

REPUBLIC OF TURKIYE
THE UNIVERSITY OF YUZUNCU YIL
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

POST-GRADUATE THESIS

**ANGLO-INDIAN RECONCILIATION IN A *PASSAGE TO INDIA* AND *KIM*
AS COLONIAL NOVELS**

PREPARED BY
Yusuf ELİTAŞ

ADVISER
Assist. Prof. Dr. M. Ali ÇELİKEL

VAN-2006

CONTENTS.....	i
Acknowledgement.....	ii
Introduction.....	1
PART: I	
a) Colonialism.....	7
b) Imperialism.....	10
c) The Beginning of Colonial Literature.....	13
PART: II	
<i>KIM</i>	
a) The Period.....	15
b) The Ideas of Rudyard Kipling.....	15
c) Who is Kim?	20
PART: III	
<i>A PASSAGE TO INDIA</i>	
a) The Period.....	24
b) The Friendship between Fielding and Dr. Aziz.....	24
PART: IV	
Comparison of the Two books.....	30
Conclusion.....	46
Özet.....	50
Bibliography.....	51

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I really want to thank my supervisor M. Ali ÇELİKEL for his precious support in writing my thesis. I also want to thank him for everything he taught me.

I also want to thank my family for their encouragement to write this thesis. Without their support, I would not have completed my thesis.

INTRODUCTION

Rudyard Joseph Kipling was born in Bombay in 1865. In 1871 Kipling was brought home from India and spent five years with a foster family in Southsea. During the years he spent at the United Services Collage, a school for officers' children, he began writing poetry and *Schoolboy Lyrics*. These lyrics were published privately in 1881. In the following year he started to work as a journalist in India. While he was in India, he wrote stories, sketches and poems. He was acclaimed for his works by many people in England as Said states: 'While Kipling was in India, he produced a body of work, stories, sketches and poems which made him an instant literary celebrity when he returned to England in 1889.' (1). Later he wrote ballads and soldier poems.

In 1892 he married an American lady, Caroline Balestier, and from 1892 to 1896, they lived in Vermont. There, Kipling wrote *The Jungle Book*. In 1901, *Kim* and in 1902, *Just So Stories* were written by him. Historical and science fiction followed his works. But *Kim* is generally thought to be his greatest long work as stated by Said: 'One way of grasping what is unusual about Kipling's best work of fiction, *Kim*, is to recall briefly who his other great contemporaries were.'(37)

From 1902 Kipling made his home in Sussex, but he continued to travel. He had his first experience about war in South Africa and he wrote some reportage on the Boer War. He started writing in his early ages, therefore; he became rich and successful when he was young. However, anti-imperialists accused him of jingoism and love of violence and reject his views (Said: 2). Great War influenced him too much that he subsequently wrote *A Diversity of Creatures* (1917), *Debts and Credits* (1926) and *Limits and Renewals* (1932). The death of his only son in 1915 also contributed to a new inwardness of vision. Kipling was the first English writer that was awarded with the Nobel Prize in 1907. He died in 1936 and his autobiographical fragment *Something of Myself* was published the following year.

The period Kipling lived was the period of British Raj in India. India was a colony of Britain so Kipling is considered as a colonial writer. Another colonial writer, that is an important figure in British Literature, is E. M. Forster.

Edward Morgan Forster was born on January 1, 1879 in London. Forster's father died a year after Forster's birth. Forster was raised by his mother, Alice Whichelo. He lived with her until her death in 1945. His grandmother and his great aunt, help Forster's mother bringing him up. While reading *A Passage to India*, I realised that women are generally good characters. I think it is because in Forster's childhood women had a good influence on him.

Forster was educated at the Tonbridge School in Kent but he did not like it. Later in 1897, Forster began his studies at King's College, Cambridge. Forster travelled in the Mediterranean in 1901 and 1902. In 1903, his friends from Cambridge founded a newspaper called *The Independent Review* and Forster began to contribute to this publication.

In 1912, Forster made his first trip to India. His trip lasted six months. In India, he visited a Muslim friend whom he met in England as well as a friend from Cambridge. Forster was impressed by India, especially because of his friend as he states: 'Until I met him, India was a vague jumble of rajahs, sahibs, babus, and elephants, and I was not interested in such a jumble; who could be? He made everything real and exciting as soon as he began to talk' (Stallybrass: 7). Presumably, Dr. Aziz in *A Passage to India* is a reflection of Forster's love for his friend.

During the First World War, Forster spent most of his time in Egypt as a search officer for the Red Cross. In 1921, Forster revisited India and served for six months as the private secretary to the maharajah of Dewas Senior. After this trip, he wrote the final half of the novel. *A Passage to India* was the last piece of fiction that Forster wrote. Afterwards, Forster published a documentary account of his trip to India and guides to Alexandria. Queen Elizabeth II awarded Forster with membership in the Order of Companions of Honour in 1953, and on January 1, 1969 he received the Order of Merit. He died on June 7, 1970 in Coventry.

Both Kipling and Forster were colonial writers and they were interested in India. I also became interested in India particularly during the courses about colonization in my post graduate education. Therefore, I decided to write something about colonization in my thesis and after reading about some writers I found myself

searching for colonial and post-colonial examples. Kipling and Forster are two writers between whom I found a lot of similarities. For example; they are both colonial writers as mentioned before. They love India and each has a novel set in India; *Kim* by Kipling and *A Passage to India* by Forster are the novels of this kind.

Kim, a young Irish boy living in Lahore, India, decides to accompany a Tibetan lama on his search for the River. Lama believes that the River washes all sins. Kim protects the lama along the difficult road to the River. They meet the peoples of various races, castes, and religions that reflect India's complex culture and history. Kim's abilities also inspire Mahbub Ali, an Afghani horse-dealer. Mahbub Ali asks him to deliver a coded message to the spymaster Colonel Creighton. Mahbub Ali persuades Kim to help the British in their Great Game against the Russians for control of the northwest territory of India.

When Kim is discovered by an Irish regiment and nearly sent to an orphanage for soldiers' children, the lama and Creighton intervene to send him to St. Xavier's school instead, because they want Kim to train in mathematics, map-making, and other skills of the Great Game along with a classical education. Kim visits Lurgan Sahib for memory training and evaluation of his potential. Later Kim has journeys with the Bengali Hurree Babu to steal survey information from two Russian spies in the hills of Tibet border.

When Kim has difficulties because of hard weather conditions an elderly Sahiba treats him with traditional remedies. Kim is uncertain whether to follow the lama's vision of paradise or to join the Great Game for good. The lama, having discovered the River, invites Kim to bathe in the River as well, to attain freedom from all worldly cares, although Mahbub waits for Kim to accompany him on another expedition for the State. The novel ends without Kim's reply.

The story of *A Passage to India* is set in Chandrapore, a city that is part of the British Raj, consisting of three parts; Mosque, Caves, and Temple.

Aziz is a poor doctor who has lived under British command, but has grown more frustrated with their treatment of him and his fellow Indians. He and his friends discuss the English and complain that the English have changed in attitude over the

years and have become more intolerant and cold. The British officials in Chandrapore run a club to which Indians are not admitted. The English try to avoid any intimate friendships or relations with the natives. Mrs. Moore, Ronny's mother, and Adela Quested, Rooney's fiancée, come over from England to visit Ronny Heaslop, City Magistrate. One night, Mrs. Moore meets Dr. Aziz in a Mosque in the moonlight. They are at first startled by each other, but after a little talk they become friends. Mrs. Moore and Adela wish to see the real India and befriend Indians. Mr. Fielding, the Principal of the Government College, invites Adela and Mrs. Moore to his home for tea. He also invites Dr. Aziz, who he recently met and liked instantly, and his Hindu colleague Professor Godbole. Fielding's tea party is very friendly and comfortable. Aziz feels comfortable and invites the women on an excursion to the caves at Marabar.

Aziz gets to the train station especially early so nothing will go wrong with the trip. Mrs. Moore and Adela arrive on time, but Fielding and Godbole have not yet arrived. Aziz is nervous because he does not want to be left alone with the women as he thinks any trouble may arise. Ronny also disapproves of the women being left alone. He sends a servant to follow the women to make sure that they are not left alone with Dr Aziz. But Fielding and Godbole arrive too late so they miss the train and Aziz is left to travel alone with Mrs. Moore and Adela.

At the caves, the weather is hot. The entrances and exits of the caves are similar and the echo of the sounds in the caves is frightening. While Mrs. Moore is in the cave, which is completely dark, she feels that something touches her. But she is worried by the sound of the echo, which takes over her thoughts. She decides to rest after her experience and let Adela and Aziz continue to explore other caves.

Adela becomes preoccupied with her engagement to Ronny and realizes she does not love him. Before she enters the cave, she asks Aziz about his wife and love. Adela and Aziz lost each other in the cave as it was dark. As she has presumably been assaulted by someone in the cave, Adela has run out of it in tears and gets on a car. Aziz cannot find Adela and when he gets out of the cave he hears a car and later assumes that Miss Derek, Adela's friend, picked up Adela. Fielding joins Aziz and Mrs. Moore lately and after a while they get in the train back to Chandrapore. When

the train arrives at the station, Aziz is arrested for charges of something that he does not know and at that moment Fielding promises to defend Aziz. When he is taken to jail Aziz understands that he is accused of making improper treatment to Adela in the caves. Fielding believes that Adela was having hallucinations in the caves.

As the trial approaches, Mrs. Moore's interest in anyone or anything lessens. While Adela seeks her support; Mrs. Moore wants nothing to do with her or anyone else. Adela is afraid of the echoes from the caves, and when she realizes that Aziz is innocent, the echoes go away. She tells Ronny about her doubts of Aziz's guilt and Mrs. Moore backs them up, but Ronny encourages her to go on with the trial and continue to press charges. Mrs. Moore, with the support and encouragement of her son, leaves Chandrapore for Britain before the trial but she dies because of the endurable heat on the ship. At the trial, Adela continues to hear echoes. The courtroom becomes charged with emotion. Indians in the courthouse begin to call for Mrs. Moore to clear the name of Aziz. When Adela is called to the witness box, Mr. McBryde presses her until finally she admits that she is not sure if Aziz is really guilty. The judge drops the charges and all of the Indians in Chandrapore celebrate Aziz's victory. Adela walks the streets in a terrible position and Fielding takes her to his office for her safety.

