

Kim and A Passage to India: A Binary of Colonial Attitude

MUHAMMED ELHAM HOSSAIN & MUSTAFIZUR RAHMAN

Abstract

In modern linguistics binary distinctions are fundamental and many social and cultural phenomena are based on binary oppositions. Even many stereotypes of culture get formulated on the basis of binary oppositions: "If you are not with me you are against me" (Hawthorn 29) is a cultural imposition of a binary opposition upon variations of attitude. Looking down upon the natives of the Subcontinent as a people, devoid of civilization, colonial authors produced the stereotypes of attitude which remained unchanged, fortified by prejudices and cultural biases. Reading of colonial texts which are based on Indian setting, reveals these stereotypes. Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* and E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* pictured colonial India from European perspective, degrading it to the level of a land of mystery, muddle, inactivity and lethargy. Both the texts depicted India as a binary opposition of Europe, formulated with cultural biases and prejudices emerging out of the boastfulness of the colonizers as the light givers of civilization to the rest of the globe. But it is true that every reading is a re-creation of the identity of the author and this axiom has inspired this paper to explore the basis of binary oppositions of the colonial attitude of Rudyard Kipling and E. M. Forster. This paper is also inspired by the perception that literary and cultural phenomena are based upon binary oppositions and in the days of postcolonial theory binary oppositions have become fundamental to many recent literary works. Keeping this in mind, this paper seeks to explore Kipling's *Kim* and E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* in colonial perspective and present binary distinctions of their attitude towards India. Both the authors have chosen India as setting of their above mentioned novels and their observation of the East and the West produced binary distinctions between Europe and the Subcontinent. This paper has made a deconstructionist analysis of these stereotypes.

Philippa Levine in her seminal book *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset* (2007) has found out a factor that made the British colonizers develop interest in India. According to her, after the failure of the American colonies and the trade in East Indies (Indonesia and the Spice Islands) India came to the attention and became the principal foothold in Asia for the British colonizers (62). Gradually India became a jewel in the crown of the British Raj, not because of its resources, but increasingly as a symbol of Britain's overseas powers and it occupied British attention until the middle of the twentieth century and acted as a training ground for scores of colonial officials. For nearly two hundred years these officials exercised imperial domination in the Subcontinent justifying their position with a vehement claim that they were extending benefits of civilization on the ground of their cultural, racial and material superiority. But the contradiction that lies in this claim is that with the exercise of colonizing mission the British extended their authority in India and thus an encounter emerged between them and the natives. In parallel with political and military coercion the colonizers went on with their operation through a supposedly neutral medium of knowledge and culture. In this connection, literary texts serve as a weapon to rule the disposition of the colonized. Thus colonial texts work as a powerful weapon to achieve loyalty of the colonized. Grossly speaking, colonial writers like Kipling, John Masters and Forster ventured successfully to produce a discourse through their texts which contribute significantly to the shaping of the minds of the Indians in the framework of the European colonizers. But Kipling and Forster did this job of shaping the minds of the Indians in distinctively different ways that emerged out of the binary oppositions of their colonial attitude.

The stereotyped attitude of Kipling and Forster was based on the prejudices and biases concerning the feeling of superiority of the European culture and the rightness of the Empire. Superiority and inferiority are a pair of related terms or concepts which are opposite in meaning. If the West stands for superiority then, in accordance with the concept of binary opposition, the East stands for inferiority. Conspicuously it is found that the colonial writers wrote from the ground of superiority as they looked

upon themselves as the rightful rulers of the world and hence, they portrayed the colonized, specially the Indians in their novels, as an inferior people, devoid of civilization. From the perspective of binary oppositions a study of *Kim* and *A Passage to India* reveals how this superiority complex formed biases and prejudices in both the authors. Kipling's protagonist Kim is white in complexion, Irish in blood and receives education from St. Xavier's School. Forster's Aziz, a typical Indian, attempts snobbishly and tirelessly to win the confidence of the white men and women. Though towards the end of the novel he protests against injustice and humiliation inflicted upon him as he appears to be swept by emotion, not knowledge that would never be sufficient to formulate a counter discourse to challenge the colonizers intellectually. Thus both the texts depict colonial India as a binary opposition of colonialist Britain.

