Kipling’s Encounters with Buddhism and the Buddhist Orient: ‘The Twain Shall Meet’?

David Scott, Brunel University

If one concern of cultural history is to reconstruct the ‘mental maps’ through which people under study orientated themselves in their specific worlds, then Kipling’s attitude towards Buddhism and the Buddhist Orient may be said to have served as such a mental map, and deserves the attention of cultural historians.¹ If international relations is seen as ‘intercultural relations’ and reflecting ‘culture and power’, the argument of Akira Iriye,² then Kipling’s views on Buddhism and the Buddhist Orient illustrate a facet of the international relations of his day, and deserve the attention of cultural historians.

Rudyard Kipling’s famous refrain ‘East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet’ from The Ballad of East and West (1889) subsequently became common shorthand for signifying cross-cultural divide. Kipling is also well known for his political advocacy of Western imperialism: in 1900 he was already dubbed the ‘Poet of the Empire’ by Walter Besant.³ In terms of Asia this imperial advocacy applies for his treatment of India; including the Bengali babu, the Indian Congress Party, Hindus and Hinduism, which Kipling dismissed in no uncertain terms. However, in terms of Asia outside India, this type of Western supremacism breaks down in the face of Kipling’s varied unexpectedly positive encounters with Buddhism. This is the focus of this article, Kipling’s encounters with Buddhism. It does this through close scrutiny of the appearance of Buddhism in Kipling’s stories, letters, travel accounts and reminiscences. Such a range of material involves problematic questions of text and context, use and misuse of sources, construction-deconstruction-reconstruction of ideas, colonial and post-colonial interpretation.
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Buddhism’s history had been one of a tradition born in India, but then disappearing from India, having survived through spreading into the more northerly and eastern parts of Asia in various Mahāyāna ‘Great Vehicle’ forms, and into the more southern and south-eastern parts of Asia in a Theravāda ‘Teachings of the Elders’ form. Kipling’s evocation of Buddhism was a broad one. The Buddhism that appears in his writings was a mixture of the extinct Buddhism that had existed in India, including the Buddha’s original ministry and the Gandhara Greco-Buddhist art style in north-western India, together with evocations by Kipling of the current Buddhism still found in Tibet, Japan and Burma. In explaining this varied appearance of Buddhism in Kipling’s writings, this article integrates the then current attitudes towards Eastern religions in the West, with Kipling’s ‘eclectic religious identity’ and developing sensibilities. Such encounters, and consequent positive comments by Kipling on Buddhism, serve as a correction, or reorientation, of Edward Said’s influential ‘Orientalism’ framework which generally brought out negative comments in the West on the East. Kipling may have reflected such Orientalism paradigms with regard to his treatment of India and Hinduism, but his comments on Buddhism outside India (Kipling’s Buddhist Orient) go rather against the Orientalism paradigm put forward by Said. It also brings out the complexity of Kipling.

While critics such as Shamsul Islam and Patrick Brantlinger, art historians like Janice Leoshko, and historical biographers such as Philip Mason and Charles Allen have highlighted Kipling’s use of Buddhism in the novel Kim (1901), there is less treatment available on Kipling’s long-running engagement with Buddhism during the two decades before Kim. Kipling’s encounter with Buddhism in various ways from 1877–1901 form the important context and perhaps sometimes neglected foundations for the more well-studied though still keenly debated Kim. His encounter was partly an indirect one, through his perceptions of Buddhism, but also consisted of direct observation in the course of his travels to Burma and Japan. From such encounters and perceptions Kipling had a sense of Buddhism’s institutional frameworks (pagodas and temples, monks, priests and lamas), rituals (meditation, chanting), sacred imagery (buddhas and bodhisattvas), ethical stances, and beliefs (karma, nirvana) – general features of Buddhism rather than specific differences between and within Theravāda and Mahāyāna schools. To pinpoint his encounters over more than two decades, this article follows a chronological structure; looking at his adolescent years from 1877–82, his time in northern India and the Himalayas from 1882–9, his travel records of
1889 in *From Sea to Sea*, his 1892 poem *The Buddha of Kamakura*, and his novel *Kim* that came out in 1901. This leads to a final section on how Kipling’s encounters with Buddhism challenge Edward Said’s Orientalism.

**Kipling’s adolescence (1877–82)**

Adolescent years in England were one avenue for Kipling’s encounter with Buddhism. Kipling’s time at Westwood Ho! boarding school from 1878–82 saw some sustained signs of Buddhism’s presence in his life. According to his school friend George Beresford, ‘Gigger [Kipling] was the apostle of Buddha … and used to declaim very finely certain portions about “om mani padme Hum”… he also preached reincarnation’. *Om mani padme hum* was the traditional Buddhist mantra ‘Hail the Jewel in the Lotus’. Beresford had a curious further recollection:

Gigger [Kipling] mentioned that most of the young ladies of his acquaintance in London had deserted the churches and preferred to burn incense and joss-sticks in their boudoirs before little shrines containing an image of the Buddha. They also took exercise, he said, by turning prayer wheels, which wound off long prayers written on strips of paper in various post-Sanskrit scripts.