Aziz becomes jealous while Adela and Fielding spend time together. Fielding is sorry for her since her engagement has been broken and she tells the truth. He asks Aziz not to collect money from Adela for damages. Rumours begin to spread that he and Adela are having an affair. Fielding denies the rumour, but in the back of his mind, Aziz believes the rumours are true and thinks Fielding will marry Adela for her money. After the trial, Aziz wants nothing to do with Adela and begins to write poetry about the motherland and the nation. He decides to move out of the Raj to a free Indian state. Fielding and Adela return to England.

Two years have passed and Aziz and Godbole now live in Mau, an independent Hindu state. Godbole is the Minister of Education and Aziz has a clinic in town. The town is celebrating the arrival of a new God and is filled with singing and dancing in the streets. Godbole receives a note that Fielding and his new wife

will visit him. He tells Aziz but he refuses to see them. Aziz has ignored all of Fielding's letters and postcards over the years and assumed that he has married Adela in London. Aziz runs into Fielding and his new brother-in-law, Ralph, by accident, when he goes out to attend to Ralph's bee sting. Aziz treats Fielding coldly. Fielding asks why Aziz never replied to his letters. Finally, Aziz realizes that Fielding did not marry Adela, but Mrs. Moore's daughter, Stella. Adela introduced them in London. Aziz continues to behave coldly and says he wants nothing to do with the British. Later on, Aziz checks up on Ralph's bee sting and continues to be cold. But this coldness does not continue too much and Aziz and Fielding become friends again. Aziz gives Fielding a letter to deliver to Adela. In this letter Aziz writes that he forgives Adela for her charges against him. He has left the past behind him. As Fielding and Aziz say their final good-byes, their horses pull them away from each other and they know they will never see each other again.

The aim of this thesis is to discuss the Anglo-Indian reconciliation in *Kim* and *A Passage to India*. As these two novels are colonial works, imperialism, colonization itself and history of colonization are needed to be conveyed.

This thesis consists of four parts. In the first part, colonialism and imperialism will be defined and information about the beginning of Colonial Literature will be given. In the second part, the period of *Kim* and Ideas of Kipling will be mentioned and then the question 'Who is Kim?' will be discussed. In the third part, the period of *A Passage to India* and Aziz – Fielding's friendship will be revealed. And in the fourth part, *Kim* and *A Passage to India* will be compared and at the end of this comparison, Anglo- Indian irreconciliation will be debated.

PART: I

A) COLONIALISM:

As the root of colonialism, it will be helpful to explain the meanings of colony and colonial. Colony is to govern other countries or nations and force them to obey the rules of the colonizing country. Colonial is anything that belongs to or about the colony. Here it is not important to be the governor or governed to be colonial, both colonizer and colonized are regarded as colonials. Webster's New World Dictionary (1988) defines colonialism as the system or policy by which a country maintains foreign colonies; especially, in order to exploit them economically.

Colonialism in literature supports colonization. There have been many colonizing countries and, as a result of this, many colonized countries. When we have a glance at the history of the world, we can easily see that most of the colonizing countries are European countries such as England, Spain, Netherlands, and France. Several African countries, Algeria, Kenya, Somalia and South Asian countries, India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are the main colonized countries. As may well be noticed, there are major differences between the colonizers and the colonized countries as being in different periods. P. Childs and R. J. P. Williams state that:

Post- Colonialism may then refer in part to the period after colonialism, but the question arise: after whose colonialism? after the end of which colonial empire? Isn't it unacceptably Anglocentric or Euro-centric to be foregrounding the mid-twentieth century and the end particularly of the British and French empires? What about, for example, early nineteenth-century Latin America and the end of Spanish and Portuguese control? or the late eighteenth century and the independence of the United States of America? Clearly, there has not been just one period of colonialism in the history of the world. (1)

The British colonized India and claimed that they took civilization to India and enabled Indians to have a better life. In fact, they forced Indians to act how the

British people -especially governors- wanted; but on the other hand, they built their own cafes, bars, restaurants, and did not want Indians to enter those places to spend time with the British. In short, they created a small Britain in India -together with Indians but far from them-. But later when they left India, they made sure to leave British governors or the Indians who would support Britain and the British in nearly all parts of India.

As we express the meaning of colonialism, a question may come up: why the civilized countries have colonized the underdeveloped countries? Of course the colonizing countries have rights from their point of view. When we have a glance at history we obviously notice that all the Governments or Presidents say that they have a right to go- conquer, colonize in other words- to other countries. The Muslims say they conquer because it is the order of God to disseminate their religion. Colonizers claim that they enlighten the colonies and take technology to these countries. They may justify themselves but it is just the opposite from the perspective of the colonized. The British people think that they take civilization to their colonies, and with the help of colonizers, the underdeveloped countries have a better life. The other colonizers also have similar ideas to have rights on their side.

Unlike the colonizers, the colonized countries think that the colonizers exploit them and steal their sources and never do anything in favour of the colonized countries.

As mentioned before, there have been many different colonial implications, but I am going to set up British colonialism in India as the main theme of my thesis. When the positions of the colonizers and colonized countries are considered one will clearly understand that most of the ideas put forth by the colonizers to prove themselves right are not credible. The results always reflect the purpose.

Here is some information to clear up that the colonizers do everything for their nations, governments, countries, citizens, but not for the colonized countries.

An annual income per capita in India is around 150 dollars but in England a person earns above this level in a week. Literacy in British India in 1911 was only six percent, and by 1947 it had increased to eleven percent that is unfathomable. (Mishra and Hodge: 409)

It is undoubtedly true that the British built modern cities with modern conveniences for their administrative officers. But it should be noted that these were exclusive zones not intended for the natives to enjoy.

As the income differences between the colonizers and the colonized people are taken into consideration, questions occur in our mind: How could the colonizers continue their presence in their colonies for a long time? Were they the success of colonizers or failure of the colonized people? In my opinion, at least for British colonization in India, it was the Indians' fault to be colonized for almost two centuries. My opinion is justified by Gandhi, the leader of the independence movement in India:

The English have not taken India: we have given it to them. They are not in India because of their strength but because we keep them. (P. Childs and R. J. P. Williams, 33)

To sum up, nobody admits doing wrong. Therefore so many unjustifiable practises have been attempted and perhaps will continue to be so; but history provides unbiased information so we should take up the results to understand it and claim something about it. Additionally; all the numerical data about Britain and India represent the idea that the British-and also the other colonizers- have colonized the countries in their favour but not for the colonized countries; and the colonized countries are right to mention how much they suffer under the colonial rule.

B) IMPERIALISM:

Another term that always goes along with colonialism is Imperialism. Oxford Advanced Genie Dictionary defines imperialism as a system in which one country controls other countries, often after defeating them in a war. It also defines imperialism as the fact of a powerful country increasing its influence over other countries through cultural and financial means.

Imperialism is as old as mankind. When we have a glance at history we see that there are a lot of Empires such as Persian Empire and Roman Empire. The first definition of imperialism by OGD is suitable for these Empires because these Empires had wars with other countries and controlled the countries they defeat.

But with the emergence of modern-nation state and the age of exploration and discovery, imperialism became the modern type of empire. To clarify; we know that after French Revolution the idea of nationalism spread most parts of the world and many Empires turned into national states. As a result of the changes in style of governing countries, the types of empire also changed. Instead of conquering or besieging underdeveloped countries, Imperialists started setting offices of their companies in their colonies and selling their products to colonized people.

As mentioned before; the imperialism has existed since the existence of human being although there have been some changes in it; if that is so, then why has imperialism existed; and why do some countries compete with each other to gain colonies in, especially, the underdeveloped countries?

There are several reasons why some nations-especially European countries-competed with each other to gain colonies in other countries. They all wanted to gain power and prestige. The more territory they were able to control in these countries the more powerful and important they thought they could become. The countries under Imperialism were tremendously rich in natural resources, which could be taken to Imperialist countries and turned into manufactured goods. Imperialists also needed markets for their manufactured goods. These goods could be sold in countries under imperialism for large profits.

Gandhi, who analyzes imperialism as a system of never-ending commercial expansion and demand for colonies as sources of both raw material and potential consumers:

The English entered India for the purposes of trade. They remain in it for the same purpose...They wish to convert the whole world into a vast market for their goods that they cannot do so is true, but the blame will be not theirs. They will leave no stone unturned to reach the goal. (Childs and Williams, 33)

It is widely known that poor countries are poor because their lands have always been infertile or their people unproductive. In fact, the lands of India, for example, have long produced great treasures of food, minerals and other natural resources. That is why; Britain went through all the trouble to steal and plunder them. One does not go to poor places for self-enrichment. India is rich. Only its people are poor--and it is because of the pillage they have endured.

Imperialism continues its presence now and will probably continue in future. But imperialism is not the same as in the past, because it is changeable, as mentioned before.

Another different definition of imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism. This definition was made by Lenin. His ideas of imperialism had great effects on many people as it is revealed by Boehmer as:

One of the best known early critiques of empire as economic explorations is V.I Lenin's *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (1917), in which attributed expansion to late capitalist accumulation. (37)

To clarify, today imperialist countries do not need to settle any colonies or govern the countries they want to colonize. They just built their factories and offices. Natives work in these factories and the imperialist countries gain most of the profit. Furthermore some imperialist countries earn a lot of money without building factories or such things. They just give franchise to some natives and these franchises become the source of the imperialist countries' income.

For example; the Coca Cola Company is known as one of the biggest, probably the biggest, companies in the world. This company is known in nearly all parts of world and its products are used by most of the people on earth. This situation is also valid in Turkey. What is strange about it is: we built the factories, produce the products of this company, we distribute these products but most of the income is taken by the company. Imagine the amount of money the company gain without great effort.

It is, of course, impossible to define Imperialism as a period that differs from the one in another period; but when each period is considered it could easily be understood that the main aim of imperialists is to provide a better life for their own citizens and during this struggle, they harm millions of people in colonized countries. The most significant point of the relation between the Colonizer and the Colonized is that the Colonizers claim to be right and say that they help the colonized people. That is why; the colonizers always have answers for their dehumanization policy even though their answers seem illogical.