A close reading reveals that the India depicted by Kipling in *Kim* is a boy's India, a kaleidoscope, tinged with varied color, panorama, deliberately detached from the political, social and cultural significances. The first six years of his life stretching from 1865 to 1872 in Bombay provided him with merely a vision of a child's India. In 1882 Kipling came back from England and joined *The Civil and Military Gazette* and worked as a journalist till 1889. The second leg of his sojourn in India provided him with mature observations. His friend circle was mostly elite which limited his experience of India. On the other hand, Forster's close involvement in Indian culture, rituals, the court life of Dewas, close contact with Sir Malcolm Darling and intimacy with Ross Masood fermented *A Passage to India*. His observation, though superficial, helped him produce a sheer picture of racial and moral crises.

Although both Rudyard Kipling and E.M. Forster wrote in the colonial era, their attitude towards India was different, as reflected in the treatment of their novels. Both of them were impressed by India's superficial beauty. Forster's interest was in human conduct and the dark regions in human heart which was responsible for unhappiness and confusion not only between individuals but also among races. Kipling's attitude was

ambivalent. Martin Seymour-Smith in his biographical book on Kipling, *Rudyard Kipling* (1989), observed that “Kipling’s attitude to India was torn in two: reverence for the ancient, mysterious and wise, which appealed to the religious, sensual, romantic and imaginative side of his personality; and contempt for its political childishness, or childlikeness, and total lack of capacity for self-government” (76). But the similarity of their attitude to India lies in their characterizations. Indian characters of both the writers are politically unconscious, naïve and incapable of producing a political discourse against the colonizers.

It is apparent that Kipling’s “characterizations of colonial life became the medium through which the British viewed their work . . .” (Boehmer 52). In characterization Kipling rigorously refuted indigenous culture of the colonized. Thus his definitive expression, “East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet” (238), revealed the superior status of the colonizers and the inferior status of the colonized. Hence, cultural biases in his consciousness of superiority saturated Kipling’s mind with prejudices as a member of the colonizers. Puffed up with such prejudice Kipling affirmed that he could feel the pulse of India. At the same time, as a typical colonial writer he believed that the Indians never attempted to look at their own destiny. According to Seymour-Smith, “His imperialistic ideas were founded in part on his notion that he was an expert on India” (76) and these ideas were the source of his prejudice. Like many other imperialists and Anglo-Indian writers, he could not come out of the colonial ethos or break free of race consciousness. In this regard Hemenway says, “Anglo-Indian novelists show how India affected the rulers, not how the rulers affected India or the Indians” (30). Actually, Kipling depicted India at the expense of realism, and India, in his eyes, was a backward country devoid of civilization for which the Indians should take up the white-man’s burden. Hence, his portrayal of India, not only in *Kim* but also in other writings, reveals his surrender to the passion and prejudice of his own community. According to Frantz Fanon, when the colonizers occupied Others’ land they made every attempt to justify their presence by proclaiming the history of the colonized before their arrival as a history of barbarity and savagery.

Kipling whom Orwell called “the prophet of imperialism” declared that “the Indians were barbaric people whom it was a heroic duty to rule and civilize” (Paffard 2). Hence, Kipling’s protagonist Kim, a European in origin, is depicted as an inevitable guide to the lama who represents the Indians.

Both Kipling and Forster do not always see their countrymen through rose-tinted glasses, but sometimes even the more despicably racist characters among them are held up to ridicule or chastisement with an extra dose of sympathy, because, after all they are in India. In this connection Hemenway says, “Most Anglo-Indians did not care or know enough about the Indians to imagine themselves in their shoes” (30). Hence, the overall view emerging from the novels of Anglo-Indian writers like Kipling and Forster is “a distorted picture of the real India” (Hemenway 30). India, commonly known as an ethnological museum, has been distorted, misinterpreted and depicted as a laughing stock. Many European historians like P. E. Roberts audaciously proclaimed that “A few paragraphs must suffice to sum up the centuries that elapsed before India came into contact with European nations by sea” (8).

