



**The Presence of the British Empire in India as discussed in Rudyard Kipling's Kim, E. M. Forster's
A Passage to India and J. G. Farrell's The Siege of Krishnapur**

A Project

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of M.A

In English Literature

Presented by:

Ebtehal Khalid Alhemayani

Supervised by:

Dr. Rajih Almughamsi

Associate Professor of English Literature

Umm Al-Qura University in Makkah

Second Semester 2019

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Ministry of High Education

Umm Al-Qura University

College of Social Sciences

English Language Department

Abstract

This study is an attempt to describe, clarify, and circumscribe Kipling's, Forster's and Farrell's positions towards the presence of the British Empire in India as embedded in their novels. This study builds up a deep analysis of their points of view depending on a historical background of the British Empire in India, post-colonial studies and a critical overview of these novels.

This study is based upon two main aspects. The first one is the representation of the colonizers. Analyzing the characters of the colonizers in *Kim* (1904) assures us that Kipling represents his colonizers positively to propagate the presence of the British Empire in India. On the other hand, in *A Passage to India* (1924) Forster represents his colonizers very negatively in his novel to raise the weight of his opposition of the presence of the British Empire in the Indian land. To criticize the British Empire, Farrell in his novel *The Siege of Krishnapur* (1973) represents his colonizers as failed and deceived by their British Empire.

The second aspect is the nationalist attempts of the colonized characters. This study proves that the fire of the national attempts of the colonized characters is put out in *Kim*, lighted in *A Passage to India* and reaches its peak in *The Siege of Krishnapur*.

It is asserted that *Kim* and *A Passage to India* and *The Siege of Krishnapur* together present a clear view of their novelists' positions towards the presence of the British Empire in India. These positions determine the continuity or the fall of the rule of this Empire in India.

المخلص:

إن هذه الدراسة لهي محاولة لوصف و لتوضيح ولرسم الخطوط العريضة لمواقف كيبلينج و فورستر و فاريل تجاه وجود الإمبراطورية البريطانية في الهند كما هو موضح في رواياتهم. إنها دراسة تبني تحليلاً عميقاً لأرائهم معتمدة على الخلفية التاريخية للإمبراطورية البريطانية في الهند و على دراسات ما بعد الاحتلال و على نظرة عامة نقدية. وتعتمد هذه الدراسة على جانبيين رئيسيين. الجانب الأول هو تمثيل المستعمرين. إن تحليل شخصيات المستعمرين في *كيم* (1904) يؤكد لنا أن كيبلينج مثل المستعمرين بشكل إيجابي لنصرة وجود الإمبراطورية البريطانية في الهند. و من ناحية أخرى، قام فورستر في رواية *العبور إلى الهند* (1924) بتصوير المستعمرين بشكل سلبي جداً و ذلك لزيادة ثقل معارضته لوجود الإمبراطورية البريطانية في الأراضي الهندية. أما فاريل فقد بنى الإمبراطورية البريطانية في الهند في روايته *حصار كريشناپور* (1973) عن طريق تمثيله للمستعمرين على أنهم قد خيب أملهم و قد انخدعوا بالإمبراطورية البريطانية. أما الجانب الثاني فهو المحاولات القومية للشخصيات المستعمرة. هذه الدراسة تثبت أن نار المحاولات القومية للشخصيات المستعمرة قد أطفئت في رواية *كيم*، و أشعلت في *العبور إلى الهند* و نصل إلى أوجها في *حصار كريشناپور*. وختاماً فإن من المؤكد أن *كيم* و *العبور إلى الهند* و *حصار كريشناپور* تقدم رؤية واضحة لمواقف الروائيين إزاء وجود الإمبراطورية البريطانية في الهند. هذه المواقف تحدد استمرارية أو سقوط حكم هذه الإمبراطورية في الهند.

Introduction:

Many nations have ruled the world. A civilization followed by another and an empire followed by another are what shape the chronological sovereignty of this world. This simple formula describes exactly the long history of our world. “The Roman Empire”, “the Persian Empire”, “the Mongol Empire” and “the Ottoman Empire” are all well known phrases. Each empire had its own strength which allowed it to have a worldwide sort of dominion that enabled it to go and occupy whatever land it chose. Each empire has its long history that notifies us of its unique story of its beginning, growth and fall. All of these empires influenced the literary and scientific productions of their nations.

One of the most renowned empires is the British Empire. The British Empire began with the trading posts that were scattered in England’s colonies around the world in the late 16th and early 17th centuries (Ferguson 2). As a result of its great span and its large dominion, it was often described as the Empire on which the sun never sets because when many land areas of this Empire were in dark, at least one part of this Empire enjoyed the sunlight. The size of the British Empire extended over most of the continents of the world. It dominated countries like Egypt, India, Australia, America and so on. As such, its power and influence stretched all over the globe shaping it in all manner of ways.

Each territory the British Empire occupied had its own and special degree of how valuable it was to its British rulers. Some territories were “hugely valuable in commercial or strategic terms” and other territories were “of little... psychological value” (Levine 85). The loss of America and the failure of British trade in the East Indies and the barriers to trade freely in China minimized the national pride of the British Empire; therefore, it had to deep its roots in

important territories like India (Levine 62). Levine argues that “India became more and more important not only for its products but increasingly as a symbol of Britain’s overseas power after the loss of America” on July 4, 1776 (62).

The Britons first arrived in India in 1600 and they were only simple traders bringing the good eastern spices back home and enjoying great wealth. But, gradually, their presence developed into a deeper and a more profound one; the simple group of traders turned into a political ruling institution. Queen Elizabeth granted trading rights to a group of London entrepreneurs who became “The dominating British enterprise in India” (Levine 62). This enterprise was the East India Company. Behind the guise of the East India Company, the British Empire laid formal and direct claim to ruling large parts of India in the middle of the nineteenth century (Levine 62).

After the Britons rooted their empire in the Indian land, their policies began to shape the way they exercise their authority over the local inhabitants. Many historians, Levine assures us, believe that “the quest for political predominance” determined the British policies of ruling the Empire (97). As soon as the British civilians and officials arrived in the Indian land, they had their own residential places. They segregated themselves from mingling with the Indians. They brought everything British and western to where they were currently living. Levine depends on a number of several historical documents that verify the fact that “areas of British settlement and residence in Indian towns and cities were slowly transformed into family oriented areas resembling more and more the environment left behind in Britain” (70). Obviously, this act of segregation proves the fences the Britons founded to block and prevent any act of communication between them and the Indians. Arrogance and prejudice towards Indians began with the call of westernizing the natives by establishing social reforms that would harmonically

go with the European taste. According to this “sophisticated” taste, anything Indian was rejected and considered very backward. This sort of taste meant westernizing the natives by adopting social reform which was clear in education, habits, religion and religious rites. However, it is very important to mention that the Britons introduced new and very good reforms to the Indians like introducing railways, steam-shipping, irrigation schemes, universities, up-to-date military techniques, a postal service and systems of land tenure (Levine 76).

Policies issued by the British served the British Empire and did a little good to the Indians who eventually rebelled and resisted to show their dissatisfaction of the way the Britons ruled India as well as their rejection of the presence of an occupying political institution signified by the East India Company. Levine assures us that “Local rebellions and resistance to company rule were not uncommon, and there was a general feeling that the British imposed alien values on local peoples.” (76). Such revolts eased the way for the nationalist movements which succeeded after the declaration of the independence of India in 1947. Nationalist Indians wanted to be political members, proud of their background and whose voices were heard. To be heard, they searched for a national culture which would unite all the Indians from the different sects and races. Frantz Fanon in his essay “On National Culture’ states that “this passionate search for a national culture which existed before the colonial era finds its legitimate reason in the anxiety shared by native intellectuals to shrink away from that Western culture in which they all risk being swamped” (153-4). Fanon goes on describing the national identity which nourishes nationalism saying that “To fight for national culture means in the first place to fight for the liberation of the nation” (154). Thus, the motive of the Indian national movements was the independence of India.