Such talk of female attraction to Buddhism is enigmatically intriguing. Though Beresford’s recollections were penned over half a century after these shared schooldays, contemporary sources painted a similar picture. Reginald Copleston, Bishop of Colombo, talked in 1890 of how with regard to Buddhism ‘the magazines were full of it [Buddhism]; and every young lady, who made any pretensions to higher culture, was prepared to admire “such a beautiful religion”’. One important channel for Kipling was Edwin Arnold’s *The Light of Asia*, a poetic rendition of the life of the Buddha (Shākyamuni), published in London in 1879 with immediate impact. Arnold’s preface, that Kipling would have read, was highly recommendatory on the ‘highest, gentlest, holiest, and most beneficent’ figure of the Buddha and his ‘sublime teachings’; it was a poem written by him to convey ‘the lofty character of this noble prince, and the general purport of his doctrines’. Arnold’s profile attracted many positive literary reviews and provided an important window into Buddhism for Kipling and many other Westerners. As William Wilkinson noted in 1884, ‘the public has been taken by storm’ by Arnold’s book, which reflected and strengthened a ‘curious development of public interest
in Buddhism’. At Westward Ho! School, Beresford recalled that Arnold’s work was ‘one of the books admired by Gigger [Kipling] and he possessed a copy . . . The Light of Asia was consulted [by Kipling] as a guide to Buddhistic philosophy, and had to be read and admired’. Later, in his novel Kim, Kipling directly incorporated material from Arnold’s The Light of Asia. In turn, as shall be seen, Arnold was later on struck by Kipling’s positive portrayal of Buddhism in Japan.

Northern India and the Himalayas (1882–89)

Kipling’s return to India as a young yet enquiring sixteen year old, took him to Lahore in October 1882. Rudyard was involved with the local Museum at Lahore, where his father was curator. The Museum was a focus for Western perceptions, and interest, concerning Buddhism. Kipling acknowledged the impact on him of ‘Lahore Museum of which I had once been Deputy Curator for six weeks – unpaid but extremely important’. Kipling’s description of the Lahore Museum emphasised its Gandharan Buddhist exhibits: ‘in the entrance-hall stood the larger figures of the Greco-Buddhist sculptures . . . There were hundreds of pieces . . . the pride of the Museum’. Particularly detailed and accurate was his description of ‘a large alto-relief representing a coronation or apotheosis of the Lord Buddha’, identified by Leoshko as the Muhammad Nari Gandharan sculpture. Kipling’s memories of the museum re-emerged elsewhere in Kim; ‘so does the stone Bodhisat [Bodhisattva] sit who looks down upon the patent self-registering turnstiles of the Lahore Museum’. The continuing fame of its exhibits brought a lament from him in 1889 about enthusiastic Austrian ‘maniacs’ who had swept through the Kipling household to request his father that ‘they wanted to see Graeco-Bhuddist sculptures’ at the museum.

Lahore’s rich tapestry of Greco-Bactrian Gandharan artefacts may have pointed to Buddhism’s past, and an interesting early moment of East-West encounters; but Tibetan Buddhism was very much a living tradition on the fringes of northwest India. Tibetan Buddhists were not unknown in the Punjabi plains during the nineteenth century, where Buddhist pilgrims going down from Tibet into the Punjab were given hospitality at the Sikh gurdwaras. Here, mention can be made of the figure referred to by Rudyard’s father in a letter to the Central Asian explorer Aurel Stein in May 1902, asking ‘I wonder whether you have seen my son’s “Kim” and recognised an old Lama whom you saw at the old [Lahore] Museum’.

Kipling recalled how his father was a gateway to the wider academic community: ‘the incessant come and go of travellers, savants,
specialists, etc. on their way through India’, who ‘would stay for a time in my father’s house (I mention Darmstetter and Gustave LeBon for examples) where, in the sympathetic atmosphere they naturally talked at ease, and I, at the foot of the table, listened and absorbed’. LeBon had come to India in 1884 to visit Buddhist sites in Nepal, a visit mentioned by Rudyard in the Lahore Gazette on 6 February 1885. Another type of material familiar to Kipling was ‘the labours of European scholars, who by the help of these and a hundred other documents have identified the Holy Places of Buddhism’ in India. Given Kipling’s own interests in travel, his specific mention of ‘the travels of the Chinese Buddhist pilgrims, Fu-Hiouen and Hwen-Tsiang’ through ‘translation of their record’ in ‘the pages of Beal and Stanislas Julien’ is not surprising. Last, but not least, is Kipling’s 1887 mention in ‘The Bisara of Pooree’ of Max Muller, the professor of comparative philology at Oxford and translator of the popular Buddhist Dhammapada text in 1881.