The picture of India which is depicted in *Kim* is impressive but it does not give the whole story. Kipling threw sufficient light on the natural and rural aspects of life of India. The Grand-Trunk Road with its endless flow of life is portrayed. But whatever parts of India are depicted in *Kim* are marked with superstition, poverty, illiteracy and reluctance to material gains. He found no enthusiasm and adventurous spirit in the Indians which was typically European. The picture of the life in India that he depicted in the novel, is superficial and at best, a vision of the picturesque. Hence, Kipling’s portrayal of Indian life “is the kind of life one would see from a train window” (Husain 5).

Forster is not very different from Kipling in his attitude towards the Indians. India in *A Passage to India*, though authentic to a great extent, is full of mystery, muddle, ignorance and anomalies. But how far did the

Europeans try to understand 'the real India'? They only labeled India as a land of mystery, muddle and primitivism. It appears that Forster associated India with the Marabar caves, devoid of harmony and balance. Adela's inability to understand the meaning of the echo in the Marabar caves may be interpreted as the colonizers' lack of interest in the exploration of the hearts of the Indians. At the same time Adela's accusation that Aziz attempted to rape her in the caves was an outcome of racial prejudices. Her abrupt fury with Aziz reminds the readers of the contemporary political turmoil in India. In this connection a brief recapitulation of the political events of the period while Forster was writing the novel, is needed. The constitutional reforms which were initiated by the Montagu Declaration could not meet popular public demands. The Russian Revolution in 1917 also encouraged and strengthened resentment of the Indians. Gandhi's *satyagraha* was impeded in all possible ways by the Anglo-Indian rulers. Jallianwala Bagh massacre that killed 379 and left uncalculated number of people wounded under the command of General Dyer infuriated the Indians. Besides, the British rulers designed many devices to suppress the political upheaval on the part of the Indians. Adela's position against Aziz after the failure of the picnic party and the enthusiasm in her compatriots, except Fielding, regarding the supposed fate of Aziz in the trial, make the readers feel the political biases of the British rulers against the Indians. But it is as if Forster had intentionally avoided an attempt reflecting directly the contemporary racial and political crises. Whatever he discovered in India was exotic, mysterious or full of muddle. *A Passage to India* explored the possibilities of friendship between Aziz and Fielding, in a broad sense, between the East and the West. Forster wanted to anatomize the soul of India through Aziz, but failed to diagnose the inscrutability of his heart. Fielding did not know when a bridge between Aziz and himself (East and West), could be built. He did not even try to know why.

Aziz finds it difficult to be civil, let alone friendly towards the English and to avoid them he has withdrawn into a Native State as court physician. Fielding is exasperated by this professional suicide but he has to accept ruefully the 'otherness', the everlasting muddle - as it

seems to him - of India, just as Forster had to resign himself to the muddle of Dewas State Senior when he was its ruler's private secretary in 1921. (Mahood 74)

Thus the mind of India had been termed as 'muddle'. Such labeling of the Indian mind was a political intention to identify the indigenous culture as mystery and muddle. Forster explored different possible grounds of friendship between races but ultimately discovered puzzling differences that retarded the attempt to build such a bridge.

Forster's India was a continual bafflement for the Europeans. The Marabar Caves represented the muddle and mystery of Indian life and it was utterly inscrutable to the British. Mrs. Moore's indifference towards Aziz and Adela's embarrassment after the incidents in the caves showed the inability of the colonizers to understand this far-off land. Forster also showed how this opacity acted as a block to the way to developing a meaningful understanding between the colonizers and the colonized. Failure of the Bridge Party also depicted this improbability of relationship between them. On the other hand, to Kipling, India is a fair and beautiful land. The picture of India depicted in *Kim* appears to be more important than the plot itself. Actually, Kipling was not mystical in his portrayal of Indian life. He was charmed by the simplicity of Indian pastoral life. He never threw light on the miseries caused by the persecution exercised by the colonizers. He rather believed, ". . . India's hope of redemption lay in a complete acceptance of the rule of the British" (Husain 30).