Although it is obvious that the colonizers do nothing for the benefits of colonized countries but for the welfare of their own citizens, a great number of the colonized people still support the colonizers. It is a fact that the Colonizers have an intelligent policy on their colonies. However colonized people should not trust the colonialists any more to have a better condition in the world.

C) THE BEGINNING OF COLONIAL LITERATURE:

As explained before, there have been many different colonizers and colonized countries since the beginning of history; and of course these colonizations have taken place in different periods of history. As a result of this there have also been many different colonial eras. It is obvious that there has always been a relationship between historical events and literature of a country; therefore, all colonized and colonizing countries have the influence of colonization in their literature.

Colonial literature is a general term. As explained before, colonial is anything that belongs to or about the colony so colonial literature involves both colonialist literature that support colonization and postcolonialist literature that is against colonization.

The period and literature about which I am going to mention is the British Colonization and the British Colonial Literature as the main subject of my thesis.

It has taken centuries for British Empire to establish itself as a long standing country after successful expansion policies. The expansion continued basically by trade, settlement and conquest. Its territories were scattered across every continent and ocean, and it was described with the infamous saying "the empire on which the sun never sets".

The starting point of being an Empire for Britain is the conquest of the Wales, Ireland and later Scotland. As the British became stronger they wanted to govern more places than they did at that time so they settled colonies in South America in, later, Australia and New Zealand.

After America's Independence, the British Empire lost its reputation and many financial sources. On the other hand; France and Netherlands that were regarded as the rivals of Britain had colonies in Asia which was a great financial source for them. Noticing the importance of this region, Britain started a new policy in order to have reputation and power in South Asia as much as it could get. Britain

established its first Spice Company in Bombay, an important city in East India, and in a short time many different companies established offices there.

As literature is affected by history, there have been many works by a lot of literary figures in British colonial period. *Kim* by Rudyard Kipling and *A Passage to India* by E.M. Foster are two colonial novels on which I am going to discuss the Anglo-Indian reconciliation.

PART: II

KIM

A) The Period:

Set in India during British Raj, Rudyard Kipling's most prominent novel *Kim* was published in 1901. As he was born in India and brought up by a native child minder, Kipling knew a great deal of Indian culture. He was sent to England for education and returned to India in 1882 when he began to write articles and hold interviews. He therefore had many experiences about colonial life. As he reflected these experiences in his stories, poems and other literary works, he has been known as a colonial literary figure.

Kim was one of his magnificent works in which Kipling reflects his admiration for India. Kipling wrote this novel in his 30s. As he began writing at a very young age, he was already an experienced writer by the time he wrote *Kim*.

In that Period, India was under the British Raj, as mentioned before, and *Kim* is set in India. Therefore, the reflection of colonization can clearly be noticed in the book.

B) The Ideas of Rudyard Kipling:

Kipling's feelings and ideas about India are open to debate. On one hand, some critics such as Benita Perry, Zohren Sullivan, John McClure and Edward Said say that Kipling supported the British colonization in India as Peter Childs quotes:

The ending of the book, in which Kim decides to continue in Great Game, has led critics such as Benita Perry, Zohren Sullivan, John McClure and Edward Said to conclude that Kipling is more clearly pro-Imperial in his novel than he was in his earlier, frequently subversive short stories.(238)

On the other, in many of his works, especially *Kim*, he seems to be a person that can never be a colonialist. He loves India and celebrates the permanence of India as Teresa Hubel states:

The reality of India is bigger than the reality of the West; therefore, the relationship between India and Britain is impermanent. In Kipling's eyes, India will remain long after the British are gone. (; 3-19)

Despite loving India, Kipling despises it when he makes a contrast between India and Britain. So Kim is not characterized as British completely but an in-between character just to point out that Kim is comfortable in India. Michael Gora observes this situation with the quotation below:

Through Kim's identity, Kipling suggests that one must not know England to be comfortable in India. Kim's Englishness remains tenuous throughout the novel, and this very Englishness makes him at home in India in a way that no Indian can be. (631-57)

Rudyard Kipling was known as a pro-imperialist figure in literature. Although he was an Imperial intellectual, he did not write from the metropolitan centre as he lived in India for a long time, a subcontinent by which he was affected a lot. Nevertheless, his fiction is still Euro-centric. He did not avoid declaring European right to colonize because of their civilized status and desires its continuity. He was never in favour of Indian independence although he admired and loved the subcontinent and the orient. Edward Said explains how important India was in Kipling's life and states that: 'Kipling not only wrote about India, he was of it. (Said: 8)

He was born in India, brought up by a native child-minder, spoke native language in his childhood, and thus he was both a native and a sahib.

In his works, Kipling mentioned about the superiority of the colonialists, and certainly to be able to talk about one's superiority there should be the inferiority of another one.

Kipling makes clear the superiority of the ruling colonial class and the inferiority of the natives in *Kim*, too. For example:

Kim can 'lie like an Oriental. (*Kim*, 71) or Kim can sleep as the train roars because the Oriental is indifferent to 'mere noise. (*Said*: 29)

The quotation from *Kim* below reflects the idea of Kipling who thinks in favour British colonization in India and makes the superiority of the ruling class clear in India:

'No,' said Kim 'Thy man is rather yagi (bad- tempered) than yogi (a holy man). But this Priest is new. The Sahib in the Wonder House has talked to him like a brother. O my mother; fill me this bowl. He waits.' (61)

Here, when Kim wants a woman to give him some food for the lama, she refuses; but Kim expresses that the Sahib talks to the lama as a friend in Wonder House and the woman fills the bowl up with food. Here it shows us how the sahibs have importance in India.

In addition, in *Kim*, Kipling points out that the natives are not trustworthy. When Kim says to Mahbub Ali that he is hungry and wants some food Mahbub Ali says to Kim:

'Beg from my men among the horses, I say. There must be some Hindus in my tail.'

'Oh Mahbub Ali, But Am I a Hindu?' said Kim in English. (67)

The quotation above clarifies that if natives speak you are not sure if they are right or not. Therefore Kim asks Mahbub Ali to believe him because Kim feels as a sahib not a Hindu.

Furthermore, Kipling describes Kim's relation with Mahbub Ali as a culturally intimate one. Kim is the only person Mahbub Ali trusts, because he believes Kim never lies to him:

Kim was the only soul in the world who had never told him a lie. That would have been a fatal blot on Kim's character if Mahbub had not known that to others, for his own ends or Mahbub's business, Kim could lie like an oriental. (71)

Although Kim has an Irish descent, he is described to be more close to a native. Kipling's narration here is distinctively from the 'white' perspective, since Kim's ability to lie is indicated as the characteristic of an oriental. Namely, Kipling wants to make clear the inferiority of natives.

The main idea, however, is that, Kipling wants to convey Kim's ambivalence. The identity of Kim is the rejection of both perceptions of inferiority and superiority. He has an identity of a sahib and a native, and he acts as a perfect in-between character for both cultures. Kim is white and native, and this hybridity gives him the ability to behave like a native. While he works for the colonial regiment and justifies and protects the British holdings.

Kim's identity drawn out by Kipling makes the idea of ambivalence more clear. For example; Kim is always left fluctuating between the identities he has adopted. Despite the ambiguity in his identity, and the ambivalence produced by Kipling as to whether Kim is a sahib or a native, Kim is desperate for his identity, and has affection for his father's regiment and his belongings. When the sahibs catch him with the documents that had belonged to his father, he tries to prove his identity as a sahib:

'. . . How long have you had these things, boy?'

'Ever since I was a little baby.'

Father Victor stepped forward quickly and opened the front of Kim's upper garment. 'You see, Bennett, he's not very black. What's your name?'

'Kim.'

'Or Kimball?'

'Perhaps. Will you let me go away?'

'What else?'

'They call me Kim Rishti ke. That is Kim of the Rishti.'

'What is that – "Rishti"?'

‘Eye-rishti – that was the regiment – my father’s.’
‘Irish – oh, I see.’
‘Yess. That was how my father told me. My father, he has lived.’
‘Has lived where?’
‘Has lived. Of course he is dead – gone-out.’ (134)

In many scenes of the novel, it is pointed out that he is the son of a sahib, which does not rescue Kim from suffering from the problems of identity. Indeed, he does not always feel like a sahib. After he is found by the sahibs he presents himself as Irish and the English people decide to take him to Masonic Orphanage assuming that it would not be proper for an English boy to live among the natives. When he is asked by the Englishman Bennett to translate whatever he said to the lama, Kim cannot make the lama believe in this fact, as he is nothing but a native boy to the other natives:

Holy One, the thin fool who looks like a camel says that I am the son of a Sahib.’

‘But how?’

‘Oh, it is true. I knew it since my birth, but he could only find out by rending the amulet from my neck and reading all the papers. He thinks that once a Sahib is always a Sahib, and between the two of them they purpose to keep me in this Regiment or to send me to a madrissah [a school]. It has happened before. I have always avoided it . . .’ (136-137)

When the sahibs want to take him to an orphanage, he does not want to leave. Although he takes advantage of having white roots, he takes indulgence in living like a native boy who has all the abilities that Kipling associates with being an Oriental. His reaction to the white people seen in his translation to the lama, is actually his ambiguity, as he has a multiple identity. He feels neither English nor Irish. However, having white roots gives him the privilege from the colonizer’s perspective. In the same manner, having been raised as a native boy gives him even more power and privilege. He satisfies both his colonizers and his fellow colonized people’s needs by being both of them.

In the climax of the novel, Kim continues questioning his identity. His white roots do not help him resolve the contradictions in his belief system:

‘What am I? Mussalman, Hindu, Jain, or Buddhist? That is a hard knot.’ (191).

The famous question of the novel remains a hard knot throughout the novel: ‘Who is Kim – Kim – Kim?’ (233).

This is a result of hybridizations produced by Kipling in cultural terms. As Kim has no stable identity he has no stable culture, either. On one hand, he acts as a native, for example; he can lie easily, and sleep in any uncomfortable conditions on the other, he acts as a sahib when he needs:

Kim flung himself whole-heartedly upon the next turn of the wheel. He would be a sahib again for a while. (196)

Kim’s hybridity is, however, not only in terms of culture and identity. Kim is hybrid in terms of the colour of his skin, too.