On the other hand, many English writers and activists showed their enthusiasm as well as their petition towards the British Empire and the policies it upheld in India. Some British novelists have portrayed the colonial presence of the British Empire in India in their novels either by celebrating or condemning it. An example of the writers who celebrated the Empire in their works is Charles Dickens. Dickens in his novella The Perils of Certain English Prisoner offers a sort of analogy of the Indian Mutiny where a native is pictured as a double-faced traitor and a very awful villain. This horrible native takes part in a massacre of British women and children. In this novel, the British characters are presented as victims terrified by the horrible natives. Many post colonial critics have accused Dickens of praising the British Empire but others have excused him and have given a justifiable explanation by saying that he was under a lot of pressure by his son's position in India and that filled Dickens with fear that his criticism would provoke his son's superiors.

On the other hand, there are many writers who have stood against the British Empire and its policies and that includes George Orwell. In his story-essay "Shooting the Elephant," he introduces a British officer who works in Burma which was part of India under the colonial rule of Britain. The officer is forced to shoot an elephant under the pressure of the natives to save the pride and prestige of himself and the Empire he is serving. The situation and events that Orwell describes emphasize the hostility between the administrators of the British Empire and their native subjects. Both sides feel hatred, distrust and resentment. Orwell concludes that the British Empire is "an evil thing" (3).

There are other important fictional works that address the British Empire and its colonial presence in India. *Kim* (1901), *A Passage to India* (1924) and *The Siege of Krishnapur* (1973) are three novels set in India during British Raj written respectively by Rudyard Kipling, E. M.

Forster and J. G. Farrell. Since their dates of publications, the novels have received much attention from several literary critics, journalists, and politicians. Each novel has its distinctive story and its unique plot. The British Empire in India is the main topic discussed in these novels. Each one of them makes a very obvious statement about this Empire's presence in India. A deep analysis of these three novels shows Kipling's complete advocacy, Forster's opposition and Farrell's criticism of the presence of the British Empire in India.

Kim (1901) was written by Rudyard Kipling in the very beginning of the twentieth century. Jeffery Meyers asserts that *Kim* has been universally praised by many writers for "its sympathetic understanding of the natives and for its translation of their idiom into measured and dignified English" (xxix). "In *Kim*, Kipling creates an exotic atmosphere, full of vivid characters and incidents, and immediately draws the reader into his strange world" (Meyers xix). Allen states that "*Kim* (1901) remains the lonely masterpiece of his longer fictions, a novel without parallel or progeny" (281). In *Kim*, Kipling expresses his advocacy of the British Empire by presenting a happy image of India under the British rule in which the colonized characters completely support the rule of their understanding and kind colonizers who are bringing civilization and progress to India.

Several critics and writers have written about *Kim* and the British Empire in their productions. Many critics think that Rudyard Kipling supported the rule of the British Empire over India. For example, T. S. Eliot states that in *Kim* Rudyard Kipling "believed the British Empire to be a good thing" (29). In *Kim*, the colonizers are portrayed very successfully as capable of ruling. To prove this, Eliot states that Kipling's colonizers "have a greater aptitude for ruling than other people, and that they include a greater number of kindly, incorruptible and unself-seeking men capable of administration" (29-30). On the other hand, some of them like

George Orwell condemn Kipling and his novel *Kim* for his complete and blind support of the British Empire. Orwell calls Kipling a “jingo-imperialist” (271). He describes *Kim* as “morally insensitive and aesthetically disgusting” (275).

A Passage to India (1924) usually compared to *Kim* was written by E. M. Forster in the twenties of the 20th century. “Like Kipling, Forster spent some time in India but his view of the country, seen in *A Passage to India* (1924), is different” (Thornley and Roberts 144). *A Passage to India* has drawn the attention of many critics and writers since its birth. Lionel Trilling, one of today’s most influential and controversial critics, devotes a whole book with a critical overview of Forster’s novels. He makes a very famous statement praising Forster’s novels saying: “E. M. Forster is for me the only living novelist who can be read again and again and who, after each reading, gives me what few writers can give us after our first days of novel-reading, the sensation of having learned something” (7). Roger Fry, a famous historian, in a letter to Virginia Woolf asserts that *A Passage to India* is “a marvelous texture— really beautiful writing” (qtd. in Trilling 44). Another writer praises this work saying: “*A Passage to India* is a superb realistic novel” (Allen 339). According to Ifor Evans, this novel has to be “valued” because “England’s contact with India produced little such imaginative work” (276).

This novel is considered by most critics as Forster’s greatest achievement which is his last and most improved and remarkable novel. Forster’s novel *A Passage to India* is one of the most readable and criticized novels of our time. Many critics have suggested that Forster is a firm critic opposing the British Empire. Most critics have focused on the relationship between the colonizers and the colonized characters and the impossibility of friendship and personal relationships between them in British India. One of these critics is Hunt Hawkins. Hawkins openly states that “The chief argument against imperialism in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*

is that it prevents personal relationships” (1). He asserts that the British Empire determined the relationship between the British and the Indians and limited it into “intolerance” which is the result of “the unequal power relationship between English and Indians, from the imperialistic relationship itself” (2). The portrayal of the colonizers is a very significant aspect discussed in the productions of the novel’s critics. For example, Rama Kundu, an Indian critic, argues that “Forster shows an extraordinary fairness and insight in portraying the Britons in India” (32). Also, Pankaj Mishra, an Indian essayist and novelist, states that Forster “[accuses] the British in India of having an ‘undeveloped heart’” (xvii).

The Siege of Krishnapur (1973) is a novel written by James Gordon Farrell and that is of course after the fall of the British Empire. Since its date of publication, the novel has received the attention of so many writers and critics. In his introduction to the novel, Pankaj Mishra describes it as “a sophisticated novel of ideas that is also an entertaining comic adventure” (xvii). Farrell criticizes the British Empire by presenting his colonizers as deceived and failed by their Empire and by presenting the idea of the siege. Mishra believes that this novel shows how “the British had made India a part of a noble idea about themselves” (xvii). He states that “It was Farrell’s achievements to describe how tentatively the mask was first worn—in a sophisticated novel of idea” (xvii). Fatma Kalpakli, a Turkish critic, wrote a very interesting article about this novel in which she expresses how the colonizers reject the culture of the colonized focusing on the idea that this sort of rejection leads to “the end of the Empire” (6).

So, there are two aspects used by the writers to express their points of view regarding the presence of the British Empire in India. The first aspect is the representation of the characters of the colonizers. The second aspect is the national attempts of the colonized characters. These

aspects are actually tools used by these writers to reinforce their positions of the British Empire and its colonial rule over India.

© GSJ

The Representation of the Colonizers:

Kipling, Forster and Farrell attempt to prove their positions by the way they represent their colonizers. The colonizers play very important roles in every writer's novel. Kipling verifies his complete advocacy of the British rule over India in the way he represents his colonizer characters. Forster opposes the British Empire by bringing bad examples to represent the British officials and civilians. On the other hand, Farrell criticizes the Empire by representing the colonizers as deceived and failed by their Empire.