However, Forster's recognition of Indian nationalism has apparently differentiated him from Kipling. Towards the end of the *A Passage to India* Aziz's angry attitude towards Fielding is a gregarious exposure of the Indian spirit of nationalism. His angry reaction to Fielding's mocking remark "Who do you want instead of the English?" (316) appears to be an outburst of nationalism. As Forster puts it, "And Aziz in an awful rage danced this way and that, not knowing what to do, and cried: "Down with the English anyhow. That's certain. Clear out, you fellows, double quick, I

say. We may hate one another, but we hate you most . . ." (317). Though Aziz's gregarious bent of mind hinders him from producing a discursive prudence, it heralds the upcoming surge of Indian nationalistic spirit which will drive the English out of Indian territory.

In the same vein, Fielding's helpless question, "Why can't we be friends now?" (317) is answered by multitudes of voices. The whole entity of India speaks together:

. . . the horses didn't want it - they swerved apart; the earth didn't want it, sending up rocks through which riders must pass single file; the temples, the tank, the jail, the palace, the birds, the carrion, the Guest House, that came into view as they issued from the gap and saw man beneath: they didn't want it, they said in their hundred voices, 'No, not yet,' and the sky said, 'No, not there.' (317)

The whole of India seems to echo Forster's acknowledgement of Indian nationalism. The 'hundred voices' indicate the rise of consciousness among the Indians. Forster truly understands that the Indians may have hatred for one another but they nourish even more hatred for the colonizers. The seed of nationalism sown with the *Sepoy Mutiny* in 1857, in fact, was the first spark of freedom which took the form of a flourishing tree through the Jalianwalla Bagh massacre in 1919. Forster's realization and acknowledgement of the development of Indian nationalism distinguishes him from Kipling. In this regard, M. Keith Booker said, "Forster's acknowledgement of the growing importance of the nationalist movement sets his work strikingly apart from Kipling's *Kim*, in which any such acknowledgement is scrupulously suppressed" (151). It is perhaps because *Kim* deliberately avoided the local controversial aspects of race and political turmoil. Forster, for his part, showed his interest in India and not in Indian politics. Kipling's India has been portrayed through the lama who felt helpless without Kim, a boy, western in origin. On the other hand, Forster's India is echoed with tremulous voice of nationalism though at the same time he was well aware of the fact that "cool head does not go with a warm heart" (Mahood 76). Aziz's sense of nationalism was mostly fermented by

the warmth of heart, not cool head which went with the West, as it was clear from the dominating disposition of Ronny. Hence, a passage between East and West was next to impossible. In this regard Mahood clarified Forster's position by saying that "Forster hated imperial domineering but he had no quarrel with imperial domination" (90). Here Forster is similar to Kipling. In the eyes of both of them India was obviously a binary opposition of the British imperial power. And again if these two texts are read on the basis of their focus on the political awareness of their protagonists, then Aziz appears to be more mature than adolescent Kim and thus *A Passage to India* is a binary opposition of *Kim*, too.

The India that has been presented in *Kim* is enchanting. It is not the India of racial clashes or political violence. The best example of a refreshing Indian point of view is the narrator's impression of the sights, sounds and smells of India. His fascination for the natural beauty of India is exemplified in the following lines:

The voice of early evening had settled down to one soothing hum whose deepest note was the steady chumping of bullocks above their chopped straw, and whose highest was the tinkle of a Bengali dancing-girl's sitar. Most men have eaten and pulled deep at their gurgling, grunting hookahs, which in full blast sound like bull-frogs. (87)

Kipling approaches closest to the Indian point of view by focusing on comic and picaresque adventures. Nevertheless, the narrative framework and context of *Kim* remain those of the colonizers. Like other colonialist texts *Kim* offers the spectacle of Indian society reproducing itself, representing its history and beliefs, repeatedly asserting its invincibility. But as a colonialist writer Kipling does not depict the picture of resistance and indifference on the part of the natives. Kim behaves like an Indian but he is sent to St. Xavier's to become a Sahib. Hurree Babu also knows that the English have forced their education on him but he is deprived of a white man's salary. Even then he cannot come out of the Great Game because of his "ape-like imitation of his English masters and their habits and interests and his

incapacity to fully digest their knowledge and mores" (Alam 11). Thus, Kipling has portrayed the picture of deprivation but has not depicted how the sense of deprivation may form resistance on the part of the deprived.