Kipling’s ambivalence remains in tact even at the end of the novel:

‘I am Kim – Kim – Kim – alone – one – person.’ (273)

‘I am Kim, I am Kim. And what is Kim?’ (331)

C) Who Is Kim?

Kim is the symbol of Kipling’s indecisiveness between the East and the West. Kim both possesses the land as a sahib and is possessed by the British as a native.

As mentioned before, Kipling thinks in favour of imperialism in his works except *Kim*. Ambivalence is the main theme in *Kim*. The identity of Kim is the rejection of the perceptions of inferiority and superiority, because he has an identity of a sahib and a native. He speaks English, but he thinks in Urdu. The opening paragraph of the novel is a reflection of his hybridity:

He sat, in defiance of municipal orders, astride the gun Zam-Zammah on her brick platform opposite the old Ajaib-Gher – the Wonder house, as the

natives call the Lahore Museum. Who hold Zam-Zammah, that 'fire-breathing dragon', hold the Punjab, for the great green-bronze piece is always first of the conqueror's loot. (*Kim*, 49)

Here, I want to reveal that as a result of ambivalence there is irreconciliation between the people in *Kim*. Kim's unstable identity does not let him reconcile with either colonizers or colonized people. For example; he is not regarded as a sahib because he has a burnt skin. He is treated as a native. After he is found by the soldiers of the Irish regiment, Kim is considered as a sahib, but Kim does not feel as a sahib completely. It is because Kipling wants to create a character to point out his ambivalent idea to the readers.

In most parts of *Kim*, the local language is used within the English text. They not only represent Kim's hybridity but also Kipling's ambiguity, because he was of India. He was born there and 'during the first years of his life spoke Hindustani, and was very much like Kim, a sahib in native clothes.' (Said: 8)

Kipling is under the influence of both languages. One is his mother tongue, and the other, Hindustani, is almost his first language. Therefore, unlike in the nineteenth century colonialist texts where the natives are the marginal to be identified and tamed, the native culture comes to the centre in Kipling's fiction despite being classified as the colonialist fiction.

In the course of the novel, Kim keeps questioning his own identity:

'Oh, Mahbub Ali, but am *I* a Hindu? said Kim in English.

The trader gave no sign of astonishment, but looked under shaggy eyebrows. (67)

The cultural collage here is what can perfectly be observed after the independence in post colonialist fiction where there are inevitable hybrid characters. As we know, Kim is an Irish descent, but tries to find out whether or not he is Hindu. The fact that he may be a Hindu as well as Irish is already unparadigmatic. However, Kim asks this question in English although he speaks Hindustani as his first language. This is because Kipling wants to show us his ambivalence here.

Apart from the language he speaks, and his identity problem caused by being both native and sahib, and Kim's relations with India and the British Empire are of interest indeed. Kipling describes Kim's relation with Mahbub Ali as a culturally intimate one. Kim is the only person Mahbub Ali trusts, because he believes that Kim never lies to him:

Kim was the only soul in the world who had never told him a lie. That would have been a fatal blot on Kim's character if Mahbub had not known that to others, for his own ends or Mahbub's business, Kim could lie like an oriental. (71)

Kim is originally Irish but he is described as a native more than an Irish. Kipling's thinks in the 'white' perspective here, since Kim's ability to lie is pointed out as the characteristic of an oriental. An imperial distrust in the natives is presented here. However, Kim is ambiguous. He is in-between his white employers and his native protectors.

Although *Kim* is one of the few colonialist novels that shows cultural surprise mutually between the British and the Indian people Kipling's ambivalence remains in tact throughout the novel. Kipling does not affirm the Indian Independence in any part of the novel but he also has no idea against it. This situation is clarified in Sara Suleri's argument:

Kipling's ambivalence remains throughout the novel. Although nowhere in his text do we see him affirming the legitimacy of Indian independence, in Kim's identity, we are to observe a manifestation of 'illegitimacy of possession' (251)

Kim's identity inside his native appearance causes inevitable cultural clashes when he comes together with other natives to serve the British purposes. But the Indians and the British are not the only ones that the cultural clashes are attributed to. When lama wants to pay for Kim's education, Kim interprets lama's words:

'Do they give or sell learning among the Sahibs? Ask them,' said the lama, and Kim interpreted . . .

'And – the more money is paid the better learning is given?' The lama disregarded Kim's plans for an early. 'It is no wrong to pay for learning. To

help the ignorant to wisdom is always a merit.' The rosary clicked furiously as an abacus. Then he faced his oppressors.

'Ask them for how much money do they give a wise and suitable teaching? And which city is that teaching given?' (142)

Here, Kipling intentionally made unclear the type and level of education, which Kim is going to get, throughout the novel and this reveals Kipling's ambivalence in the novel. As many questions in the novel, this one is left open, too.

Before coming to conclusion, I want to add an interesting coincidence which helps us to show the ambivalence in *Kim*:

We know that the main character in *Kim* is Kimball; but in the novel he is called Kim shortly. In my native language, Turkish, Kim means who.

The word 'who' expresses that we have no information about the person we are talking about; and if we do not know anything about someone we cannot identify them so we are impartial about the person we are talking about. Namely, ambivalence occurs in this condition.

As mentioned before, Kim always questions his identity and asks himself 'Who am I?' and then he himself answers: I am Kim.

Here we may make a relation between Kipling's main idea and the answer 'I am Kim' because Kim is a representation of British people in India and Kipling does not explain whether Kim likes being British or Indian most.

Coincidental but a good example to show the ambivalence in *Kim* is this fortuitous event.

To explain who Kim is, in short, he is neither the representation of the colonizers nor of the colonized people but of ambivalence, and this is the main idea in *Kim* given by Kipling.

PART: III

A PASSAGE TO INDIA

A) The Period:

E. M. Forster is one of the most important figures in British Literature in the first decades of twentieth century. After graduating from King's college in Cambridge he lived in Italy for a while and during that period wrote *Where Angels Fear to Tread* and *Room with a View*. These two novels reflect the relationship between the Mediterranean culture and the serious-minded heroes in English novels.

E.M. Forster reflects his experiences during his travels in his novels and so *A Passage to India*. It is considered to be his most famous work and it was written by him after his two visits to India in 1911 and 1921. We know that the time Forster travelled to India was the period that India was under the British Raj; that is why, the theme of *A Passage to India* recounts the colonization of Britain in India. In this novel he tells that it is impossible to have a real and friendly relationship between the colonizer England and colonized India.

B) The Friendship between Fielding and Dr. Aziz:

The friendship between Dr. Aziz and Fielding can be examined in two different phases; before and after Dr. Aziz's arrest: These two periods are completely different, at least for Dr. Aziz. The quotations below make it clear:

.....Anything wrong?'
'I have stamped on my last collar-stud.'
'Take mine, take mine.'
'Have you a spare one?'
'Yes, yes, one minute.'
'Not if you are wearing yourself.'
'No, no, one in my pocket.' (*A Passage to India*, 75)
'Many thanks.'(76-77)

This is a dialogue between Dr. Aziz and Fielding and we easily notice how sincere they are to each other.

Here I want to clear up why Aziz wants to give more importance to Fielding. Aziz, contrary to other Indians, believes that Indians can befriend the British. Therefore; he is accused of coming closer to the British by his friends such as Mahmoud Ali. Aziz also wants to be accepted as a friend by Fielding, so by the British in India. Aziz thinks that it is important to be accepted by the British because Indians are not trusted by the British as stated in the novel:

‘...Natives don’t respect one any the more after meeting one, you see.’
‘That occurs after so many meetings.’(44)

Additionally, Aziz thinks that if he befriends Fielding, he himself will have a better respect among the Indians. That is because Indians envy the British in India and Indians tells each other with proud if they have any relationship with the British. For example; when Aziz and his friends talk Aziz says:

‘He (Turton) has shown me his stamp collection.’
‘We all admire them.’ answers Mahmoud Ali. (32)

From the above quotation, we understand that Aziz thinks it is a great gesture of Turton to show Aziz his stamp collection, but indeed, showing a stamp collection to a friend is an ordinary thing, not a gesture. But Aziz tells it with proud.

But after the trip to the Marabar Caves and Dr. Aziz’s arrest, Dr. Aziz completely changes his ideas about the English People. That is why, the friendship between Fielding and Dr. Aziz is not intimate anymore. Towards the end of the novel, when Dr. Aziz and Fielding come across and talk about Indians’ future:

‘Who do you want instead of English? The Japanese?’ jeered Fielding, drawing rein.
‘No, the Afghans. My own ancestors.’
‘Oh, your Hindu friends will like that, Won’t they?’
‘It will be arranged- a conference of oriental statesman.’

‘It will indeed be arranged.’

.....

‘India shall be a nation! No foreigners of any sort! Hindu and Moslem and Sikh and all shall be one! Hurrah! Hurrah! For India! Hurrah! Hurrah!’

‘India a nation! What an apotheosis! (289)

It seems like two foreign people speak with no sign of friendship in their conversation. As we know Fielding is British and Dr. Aziz is a native Indian. So the friendship between these two characters may be considered as the reconciliation of the British and India, the colonizer and the colonised people in other words. But despite their friendship there is not a complete agreement between these two characters as revealed in the above quotation. There is no reconciliation but irreconciliation between the people in *A Passage to India*. That is why; we can say that there is not reconciliation between the British and the Indians.

Forster creates characters such as Fielding and Aziz to show his ambivalent idea and as a result of this idea we clearly see irreconciliation in the novel. For example; there is agreement between the officers of Britain in India such as Turtons and Dereks. These two families have the same idea about Indians and so do the other families. But Fielding, despite being one of the officers, does not think like these families. So there is an irreconciliation between Fielding and British families. There is a similar relationship between Aziz and Indian families. When Aziz says that it is possible to befriend English people, other Indians such as Hamidullah and Mahmoud Ali do not think as Aziz. So Aziz’s attitudes towards British people create irreconciliation between Aziz and Indians.

Forster forms these two characters, Fielding and Dr. Aziz, to help him convey his main idea to the readers. What is it? It is, especially after Dr. Aziz’s arrest, the idea that the Indians and the British can come closer but can never be real friends.