By the mid-1880s, Kipling was referring to Buddhism in his own writings. In 1885, in ‘After the Fever or Natural Theology in a Doolie’, Kipling evoked Buddhist reincarnation tenets whereby ‘after Death / I ... pass on to my new life / Higher or lower as the record runs. / This is ... Buddhism’. That same year Kipling’s ‘The Vision of Hamid Ali’ included mention of ‘the calm-eyed Buddha’. The following year, Kipling’s ‘A Popular Picnic’ contained the comparison ‘as much merit as a Buddhist priest’. A letter to Edmonia Hill in 1888, amidst other matters, included the phrase ‘retire into Nirvana’, with Nirvana being the Buddhist state of enlightenment.

Regular summer stays by Kipling at Simla during the 1880s took him closer to the Himalayan world. Here Kipling was rubbing shoulders with Theosophist embrace of Buddhism: ‘our little world [at Simla] was full of the aftermaths of Theosophy as taught by Madame Blavatsky to her devotees’. Helena Blavatsky and Henry Olcott had formally taken Buddhist vows in 1880, whilst Alfred Sinnett (the editor of The Pioneer of Allahabad, where Kipling was working as a journalist from 1887–9) wrote his own theosophist exposition Esoteric Buddhism in 1883. Theosophy claimed secret psychic authorisations from the mahatma masters located in Buddhist Tibet; but Kipling was sceptical over such Theosophist interpretations of Buddhism, considering that it facilitated a cultic eccentricity and fraudulent claims over Blavatsky’s psychic powers. Thus, Kipling satirised Theosophy in various stories like ‘A Nightmare of Rule’ in 1886, and ‘The Sending of Dana Da’ in 1888. Punch could well see Theosophists using Kipling for giving
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‘local colour’ at Simla to their claims for special knowledge about ‘Esoteric Buddhism’; but Kipling did not use Theosophy as his particular avenue into Buddhism.\(^{30}\)

Whilst Kipling did not join in the Theosophist turn towards Buddhism, Simla served as a window for Kipling onto the Himalayan world that looked onto Tibet. The year 1885 saw Kipling heading a little further into the Himalayas, when ‘on one of my Simla leaves – I had been ill with dysentery again – I was sent off for rest along the Himalaya-Tibet road’ which ran eastwards along the Sutlej valley.\(^{31}\) These Himalayan travels were significant for Kipling; ‘what I realised then came back to me in *Kim*’.\(^{32}\) In such a vein, Buddhist-related locations around the Sutlej valley reaches were prominent in the concluding chapter of *Kim*, which mentioned the Chini valley, Spiti, Han-le, Kulu, Kailung, and Leh – the Tibetan Lama enthusing ‘these are the hills of my delight! . . . There my eyes were opened to this world; there I found Enlightenment’.\(^{33}\) All of these areas were Tibetan Buddhist zones. In short, though Kipling may not have gone to Tibet itself, he seems to have encountered Tibetan Buddhism during the 1880s in and around the Himalayas. This was an encounter that was to re-emerge in fuller force in his novel *Kim*. In the meantime, Kipling’s travels were to bring him face to face with thriving Buddhist communities in Burma and Japan.

**From Sea to Sea (1889)**

Kipling left India in 1889, to travel across the Pacific to America. His resulting travels through South-East Asia and the Far East were immediately recounted by him en route in travel letters written for *The Pioneer* newspaper that he had just left, and were subsequently published in 1899 as the book *From Sea to Sea*. During these travels, Buddhism in various shapes was encountered at first hand in Burma and Japan, illustrating Low’s point that ‘travel necessitates the interrogation of the cultural travelling self’, and was profiled quite sympathetically.\(^{34}\) Such travel accounts, outside India, form a contrast to the ‘overt orientalism’ seen in his preceding 1887–8 *Letters of Marque* travel reports on the Indian Princely States.\(^{35}\)

Kipling’s first port of call was Burma, where Theravāda Buddhism was in a state of revival, following the Fifth Buddhist Council that had been held from 1868–71, and where British occupation came in 1886 following the Third Anglo-Burman War.\(^{36}\) Burma had a positive impact on him: ‘personally I love the Burman with the blind favouritism born of first impression. When I die I will be a Burman’.\(^{37}\) Ricketts’ suggestion that Kipling’s Burmese comments merely represented
‘comic copy’ romantic interludes for his *Pioneer* readership ignores the varied serious and positive religious comments from Kipling about Buddhism in Burma and elsewhere.  

