

East and West in *Kim* and *Gora*

Ruhul Asfia*

Abstract: The two novels, Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* (1901) and Rabindranath Tagore's *Gora* (1908), explore the different national and cultural perspectives of Eastern and Western writers regarding the representation of India during the British Raj. But the two novels have interesting parallels which are the focus of this paper. Kipling acquired this race-prejudice from his Anglo-Indian community and reinforced imperialistic theories in his writings current in England towards the close of the nineteenth century. He deliberately focused attention on those things in Indian life which would provide a justification for his imperialistic views. In some of his writings he attempted to show the convergence of East and West, but it always resulted in confrontation.

Rabindranath Tagore's commitment to the nationalist movements originated from his realization of the intense feeling of how miserably Indians felt subordinated during the colonial rule. Tagore's novel is a scathing exposure of the narrowness, bigotry and stupidity of Hinduism. Where it differs artistically from *Kim* is that the racial problems in it are treated on a purely human level. In *Gora*, Rabindranath Tagore speaks for global humanity. But Kipling could not transcend the imperialist ideology in *Kim*. Tagore's *Gora* explores the possibilities of the convergence of East-West but Kipling's *Kim* does not let the East and West converge.

Rabindranath Tagore's *Gora* (1908) offers an interesting parallel to Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* (1901) not only because they are written in the same colonial period of British imperialism with the same setting but also for the resemblance of the main characters who share the same Irish origin. The government of colonial India was essentially an absolute government founded not on consent but on conquest and representative not of the Indian people but of ideas totally different from theirs – ideas derived from English and European morality. James Fitzjames Stephen argued that their government implies at every point the superiority of the conquering race. The attitude of the Anglo-Indians has been recorded by Philip Mason in this way:

Between people so different there could be courtesy, kindness, and liking, there could be affection, but no dealing on equal terms. The relationship was paternal, accepted on both sides. It was fixed and settled like caste; the district officer and his family were one kind of human beings, the people of this district another. (Mason 1963:76)

* Ruhul Asfia, Lecturer, Department of English, Primeasia University, Dhaka

The colonial novels reflect the atmosphere of that period minutely. We get different pictures of India from western and eastern writers. Most Anglo Indian writers sought to paint, quite understandably, the life of their own community, and the Indian world around them formed a mere background. Kipling went further than perhaps any other previous writer to explore the Indian world, but his race-consciousness constituted a serious limitation. He also took the Indian world as a background against which the adventures and activities of his European heroes are measured and judged. Kipling's pictures of Indian life are full of miscellaneous information. But a search for a complete picture of Indian life will show many gaps in Kipling's knowledge and one wonders whether he would not have done better to delineate a few individuals in all the phases of their lives instead of allowing his energies to be diffused over so wide a field. The result of Kipling's Indian writings is one in which relations and proportions of things to each other are very different from what they are in reality. The Anglo-Indian relationship in his time was characterized by race-prejudice. Kipling acquired this prejudice from his community and reinforced imperialistic theories in his writings which were current in England towards the close of the nineteenth century. He deliberately focused attention on those things in Indian life which would provide a justification for his imperialistic views. He stayed for a long time in India, worked as a journalist for seven years, and traveled a lot in different parts of India. In some of his writings he attempted to show the convergence of East and West, but his attempts always resulted in their confrontation.

British imperialism bred an English-educated middle class among the Indian people to form "a class of interpreters between them and the millions whom they govern; a class of persons Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect" (Macaulay 285). This certainly backfired, because many middle class people learnt and gained from this very education the ideas of nationalism, linguistic freedom and other such concepts. Tagore expressed resentment against the British rule even early in his life in essays such as "Chine Maroner Babshae" (Trading with Death in China), "Doyalu Mangshashi" (the Kind Predator), "Town Hall-e Tamasha" (the Joke in the Town Hall). But later, he wrote:

In recent times, the English people from the West have come to India and have acquired a special position. This incident is not sudden and unexpected. India will deprive herself of earning completeness if it cannot make close contact with the West. . . . We should not confine ourselves within a narrow boundary if we are to prove our importance in the world. Rather, we have to share knowledge, love, good jobs, inventions, all the good things with others. The British have come to our poor country to restore these positive values in us. (From Tagore's essay, "Purbo o Paschim." My translation.)

