memmi ,Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. trans. Greenfield, Howard. Earthscan Publication Hd.

Siber, Mouloud. *Rudyard Kipling, Edward Morgan Forster,William Somerset Maugham, and Joseph Conrad: the British Imperial Tradition and the Individual Talent*.Phd Thesis.Mouloud Mammeri university of Tiziouzou.2012.

Siber, Mouloud , Riche , Bouteldja. *Native Mis/rule and ‘Oriental Despotism’ in Alexander Dumas’s Adventures in Algeria(1846)and Rudyard Kipling’s From Sea to Sea: Letters of Travel* Asian Journal of Humanity Art and literature, 2012.

Suresh, Ranjan, Basak. E M Forster, Mulk Raj Anand and Gabriel Garcia Marquez: a Postcolonial Reading of Inherited Dichotomies ,eh 2011.

John McLeod, *Beginning Postcolonialism* ,Manchester University Press.2000.

Robert, young. *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction* oxford University Press,2006.

Spivak can The *subaltern speak*,1988

Oxford dictionaries. s.v “sati”: viewed on july2016.<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/English/sati>

Thomas, Metcalf. *A Concise History of Modern India: Ideologies of the Raj*. Cambridge

University Press,1995.

Ania Loomba, *Colonialism /Postcolonialism*. 3rd Edition.London: Routledge Taylor &Francis Group,1994.

Mittapali Rajeshwar, *the Novels of Mulk Raj Anand: A Critical Study*, 2014.

David Cody, Rudyard Kipling: A Brief Biography,2012.

Alam, Muhammad Jane. '*Racial Tension in A Passage to India*'. Bangladesh, Ihsan University.

Ms Kp Suchitra, Postcolonial Reading of MRA's *Coolie* v1 issue 6, India, Karpagam University of India, November 2014.

Sethi, Khagendra, 'Sketching Mulk Raj Anand as a Postcolonial Writer', Vol 2, Issue 4, Ravinshaw University India, 2015.

Edward B. Tyler, *Primitive Culture: Researches in the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art and Custom* 2nd ed.2vols.London: John Murray. 1871.

Bill Ashcroft, et al. Postcolonial studies: Key Concepts. Abingdon: Routledge. 2007.

Joanne P, Sharp, *Writing Travel/Travel Writing: Roland Barthes detours the Orient*, Scotland, 1999.

www.postcolonialweb.org/poldiscourse/young/1.html/representation and resistance :a cultural , social and political perplexity in postcolonial literature

Tim, Macneese , *The Industrial Revolution*. St. Louis Misory: Millikan Publishing Company, 2000.

Valerie, Kennedy. *Edward Said: A Critical Introduction* (Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publisher Ltd, Cambridge, 2000.

Bibliography

1- Primary Sources

- Kipling ,Rudyard. *From Sea to Sea :Letters of Travel*. New york : Doubleday& c culture company , 1899.
- Forster, Edward and Morgan, *Selected letters* . ed.Mary Lago and P.N.Furbank, volume1(1879-1920)/volume2 (1921-1970) .
- Anand , Mulk ,Raj. *Letters on India* .George Routledge & Sons Ltd ,1942.

2 - Secondary Sources

- Said, W.Edward .*Orientalism* .London: Penguin Books,1978.
- Said ,W.Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York :Vintage Books.1994.
- Kortnigh,Chris. *Colonization and Identity*. The Anarchist Library,Copyright 2003.
- Memmi ,Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. trans. Greenfield, Howard. Earthscan.
- Siber, Mouloud.*Rudyard kipling ,Edward Morgan Forster ,William Somerset Maugham, and Joseph Conrad:the British Imperial Tradition and the Individual Talent*. PhD Thesis. Mouloud Mammeri Universityof Tizi-Ouzou. 2012.
- Siber, Mouloud . Riche , Bouteldja. *Native Mis/rule and ‘Oriental Despotism ‘in Alexandre Dumas ‘s Adventures in Algeria (1846) and Rudyard Kipling’s From Sea to Lea:Letters of Travel*. Asian journal of Humanity Art and literature: 2012.
- Suresh, Ranjan ; Basak *E M Forster,Mulk Raj Anand and Gabriel Garcia Marquez a Postcolonial Reading of Inherited Dichotomies* , 2011.
- John McLeod, *Beginning Postcolonialism* .Manchester University Press.2000.
- Robert, young, *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction*.Oxford University Press.2003.
- Spivak, Gayatri.can The *subaltern speak*,Macmellan,1988.
- Oxford dictionaries . s.v “sati”: viewed on july 2016.<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition /English/sati>.

- Thomas , Metcalf, *A Concise History of Modern India :Ideologies of the raj*,Cambridge University Press ,1995 .
 - Ania, Loomba, Colonialism /Postcolonialism. 3rd Edition .London: Routledge taylor&Francis Group.1994.
- Mittapali Rajeshwar, The Novels of Mulk Raj Anand :A Critical Study ,2014.
- David Cody, Rudyard Kipling :A Brief Biography,2012.
- Alam,Muhammad Jane . 'Racial Tension in A Passage To India.Bangladesh,Ihsan University Ms KP Suchitra ,Postcolonial Reading of MRA's Collie v1 issue6,Karpagam University India , November20014.
- Sethi Khagendra , 'Sketching Mulk Raj Anand as A Postcolonial Writer' ,V2,issue 4,Ravinshaw University India,2015.
- Edward B. Tyler ,*Primitive Culture :Researches in to the Development of Mythology , Philosophy, Religion , Language , Art and Custom* 2nded.2vols.London:John Murray.1871.
- Bill Aschcroft et al .*Post Colonial Studies :Key Concepts* .Abimgdon :Routledge.2007.
- Joanne P ,Sharp, *Writing Travel /Travelling Writing:Roland Barthes detours the Orient*, Scotland, 1999.
- Tim, Macneese , *The Industrial Revolution* .St Louis Misory: Millikan Publishing Company,2000.
- Valerie , Kennedy ,*Edward Said :A Critical Introduction* (Polity Press & Blackwell Publisher Ltd ,Cambridge,2000.