Kipling's colonizers can be divided into two groups. The first group members are pictured as understanding and kind to the colonized natives. The second group is represented as foolish and thoughtless and Kipling links their bad behavior to being in India for a short time and their lack of experience. Creighton is a very good example of the first group. "Creighton embodies the notion that you cannot govern India unless you know India, and to know India means to understand the way it operates" (Said 153). He is a colonial official and a scholar and represents the "union of power and knowledge" (Said 152). We are introduced to this character in chapter seven in which the colonel with his farsighted expectations shows an interest in turning Kim into a spy working for the British Empire. Colonel Creighton is represented as a very kind colonel who treats the natives in a very just and gentle way regardless of their background or race. We never see Creighton talking badly about the natives but rather he respects and treats them very well. Creighton gives Kim very valuable advice concerning his schooling at St. Xavier saying:

thou art a Sahib and the son of a Sahib. Therefore, do not at any time be led to
contemn the black men. I have known boys newly entered into the service of the

Government who feigned not to understand the talk or the customs of black men. Their pay was cut for ignorance. There is no sin so great as ignorance. Remember this. (102)

The previous quotation reflects Creighton's policy in dealing with and commanding the natives. The relationship between the "Sahibs" and "black men" has to be built on the act of commanding. The act of commanding should not be free from understanding and kindness. It is quite important to note that Kipling wants to verify his justification for the bad attitude of some Sahibs like the "devils" of the school who belong to the second group (103). Creighton tells us that those boys who are "newly entered into the service" just like the Drummer Boy represent the bad type because they are inexperienced and have been in India for a short time (102). Being in India for a long time will turn such boys into good people like Creighton. Kipling wants to convey the idea that the Drummer Boy and his likes will soon be just like Colonel Creighton. Edward Said notices a fault found in the character of Creighton. Said quotes Michael Edwards's words saying "few really bothered to learn the language of the people they ruled with any fluency, and they were heavily dependent on their native clerks, who had taken the trouble to learn the language of their conquerors" (151). The image given by Edwards shows the ordinary British official sent to the hot and strange India. However, Kipling did not attempt to use such an image unlike Forster's Ronny Heaslop, who will be discussed later. Ronny Heaslop "is an effective portrait of such an official" (Said 151).

To intensify his complete support to the British Empire, Kipling chose to make the foreign spies fail in the Great Game. He gives a convincing reason behind their failure which is their lack of understanding and knowing the colonized land, their insensitivity to local costumes, unconvincing disguise as hunters and their disrespect to local monks. When Hurree Babu meets

the spies, he introduces himself to the spies as a welcoming representative from the Rajah of Rampur offering them his services and hospitality as a guide through the hill country. His true aim, of course, is to take their secret documents before they are delivered into enemy hands. To win their confidence, he tells them of how the oppressing Britons took his country and he uses some crocodile tears to support his cries and whines. The ignorant spies believe that Babu “has a most complete hatred of his conquerors” (205). So, they agree to have him as their guide.

Kipling then tells us that “they were poor Sahibs, and ignorant; for no Sahib in his senses would follow a Bengali's advice” (205). Therefore, they are not as experienced as the British officials like Colonel Creighton who would know how to choose a good guide if he were in their shoes. Unlike Creighton, the spies show no respect to the native holy men. When Babu and the spies meet Kim and the Lama on their way, one of the spies sees the Lama's drawings of the Wheel of life and demands the Lama to hand it over to him. The Lama refuses so the Russian spy beats the Lama in the face. The spies' servants who are Buddhists are enraged by their masters' disrespectful attitude towards a Buddhist holy man. They escape leaving their masters to face their unknown destiny alone. Hence, Kipling links the foreign spies' failure to their inability to match the British standards of understanding and knowing the people and the land they are colonizing. According to Kipling, the British winning the secret documents of the Great Game assures their superiority of colonizing India the land they know and respect.

The kind experienced British characters that we have seen in Kipling's *Kim* are almost absent in Forster's *A Passage to India*. Only Fielding, Mrs. Moore and Miss Quested are pictured as friendly and considerate characters. But, those who govern the country, those who directly represent the British Empire and those civilians who represent the British civilian community are

depicted very badly. Forster wants us to link such characters to the British Empire and make a connection. What connects them together is their ignorance, corruption and racism.

As an example of the British officials' ignorance is the character of Major Callendar, the civil surgeon at Chandrapore. Earlier in the novel, we are notified that because of Callendar, Aziz always thinks that "the English are a comic institution," and he enjoys "being misunderstood by them" (44). All what Callendar knows about the Indians is "that no one ever told him the truth, although he had been in the country for twenty years" (44). As a matter of fact, twenty years of service is a long and sufficient period of time to know the other if utilized very well. But, in Callendar's case, this long period of time has blinded his eyes and has fed his heart with hatred.

One of the British corrupted officials is Ronny Heaslop who is the city magistrate at Chandrapore. He is responsible for the court of law and the state of justice in the city of Chandrapore. There are key adjectives that have to describe any good city magistrate. These adjectives would be just, reasonable and fair. A fair and reasonable analysis of Ronny asserts his inability to be described with the previous three adjectives. In the beginning of the novel, Mrs. Moore has a very serious argument with Ronny about the disagreeable treatment of the Anglo-Indians to the Indians. He answers her saying: "We're not here for the purpose of behaving pleasantly!" and he adds: "We're out here to do justice and keep the peace" (41). The narrator comments on this situation ironically saying:

Every day he worked hard in the court trying to decide which of two untrue accounts was the less untrue, trying to dispense justice fearlessly, to protect the weak against the less weak... surrounded by lies and flattery. That morning he

had convicted a railway clerk of overcharging pilgrims for their tickets, and a Pathan of attempted rape... both clerk and Pathan might appeal, bribe their witnesses more effectually in the interval, and get their sentences reversed. It was his duty. (41-42)

The previous quotation shows the narrator's ironic statement about Ronny's corrupt practice of his job. Doing his kind of justice and keeping the so-called peace prevent him to work a little bit harder to really protect the oppressed against the oppressors. The narrator hints that Ronny certainly knows that there are bribes that can change the natives' statements but he does not do anything to prevent them and does not take his job seriously and work harder to discover the bribes. Edward Said, in his article "The Pleasures of Imperialism," compares Kipling's Colonel Creighton to Forster's Ronny Heaslop. He states that Ronny is "an effective portrait" of those British officials in colonial India who "were heavily dependent on their native clerks" (151).

The corruption of the British officials and civilians is clearly stated by Mahmoud Ali who tells Aziz and Hamidullah ironically that he admires the British because "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" (6). He adds that "Mrs. Turton takes bribes" and she is so "skillful" in this (6). Certainly, there is neither peace nor justice when the oppressor exercises his strength over the oppressed in direct or indirect ways while the eye of justice is witnessing the wrongful situation and doing nothing.

Another important official used by Forster to clarify his opposition to the Empire is Mr. Turton, the Collector. He is in charge of governance of Chandrapore. So, he is the highest British

official in the city and is supposed to be experienced and nonpartisan. Let us suppose that he is experienced. As a reaction to Adela's accusations, he tells us that his "twenty-five years' experience of [India]" forces him to believe that only "disaster result" will surely come out "when English people and Indians attempt to be intimate socially" (145-146). He adds that he "[has] been in charge at Chandrapore for six years, and everything has gone smoothly if there has been mutual respect and esteem" (145). To him, mutual respect and esteem do not imply an intimate kind of relationship. So, his long experience assures him of the impossibility of normal relationships between the two nations. If there is any, only horrible events and disastrous consequences will come out. A native and a British have to build and yearly mend fences that prevent them from any simple contact. The attempt to know or understand the other is completely forbidden for safety reasons. Such attempts are useless and evil according to our experienced Collector.

As we said earlier, one trait of a good governor is being nonpartisan. Adela's story uncovers the Collector's racial and partisan's attitudes. Metaphorically speaking, the Collector crowns himself as a general of an army and the club members as his soldiers whose enemies are the Indians. He directs the process of the current plans addressing his soldiers saying:

Don't start carrying arms about. I want everything to go on precisely as usual, until there's cause for the contrary. Get the womenfolk off to the hills, but do it quietly, and for Heaven's sake no more talk of special trains. Never mind what you think or feel. Possibly I have feelings too. One isolated Indian has attempted-- is charged with an attempted crime... Act upon that fact until there are more facts... Assume every Indian is an angel. (163)

The quotation above shows the Collector assuming the current state of Chandrapore after Adela's accusations as a real state of war. The Collector makes the plans and tells the club members what to do and how to act in the before-battle time. To reinforce his opposition to the British Empire, Forster unmasks the real face of the British Empire represented by its civilians and officials who belong to different categories. Of course, their prejudice is clarified by the story of Adela and Aziz which uncovers the real attitudes of the British characters who regard the trail as a war in which the British characters' decisions and attitudes towards the natives are exposed. Before the trail, the narrator informs his readers that "[t]he issues Miss Quested had raised were so much more important than she was herself that [the club members] inevitably forgot her" (192). Therefore, considering the trail as a war and acting like generals and warriors are mistakes that expose the British in India. Such mistakes assure Forster's opposition to the presence of the British Empire in India.