He goes on to say,

Unless we respond to them with positive attitude and converge with them successfully, we cannot acquire the strength we need to get them out of our country. The British are sent to show us the path to the future, the India which was germinated in the past and looking for its future. We should not have the right to get them out before its time, as they have come for our betterment. (From Tagore's essay, "Purbo o Paschim." My translation.)

Tagore gave the above statement in 1908, the year when he was writing *Gora*. Even, at the last stage of his life in the essay "Shovvotar Shankat," he declared, "From the beginning of my life, I believed in the European gift of civilization." Tagore's liberal attitude makes the depiction of the convergence of East-West possible in his writings.

To explore Kipling's attitude towards India in *Kim* will necessitate knowing his approach towards British imperialism. Rudyard Kipling's writings abound in political beliefs and social ideals to which some of his contemporaries reacted very sharply at the turn of the century; some admiring his views and others deploring them. W. T. Stead, an outspoken imperialist, praised Kipling as the interpreter of the popular consciousness and the inspiration for the popular imagination (*Review of Reviews*, 15 April 1999).

Benita Parry says, 'Kipling's imagination was daring, his themes diversified, his tales always more than pegs on which to hang ideas, and textual analysis of his prose can proceed without reference to his imperialist postures' (203). Modern scholars have accepted Kipling's imperialism as a politically viable and ethically justifiable stance. J. L. M. Stewart defends Kipling's views on the Indian's unfitness for self-rule by extrapolating the political realities of the period from Kipling's fictional reconstruction of the situation. In 1929, Bonamy Dobree was suggesting that for Kipling, the Empire 'is to be cherished not so much because it is in itself an achievement, but because, like old Rome, it is the most superb instrument to cause man to out-face the universe, assert himself against vacancy' (43). When Kipling looked on India through Indian lenses he still retained his psychological detachment as a Westerner. But whenever Indians challenged the white man's image of himself and questioned his status as ruler, Kipling could not but express his racial attitude. When questions regarding moral basis were raised, Kipling presented the intentions and actions of the white world as part of a moral order from which the dark races were excluded. This racial attitude of the white man towards the rest of humanity also had fed Kipling's vision of imperialism as the triumphant expression of an Anglo-Saxon . . . destiny' (Parry 208). From these various angles he received the images, which formed a montage of India for him.

Kipling's selection of Indian characters seems to have been governed by the theory that the Indian population could on the whole be divided into two classes:

first, the real natives who form the lower, uneducated strata of society, who are uninterested in politics, and whose loyalty to the British government rests on secure foundations, and, second, a small section, mainly taken from the Bengali Hindus, who were vocal and disloyal but who did not represent the native opinion. His portraits are intended primarily to underline the superiority of the white man over the Indian, and thus justify the former's right to govern India. He is not interested in Indians for their own sakes except in so far as they illustrate his theory (Syed S. Hossain 101).

Edward Said's deconstruction of Kipling's novel explores how *Kim* embodies the absolute divisions between white and non-white that existed in India and elsewhere at a time when the dominantly white Christian countries of Europe controlled approximately 85 percent of the world's surface (1987:24-7). For Kipling, who believed that it was India's destiny to be ruled by England, it was necessary to stress the superiority of the white man. Throughout the narrative, Kipling creates unequal dichotomies between the ruler and the ruled through a system of what Jacques Derrida calls "binary oppositions" or well-schooled dichotomies which constructed a whole hierarchy of meanings.