The friendship of Dr. Aziz and Fielding is the reflection of the relationship between the British and Indians, in other words the colonizers and the colonized people. To make it clear here is an example from *A Passage to India*.

.....-they were discussing as to whether or not it is possible to be friends with an Englishman. (31)

Here the Indians are talking among themselves and while Dr. Aziz thinks that it is possible to befriend the Englishmen due to his friendship with Fielding, other Indians are against Dr. Aziz and claim that an Englishman can never be a real friend. So here the friendship between Dr. Aziz and Fielding teaches us what the Indians think about the British. In the same way; Mr. and Mrs. Turton, Ronny,- city magistrate- do not approve Fielding's close friendship with the Indians.

At the party when English people chat among themselves, they see Fielding, and Adela wonders who he is and finds out about him. After a while, as Adela insists on seeing the natives Mrs. Turton comments on this situation and says:

'India does wonders for the judgement, especially during the Hot Weather; it has even done wonders for Fielding.' Mrs Turton closed her eyes at this name and remarked that Mr. Fielding was not pukka, and had better marry Miss Quested for she was not pukka. (45)

By these words we understand what the English people think about Fielding, a mistaken person, in English people's view, as he befriends Indians.

However, as mentioned before, Forster's *A Passage to India* is different from his other works. Although some of Forster's colonialist ideas are seen in *A Passage to India*, ambivalence is the main theme in the novel. So it is apparent that Forster reflects ambivalence in the relationship between Dr. Aziz and Fielding.

On one hand, when Fielding wants to visit Dr. Aziz in his house, Dr. Aziz is ashamed as he thinks that the Englishmen are so respectful and welcoming them in such a house is a shame because Dr. Aziz thinks his house is dirty and uncomfortable:

All rose to their feet, and Hassan, to do an Englishman honour, struck with a sugar -cane at the coil of flies.

Aziz said 'sit down' coldly. What a room! What a meeting! Squalor and ugly talk, the floor strewn with fragments of cane and nuts, and spotted with ink, the pictures crooked on the dirty walls, no punkah! He had not meant to live like this or among these third-rate people. And in his confusion

he thought only of the insignificant Rafi, whom he had laughed at, and allowed to be teased. The boy must be sent away happy, or hospitality would have failed, along the whole line. (111)

On the other hand, when Dr. Aziz goes to Fielding's house they have a talk and during their talk Dr. Aziz looks around and thinks:

'But I always thought that Englishmen kept their rooms so tidy. It seems that this is not so. I need not be so ashamed.' He sat down gaily on the bed; then, forgetting himself entirely, drew up his legs and folded them under him. 'Everything ranged coldly on shelves was what I thought. (76)

By giving these two juxtaposing situations, Forster does not show his idea whether he thinks in favour of the British or Indians but reflects his ambivalence.

Here is another example of ambivalence: When Fielding goes to Dr. Aziz's house for a visit as Dr. Aziz is ill, a group of Indians and Fielding are talking. After a while somehow the Indians start to question the British presence in India. When Fielding is asked why Britain is in India, he could answer it in two ways; the British are there because of Britain's benefits or to bring civilization to India, namely for Indian benefits. But as mentioned before, Forster left open many things in *A Passage to India*. Fielding prefers answering as below:

'I am delighted to be here, too-that is my answer, there is my only excuse I cannot tell you anything about fairness. It may not have been fair I should have been born. I take up some other fellow's air, don't I whether I breathe? Still I am glad it is happened, and I am glad I am out here. However big a badmash one is- if one is happy in consequence that is some justification' (113)

This situation is expressed by Lidan Lin differently: England is 'there just as a new-born baby is there to take some of India's air, and no one should blame the new-born for breathing other people's air.(146)

As understood in Lin's words, Forster justifies his belief in England's right in holding India through Fielding's perspective.

Moreover, Forster emphasises ambivalence in nearly all parts of the story in *A Passage to India*. To clear it up: In the climax of the story, what happens in the

Marabar Caves is set by Forster in such a way that the reader can comment on the attack to Adela in a different way. When Dr. Aziz arranges a trip to Marabar Caves he invites many people. Fielding is one of these invited guests, of course. Although Fielding and Dr. Aziz are two close friends and are careful to be on time for their dates somehow Fielding is late for the train which takes Dr. Aziz and his guests to a city near Marabar Caves. He says to Dr. Aziz that he would come to the Caves, and he does. But he goes to Caves later than Dr. Aziz and his guests.

Here Fielding's late arrival is very important, because if he had come with Dr. Aziz to the Caves he would have accompanied Adela and Dr. Aziz when they visited the Caves where Adela was attacked. The presence of Fielding would have prevented the attack to Adela. This situation is presented by Forster intentionally to leave the attack open whether it is done by Dr. Aziz or not.

Another situation, here, which reflects ambivalence is that Adela does not see the person who attacks her, she thinks he is Dr. Aziz as he was the only person near her when Adela goes into the cave. Forster sets the story in such a way that on one hand, the reader has many reasons to accuse Dr. Aziz of attacking Adela but on the other hand, another reader may have nearly as many reasons as the previous one to accept that Dr. Aziz is innocent. Forster wants to let the readers think the way they want.

PART: IV

COMPARISONS OF *KIM* AND *A PASSAGE TO INDIA*

The two major novels of this study, *Kim* by Kipling and *A Passage to India* by Forster, were written at the turn of the twentieth century. They are both known as the most well known colonialist novels and written by two metropolitan authors. However, due to their ambivalence and mutual perspectives, they do not appear to be stereotypical colonialist novels. These two novels were written in the same periods of the British Raj, the racial relations are represented from both perspectives in these two novels. Hybridity, identity problem, ambivalence are major themes in these novels.

Both Forster and Kipling are against the independence of India but they also seriously hesitate between criticizing the British occupation of the sub-continent and supporting the Indian struggle for independence. They think in a humanist perspective and they have impartial ideology.

As cleared up by Peter Childs: '*Kim* and *A Passage to India* are regarded as the two English novels that offer the most interesting attempts to overcome the barriers of racial difference.' (Childs, 1999, 348)

In both of these novels, the words borrowed from the native language are used so freely within the English text. Therefore, it becomes rather difficult to comprehend the text for the readers except Indian readers without assisting notes. The usage of vernacular words hardens the reading, and the idiomatic expressions are used in these two novels. Some sample of these vernacular words will help us to examine how difficult it is to understand them:

Then there were holy men, ash-smear'd fakirs by their brick shrines under the trees at the riverside. (*Kim*, 51)

Here, 'fakirs' means religious beggars or Hindu beggars who smear themselves with ash.

In addition, while speaking to the Colonel, Kim tries to speak royal English, but in fact, the native characters' English is mixed with culturally idiomatic expressions. It significantly indicates their nativeness even when they speak English, as they use Indian proverbs and idioms translated into English. The expression; 'I am thy sacrifice' (226), is a culturally specific idiom, which expresses a Muslim oath of loyalty and indebtedness. In the same manner, the idiom; 'I have eaten thy bread' (238) is another expression of loyalty, because Kim has lived at lama's expense at school. This cultural significance would not be possibly understood in their specific meanings by the western reader without the notes in the end.

He stopped; for there shuffled round the corner, from the roaring Motee Bazar, such a man as Kim, who thought he knew all castes, had never seen. (*Kim*, 52)

He never realized that he educated Indians visited one another constantly, and were weaving, however painfully, a new social fabric. Caste or 'something of the sort' would prevent them. (*A Passage to India*, 66)

'Caste' means the term applied to Hindus. By tradition, a Hindu must follow the occupation of his forefathers; he may not marry someone outside his caste except under strict conditions or penalties, and his food must be prepared by one of his caste.

'.....It seems that I stand by while a young Sahib is hoisted into Allah knows what of an idolater's Heaven by means of old Red Hat. (*Kim*, 334)

'..... Hulloo, Nevvab Bahadur! Been watching the polo again?' said Ronny tepidly.

'I have, sahib, I have' (*A Passage to India*, 92)

Sahib is used in India, especially in the past, to address a European, especially one with some social or official status.

These, of course, are the acknowledgement of the cultural differences and admission of the uncivilized culture. In *Kim* the characters that are drawn as Orientals, are apparently despised. It is well known that Kipling was not in favour of the Indian independence.

In *A Passage to India*, the mistrust is represented mutually between the British and the Indian cultures. The depiction of the Indian is from the British perspective, but at the same time, the Indian perspective is also allowed into the text. However, the superiority of the British among the Indian people is not hidden.

Now, I would like to analyse some of Kipling's representation of hybridity, cultural clashes and ambivalence in *Kim* and then analyse *A Passage to India*.

Kim, the orphan son of an Irish colonial officer, is the main character of *Kim*. He is a hybrid boy, brought up by a native woman. He is regarded both as a sahib and a native in the novel. *Kim* follows the adventures of this boy and his relationship with India as well as the British Empire. Kim's problem of identity is associated with India where cultural clashes are a daily reality. As the consequence of British imperialism, European modernity is naturally brought into the subcontinent. Kipling shows the depiction of modernity and 'old-world piety':

'And when dost thou go?' The Curator smiled at the mixture of old-world piety and modern progress that is the note of India today. (*Kim*, 59)

Kipling reflects the disagreement between modernity and the traditional old world realities of India. The characters and the environment consist mainly of hybridity and collage generated by the co-existence of opposite values and life styles in *Kim*. Kipling depicts the subcontinent in its contradictions in itself, which is the co-existence of modernity and the tradition. Kipling not only acknowledges these differences within the land, but also acknowledges the differences between the coloniser and the colonised.