Major Callendar is a character used by Forster to assert the fact that the club members deal with Aziz's trail as a war against the native Indians and to assure his opposition to the Empire is. Callendar claims that "It's not the time for sitting down. It's the time for action. Call in the troops and clear the bazaars" (166). He adds that what happened in the caves is "a damn good thing" because "It'll make [the Indians] squeal and it's time they did squeal" (191). As a kind of revenge, he describes how he tortured Nureddin who had been hospitalized saying:

You should see the grandson of our so-called leading loyalist... His beauty's gone, five upper teeth, two lower and a nostril... Old Panna Lal brought him the looking-glass yesterday and he blubbered. . . . I laughed; I laughed, I tell you, and so would you; that used to be one of these buck niggers, I thought, now lie's all septic; damn him, blast his soul--er--I believe he was unspeakably immoral—er...

I wish I'd had the cutting up of my late assistant too; nothing's too bad for these people. (191)

Ironically, the character of Major Callendar asserts that Forster's attempt to assure the inhumane attitudes of the British community members who regardless of their profession carry racial and prejudicial feelings against the native Indians. Callendar should prove his mercy and humanity as a physician instead to openly announce his prejudice and racism towards his patient Indians.

The female British characters are very significant characters used to verify Forster's opposition to the presence of the British Empire in India. Forster presents the female British characters in a very horrible picture. These female characters tend to deprive the Indians from human qualities. Ironically, such women should prove their feminine side and their soft nature instead of exposing their evil and monstrous reality. As an example, Mrs. Turton makes a very important statement verifying her lack of sympathy towards the Indians. In the club before the trail, she proudly proclaims that "[Indians] ought to crawl from [Chandrapore] to the caves on their hands and knees whenever an Englishwoman's in sight, they oughtn't to be spoken to, they ought to be spat at, they ought to be ground into the dust," and she adds "we've been far too kind with our Bridge Parties and the rest" (192). So, she openly suggests that all the Indians have to be treated worse than animals because they must be deprived from any normal and humane treatment. Also, Mrs. McBryde is as racial as Mrs. Turton. In the beginning of the novel, Mrs. McBryde, who used to be a nurse in India before her marriage, states that nursing Indians is "A most unsuitable position for any Englishwoman" (20). She recommends that humane jobs like nursing should not be given to British women for the sake of taking care of their inferior Indians who do not deserve any better treatment. Mrs. Callendar is another prejudiced character who

claims that “the kindest thing one can do to a native is to let him die” (20). Death, according to Mrs. Callendar, is the most merciful thing one can do to an Indian. Miss Derek who works for a rich Indian family states that Indians are “priceless” (79). Usually, we use this word to describe objects not people. So, using it to describe Indians verifies the process of dehumanization practiced by the British characters which asserts the inferiority of the Indians.

Hence, Forster presents a variety of British characters of several ages, of different jobs and of opposite sexes to show his disagreement to the presence of the British Empire in India. Those administrators and civilians have been in India for a long time and thus they are supposed to know the country and its people and to show some sort of sympathy towards them. However, according to Forster, corruption, ignorance and prejudice link the Empire to its British officials and civilians.

The British officials and civilians play significant roles in *The Siege of Krishnapur*. In this novel, these characters are represented as strong supporters and tough defenders of the Empire because they think that it is bringing good things and making useful achievements in India. But, after being under the siege, they begin to lose their faith in it. Losing their faith in the Empire confirms Farrell’s criticism of it. Thus, they are deceived by their own Empire which used to be a symbol of their national pride and honor. The Collector and the padre are the most important characters who defend the British Empire. Gradually, the siege allows them to reevaluate the civilization the British Empire is bringing to India and then to restate their positions regarding it.

The Collector, Mr. Hopkins, is the strongest promoter and supporter of the presence of the British Empire in India. From the very beginning of the novel, the Collector always talks

proudly about the civilization his country has brought to India as clarified by his repeated reference to the Great Exhibition; but, later on, the Collector loses his faith in this Empire and the civilization it is bringing to India. The Great Exhibition, which “symbolizes the industrial, military and economic superiority of Great Britain,” is a topic that interests the Collector (“The Great Exhibition at the Crystal Palace”). The Collector believes that the Great Exhibition shows the great achievements of Britain which needs to spread its wings and add many lands to its colonies if the people of these lands want to have their own great exhibitions. “[The Collector’s] unreserved admiration for the Great Exhibition is based on the conviction that it is a British mission to civilize the world” (Prusse). Such achievements should be brought to India and only colonization is able to bring spread it. Farrell clarifies that the Collector “had devoted a substantial part of his fortune to bringing out to India examples of European art and science in the belief that he was doing as once the Romans had done in Britain” (31). Since the Great Exhibition is based on a materialistic foundation and lacks an emotional one, it brings with it its own failure to continue. Hence, the Collector begins to lose faith in his view of civilization and the Great Exhibition by the end of the novel. The narrator elaborates on the beginning of the change in the Collector’s attitude:

He thought again of those hundred and fifty million people living in cruel poverty in India alone... Would Science and Political Economy ever be powerful enough to give them a life of ease and respectability? He no longer believed that they would... This notion of the superiority of the nineteenth century which he had just been enjoying had depended on beliefs he no longer held, but which had just now been itching, like amputated limbs which he could feel although they no longer existed. (216-217)

The Collector who used to talk so proudly about the achievements it had made in India, is now sure that science, economy and politics are merely things he no longer believes in. His Empire has failed him and this is the only thing that he believes right now. The Collector's lack of faith in the British Empire assures Farrell's criticism of the presence of the British Empire in India.

The Collector's change in beliefs is symbolized and clarified by the illness that hits him. By the end of the siege, the Collector becomes ill of erysipelas. This illness allows him to open his eyes and start to see things differently. It enables the Collector to reevaluate his points of view about the Empire by concluding that "India itself was now a different place; the fiction of happy natives being led forward along the road to civilization" that we saw in Kipling's *Kim* "could no longer be sustained" (244). So, he develops a more static and settled conclusion saying "What a shame it all is, even so! What a waste of all the good work that has been done in India" (310)! As soon as he changes his viewpoints about the Empire and its civilization, his illness leaves him creating a very expressive and special impression on us, the readers.

Another aspect that strengthens Farrell's criticism to the Empire and assures the Collector's lack of faith in the Empire is using the European signs of civilization as tools of explosions. Just before the arrival of the relieving force, the Collector decides that the possessions which used to symbolize his nationalist pride because they represent the British civilization, are now to be destroyed by firing them at the natives. These possessions are the statues, furniture, beads, jewel and valuable pictures that he used to keep in the residency. "The clutter of possessions thus loses all its material value and is turned into a defensive wall of limited usefulness" (Prusse). Firing the possessions announces the Collector's rejection of his old

viewpoints. Now, he officially does not believe in the current sort of civilization the Empire is bringing to India any more.