Kipling's prejudices led him to produce a towering protagonist of Western origin. Kim, the protagonist, has connection with the Indians such as Mahbub Ali and Hurree Chunder Mookerjee. But they only support the development of his character and never come to the center of the novel. The Indian characters have "no importance in the novel in so far as they exist in relationship with Kim, or in relation to their work for the Great Game, the Secret Service of British India" (Boehmer 67). Kim is depicted with all the excellence of superiority. He may accompany the lama but will not adopt his way of life. He uses the lama as a sort of mask which has saved him from the arrow of suspicion of those with whom he maintains gregarious relationship. Kim's ultimate desertion of the lama shows how he behaves like a typical colonial agent. His involvement in the Great Game suggests that he will in the end never surrender his colonial self to the culture of the Indians. Kipling's chauvinistic attitude and belief that England is superior to all other countries, has been projected through Kim's exploitation of the lama's identity. It is true that Kim possesses a profound love for the lama, but it is also true that his love is never like the Oriental or impulsive type of surrender. The love of an Indian is a kind of worship that a European wants as it is wanted by Ronny in *A Passage to India*. Ultimately, Kim repudiates the lama's mystic quest of spiritual life and to a great extent Kim is an incarnation of materialism and the colonial enterprise.

A very subtle difference between Kipling and Forster is marked in the characterization of the protagonists. In *Kim*, though the protagonist has not yet grown beyond adolescence, he is innovative and a chameleon-like figure. He is skilled in "inventiveness" and has an "acute power of observation" (Boehmer 71). His acuteness in adopting any role in accordance with the demands of the situation is a testimony to his fitness to be an imperialist and a Secret Service spy. He is inevitable for the lama as Kipling concedes that the British are inevitable for the Indians.

On the other hand, Aziz, in *A Passage to India*, a typical Indian, devoid of discursive skill, is unable to fight against the colonizers. His non-discursive anger against the colonizers cannot make him potent enough to fight for the colonized. But he knows and maintains that the colonizers have nothing to do in India. In the Mosque scene Aziz's reaction to Mrs. Moore shows that the mosque and the temple in India belong to the Indians, not to the colonizers as "The Church in the colonies is the white people's Church, the foreigner's Church. She does not call the native to God's ways but to the ways of the white man, of the master, of the oppressor" (Fanon, *Black Skin* 32). Only intellectual response to life is not enough to have an access into the hearts of the natives and it is powerfully exhibited in the cave scene when Adela undergoes a hysteric experience resulted in her attempt to perceive India intellectually. Mrs. Moore also initially in the first cave felt suffocated and rushed out of it and lost interest in Aziz and above all, India.

Like Kipling, E. M. Forster has maintained a strict division between the colonizers and the colonized. However friendly Aziz and Fielding may be, their friendship can never elevate them to the level of brotherhood. Aziz has rightly said to Mrs. Moore that the Indians are not allowed in the English club even as guests. Though he is educated, he is not appreciated by the Anglo-Indians. Aziz looks upon Fielding as his friend or even brother. But the passage between the souls is yet to be linked. As Fanon noted, "Brother, sister, friend - these are words outlawed by the colonialist bourgeoisie because for them my brother is my purse, my brother is part of my scheme for getting on" (Fanon, *The Wretched* 36).

It is apparent that Forster emphasizes the relationship and not the friendship between the colonizers and the colonized. Friendship with so vast a gap in status is yet to be made. Only by transcending all factors such as culture, religion, points of view and histories is relationship possible. Relationship is different from friendship. Relationship in the transcendent state of mind is not impossible even between distinctively different persons let alone two different nations because it passes through the heart while

friendship is determined on the material scale. Thus in chapter 36, though Aziz will have nothing to do with the visiting English party, Ralph's simplicity and sensitivity move him to use some words to him that he had used long ago to Mrs. Moore in the Mosque scene, "Then you are an Oriental" (24). This is an acknowledgement of a relation deeper than mere friendship, for it suggests a sense of oneness that Aziz and Fielding never achieve. It is remarkable that Forster has very aptly showed the resistance and indifference on the part of the colonized. Aziz's indomitable and indocile attitude towards the English, whether he is Turton or Burton, reflects his obstinate nationalism, mostly saturated with impulsive disposition. It is not politically discursive. Actually, Forster has gone deeper into the hegemonic differences between East and West. In the same vein, Kipling has examined the improbabilities of the reconciliation between them. Like Kipling he also maintains the belief that "The British have right to rule (Mahood 79).