Kipling delineates the Indian characters with very little significance. Kim, the main character of this novel, is Irish in origin. That Lama gets importance in spite of being an Indian is because Kipling was very much interested in Buddhism and Lamaism. Another reason why the Lama gets importance is that he does not pose any threat to the British authority. Although he is a learned man, he is sympathetic to the British and expedites the British mission by paying for Kim's education. The Lama is, therefore, hardly to be feared. Kim's business, he tells the boy, "was to get all the wisdom of the sahibs" (407).

Kipling conveys the message about the "white man's burden" by locating the educated Hurree Babu in a position that subordinates Kim. The babu, in other words, is Kim's anti-self to whom Kipling assigns a negative value in relation to Kim, the sahib. As Nandi Bhatia puts it: "Kipling frames the Babu in a relationship of power, of domination, and of varying degrees of a complex hegemony with Kim, through which he constantly reiterates, what Said suggests as, 'European superiority over oriental backwardness'" (Bhatia 1-2).

Purnima Bose argues that babu-stereotypes emerged out of the colonial racial attitudes about the Bengalis, who as a highly educated community challenged the British representations of Indians:

...the western educated Bengalis were dismissed as comic imitations of westerners. They were virulently caricatured in the figure of the Bengali babu: a small dark-skinned, effeminate intellectual who had an imperfect command over English. (PhD diss. 1993)

Hurree Babu is shown to possess a kind of feline courage, the courage that manifests itself best in silent intrigues, in situations calling more for the exercise of intelligence than for physical bravery. He shares his race's fear of responsibility: "I am a fearful man and I do not like responsibility" (400).

We cannot blame Kipling for having formed a vague idea about the "moral weakness of the Orientals." The overwhelming tendency of Anglo-Indians was to believe in their own excellence and in that of their society's codes and customs. It was therefore inevitable that they would condemn Indians for deviating from these standards. In his speech to the Convocation of Calcutta University in 1905, Lord Curzon, who could conceive of Indians only as permanent wards of Britain because they lacked what he regarded as the basic attributes for self-rule, criticized the 'moral weakness' of the Orientals:

I hope I am making no false or arrogant claim when I say that the highest ideal of truth is to a large extent a Western conception. I do not thereby claim that Europeans are universally or even generally truthful, still less do I mean that Asiatics deliberately or habitually deviate from truth. The one proposition would be absurd, and the other insulting. But undoubtedly truth took a higher place in the moral codes of the West before it had been similarly honoured in the East, where craftiness and diplomatic wile have always been held in much repute. (Curzon 409)

This same attitude is reflected in Kipling's mind when he has Kim accuse Hurree Babu as a liar: "He robbed them", thought Kim... 'He tricked them. He lied to them like a Bengali.'" (402)

Kipling's Indians share this habit of telling lies irrespective of class and nationality. Since the babu's bicultural education grants him access to both cultures, Kipling hybridizes Kim's education systematically, providing him knowledge of both Indian culture and British formal education. As opposed to Kim's education that is favorable to empire, Kipling dismisses the babu's knowledge of anthropology, medicine, and English and Western training as a monstrous hybridism of the East and West.

Kipling wrote *Kim* at a time of emerging Indian nationalism. This was a time when important changes had taken place in the national and political fabric of India following the Mutiny of 1857. The congress party was formed in 1885 and a large part of nationalistic resistance arose from the educated sections of the Indians, from people like Hurree babu, who with their close encounters with British administrations were more fully aware of British ways. The educated babu Hurree thus represents a threat to the colonial presence. Kipling, perhaps, recognized this threat. Therefore, to relegate the educated babu to a subordinate position is for Kipling a historical necessity in order to ward off any obstacles to the empire. Kipling makes Hurree describe himself to Kim in this way:

"I am only Babu showing off my English to you. All we Babus talk English to show off." (120)

Kipling does not explore the general socio-political situation of India of that particular period but only unearths some of its mysteries. He did not intend to explore the Indian culture to the fullest but showed only partially some of its aspects that do not appear before us as an authentic picture of the India of the colonial period.