Another character used by Farrell to express his criticism of the British Empire is the padre. The padre is a strong defender of the British Empire and the civilization it is bringing to the native Indians. He stands firm against Fleury's accusations and claims regarding the British Empire and its civilization. The Padre is always ready with a powerful shield against Fleury who repeatedly accuses the British Empire of lacking an emotional foundation. Because the padre opposes Fleury's statements about the Empire and the kind of Christianity it is spreading, he assures himself saying: "Surely the Devil is putting words on this young man's tongues" (214)! In the beginning of the siege, the padre thinks that God would stop punishing those who are besieged only "if they [show] signs of penitence" (139). Here, he blames the bad deeds done by the British people who are under the siege. But, as a sign of the change in his opinion of the Empire, he starts to realize that he has been deceived by his Empire. So, he calls the Great Exhibition "The World's Vanity Fair," and blames this achievement for the suffering the British are now going through (328). And, he informs the Collector that he "[has] committed a grave error in lending his approval, together with that of the Church he represented, to the Exhibition" (328). He states that the "Vanity Fair of materialism" is not based on "the word of God" (336). Thus, he comes to a very strong conclusion when he notifies the Collector that "The Crystal Palace was built in the form of a cathedral! A cathedral of Beelzebub" and he adds that it is "A cathedral of Baal! A cathedral of Mammon" (337). Saying this last sentence saves everybody in the residency and creates a very dramatic scene because as soon as it is pronounced a soldier from the relieving force comes in and addresses the Collector, the padre and everybody in the residency saying: "I say, d'you mind if we come in? We've come to relieve you" (337).

So, both of the Collector and the padre are saved once they both realize that the British Empire is not what they thought it was. In other words, it does not act the way it promised them to act. That is why the Empire fails them by not fulfilling and gratifying their expectations and hopes. So, they stop believing in the goodness of the British Empire and its civilization. According to Farrell, the Empire has to change its policies and practices. The current policies and the existing sort of civilization do not work well any longer and that is why this Empire is subject to his criticism. Unlike many Mutiny writers, Farrell gives the impression that the victorious end of the siege “is actually a defeat or a failure as it is the beginning of the end, the end of the British Empire and of the British culture” (qtd. in Kalpakli 214). Although he is with the Empire but he is against its sort civilization and its policies. More accurately, he is against its conception of civilization. Fatma Kalpakli in her article believes that “Farrell adopts a critical look towards the British policies, however, not for being against the British imperialism, but for the improvement of British imperial policies” (210). According to Farrell, realizing and changing the out-of-date policies will save the British Empire from its downfall. The sooner these mistakes are corrected, the better.

The Nationalist Attempts of the Colonized Characters:

A very significant aspect that Kipling, Forster and Farrell depend on is the nationalist attempts of the characters of the Indians. The colonized characters' nationalist attempts are used to serve each writer's goal. Kipling's advocacy to the rule of the British Empire over India is translated into the native characters' complete support of the British Empire. Their speeches and actions advocate and support the presence of the British Empire in India. In order to reinforce his opposition to the rule of the British Empire over India, E. M. Forster allows his colonized characters to be *nationalist Indians*. They speak the way Indians are supposed to speak when their country is ruled by a foreign and a racial force. James Gordon Farrell asserts his criticism to the British Empire by introducing the idea of the national siege which confirms the natives' desire of getting rid of the foreign presence in their land.

Rudyard Kipling is the literary godfather of the British Empire. Kipling uses several colonized characters from different sects and ethnicities to assure their agreement of the necessity of the presence of the British Empire in their country. Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs, Sansis, Jains, Buddhists, Bengalis, and Tibetans are all present in this picaresque novel. From the beginning of the novel till its end, the idea of supporting and advocating the British rule regardless of the character's ethnicity and race is emphasized. According to Jeffery Meyers "Loyalty— to the British cause— is a dominant theme in the novel" (xxvii). Meyers wants to say that all of Kipling's characters remain loyal to the British no matter what happens. Mahbub Ali, Hurree Chunder Mookerjee, the Old Solider, the Woman of Shamlegh and the Kulu Woman are the most important colonized characters who would do and say anything to serve the peace of British India. Using these colonized characters to assure his advocacy, Kipling "puts the preservation of the British Empire directly in the hands of the [loyal] Indians" (Fernando 3).

Upon discussing the British Empire and India, Edward Said argues that “one purpose of the novel is in fact to show the absence of conflict” in British India (146). The colonizers and the colonized are used as tools to express Kipling’s support to the British Empire. Said analyzes the colonizers and the colonized characters in *Kim* and concludes that “in *Kim* no one challenges British rule, and no one articulates any of the local Indian challenges that must have been greatly in evidence” (148). So, in *Kim*, we are introduced into a happy image of India where the nationalist Indians are silenced.

Mahbub Ali is actually a spy under the disguise of a famous horse trader. He works for the British Empire in the Great Game, follows the suspected who threaten the peace of British India and delivers the top secret information to the British authorities. Everything he does is for the sake of the British Empire which is ruling India. He has high expectations of Kim’s abilities to serve British India, he offers Kim very valuable advice concerning the latter's schooling at a British school. Ali tells Creighton that school will allow Kim to be "a good soldier" for the British Empire (94). He assures us of Kim’s potentials because he already “sent him to deliver a message once from Lahore” very successfully (94). In the process of turning Kim into a formal spy, Ali teaches Kim how to make “a written report” (146). All these efforts are due to his full devotion to the British Empire. However, Edward Said in his article “the Pleasures of Imperialism,” states that Mahbub Ali belongs to the Pathan people who were “historically in a state of unpacified insurrection against the British throughout the nineteenth century” (148). So, according to historical facts, Indians with Mahbub Ali’s background were against the British rule over their land. But, here, in *Kim*, a Pathan risks his dear life to the colonizers who are colonizing his country.

Another character used to serve Kipling's goal is Hurree Babu. Hurree Babu is also a spy working for the British Empire. He outsmarts the French and Russian spies when he talks about the oppression of his British masters. Of course, Babu does not feel oppressed but he lies about this to relieve them of their secret documents concerning the Afghan border. So, he succeeds in taking the secret documents. As a reward to his successful mission, the British authorities "gave him a certificate praising his courtesy, helpfulness, and unerring skill as a guide. He put it in his waist-belt and sobbed with emotion; they had endured so many dangers together" (230). Babu put up with such dangers because he was serving British India. Therefore, his honor and reputation are attached to protecting an India ruled by Britain which is his promising land of honor and credit.

The Woman of Shamlegh is also another native character used by Kipling to express his advocacy to the British Empire. Failing to seduce Kim who reminds her of her British lover, she informs Kim about her sad love affair with a Sahib saying:

I was fair once. Laughest thou? Once, long ago, if thou canst believe, a Sahib looked on me with favour. Once, long ago, I wore European clothes at the Mission-house yonder.' She pointed towards Kotgarh. 'Once, long ago. I was *Kerlistian* and spoke English—as the Sahibs speak it. Yes. My Sahib said he would return and wed me—yes, wed me. He went away—I had nursed him when he was sick—but he never returned. Then I saw that the Gods of the Kerlistians lied, and I went back to my own people ... I have never set eyes on a Sahib since. (226)

To any normal human being, a bitter and romantic love affair such as the above would probably result in a sense of hatred and revulsion against anything and anyone attached to the

other side of the affair. In psychology, the term *generalization* means “A principle of conditioning. When a conditioned response is established to a certain stimulus, it will be done to all similar stimuli” (Banerjee 101). The Woman of Shamlegh should have suffered from generalization. But, according to Kipling, it is normal and logical to be very generous and extremely helpful to one’s oppressors and to those people who remind us of sad and depressing memories. Kipling stresses this point by allowing the Woman of Shamlegh to provide Kim and the Lama with a good litter and an excellent amount of food for their journey; and, above all, she bids them blissful goodbye. The Lama makes her unique by saying that “She has acquired merit beyond all others” (226).