Kipling affirms through *Kim* the "will to power" of the colonizers. He has not shown how colonizers faced opposition from the colonized. He has rather focused on the skill and dexterity of the colonizers and their colonial potential. On the other hand, Forster portrayed the typical Indians with feeble strength fighting against the tremendously equipped colonizers. Aziz's passage from Anglo-Indian dominated territory to the princely state of Mau, where he believes Indian nationalism will have a better chance to grow, produces a picture of the spirit of nationalism emerging among the Indians. On the other hand, Kim's return to the Great Game indicates Kipling's suggestion that welfare for the Indians lies in their complete surrender to the British rulers. Kipling's indifference to Indian self-government is also seen in his portrayal of the Indian characters with passivity and reluctance.

As a British colony, India always remained a 'far off' land to British colonizers. In *A Passage to India* Forster portrayed an India that was inaccessible in many respects. In this regard, Elleke Boehmer said:

E. M. Forster's attempt in this novel to understand the difference of India by way of a Western vocabulary of liberal tolerance has received much critical acclaim, not least in India itself. Throughout the narrative, Indian sophistication in spiritual matters shows up the so-called superiority of the Western intellect. (150)

The colonizers are portrayed with elevated features of education, tolerance, philosophy and manliness in contrast to the ignorance, muddle and informality of the natives. To Forster an educated Indian like Aziz is talkative, impractical and incapable of understanding practical matters.

Kipling's portrayal of the character of his protagonist reflects his cultural biases. Frantz Fanon said in his *Black Skin White Masks* (1967) that the desire of the slave to own the colonizer's world results in schizophrenic imitativeness (79). Colonization certainly leads to a cultural encounter, and the colonized subjects develop interest in that encounter. In *A Passage to India* Forster has also showed the schizophrenic imitativeness in Aziz, especially till the failure of the picnic party in the Marabar caves. Aziz's anxiety regarding the arrangement of the picnic shows how restlessly he tries to be furnished with the label of punctuality, sincerity and appreciation of the colonizers.

In consequence of schizophrenic imitativeness and Eurocentric disposition the colonized begin to think themselves to be blessed in serving the colonizers. Lurgan Sahib, Hurree Babu, Mahbub Ali are all very useful in playing the Great Game with the colonizers. Their subconscious bent of mind towards the colonizers apparently represents their passivity and dementia. Kipling, eager to promote the colonial machinery, depicted the distorted image of the colonized subjects, disrupted "in a conflict of loyalties or aspirations" (Bullock and Stephen 413). On the other hand, Forster dug out the seed of this force of resistance in Aziz. After acquittal from the trial, his decision to go to some other state which is free from British domination appears to be an exposure of his need for self-

government though it is feeble on the ground of the strength of his political ideology.

Forster is sincere in depicting corrosive racial clashes. The factors which perpetuate colonialism have also come under scrutiny in various situations in the action of *A Passage to India*. India's internal casteism and religious disparity lengthened the slavery to colonialism. In this respect, Hawley says, "In colonized and de-colonized India, casteism and disparity of wealth perpetuate colonialisms" (19). In *A Passage to India* the racial problem is seen as corrosive. Aziz is a good doctor but his bed room and the bi-cycle that he rides, reveal his poverty - stricken life. On the other hand, the life of English rulers is depicted as polished and privileged. Economic exploitation produces discontent among the Indians. Their long deposited discontent inspires the deprived to stand face to face with the rulers. It also gives an impetus to the self-determinism among the natives. This determination, of course, leads the colonized to liberty. Forster showed this determination functioning in Aziz, but Kipling did not create anything like that in any of his Indian characters.