Kipling's ambivalence, which is, perhaps, due to the multiplicity of the land, is actually rooted in his affection for the place. Despite this affection for both the land and its people, he did not hesitate to proclaim the European right to colonise because of the Europeans' civilised status and wrote about the indulgence of the colonial experience. He shows the superiority of the ruling class in most of his texts. However, the identity of Kim is the rejection of the perceptions of inferiority and

superiority, because he has an identity of a sahib and a native. He speaks English, but thinks in Hindu. The opening paragraph of the novel is a reflection of his hybridity:

He sat, in defiance of municipal orders, astride the gun Zam-Zammah on her brick platform opposite the old Ajaib-Gher – the Wonder house, as the natives call the Lahore Museum. Who hold Zam-Zammah, that ‘fire-breathing dragon’, hold the Punjab, for the great green-bronze piece is always first of the conqueror’s loot. (*Kim*, 49)

The vernacular is used within the English text. They not only represent Kim’s hybridity but also Kipling’s ambiguity, because he was of India. He was born there and as expressed by Edward Said: ‘.....during the first years of his life spoke Hindustani, and was very much like Kim, a sahib in native clothes.’ (8)

Kipling is under the influence of two languages. One is his mother tongue, and the other, being Hindustani, is almost his first language. This, in a sense, produces an inevitable collage in his text. Therefore, the native culture comes to the centre in Kipling’s fiction despite being classified as the colonialist fiction.

In the course of the novel, Kim keeps questioning his own identity:

‘Oh, Mahbub Ali, but am *I* a Hindu? said Kim in English.

The trader gave no sign of astonishment, but looked under shaggy eyebrows. (67)

Here, the cultural collage is observed. Kim, as we know, is an Irish descent, but tries to find out whether he is a Hindu or not. The fact that he may be a Hindu as well as Irish is already unparadigmatic. However, Kipling’s ambivalence over his identity makes him ask this question in English, although he speaks Hindustani as his first language.

Except for the language he speaks, and his identity problem caused by being both a native and a sahib, Kim’s relations with India and the British Empire are interesting indeed. Kipling describes Kim’s relation with Mahbub Ali as a culturally intimate one. Kim is the only person Mahbub Ali trusts, because he believes Kim never lies to him:

Kim was the only soul in the world who had never told him a lie. That would have been a fatal blot on Kim's character if Mahbub had not known that to others, for his own ends or Mahbub's business, Kim could lie like an oriental. (71)

Kim is described to be more intimate with natives although he has an Irish descent. Kipling's narration here is distinctively from the 'white' perspective, since Kim's ability to lie is indicated as the characteristic of an oriental.

Said points out some of Kipling's more denouncing discourse on the natives, such as Oriental's 'love of money':

When 'Kim pays for train tickets with Lama's money' for example, he keeps 'one anna per rupee for himself', which, Kipling says, is 'the immemorial commission of Asia' (Said, 29)

Although, *Kim* is one of the few colonialist novels that spreads cultural surprise mutually between the British and the Indian people; Kipling's ambivalence remains unchanged throughout the novel. In *Kim*, nowhere of the novel, Kipling affirms the legitimacy of Indian independence; but in Kim's identity, we can see that Kipling never gives us a certain information whether he himself is in favour of India or not. Kim's quest for his identity is never ending. The fact that Kim has Irish blood is, however, another satire. He is the son of a sahib that comes from another colonised nation, which legitimises the author's denouncement and association with roots:

Swiftly Kim took up the money; but for all his training, he was Irish enough by birth to reckon silver the least part of any game. (84)

However, here there is a relation between Kim's identity and Kipling in terms of being on the side of Empire while having affection for the subcontinent and the native cultures and belief systems. Yet, Kim does not have affection. He is of India. Contradicting himself, Kim satisfies his colonial masters' adventurous desires by casting natives to help him, but with all these there is again a cultural clash:

'But why not sit and rest?' said one of the escort. 'Only the devils and the English walk to and fro without reason.'

‘Never make friends with the Devil, a Monkey, or a Boy. No man knows what they will do next,’ said his fellow. (126)

This is a cultural clash in all senses. Kim’s identity with his native appearance causes inevitable cultural clashes when he comes together with other natives to serve the British purposes.

It is not only the Indians or the British that the cultural clashes are attributed to. When lama wants to pay for Kim’s education, Kim is the interpreter of lama’s words:

‘Do they give or sell learning among the Sahibs? Ask them,’ said the lama, and Kim interpreted . . .

‘And – the more money is paid the better learning is given?’ The lama disregarded Kim’s plans for an early. ‘It is no wrong to pay for learning. To help the ignorant to wisdom is always a merit.’ The rosary clicked furiously as an abacus. Then he faced his oppressors.

‘Ask them for how much money do they give a wise and suitable teaching? And which city is that teaching given?’ (142)

The above quoted scene also indicates a cultural clash, because paying for education is impossible for lama to imagine. He can understand, but not capable of admitting the western monetary system. And here the type and level of education which Kim is going to get is intentionally made unclear throughout the novel and this situation reveals Kipling’s ambivalence in the novel. As we know there are many questions that are left open in the novel and this is one of them.

Kim is desperate for his identity, and has affection for his father’s regiment and his belongings. When the sahibs catch him with the documents that had belonged to his father, he tries to prove his identity as a sahib:

Father Victor stepped forward quickly and opened the front of Kim’s upper garment. ‘You see, Bennett, he’s not very black. What’s your name?’ ‘Kim.’

‘Or Kimball?’

.....

‘They call me Kim Rishti ke. That is Kim of the Rishti.’

‘What is that – “Rishti”?’

‘Eye-rishti – that was the regiment – my father’s.’

‘Irish – oh, I see.’
‘Yess. That was how my father told me.’ (134)

Kim’s identity is revealed as Irish here. It should be noted that while Kim knows the name of his father’s regiment, he mispronounces it. Here it is clear that he does not know what it really means. This is a useful narration for Kipling as it helps him to create characters to act for the empire. In addition, it is apparent that Kim takes pleasure in India. His whiteness is employed in the book so that Kipling pulls the reader into this pleasure but a complete whiteness would have been against the idea of his abilities to ‘lie like an oriental’.

Kim continues questioning his identity in the climax of the novel. His white roots do not help him resolve the contradictions in his belief system:

‘What am I? Mussalman, Hindu, Jain, or Buddhist? That is a hard knot.’ (191).

The famous question of the novel remains a hard knot throughout the novel:

‘Who is Kim – Kim – Kim?’ (233).

This is a result of hybridisation that Kipling’s work produces in cultural terms. Kim’s hybridity is, however, not only in terms of culture and identity. Kim is hybrid in terms of the colour of his skin, too. Here Kipling appears to present his own ambiguity. While he has affection for the place, he does not legitimise the independence, and he draws a savage figure for the natives. It is worth noting that Kim’s identity still remains unresolved even at the end of the novel:

‘I am Kim – Kim – Kim – alone – one – person.’ (273)

...

‘I am Kim, I am Kim. And what is Kim?’ (331)

It will be useful here to add some examples from *A Passage to India* to clear up that there are many mutual perspectives in terms of their vernacular languages, cultural idiosyncrasies, and ambivalent looks at the Indo-British relations of the time between *Kim* and *A Passage to India*.

A Passage to India was considered as an unfair novel in its characterisation and the depiction of India from both British and Indian perspectives. In the story the distrust between the British and Indians is one of the main themes. There are also lively and realistic descriptions of India and of its people in the novel.

The relation between the characters in *A Passage to India* reflects the ideology of colonisation. The friendship between Dr. Aziz and Fielding shows the closeness between Anglo-Indians and native Indians but it suddenly turns to cause ideological debate over the justification of the British rule after Marabar Caves incident. The arguments against the Empire occur only among the Indians before Aziz is accused of assaulting Adela and is arrested; namely it is between Aziz and his friends. However, Fielding, who is a good friend of Aziz, takes side with him after Aziz's arrest. The ambivalence of the author appears here as it is not clear whether or not Aziz has assaulted Adela in the Marabar Caves. Forster leaves it open in the end. Whether Aziz has lied or not is unresolved. Here any reader can assume that Aziz is a liar, or a strong sense of injustice is felt in the fact that Aziz is found guilty by the British without a trial and without listening to his defence. Mrs Moore's death who is the only person that knows vital secrets to enlighten the trial, increase the ambivalence in the reader's mind.

Although *A Passage to India* is written by a pro-imperial novelist, the native culture is accepted and this culture is depicted in the novel, like in *Kim*.

In the first pages of the novel, the Englishmen are considered in a way that The Indians are not sure whether to trust them or not:

He lay in a trance, sensuous but healthy, through which the talk of the two others did not seem particularly sad – they were discussing as to whether or no it is possible to be friends with an Englishman. (*A Passage to India*, 31)

The quotations above are from an Indian perspective. As well as the Indian dislike and mistrust in the English, the English also dislike and mistrust in Indians. The Indians believe that there have been some good-hearted Englishmen who befriend Indians on their first arrival in the subcontinent but after a while they are

told by the forecomers not to trust the Indians. An Englishman who shows his stamp collection to an Indian is expected to change in time:

‘ . . . He has shown me his stamp collection.’

‘He would expect you to steal it now. Turton! But red-nosed boy will be far worse than Turton!’ (32)

In the conversation above there is ambivalence as the English are criticised both in good and bad way. The ambivalence increases gradually in the same conversation:

‘Did you know that when they were lent to Central India over a canal scheme some rajah or other gave her a sewing machine in solid gold so that the water should run through his state?’

‘And does it?’

‘No that is where Mrs Turton is so skilful. When we poor blacks take bribes, we perform what we are bribed to perform, and the law discovers us in consequence. The English take and do nothing. I admire them.’

‘We all admire them. Aziz, please pass me the hookah.’ (32)

The above quotations show Forster’s mutual stereotypes. From the Indian perspective, the English are rude as they do not trust in Indians, and they are unreliable as they do not do what they promise to do. However, Forster does not hide his idea that supports the British colonization in India. The fact that the Indians admire their colonisers and always try to have relationship with them is the most important side of the novel, because this creates an ambiguous view of the author and leave the reader in the same ambivalence as to whether the colonised or the coloniser is right. However, most of the English characters in the book dislike and distrust Indians, so the Indians dislike and distrust the English in return.