The Woman of Kulu is another important colonized character used by Kipling to stress his idea of a happy India under the British rule. She is generous to Kim and the Lama and offers them food and shelter when they are in need. Also, she nurses Kim when he is ill. Upon discussing the current state of peace in India, she talks about the Britons saying:

‘These be the sort to oversee justice. They know the land and the customs of the land. The others, all new from Europe, suckled by white women and learning our tongues from books, are worse than the pestilence. They do harm to Kings.’ Then she told a long, long tale to the world at large, of an ignorant young policeman who had disturbed some small Hill Rajah, a ninth cousin of her own, in the matter of a trivial land-case, winding up with a quotation from a work by no means devotional. (66)

In this interesting quotation, she tells us that only the Britons know the customs, habits and the local traditions of India and that is exactly why they are the only ones who are able to run

it. Others, whether the Indian natives or of any other nationality cannot do that. Justice and management in India have to be exercised by the Britons who know and understand everything concerning India. This character can be best described as a witty and cunning old woman with a very salty and sharp tongue who would say anything without being afraid or hesitant. So, Kipling utilized this fact and made her say a very significant statement concerning who is capable to rule India. Such a woman with such a type of character should have mentioned at least one small thing that can be considered negative about the colonial rule of the British Empire but Kipling did not choose to do that. Therefore, Kipling tried to enforce his point of view despite the logical way of creating a character and putting believable words in her mouth.

It is very significant to come across another colonized character that sees things from Kipling's eyes. This character is the Old Solider who fought in the 1857 Mutiny with his British officers against his own people. Before we go into his famous speech, let us have a quick historic survey of the story of this munity. The 1857 Mutiny was about a religious taboo which began with the rumor that the cartridges of the new-issue Enfield rifles were greased with animal fat. The rumor said that the fat was pork and beef which are both prevented to be used by both Muslims and Hindus. The very size of the rumor suggests a profound degree of unhappiness. Levine discusses the value of the 1857 revolt saying:

The 1857 revolt was far more than merely a soldiers' protest. It expressed in many ways the burgeoning gulf between British authority and Indian subject... This revolt covered a whole range of frustrations – over extortionate tax demands, extensive overt racism, insensitivity to local culture and religion, and incessant territorial expansion. (77)

The revolts and rebellions initiated by this rumor extended from the original place of the uprising sepoys into many parts of India. The rebellions posed a considerable threat to the British Empire behind the mask of the East India Company.

It is very important to note that Kipling chose this Solider to be old for two reasons. Firstly, his old age has of course to go in harmony with the timing of the story of the novel. Secondly, it serves another point which is being old makes one wise, sensible and mature and this fact raises the strength and the weight of the Old Soldier's words. The Old Solider meets Kim and the Lama in the outskirts of Umballa and he tells them:

A madness ate into all the Army, and they turned against their officers. That was the first evil, but not past remedy if they had then held their hands. But they chose to kill the Sahibs' wives and children. Then came the Sahibs from over the sea and called them to most strict account. (46)

The Solider describes the act his peer soldiers did as madness which literally means blind rage and reckless state of mind. So, wisdom and sanity are all absent in their act. According to Kipling, the Soldier's sanity and wisdom are supposed to prevent the soldiers from turning against their British superiors. The Old Solider goes on and links the soldiers with a very violent act which is killing "the Sahibs' wives and children" (46). What could be more violent, hostile and barbaric than the soldiers' act? Kipling tries to stress the practical and orderly side of the British Empire by emphasizing that their reaction was only that they "called" not *dragged* the native soldiers "to strict account" not *to the gallows* (46). Edward Said states that " 'calling' the Indian mutineers 'to strict account,' we have left the world of history and entered the world of imperialist polemic, in which the native is naturally a delinquent, the white man a stern but moral

patent and judge” (148). The Solider assures us that he was motivated by a sense of duty and sanity to fight against his own people despite the fact that he became “an outcast among [his] kin, and [his] cousin’s blood [was] wet on [his] sabre” (64). Of course, the Indian national identity does not find any place in his voice. His voice is fully British as well as his point of view. History tells us that the 1857 Mutiny is regarded as the first war of independence (Levine 77); but, Kipling sees this mutiny as evidence of the irrationality of the natives. Tamara Fernando states that “Kipling frames the mutiny not as the group’s legitimate attempt for independence and nationalization, but as an unjustified, irrational, and isolated act of brutality” (2). So, nationalism and independence are absent in *Kim*.

Unlike Kipling, Forster presents a variety of incidents that show the spirit of nationalism sensed in his characters and verify his opposition of the British Empire. Certainly, nationalism is the result of the oppression practiced by the strong British rulers over the weak Indian natives. It expresses the natives’ feelings of being under a lot of pressure and their desire to get rid of the foreign rulers. In *Kim*, there is one incident that shows the spirit of nationalism of the colonized. Those who fought in the Mutiny against their British masters were not given a voice. Only those opposing the revolt spoke and said what Kipling wanted them to say. But, in *A Passage to India*, Forster gives nationalism a voice. Its voice is clearly heard. Farantz Fanon in his article “National Culture” states that “To fight for national culture means in the first place to fight for the liberation of the nation” (154). He adds that national identity “is the concept of a shared community, one which Benedict Anderson calls an ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1983:15) which has enabled post-colonial societies to invent a self image through which they could act to liberate themselves from imperialist oppression” (151). Lin asserts that *A Passage to India* is a novel that embodies the notion of the “resistance of colonialism” and “the law it imposes.” In *A*

Passage to India, the colonized people's nationalist attitudes obviously oppose the presence of an oppressing foreign power controlling their own country. The nationalist Indians are used by Forster to intensify his opposition of the British Empire in India.

In order to increase the power of his opposition to the Empire, Forster introduces the idea of Aziz's trial as a national incident. The trial of Aziz uncovers the feelings and the opinions of the British characters towards the native Indians. The British side deals with it as a war and so does the Indian side. Forster asserts that the trial is considered as "a political challenge" by both sides (154). Before the trial, the Indians organize their army and create a campaign for Aziz which is "working up" (170). Financially, the Nawab Bahadur sustains "the defense" (189). To defend Aziz, Hamidullah chooses Amritaro, a Hindu lawyer, to defend Aziz. Hamidullah's choice of Amritaro is not a random or an arbitrary thing. But, he has an aim which is "To drag in everyone" and only then "the defense would then make a wider appeal" (154). This choice will attract public attention which is a very effective tool to create a national issue out of Aziz's trial. Amritaro is favored because he is Hindu and "[has] a high reputation professionally and personally" and because he is "notoriously anti-British" (154). Also, according to the organizers of the campaign, demonstrations organized by Indians for the sake of freeing Aziz are very necessary "otherwise [the British] will still think [the Indians] are afraid" (208). Demonstrations will threaten the confidence felt by the British side who think that they are certainly winning the case. The Indians have to prove their strength and ability to match the British forces. After announcing the innocence of Aziz, an expressive scene in which all Indians shared the happiness of winning the case is described:

And then the flimsy framework of the court broke up, the shouts of derision and rage culminated, people screamed and cursed, kissed one another, wept

passionately. Here were the English, whom their servants protected, there Aziz fainted in Hamidullah's arms. Victory on this side, defeat on that--complete for one moment was the antithesis. (204-205)

This vivid picture is a scene that does not only describe the joy felt by the prisoner after being released; but, it symbolically describes a scene of people's excessive happiness after the announcement of the independence of their country. Mixing many emotions that include anger, mockery and happiness helps us to consider the trial as a serious national issue and winning it as the independence of a country. Therefore, "their resistance was... not only a resistance against the unjust accusation of one innocent Indian, but a resistance against the unjust colonial rule itself" (Lin). All these actions done by all Indians regardless of their race or religion can be summed up as cultural actions which "cannot be divorced from the larger struggle for the liberation of the nation" (Amuta 160).

One way used by Forster to express Aziz's flaming nationalist feelings is poetry. Aziz releases his imprisoned emotions through poetry. The trial is a turning point in Aziz's view of what poetry should discuss. Before the trial, we are informed that he is mostly interested in poems written in Persian, Urdu, and Arabic discussing the topics of "the decay of Islam and the brevity of love" (9). But, after the trial, when Das comes to him and asks for a poem written especially for the "general Indian" which means that it is not only for Muslims but also for all Indians, Aziz changes his view of what poetry should discuss (236). Das addresses him saying: "You are our hero; the whole city is behind you, irrespective of creed" (236). This conversation makes a very strong effect on Aziz who decides "to compose a new song which should be acclaimed by multitudes and even sung in the fields... He vowed to see more of Indians who were not Mohammedans, and never to look backward" (237). Aziz concludes that "[India] must

imitate Japan. Not until she is a nation will her sons be treated with respect” (238). Therefore, the trial and his conversation with Das positively intensify and direct his nationalist attitudes and open his eyes to see reality as it is.