In this regard we can look at the fact that the holy men produce a very interesting side-light to Kipling's view of Indian superstitions:

"All India is full of holy men stammering gospels in strange tongues; shaken and consumed in the fires of their own zeal; dreamers, babblers and visionaries: as it has been from the beginning and will continue to the end." (45-6)

These babblers are an integral part of Kipling's view of Hindu life who can transform the physiognomy of human beings; it was the belief that saved the Maratha spy in Kim's compartment (292). To strike a holy man is a grave sacrilege for them which may result in serious material consequences.

"He struck the Holy One—we saw it! Our cattle will be barren—our wives will cease to bear! The snows will stick upon us as we go home!" (247)

Dread of the "Evil Eye" is a common phenomenon in India that Kipling did not miss a chance to emphasize truly. This "Evil Eye" is a belief that presupposes the existence of a mysterious, jealous, maleficent power which frowns upon any departures from the beaten track or excesses of any kind. Hurree babu dreaded the "Evil Eye"; the Jat at Benares told Kim that he has put his little boy into girl's clothes to help him escape a fever—a naive way of deceiving the Eye; and the Kulu woman would not listen to the praises of her grand-children for the same reasons, praise being a source of great provocation to the power which guides the Eye's operations (312).

Hinduism as presented in his writings seems much more a matter of gods and goddesses than of doctrines. "He did not try anywhere to write about its philosophical basis as distinguished from its worship of idols. His Hinduism is thus largely Hindu mythology rather than religion" (Hussein 101).

When Kipling portrays the hill men, he always shows them as backward and ignorant of the outside world. The most interesting fact which Kipling depicts about the hill people is that their society is polyandrous.

"She hailed hoarsely, and there came out of a cow-pen her two husbands..." (378)

Kipling knew the rules of caste in India. His reference to the caste system does not present him before us as being very critical about it. In fact, he took it as a

very normal matter for such a backward and inferior country like India. In *Kim*, a moneylender in Kim's compartment complained of the violation of caste rules which railway travel involves: 'I say,' began the moneylender, pursing his lips, 'that there is not one rule of right living which these te-rains do not cause us to break. We sit, for example, side by side with all castes and peoples' (40).

It may come to our mind that Kipling had hinted at the convergence of East and West by showing the intense relationship between Kim and the Lama which is full of love, respect and admiration. But East and West cannot converge only in this way. Though their relationship is intense, their views of life are different. Lama's life is one of meditation and Kim's of action. The Lama never hinders Kim's journey of life that eventually leads him to get into the British imperialist structure and achieve the stature of a "sahib." It was Kipling's curiosity towards Buddhism that inspires him to portray the Lama's character with so much significance, and Kim's emotional bonding with the Lama was the reflection of that curiosity. In other words, the author's intention was not to bridge the gap between the East and the West.

Though Tagore criticized European imperialism and supported Indian nationalists, he also lampooned the Swadeshi movement, denouncing it in "The Cult of the Charka," an acrid 1925 essay. Instead, he emphasized self-help and the intellectual uplift of the masses, stating that British imperialism was not the primary evil, but instead a "political symptom of our social disease." He urged Indians to realize that "there can be no question of blind revolution, but of steady and purposeful education" (Wikipedia 7).

For Tagore it was of the highest importance that people are able to live and reason in freedom. His attitude towards politics and culture, nationalism and internationalism, tradition and modernity, can all be seen in the light of this belief.

Rabindranath's commitment to the nationalist movements originated from his realization of how miserably the Indians felt subordinated during the colonial rule. Patriotism, he argued, however, can limit the scope to incorporate positive values from outside "narrow domestic walls." He accepted all the positive aspects he could from the British Imperial rule to develop his own vision and his country while rejecting the humiliating aspects of his nation. He rebelled boldly against these aspects. He was critical of his own religious orthodoxies, such as the caste system and child brides, and also of the unjust British rule.