The British rule, in most cases, appears in the discourse:

The roads, named after victorious generals and intersecting at right angles, were symbolic of the net Great Britain had thrown over India. (36)

Of course the influence of Great Britain is not only felt in the street names, but also in the social life between the British and the Indians. To make it clear here is

a conversation between Dr. Aziz, the protagonist, and Mrs. Moore, a British newcomer in India:

‘ . . . I think you are newly arrived in India.’
‘ Yes how did you know?’
‘ By the way you address me . . . ’ (39)

Here it is shown that an English person does not treat the Indians in good manners. The treatment of Mrs. Moore to Aziz is in a good manner because she is a newcomer. Otherwise she cannot treat such a way because the Indians have seen a lot of British people such as Turtons, British officials who treat them in good manner at first but later change the way they treat the Indians. Mrs Moore, as a newcomer in India, is sympathetic to Aziz, who is amazed by her. The above quotation represents his surprise and reasoning over her kind treatment. She becomes more sympathetic for Aziz after criticising a fellow countrywoman of hers, whom Aziz also dislikes:

He was excited by his wrongs, but much more by the knowledge that someone sympathised with them. It was this that led him to repeat, exaggerate, contradict. She had proved her sympathy by criticising her fellow countrywoman to him, but even earlier he had known. (41)

The newcomers who want to have relationship with Indian people and even befriend them are criticised. They are also ridiculed by the ruling class in India. In many places in the novel, it is presented that the Indians are not worth meeting, befriending and trusting:

She became the centre of an amused group of ladies. One said: ‘Wanting to see Indians! How new that sounds!’ Another: ‘Natives! Why, fancy!’ A third, more serious, said: ‘Let me explain. Natives don’t respect one any the more after meeting one, you see.’ (44)

Many Indian critics celebrated Forster for his *A Passage to India* after its publication, because, although it is a colonial novel, it satirises the English attitude in India. It forces the coloniser’s attitude to be questioned, although not suggesting that it is unjustifiable:

‘I think it was impudence, but I don’t know about a trick,’ said Mrs Moore. ‘His nerves were all on the edge – I could tell from his voice. As soon as I answered he altered.’

‘You oughtn’t to have answered.’

‘Now look here,’ said the logical girl, ‘wouldn’t you expect a Mohammedan to answer if you asked him to take off his hat in church?’

‘It’s different, it’s different; you don’t understand.’ (47)

The above quotation is a conversation between Mrs Moore and his son, Ronny, who is the City Magistrate in Chandrapore. She tells how she was approached by Aziz who asked him to take her shoes off in the mosque. Of course Ronny gets angry with the fact that an Indian finds the courage to ask an English lady to be attentive with the religious customs in India. Adela, who has travelled to India to meet Ronny, her future husband, offers a logical mutual perspective:

‘I think it was impudence, but I don’t know about a trick,’ said Mrs. Moore. ‘His nerves were all on edge- I could tell from his voice. As soon as I answered he altered.’

‘You oughtn’t to have answered.’

‘Now look here,’ said the logical girl, ‘wouldn’t you expect a Mohammedan to answer if you asked him to take off his hat in church?’

‘It’s different, it’s different; you don’t understand.’ (*A Passage to India*, 47)

This is one of the most critical points in the novel that leads the text to an open argument as to why an Indian should not have the right as same as the English people.

There is a mutual perspective of the novel here as the ignorance of the coloniser about the natives is presented. Contrary to the colonialist discourse of the nineteenth century, Forster’s discourse does not try to redefine the native culture. His discourse is within the native culture. Namely, this culture is integrated within his discourse. However, it is rediscovered and redefined by the British characters. The ignorance of the Imperial ruling class and the discontact between them and the Indians are obvious in The Major Callendar’s surprise at the fact that the Indians visit one another:

He never realised that the educated Indians visited one another constantly, and were weaving, however painfully, a new social fabric. Caste 'or something of the sort' would prevent them. He only knew that no one ever told him the truth, although he had been in the country for twenty years. (66-67)

The Indians are criticised not only by the English, but they are also criticised by themselves. In the following scene where Mr Fielding visits Aziz who is ill at his home, Aziz is ashamed to be in a room like that:

What a room! What a meeting! Squalor and ugly talk, the floor strewn with fragments of cane and nuts, and spotted with ink, the pictures crooked upon the dirty walls, no punkah! ... (111)

Although Hassan stands up and gives Fielding a seat Aziz does not welcome Fielding warm-heartedly. However, foregrounding Hassan's behaviour is a satire in that the same group of Indians constantly talk about the impossibility of trusting and befriending an Englishman. On the other hand, opposite to Hassan's hospitality, Aziz, who is the closest friend of Fielding among the Indians, reacts coldly to Fielding. When the text is analytically read after Aziz's unfriendly reaction to his English friend, it is observed that, although the sentences are not in Aziz's speech but in the narration of the text, they appear to be Aziz's thoughts. Obviously, his relation with Fielding makes him feel embarrassed to be among his fellow Indians because of their non-English and non-European manners.

Maybe by this cold reaction, Aziz does not want to be friendly with an Englishman in front of his anti-British friends, and still wants to continue his conversation with Rafi by turning away from Fielding and directs his hospitality towards a fellow Indian. However, when a political question is asked, it is clear from the context that he feels uncomfortable both with his friends and with Fielding:

'Excuse the question, but if this is the case, how is England justified in holding India?'

There they were! Politics again. 'It's a question I can't get my mind onto,' he replied. 'I'm out here personally because I needed a job. I cannot

tell you why England is here or whether she ought to be here. It's beyond me.' (112)

A contextual ambiguity is seen in the above narration. After the question of the justification of the British rule, it is unclear who says 'There they were!' There is more than one possibility.

First of all, it might be Aziz's thinking upon a political question like that, exclaiming his own protest over his Indian friend. If they are Aziz's words, then it is the indication of Anglophilia. Second, they might be the words in Fielding's mind as a complaint. Because he is asked the same political, ideological and historical question by the Indians many times. He avoids taking part in such debates.

Among these possibilities the strongest one is that they are the authorial entries into the text, which gives clues about the author's thoughts: The justification of the British rule should not be questioned, as the British is considered to have a right to rule India. Although it is suggested in the text that Fielding has no answer to justify the British occupation in India, and avoids the implication of the British injustice, the author reveals Fielding's idea: 'England holds India for her own good' (112).

Of course the answer above cannot be given by Fielding because the Indians think that the presence of British in India harms the Indians. That is why; an intelligent answer is given by Fielding to calm down the situation.

'I'm delighted to be here too – that's my answer, there's my only excuse. I can't tell you anything about fairness. It mayn't have been fair I should have been born. I take up some other's fellow's air, don't I, whenever I breathe? Still, I'm glad it's happened, and I'm glad I'm out here. However big a badmash one is- if one's happy in consequence, that's some justification.' (112-113)

In a sense, Forster justifies his belief in England's right in holding India through Fielding's perspective.

Forster creates the character Aziz in the novel to justify Fielding's and implicitly Forster's imperialist views. After everyone leaves with Fielding, Aziz quickly goes out to find Fielding and invites him to the house again. He wishes to show his loyalty to Fielding

In this respect, Aziz is similar to Kipling's Kim. Aziz is an in-between character and represents India for the English reader. He also acts as a good and fair representative of Indian culture.

Fielding is another character that provides a balance between two cultures. He is a fair Englishman who has a life close to the natives and tries to look at things from their perspective. He is the first and only Englishman in the book who believes Aziz after the Marabar Caves incident and this attitude of Fielding proves his sincerity to Aziz. These two characters provide the novel's ambivalent sense in its ideology. These two characters' friendship makes the novel one of the rare colonial novels which takes up the Indian perspective and takes up a humanist approach towards the Indians.

The justification of British Raj is contradicted in many parts of the novel with the belief that India is impossible to hold as one. However, this is expressed by either the description of Adela's thoughts, who resents his fellow countrymen for mistreating the Indians, or by Aziz's conversations with Fielding. For instance; when they go to Marabar Caves, it occurs to Adela that India is such an interesting and vast country that her mind cannot take hold of it:

'How can the mind take hold of such a country? Generations of invaders have tried but they remain in exile.' (136)

Aziz answers Adela's question such as:

'Miss Quested, fine but foolish. You keep your religion, I mine. That is the best. Nothing embraces the whole of India, nothing, nothing, and that was Akbar's mistake.' (142)

It is regarded as an apotheosis that India can be one nation despite the different nationalities, religions: 'India a nation! What an apotheosis!' (289).

Forster reveals that the colonial officers claim that the togetherness of the British and Indian people always cause problems. The fact that the Collector at the police quarters, where Aziz is arrested, finds the intimacy of the Indians and the English dangerous is a reflection of the theory of 'divide and rule':

I have never known anything but disaster result when English and Indians attempt to be intimate socially. Intercourse, yes. Courtesy, by all means, intimacy – never, never. (158)

We understand from the above quotation that both the impossibility of the union of such a diverse country and the justification of the British rule is supported.

As mentioned before, there is mutual perspective in *A Passage to India*. Indian critics found that it was the first novel where an Indian is considered as a human with all aspects. This humanist approach of the text contradicts with the conventionally inferiorated view of the Indians. The prominent English people in the novel cannot think free from the conventional colonial feelings. McBryde, the District Superintendent of Police is the best educated person among Chandrapore officials. He thinks that the Indians should not be trusted. We can understand this when Aziz cries in his presence. However, his contradiction is in a harsh contradiction with his own life:

Mr McBryde was shocked at his downfall, but no Indian ever surprised him, because he had a theory about climactic zones. The theory ran: 'All unfortunate natives are criminals at heart, for simple reason that they live south of latitude 30. They are not to blame, they have not a dog's chance – we should be like them if we settled here.' Born at Karachi, he seemed to contradict his theory, and would sometimes admit as much with a sad, quiet smile. (160)

The ambiguity of the novel is reflected by the fact that he contradicts himself. Forster's approach to the Indians is humanist. He reflects the Indian perspective as well, but he also reflects the superiority of British over the Indians. Forster's style is expressed with these words:

‘No matter how ‘ambivalent and troubling Forster’s handling of English-Indian relations may seem to be, one thing that he never doubts is that the English are superior to the Indians’ (*Lin*, 146-147)

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, Anglo-Indian reconciliation in *Kim* and *A Passage to India* as two colonial novels has been discussed. Both Kipling and Forster reflect their love of India in their novels. The reason for this love is that Kipling spent his childhood in India and he was impressed by it a lot. Forster was also impressed by India when he had two trips to India. One of Forster's friends from India who he meets at school in England also has a role for Forster to love India. When Forster arrived in India, he was hosted by his friend and shown most beauty of India. I think Dz. Aziz in *A Passage to India* is a reflection of this friendship.