One important consequence that results from the trial is Aziz’s choice to live in a state where the British rule is not exercised. He wants to live in an independent state free from any foreign influence. Because he knows that he is always going to be misunderstood and suspected and because he knows that he can never live happily ever after in a state controlled by the British, he addresses Fielding saying the following:

You think that by letting Miss Quested off easily I shall make a better reputation for myself and Indians generally. No, no. It will be put down to weakness and the attempt to gain promotion officially. I have decided to have nothing more to do with British India, as a matter of fact. I shall seek service in some Moslem State, such as Hyderabad, Bhopal, where Englishmen cannot insult me any more. (223)

Forster assures us that Aziz and his Indian peers know that the result of the trial will never change the Anglo-Indians’ attitudes towards the Indian natives. It is the Indians’ definite doom to be forever misunderstood and prejudiced inferiors. This is one reason why nationalism blazes with fire in their hearts. The narrator again notifies us that the English people who attended the trial “still believed he was guilty, they believed it to the end of their careers” (231). Adela almost became their “national heroine” (223). Even Hamidullah believes that “If God himself descended from heaven into their club and said [Aziz] [was] innocent, they would disbelieve [Him]” (238). According to Foster, the changing the feelings and opinions of the Anglo-Indians about the Indians is simply impossible. The superiors will always think that one

reason that makes them superior is making good and reasonable decisions. So, they will not step down to their inferiors' level and commit mistakes. Hence, Forster presents a mistake exposed by nationalism and committed by the British is their Empire which is ruling several lands and increasing the weight of this mistake.

Nationalism extends over many Indians not only Aziz. It asserts their lack of desire to have a country ruled by the British Empire. As a nationalist reaction to Adela's false attacks and Nureddin's injury caused by Major Callendar, the Nawab Bahadur "announced that he should give up his British-conferred title, and live as a private gentleman, plain Mr. Zulfiqar" (210). After that, "he began a speech about Justice, Courage, Liberty, and Prudence" (210). The themes of this speech clearly question the imperial British rule over India. A man with a position like the Nawab Bahadur is very important for the sake of the long term presence of the British Empire in India. Losing such a man is a big loss for the Empire which is beginning to lose the support of the socially important Indians whose words and opinions are very respected and appreciated by the native Indians as well as the British officials. Foster clearly foretells the impending fall of the British Empire because it is beginning to lose its Indian support.

Unlike *Kim* and *A Passage to India*, the violent siege of Krishnapur is directly introduced to the readers and the scenes of the attacks and fights between the British and the Indians are presented. Nationalist Indians take a very serious step in this novel. The siege brings many deaths and ills with it to the Anglo-Indians. We should keep in mind that Farrell's criticism of the British Empire does not mean that he is against its presence in India. His criticism differs from that of Forster's. Forster opposes the British Empire and does not believe it should exit and rule other countries any longer. On the other hand, Farrell criticizes it and wants it to change its practices and its policies in the colonized lands. The siege should be understood as a national

attempt to get rid of the British Empire whose practices and policies have been proved unsuccessful.

Many British people were killed in these cities. In the Residency of Krishnapur, cholera spread. Many people died either by the sepoys or by illness. For example, Lieutenant Cutter and Mr. Wright died in their fight with the sepoys, Mrs. Scott died along with her newborn after giving birth and Dr. Dunstaple died by cholera. Farrell uses their death as a symbol of the wrong policies and bad methods of ruling India. “Binns further expresses that the cholera outbreak in the English Residency can also be taken as the ‘manifestation of moral decay and sickness’” (qtd. in Kalpakli 3).

Although the nationalist colonized characters are given very minor roles and are deprived from speech, the bloodshed and these attacks convey their national voice and their desire to get rid of the rule of the British Empire over their own countries. James Gordon Farrell conveys their voice to his readers by presenting the idea of the siege. Therefore, Indian nationalism represented by the siege is a topic that creates the story of *The Siege of Krishnapur* and confirms Farrell’s criticism of the British Empire. So, the siege is a national attempt of the natives to get rid of the rule of the British Empire over India.

The siege begins after a strange distribution of chapatis, a form of Indian bread. The Collector finds them in his study, in the portico of the Residency and later on he finds out that they are found in the northern stations of British India. He realizes that they are omens of a coming danger. The choice of this sort of food is very important and quite successful. This bread does reflect a sense of Indian independence and nationalism because the nationality of this bread

is wholly Indian. A few days after the distribution of these chapatis, many British stations are attacked by the sepoys and one of them is the station of Krishnapur.

The policies and practices applied by the British Empire are old-fashioned and need to be improved. Such policies have to be checked again and get updated. The system is ill and needs to be cured otherwise it will die. To prove this, the story of treating cholera is emphasized in this novel. Treating cholera is one of the big and page-consuming controversies of the novel.

Treating cholera is a symbol of ruling India. Dr. Dunstaple treats cholera as most of physicians of his time do. Such physicians believe that “an invisible cholera cloud” and “impure or damp air” cause this disease (276). Because Dr. McNab has come up with a new and effective remedy and because he does not believe in the current causes of cholera, Dr. Dunstaple accuses him of dereliction and recklessness. Upon debating on the best treatment for cholera, Dunstaple shouts to the public saying:

I don't pretend that medical science has yet found a method of treating cholera that's quite satisfactory, I don't say there isn't room for improvement, ladies and gentlemen... but what I do say is that it's the duty of a member of a medical profession to use the best available treatment known and accepted by his fellow physicians! It's his duty. A license to practise medicine isn't a license to perform whatever hare-brained experiments may come into his head. (274)

The failure of Dr. Dunstaple's claims is proved by his death. He dies of cholera after using his own way of treatment which is the old-fashioned and outdated one. His death means McNab's success. Therefore, using the old and useless medicines and applying the unsuccessful methods of treatment are symbols of the wrong practices and the useless policies used in ruling

India. The patient is British India which is weakening and has to be recovered by making the right decisions and taking the correct steps. Dunstaple is not able to see the causes of the illness and the British Empire is not able to see the causes of the siege and has not been able to see the symptoms and the signs of the sieges and the attacks. Failing to see the signs of a coming revolt explains why “Only the Collector remained convinced that trouble was coming” (14). Farrell asserts that if the inability to note the causes and the signs of the failure of the rule of the British Empire continues, it will definitely lead the patient British India into its downfall.

© GSJ

Conclusion:

The three novels clarify the positions of each writer towards the presence of the British Empire in India. Each position determines the continuity of the rule of the British Empire over India. Each novelist depends on two aspects that increase the weight of his position.

Kim exposes Kipling's advocacy of the British Empire and its presence as a colonial power and rule over India. Kipling creates a bright and a happy picture of British India ruled by a good group of colonizers using the supporting colonized characters as his paintbrushes. Kipling assures us that Indians are happy for being ruled by the British Empire and that the British are the best rulers they can ever have. He strengthens the point that the British Empire brings progress and civilization to India. Therefore, Kipling believes that the Empire will continue ruling this land for a very long time. Kipling presents a big number of Indian characters who all agree on the presence of the British rule in India. Kipling forces his colonized characters to repeat what he wants to say. The Shamlegh Woman, the Old Woman of Kulu, the Old Solider, Mahbub Ali and Mokerjee Hurree Babu are Indian characters supporting the presence of the British Empire in India. They would do anything to help to protect its presence in their own country. They agree that the British are the best rulers they can ever have and that neither Indians themselves nor foreigners can protect and rule India the way the British do. The British colonizers know India and respect its people. To prove this, Kipling brings the story of the two foreign spies to assure their disrespect and lack of understanding to India and its people. To justify the bad treatment of some British colonizers to the Indians, Kipling links their lack of experience and their foolishness to their bad treatment. So, Kipling uses his colonized characters and his colonizers to say one sentence: long live the British Empire in India.