Exercise of power gives birth to resistance. In the last chapter Aziz's vehement hatred for the English may be interpreted as a form of resistance against the force that Ronny refers to in Chapter 5 when he tries to convince his mother regarding the justifiability of a rigorous role. He says to his mother that he is here to hold this wretched nation as ruler and not as a missionary. Ironically, Ronny refers to a missionary who, according to him, should be a repository of mercy. But colonial Christian missionaries worked in many countries to supplement the colonial machinery which functioned to exploit the natives. Colonialism took many countries in its grip under the disguise of Christianity. Ronny always maintains his status as a part of the colonial force. Exercise of such force gradually produces a kind of resistance that comes from Aziz, who, imbued with the spirit of nationalism, snubs Fielding, "Down with the English anyway" (317). It appears that Forster's interest lies in the study of characters in association with cultural differences. But all his characters are not endowed with

sufficient force of resistance. Kipling, for his part, intentionally does not show any interest in the development of political consciousness in his characters and his Indian characters are even fond of taking up the strategy of mimicry. They are dedicated to the service of the Anglo-Indians.

But both Kipling and Forster exhibited a keen awareness of the insecurities which dogged colonial rule. Though Kipling believed that the Indians could not stand alone, he knew that the colonial power was not free from the inner and outer threats. In *Kim* the Secret Service apprehends insecurity of colonial rule. Similarly, in *A Passage to India* Forster portrayed the insecurity of the colonial exercise through the vagueness, vastness, sharpness and inscrutability of the Marabar caves that perplexed both Mrs. Moore and Adela Quested. "The Marabar caves in *A Passage to India* denote nothing but their own vacancy of meaning" (Boehmer 95). The incapacity to identify the disposition, epistemology and cultural traits of the Indians took the form of a sense of insecurity that haunted the colonial rulers.

Both *Kim* and *A Passage to India* tend to suggest that the Indians appear to lack the skills needed to rule themselves. Kim's ultimate return to the Great Game shows his loyalty to the authority of the colonizers. On the other hand, Aziz's spirit of nationalism only allows space for a faint hope of social interaction between the Indians and the Europeans. Kipling is never ready to compromise regarding the political right of the British colonizers to govern India and his imperialistic disposition makes him an enthusiastic propagandist of the British imperialism. On the other hand, Forster's delicate evasion of the political growth of the Indians makes the readers realize how he has maintained the superiority of the colonizers. Thus India in both the texts has been depicted as an entity of the binary oppositions of the West and the attitudes of Kipling and Forster towards the British and the Indians are based upon binary distinctions between 'Self' and 'Other'.

Works Cited

- Alam, Fakrul. "Imperial Entanglements and Literature in English." *Spectrum, DU Journal of the Department of English* 5.1 (2007): 1-18. Print.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. Print.
- Booker, M. Keith. *Colonial Power, Colonial Texts*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1997. Print.
- Bullock, Allan and Stephen Trombly, ed. *The Norton Dictionary of Modern Thought*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1999. Print.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Constance Farrington. London: Penguin Books, 2001. Print.
- - -. *Black Skin White Mask*. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove Press Inc., 1967. Print.
- Forster, E.M. *A Passage to India*. London: Penguin Books, 1965. Print.
- Hawley, John C., ed. *Encyclopedia of Postcolonial Studies*. London: Green Wood Press, 2001. Print.
- Hawthorn, Jeremy. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. London: Arnold, 2000. Print.
- Hemenway, Stephen Ignatius. *The Novel of India*. Calcutta: A Writers Workshop Publication. 1975. Print.
- Husain, Syed Sajjad. *Kipling and India*. Dacca: The University of Dacca, 1964. Print.
- Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*. New Delhi : Rupa Publishers, 2003. Print.
- Levine, Philippa. *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset*. Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Limited, 2007. Print.
- Mahood, M.M. *The Colonial Encounter: A Reading of Six Novels*. London: Rex Collings, 1977. Print.
- Paffard, Mark. *Kipling's Indian Fiction*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1989. Print.
- Roberts, P.E. *History of British India: Under the Company and the Crown*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967. Print.
- Smith, Martin-Seymour. *Rudyard Kipling*. London: Queen Anne Press, 1989. Print.