In 1907, in a letter to his son-in-law Nagendranath Ganguly, who had gone to America to study agriculture, he wrote:

To get on familiar terms with the local people is a part of your education. To know only agriculture is not enough; one must know America too. Of course if, in the process of knowing America, one begins to lose one's own

identity and falls into the trap of becoming an Americanized person contemptuous of everything Indian, it is preferable to stay in a locked room. (Chakravarty 386)

On a number of occasions, Tagore strongly protested against the British Raj. His most notable role was in the movement to resist the 1905 British proposal to split in two the province of Bengal, a plan that was eventually withdrawn following popular resistance. He was forthright in denouncing the brutality of British rule in India, and was never more vocal against it than after the Amritsar massacre of April 13, 1919. In protest, he wrote a letter to the viceroy of India a month after that massacre, asking to be relieved of the knighthood he had accepted four years earlier.

Both Gandhi and Nehru expressed their appreciation of the important part Tagore took in the nationalist struggle. Nehru's judgment on Tagore was, of course frankly political:

.... Rabindranath Tagore has given to our nationalism the outlook of internationalism and has enriched it with art and music and the magic of his words, so that it has become the full-blooded emblem of India's awakened spirit. (Chakravarty 386)

And Gandhi proclaimed,

I regard the poet as a sentinel warning us against the approach of enemies called Bigotry, Lethargy, Intolerance, Ignorance, Inertia, and other members of that brood. (Datta and Robinson 13)

Rabindranath Tagore rebelled against the strongly nationalist form that the independence movement often took, and this refrained him from taking a particularly active part in contemporary politics. He wanted to assert India's right to be independent without denying the importance of what India could learn freely and profitably from abroad. He was afraid that a total rejection of the West in favor of an indigenous tradition was not only limiting in itself; it could easily turn into hostility to other influences from abroad, including Christianity, Judaism, and most importantly, Islam. (Sen 13)

Tagore was uncompromising in his beliefs that human beings should absorb quite different cultures in constructive ways:

Whatever we understand and enjoy in human products instantly becomes ours, wherever they might have their origin. I am proud of my humanity when I can acknowledge the poets and artists of other countries as my own. Let me feel with unalloyed gladness that all the great glories of man are mine. Therefore it hurts me deeply when the cry of rejection rings loud against the west in my country with the clamor that western education can only injure us. (Sen 20-21)

His welcoming attitude to western civilization was reinforced by the confidence that he did not see India's culture as fragile and in need of "protection" from western influence. (Sen 22)

In *Gora*, Tagore explores the nature of West-bred English-educated Bengali babu class and was very critical about them. He was also an English-educated babu but not a member of the class who had accepted the British authority at the cost of their self-respect, and even their nationality. He believed that the self-proclaimed superiority of the white people and their condescending attitude toward the natives had created an inferiority complex in the minds of Indians. They were like slaves to the British and disliked everything of their own nationality: "Haran says, 'a number of Bengali people may pass the exam, but they are incapable of doing anything significant.'" (40) (My translation)

Panu babu's conversation with the magistrate provides a perfect example of that class when they discuss the issue of education in colonial India. They argue that the presence of British imperialism in India is the divine will and that native people were very ungrateful towards them for disapproving that manifest destiny (120). Gora ridicules Panu Babu and Baroda Shundori for their servile obedience to the British Raj. The criticism of Panu Babu and Baroda Shundori's characters makes it clear that Tagore never tolerated the subservient nature of that class who accepted the unquestioned authority of the British.

Gora's indomitable anger towards the Bengali babu's sycophancy as well as his attempt to prove his superiority over the other Indians by ridiculing the sufferings of the masses reflects Tagore's own bold stand against such men, when Gora says:

"Fie! You are shameless!"

The Bengali babu replied, "Shame, the beastly ignorant creatures should be ashamed of themselves."