On the other hand, *A Passage to India* exposes Forster's opposition to the presence of the British Empire in India. Forster asserts that Indians are not happy for having a country ruled by the British and their attitudes have proved it. He asserts that the British colonizers' hostility and corruption do not enable them to rule other nations. He concludes that the Empire will fall down soon. To verify his opposition to the British Empire ruling India, Forster presents many British characters who represent the British Empire in India very negatively. They are corrupted, racist and ignorant. Ronny Heaslop, the Turtons, the Callendars, Miss Derek and others are all bad examples representing the Empire. They have been in India for a long time and yet they disrespect the country and despise its people. Forster brings these bad examples to oppose the British Empire which has been projected very positively and nicely in Kipling's *Kim*. To increase the power of his opposition of the British Empire, he allows nationalism to play a role in his novel. The British and Indian characters deal with Aziz's trial as a nationalist case in *A Passage to India*. The British side has to win to prove its superiority and on the other hand the Indian side has to win to prove its nationalist dignity. As a consequence, many Indians get to change the way they view things. Aziz wants to write poetry for all Indians and the Nawab Bahadur gives up his British title and desires to be called plainly with his Indian name. Therefore, Forster foresees the impending fall of the British Empire in India. He knew that the Empire was not going to last.

The Siege of Krishnapur sheds light on Farrell's criticism to the presence of the British Empire in the Indian land. He assures us that he does not oppose the presence of the British in India, but rather he demands a change in these policies and agenda. These policies and methods of ruling need to get updated otherwise the Empire will fall down. To prove his statement, he represents his colonizers as deceived and failed by their own Empire which used to be a symbol

of their nationalist pride. The Collector and the padre lose their faith in this empire and change their points of view about it. The siege which is a nationalist attempt made by the colonized characters allows them to open their eyes and see the truth. It allows them to realize that the British using the very old policies and methods in ruling India are not able to rule it any longer. Thus, Farrell assures us that if the Empire is going to continue with these policies, it is going to fall down to pieces very soon.

These are the positions that each writer takes and makes his novel very distinctive and unique. The representation of the colonizers and the nationalist attempts of the colonized characters are two aspects that verify each writer's position towards the Empire. So, it is clear that each writer wrote down his ideas on the pages of his novel in a distinguished way. Each writer expressed his opinion and position regarding the British Empire and India in a way that makes reading each novel a new and a different experience. These novels have survived since many decades and have affected the British and Indian societies. These novels give us a chance to understand the ideologies and the foreign policies of the colonial and imperial powers of the world. Also, they direct and enrich our understanding of the demands and desires of the colonized nations.

Works Cited

Allen, Walter. *The English Novel: a Short Critical History*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1958.

Print.

Amuta. Chidi. "National Liberation." Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. 158-163.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*. London:

Routledge, 1995. Print.

Banerjee, J. C. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Psychological Terms*. New Delhi: M D Publications,

1994. Print.

Evans, Ifor. *A Short History of English Literature*. 4th ed. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin,

1981. Print.

Fanon, Frantz. "National Culture." Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. 153-157.

Farrell, J. G. *The Siege of Krishnapur*. New York: New York Review, 2004. Print.

Fernando, Tamara. "Critical Essay on 'Kim'." *Novels for Students*. Ed. Ira Mark Milne and

Timothy Sisler. Vol. 21. Detroit: Gale, 2005. *Literature Resource Center*. Web. 25 Apr.

2010.

<[http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?&id=GALE%7CH1420064887&v=2.1&u=edmo56673
&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w](http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?&id=GALE%7CH1420064887&v=2.1&u=edmo56673&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w)>.

Ferguson, Niall. *Empire: the Rise and Demise of the British World Order and the Lessons for*

Global Power. New York: Basic, 2004. *Google Books*. Web. 16 Nov. 2010.

<<http://books.google.com/books?id=luSjXeSBYHEC&dq=Empire:+the+rise+and+demise>

+of+the+British+world+order+and+the+lessons+for+global+power&hl=en&src=bmrr&e
i=hcYITfeLLc_z4garxNXMCQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=book-
thumbnail&resnum=1&ved=0CCQQ6wEwAA&safe=active>.

Forster, E. M. *A Passage to India*. London: Penguin, 1998. Print.

Hawkins, Hunt. "Forster's Critique of Imperialism in *A Passage to India*." *JSTOR*. JSTOR, 29
May 2007. Web. 12 Dec. 2010. <<http://www.jstor.org/pss/3199513>>.

Kalpaklı, Fatma. "The Failure of the Concept of the White Man's Burden in James Gordon
Farrell's the Siege of Krishnapur." *British Novelists and Indian Nationalism: Contrasting
Approaches in the Works of Mary Margaret Kaye, James Gordon Farrell and Zadie
Smith*. Bethesda: Academica, 2009. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 1 Aug. 2010.
<http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt2/sayi9pdf/kalpakli_fatma.pdf>.

Kipling, Rudyard, and T. S. Eliot. *A Choice of Kipling's Verse: Selected with an Essay on
Rudyard Kipling*. London: Faber and Faber, 1963. Print.

Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*. Kent: Wordsworth Classics, 1995.

Kundu, Rama. "India through British Eyes in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*." *Kito Zvilgsnis*
2008: 32-37. *CEEOL*. 2008. Web. 1 Jan. 2011.
<[http://www.ceeol.com/aspx/issuedetails.aspx?issueid=fb80250b-f962-4327-8fab-
8a7c70cc0999&articleId=2ce63404-cf33-4978-a258-34ee6965311b](http://www.ceeol.com/aspx/issuedetails.aspx?issueid=fb80250b-f962-4327-8fab-8a7c70cc0999&articleId=2ce63404-cf33-4978-a258-34ee6965311b)>.

Levine, Philippa. *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset*. Harlow, England: Pearson Longman,
2007. Print.

Lin, Wen-Chi. "Law and (Anti-)Colonialism in A Passage to India." *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism*. Ed. Janet Witalec. Vol. 126. Detroit: Gale, 2002. Literature Resource Center.

1995. Web. 11 May 2010.

<<http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?&id=GALE%7CH1420046534&v=2.1&u=edmo56673&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w>>.

Meyers, Jeffrey. Introduction. *Kim*. By Rudyard Kipling. New York: Barnes & Noble, 2004. Xv-Xxix. Print.

Mishra, Pankaj. Introduction. *The Siege of Krishnapur*. By J. G. Farrell. xvii.

Orwell, George. *The Orwell Reader; Fiction, Essays, and Reportage*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956. Print.

Prusse, Michael C. "The Siege of Krishnapur, by J. G. Farrell." *Booker Prize Novels: 1969-2005*. Ed. Merritt Moseley. Detroit: Gale, 2006. Dictionary of Literary Biography Vol. 326. *Literature Resource Center*. 2008 Web. 9 May 2010.

<<http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?&id=GALE%7CH1220000964&v=2.1&u=edmo56673&it=r&p=LitRC&sw=w>>.

Said, Edward W. "The Pleasures of Imperialism." *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993. Print.

"The Great Exhibition at the Crystal Palace." *Victorian Station*. 1 Oct. 2001. Web. 16 Dec. 2010.
<<http://www.victorianstation.com/palace.html>>.

Thornley, G. C., and Gwyneth Roberts. *An Outline of English Literature*. Harlow: Longman, 1984. Print.

Trilling, Lionel. *E. M. Forster*. New York: New Directions, 1965. *Google Books*. 2009. Web. 12 Oct. 2010.

<http://books.google.com/books?id=AESTWbfW8G8C&printsec=frontcover&dq=Forster+By+Lionel+Trilling&hl=en&ei=Jjf9TMuEIsM44gbq4NWUBw&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CCMQ6AEwAA&safe=active#v=onepage&q&f=false>.

© GSJ