Both Kipling and Forster are British and they love India, therefore; when we read *Kim* or *A Passage to India*, we are not sure which side these writers take. Ambivalence is dominant in both novels. For example, on one hand Kim has talents that he attains from the natives, but on the other hand, among the millions of children, a young Sahib is chosen to be the main character of the novel. Namely, the character is neither British nor Indian, completely.

In *A Passage to India*, ambivalence is also dominant. For example; in the novel Forster does not clarify whether Aziz is guilty or not. If Aziz was found guilty, Forster probably would be accepted by readers to be on the side of the British. Or, if Adela was presented as guilty because of accusing Aziz, that time Forster presumably would be accepted to be on the side of Indians. So Forster sets the story in a way that it is open to debate whether Aziz or Adela is guilty. Kipling and Forster let the readers judge the characters in the novels by themselves.

As ambivalence is dominant in *Kim* and *A Passage to India*, there has been no reconciliation between the British or Indians. To clarify; in *Kim*, for example, Kim is Irish, with dark skin. So, he is considered as a native in Wonder House at the beginning of the novel, or in St. Xavier's school after he is realized by the soldiers of Regiments. As Kim acts as a native, he is criticized by the Sahibs so there is always a conflict between them, therefore; there is irreconciliation.

In *A Passage to India*, as Fielding is close to Indians, especially to Aziz, he is accused by the British in India. So clashes appear between Fielding and people of his race, too. Of course, here, same situation is valid for Aziz. He is also criticized by

Indians because of befriending Fielding and other British people. So there is no reconciliation in *A Passage to India*, either.

As explained in the thesis, Imperialism and Colonialism are as old as mankind. Colonizers do everything for their own benefits, but while colonizing any country they claim that they bring civilization there. Up to now, we see that colonizers colonize any place for their own benefits, not for that of the colonized people. Thus, colonized people do not trust in colonizers anymore. Being aware of this situation, I analyse *Kim* and *A Passage to India* and their writers. Both Kipling and Forster were aware of the fact that a colonizer and a colonized country could not go along together, so could Britain and India as Forster states in one of his diaries:

‘When I began the book I thought of it as a little bridge of sympathy between East and West, but this conception has had to go, my sense of truth forbids anything so comfortable think that most Indians, like most English people are shits, and I am not interested whether they sympathize with one another or not.’ (Stallybrass: 14)

When we have a glance at *Kim*, we notice that Kim decides neither to work for British government nor to go with the Lama. On one hand, there is no reconciliation between him and the British because he does not love St. Xavier’s school as he is not accustomed to it. Soldiers of the Regiment also find Kim peculiar as he has dark skin and has native-like behaviours. On the other hand, Kim is a Sahib originally. But he questions his identity during the novel. Therefore; we may utilize that there is no reconciliation in Kim’s thoughts.

In addition, there is no reconciliation between the British in India and the Indians. Here is a comment about the English by people living in India:

‘But why not sit and rest?’ said one of the escort. ‘Only the devils and the English walk to and fro without reason.’

‘Never make friends with the Devil, a Monkey, or a Boy. No man knows what they will do next,’ said his fellow. (*Kim*, 126)

In the above quotation, the English and devils are put in the same class so there is no reconciliation between the English and the Natives

In retrospect, we see that there is no reconciliation in *A Passage to India* either. On one hand, there is irreconciliation between the British themselves in India. For

example, Adela and Rooney do not reconcile their differences. In many places in *A Passage to India* they discuss about many things. For instance; when Adela, Mrs. Moore and Aziz make a plan to have a trip to Marabar Caves, Rooney does not accept this expedition and wants Adela and his mother to give up it.

‘Similarly, to “meet” in the caves as if they were the clock at Charing Cross, when they are miles from a station and each other.’ said Rooney.
‘Have you been to them?’ asked Adela.
‘No, but I know all about them, naturally.’
‘Oh, naturally!’ (*A Passage to India*, 89)

In the above quotation, although he has not been there, Rooney tries to persuade Adela not to go to the Caves. In the novel, there are various conversations between Rooney and Adela that clarifies the irreconciliation between them. But we know that they do not marry in the end although Adela comes to India to see and later marry Rooney. So, mostly, their split shows us the irreconciliation.

On the other hand, there is no reconciliation between Indians and the British in India. To give examples; in the beginning of the novel, Aziz and Hamidullah have a conversation about whether it is possible to be friends with an Englishman. While Aziz says that it is possible, Hamidullah refuses it and says:

‘It is impossible here. Aziz! The red-nosed boy has again insulted me in court. I do not blame him. He was told that he ought to insult me. Until lately he was quite a nice boy, but the others have got hold of him. (31)

In the above quotation, we see that Hamidullah never believes that he and other Indians can befriend the British. Namely, there can hardly be reconciliation between the British and the Natives.

Although Aziz believes that it is possible to befriend with an Englishman and he befriends Fielding, he changes his mind after his arrest because of Adela’s accusation. So, the thought of one of the main characters in the novel who believes that there can be reconciliation between the British and the Natives has also been changed. At the end of the novel, irreconciliation is clearly understood with the following words:

‘Why can’t we be friends, now?’ said the other, holding him affectionately. ‘It is what I want. It is what you want.’

But the horses did not want it- they swerved apart; the earth did not 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 come into view as they issued from the gap and saw Mau beneath: they did not want it, they said in their hundred voices, ‘No, not yet,’ and the sky said, ‘No, not there.’ (289)

Consequently, Anglo- Indian reconciliation in *Kim* and *A Passage to India* is hardly possible, considering the examples chosen from these novels in the scope of this thesis. As the aftermath of what has been discussed with examples in this study, it could be argued that two different cultures that have been brought together by the colonial rule can hardly be in peace. The reconciliation, as presented with examples in this thesis, is only possible by keeping two societies apart as could be seen from the examples quoted from the novels in question.

Since neither Kipling nor Forster claimed to be anti-imperialist authors, it is not possible to come across a peaceful societal situation in the colonial rule depicted in their novels. Both of them describe a society in which the coloniser is always privileged over the colonised. *Kim* and *A Passage to India*, therefore, prove to be the most important colonial novels that present colonial irreconciliation.

ÖZET

Bu tezde kolonyal dönemde, E.M.Forster tarafından yazılmış olan *A Passage to India* ve Rudyard Kipling tarafından yazılmış olan *Kim* adlı eserlerinde İngiliz-Hint uzlaşmasının olup olmadığı çalışılmıştır. Bu eserler kolonyal dönemde yazıldığı için kolonyalizm ve bu terimle yakın ilişkisi olan emperyalizm kavramları bu tezin ilk bölümünde açıklanmıştır. Ayrıca bu iki eserin yazıldığı Kolonyal Dönem Edebiyatı'nın başlangıcı hakkında bilgi verilmiştir.

Tezin ikinci bölümünde *Kim* romanından alıntılar yapılarak bu romandaki Hint ve İngiliz karakterler arasında uzlaşmanın olmadığı belirtilmiştir. Yapılan alıntılarda Kipling'in bazı zamanlar bir Hintli bazı zamanlar ise bir İngiliz gibi düşündüğü görülmüştür. Bu durumun da Kipling'in tarafsızlığını ortaya koymuştur.

Üçüncü bölümde, *Kim* de ele alınan konular *A Passage to India* adlı romanda aynı şekilde incelenmiştir. Ayrıca Forster'in tarafsızlığı da ele alınmıştır.

Tezin son bölümünde ise bu iki roman karşılaştırılıp aralarındaki benzerlikler belirtildikten sonra bu iki eserde bulunan yeri, yani Hintli, ve sömürgeci İngiliz karakterler arasında uzlaşmanın olamayacağı ortaya konulmuştur. Diğer taraftan, uzlaşma olmasa da her iki milletin bir arada yaşamasının ancak bu iki milleti birbirinden uzak tutarak sağlanabileceği savunulmuştur.

Neticede ne Kipling ne de Forster anti emperyalist yazarlar olduklarını idda etmedikleri için her iki romanda da sömürgecinin egemen olduğu bir yerde sömüren ve sömürülen arasında tam bir barışın olamayacağı aşınadır. Her iki yazar da eserlerinde sömürgecinin imtiyazlı olduğu bir portre çizmiştir. Bundan dolayı *Kim* ve *A Passage to India* kolonyal dönemde uzlaşmanın olmadığını belirten en önemli iki eserdir.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A) MAIN SOURCES

FORSTER, E. M. A Passage to India. London; Penguin Books. 1978

KIPLING, Rudyard. Kim. London; Penguin Books. 1994.

B) SECONDARY SOURCES

BOEHMER, Elleke: Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors. Oxford University Press, 1995, pp 1-59

CHILDS, Peter and WILLIAMS, R.J. Patrick , An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory, 1997, pp1-23

CHILDS, Peter (ed.), Post-Colonial Theory and English Literature: A Reader, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999, pp. 237-39

GORRA, Michael, 'Rudyard Kipling to Salman Rushdie: Imperialism to Postcolonialism', in Richetti, John (ed.); Bender, John; Dierdre, David; Seidel, Michale (ass. Eds.), The Columbia History of the British Novel, Columbia: University Press, 1994), pp 631-57

HUBEL, Teresa, 'The Bride of His Country': Love, Marriage, and the Imperialist Paradox in the Indian Fiction of Sara Jeannette Duncan and Rudyard Kipling', ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature, 21:1, January 1990, pp. 3-19

LIN, Lidan, 'The Irony of Colonial Humanism: "A Passage to India" and the Politics of Posthumanism', ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature, 28:4, October 1997, pp133-53

MISHRA, Vijay and HODGE, Bob, Textual Practice, Vol. 5, No.3, Winter 1991

SAID, Edward (ed.), 'Introduction', in Kim by Rudyard Kipling, London: Penguin Books, 1987), pp7-46.

STALLYBRASS, Oliver (ed.): 'Introduction', in A Passage to India, London: Penguin Books, 1978, pp 7-25

SULERI, Sara, From 'The Adolescence of Kim', in Childs (ed.), 1999, p. 251