Gora's face turned red with anger and he said, "those are more beastly who don't have any feeling." (36-37) (My translation)

Tagore's response to the attitude of the English-educated middle class is explored through Binoy's comments:

"This middle class people of our country are concerned only about their own jobs, the rich people are happy with getting 'titles' from the British ...Once I, too, thought of getting a good government job with the recommendation of Gora's father to the British. But Gora told me never to get into the government jobs." (89-90) (My translation)

Gora clarified his own view regarding middle-class people to Suchorita by telling that he was not showing his anger towards the British government. Rather, he was revealing the general attitude of the middle class people who had started to

make the government's strength their own and, thus, distance themselves from the masses. (90)

Tagore explores the unjust rule of the colonial period by placing Gora in a remote village, where he first realizes to what extent poor Indians could suffer because of the unjust British governance and how helpless they were at the hand of the British.

At the same time, Tagore showed the absurdity of the Hindu-Muslim clashes that were prevalent not only in the villages but also all over India through Gora's refusal to take food in the poor Hindu barber's house because he was taking care of a little Muslim orphan boy. The family of this boy and all the people of that village had suffered terribly from the taxes imposed on indigo planting. When Gora scolded the barber for breaking the strict rules of Hindu religion by keeping the Muslim boy in his house, the barber replied, "Sir, we say Hari, they say Allah, there is no difference" (114). Here, Tagore's own stand regarding religion is reflected in the barber's comments through which he transcends all kinds of parochialism.

Tagore shows the unjust utilization of British power of exploiting the natives through Mahim's occupation. Mahim says, "the newly appointed big boss of our office whose face resembles a dog's face is a notorious man. He calls the babus 'baboon'. He doesn't want to grant leave even if someone's mother dies, and he takes it as a lie. None of the Bengali officials can get a full month's salary; because unjust fines reduce it all." (114) (My translation)

The Colonial period witnessed a terrible religious conflict between Hindu fanaticism and Brahma society. Their confrontation was the result of East-West confrontation. Brahma society was very much influenced by the western world and one positive aspect of it was that Brahma could realize the bigotry of Hinduism and scorn their awful concept of the 'untouchables'.

In this regard, let us get into *Gora*, where Suchorita asks Binoy,

"Do you want us to regard the Brahmins as the Human-gods? Do you really believe that the dust of their feet can cleanse the sins of human beings?" (77)

Through Paresh Babu, Suchorita and Lalita's characters, Tagore upholds the positive values of Brahma society that were gained from the British. But the negative side of it was also horrifying. They rejected Hinduism totally; confronted with their own native people they felt themselves superior to all the castes of India because of their close contact with the British. Many ludicrous aspects of Brahma society are explored through Panu Babu and Baroda Shundori's characters.

The female characters in *Gora* appear before us as very important characters. Shuchorita and Lalita are well-educated and Anondomoyee charms us with her liberal approach to life. Such female character portrayals could have been possible only for British rule. Tagore approves the fact that British rule made female education possible and the females could take important roles in society. Binoy tells Gora,

“... It is true that we do not bring women to our thoughts as much as we should when we think about our country. I can surely say that you do not think of the female portion even for a moment - it seems that you see our country without women --which is never justifiable.” (73) (My translation)

These thoughts of Binoy were provoked by British influence and he could think of the females of his country from a broad outlook rather than the traditional one.

Gora's ascetic Hinduism certainly comes from his extreme nationalistic feeling. He vows to cling to all the ins and outs of his national identity, culture, religion, caste-system, language – every aspect of it. Tagore explores the narrowness of Gora's extreme nationalism as opposed to British selfish-nationalism and successfully reveals the fact that extreme nationalism takes such a mean form that it prevents people from respecting other's nationality. It is possible for one to respect others only if one has the broadness of mind to critically examine the narrowness of one's own nation and also to accept the positive sides of others.

Gora's earlier rejection of Binoy's and Anondomoyee's liberal outlook reflect the confrontation of East and West, and their later accepting of this very attitude shows the convergence of East and West. The ultimate realization of Gora at the end of the novel attests to the fact that Rabindranath was for convergence rather than confrontation.

Gora says, “From today, I am an Indian. There is no conflict in me regarding Hindus, Muslims, Christians. Every religion is my religion, every race is my race.” (301) (My translation)

Tagore draws the mother figure of Anondomoyee in such a way that she becomes someone larger than life. She sacrifices everything – her religion, her caste – after receiving Gora as her child. Gora is not a Hindu, he is not even an Indian. He is an Irish Christian but she accepts him as her own son and at that very moment realizes that there is nothing more precious than humanism, not even nationalism. Anondomoyee's speech is Tagore's. He does not degrade any other's national identity, culture, religion, law, literature, language. Gora's delight in accepting Anondomoyee as his mother leads Tagore to stand supreme at the height of global humanity. Gora is Irish in origin and Indian in nationality. So, he himself becomes the converging point of East and West:

Gora says, “Mother, you are my actual mother. The mother I was finding for so long was in my own room. You have no caste-discrimination, no

racial discrimination, no hatred. You stand only for humanity. You are my India." (335) (My translation)

On the other hand, Kipling must surely have nursed within himself utterly contradictory impulses, -- one half of his mind impelled him to extol, uphold and worship the majestic structure of the British Empire and tinge his writings with sermons on the white man's superiority, while the other half hankered after what Puran Bhagat or the Lama or even Mowgli represented. The conflict of loyalties was in other words a conflict between Kipling the writer and artist, and Kipling the Imperialist, the spokesman of the British. The conflict was never fully resolved; he left India before he could possibly have felt the need for such a resolution. On the other hand, had he stayed longer, he might never have written *Kim*, and would probably have surrendered more abjectly to his colonial, imperialistic self.

Tagore's novel is a far more scathing exposure of the narrowness, bigotry and stupidity of Hinduism than anything Kipling said in *Kim* or anywhere else. Where it differs artistically from *Kim* is that the racial problems in it are treated on a purely human level; the conflict in Gora's mind is boldly faced and a solution offered in which Tagore stresses for the convergence of East and West. In *Gora*, Rabindranath Tagore stands much higher. His liberal outlook transcends all kinds of parochialism and narrowness of nationalism reaching the height of global humanity. But the Anglo Indian community did not allow Kipling to transcend his narrow nationalistic views, and his imperialist ideology is revealed in *Kim*. Tagore's *Gora* explores the possibilities of the convergence of East-West but Kipling's *Kim* does not let the East and West converge.

Works Cited

- Allen, Charles, ed. *Plain Tales from the Raj. Images of British India Twentieth Century*. Andre Deutsch: British Broadcasting Corporation, 1975.
- Belippa, K.C. "The Meaning of Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*", *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, Vol. 16, No. 1(1991): 151-157.
- Berlin, Isaiah. "Rabindranath Tagore and the Consciousness of Nationality." *The Sense of Reality: Studies in Ideas and Their History*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1997.
- Bhatia, Nandi. "Kipling's Burden: Representing Colonial Authority and Constructing the "Other" through Kimball O'Hara and Babu Hurree Chander in *Kim*". Tue. May 22 08:55:19 2007. <http://asnic.utexas.edulasnic/sagar/spring1994>
- Bose, Purnima. "Survivors of the Raj, Survivors of the Empire: Narrating the Colonial and Post-Colonial Encounters," Ph. D. diss., University of Texas, May 1993.
- Candler, Edmund. *A Vagabond in Asia*. London: Greening, 1900.
- The Mantle of the East*. London: Blackwood, 1910.
- Chakravarty, Armiya, ed. *A Tagore Reader*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1961.

- Chaudhuri, Nirad, C. 'Passage to and from India', *Encounter*. June, 1954.
- Chaudhuri, S. Islam. *Nirbachito Shahityo Shomalochona*. Dhaka: Mouli Prokashoni, 2002.
- Cornell, Louis L. *Kipling in India*. London: Macmillan: 1966.
- Dasgupta, indranil. "Gora'r Rabindranath". Sun Jul 15 05:48:19 2007.
<http://www.parabaas.com/rabindranath/articles/pGora.html>
- Dobree, Bonamy. "Rudyard Kipling" in *The Lamp and the Lute*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921.
- Rudyard Kipling*. London: British Council, 1951.
- Rudyard Kipling: Realist and Fabulist*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Dutt, Shomjit. "A Foreign Shine and Assumed Gestures: the Ersatz Tagore of the West". Sun Jul 1 05:43:25 2007 <<http://www.parabaas.com/Rabindranath/articles/>
- Dutta, Krishna and Andrew Robinson. *Rabindranath Tagore- The Myriad-Minded Man*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967.
- Forster, E. M. *A Passage to India*. London: Arnold, 1924.
- Gopal, Ram. *British Rule in India: An Assessment*. London: Asia Publishing House, 1963.
- Greenberger, Allen J. *The British Images of India: A Study in the Literature of Imperialism, 1880-1960*. Oxford: O.U.P., 1969.
- Rev. of. *Kim* by Rudyard Kipling.. *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. .27. No.1, 1985: 167. Mon Jul 16 06:51:15 2007 <http://www.jstor.org>
- Hussein, Syed S. *Kipling and India: An Enquiry into the Nature and Extent of Kipling's Knowledge of the Indian Sub-continent*. Dacca: University of Dacca, 1964.
- Kate. "British Imperialism in India" 1872. Wed Jul 15 04:42:17 2007 <http://www.planetpapers.com/Assets/>
- Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*. London: Macmillan, 1901.
- , *Plain Tales from the Hills*. London: Macmillan, 1888.
- , "A Song of the English," *Rudyard Kipling's Verse*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Inclusive edition, 1885-1918.
- , *Something of Myself*. London: Macmillan, 1937.
- Macaulay, Thomas B. "Minute on Indian Education," *Selected Writings*. Edited by John Clive. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Mason, Philip. *The Men who Ruled India*. London: cape. 1963. vol. 2, p. 76.
- Nandy, Ashis. *The Intimate Enemy. Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. Delhi: Delhi University Press, 1983.
- O'Reilly, Christopher. *Post-Colonial Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Parry, Benita. *Delusions and Discoveries: Studies on India in the British Imagination, 1880-1930*. Bristol: Western Printing Service, 1972.

- Rabindranath Tagore - Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia. pp. 1-17. Sat Jul 21 06:53:15 2007 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rabindranath_Tagore
- Rao, Bhaskara K. *Rudyard Kipling's India*. Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, 1978.
- "Kim, The Pleasures of Imperialism," *Raritan*, 7(1987): 27-74.
- Sandison, Alan. *The Wheel of Empire*. London: Macmillan, 1967.
- Sen. Amartya. *Tagore and His India*. 28 August 2001. Sun Jul 22 04:57:15 2007 http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/articles/sen/
- Sen. S. P. 'Effects on India of British Law and Administration in the Nineteenth Century', *Journal of World History*, Vol. 4, No.4, 1958.
- W.T. Stead, editor of the *Pall-mall Gazette*, the article on Kipling appeared in *Review of Reviews*, 15 April 1999.
- Stephen, James Fitzjames. 'The Foundations of the Government of India'. *The Nineteenth Century*, Vol. LXXX, 1883.
- Tagore, Rabindranath. *Gora*. Dacca: Bartoman Shomoy, 2001. 3rd Ed.
- "Purbo o Pashchim". *Rabindra Rachonaboly*. Vol. 12. Dhaka: Mouli Prokashoni, 1994.
- Tompkins, J. M. S. *The Art of Rudyard Kipling*. London: Methuen, 1959.
- Wurgaft, Lewis D. *The Imperial Imagination. Magic and Myth in Kipling's India*. Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1983.