Buddhism’s gentle contemplative and ethical nuances seem to have caught Kipling’s attention in Burma. As a religion he judged Buddhism to be ‘a genial one . . . to begin with, it is quiet’.  

Kipling was impressed by what he called ‘Burma’s greatest pagoda’, the Shwe-Dagon pagoda at Rangoon. His first sight of it was striking:

A golden mystery upheaved itself on the horizon a beautiful winking wonder that blazed in the sun, of a shape that was neither Muslim dome nor Hindu temple-spire. It stood upon a green knoll, and below it were lines of warehouses, sheds, and mills. Under what new god, thought I, are we irrepressible English sitting now? ‘There’s the old Shway Dagon’ . . . the golden dome said: ‘This is Burma, and it will be quite unlike any land you know about’.

Some criticism of superficial common Western attitudes towards Buddhist sites was apparent. At the Shwe-Dagon pagoda Kipling asked ‘why is it that when one views for the first time any of the wonders of the earth . . . such men . . . would patronise’ and dismiss such wonders? Though ‘the pagoda was always close at hand’, Kipling did not actually go inside, so it remained ‘as brilliant a mystery as when first sighted far down the river . . . I had not actually entered the Shwedagon, but [still] I felt just as happy as though I had’.

In contrast, Kipling did enter another Buddhist pagoda, across the Gulf of Martaban at Moulmein: ‘ablaze with pagodas – from a gorgeous golden and vermilion beauty to a delicate grey stone one just completed in honour of an eminent priest lately deceased at Mandalay. Far above my head there was a faint tinkle, as of golden bells’. In contrast to Rangoon, Kipling entered this particular sacred site: ‘I climbed higher and higher up the steps till I reached a place of great peace, dotted with Burmese images, spotlessly clean’. The word ‘peace’ is perceptive enough. At Moulmein, Kipling criticised the typical Western ‘Globetrotter’ traveller: ‘a Globetrotter is a brute. I had the grace to blush as I tramped round the pagoda’. He distinguished between his own behaviour there and that of his travelling companion Alec Hill; Kipling ‘sitting in meditation while the Professor went round with a sacrilegious camera, to the vast terror of the Burmese youth’.

Kipling’s travel reports in *From Sea to Sea* took him further east to another important Buddhist land, Japan and its Mahāyāna ‘Great Vehicle’ forms. Ironically, his visit coincided with another enthusiastic
adoptee of Buddhism, the Theosophist leader Olcott. Kipling was not impressed:

Colonel Olcott is wandering up and down the country now, telling them that the Buddhist religion needs reformation ... tramping about as if the whole show belonged to him ... The two [Buddhism and Theosophy] are built on entirely different lines, and they don’t seem to harmonise. It only needs now Madame Blavatsky, cigarette in mouth ... and the menagerie would be full.\(^{48}\)

Instead, Kipling was ready to encounter Japanese Buddhism on its own terms, an encounter in which Kipling was quite impressed by what he saw.

One of the sites Kipling visited in 1889 was Kamakura ‘by the tumbling Pacific, where the great god Buddha sits and equably hears the centuries and the seas murmur in his ears’.\(^{49}\) At Kobe, Kipling visited a Buddhist ‘monastery and a place of great peace’; where, ‘in an inner enclosure, where lay the prettiest garden of all, was a golden tablet ten or twelve feet high, against which stood in high relief of hammered bronze the figure of a goddess [Kuan-Yin, the embodiment of compassion] in flowing robes’.\(^{50}\) Kobe’s peaceful meditative atmosphere was complemented by the ‘Procession of the Cherry Blossom’ at Chion-in. There, its ‘splendour of ritual and paraphernalia’ was shown; in which ‘the priests of Buddha excelled the priests of the Pope ... solemnly, as befitted their high office ... in solemn calm the books were unrolled, and the priests began chanting Pali texts’.\(^{51}\) The comparison with Roman Catholicism, to the advantage of Buddhism, is an interesting aspect of this passage. Kipling’s positive perceptions of Japanese Buddhism, and of Japan, were to be renewed in greater force when he returned there in 1892.

**The Buddha of Kamakura (1892)**

Kipling’s second trip to Japan in 1892 took him back to Kamakura: ‘where the great bronze Buddha sits facing the sea to hear the centuries go by. He has been described again and again – his majesty, his aloofness, and every one of his dimensions ... for that reason he remains beyond all hope of description’.\(^{52}\) Originally, Kipling’s 1892 letter sketch ‘The Edge of the East’ ended with verses on Kamakura; verses which were subsequently published separately in 1903 as the poem ‘Buddha at Kamakura’ in *The Five Nations*. The poem has attracted relatively little attention from scholars, but deserves highlighting for the way in which Kipling profiles religion and Buddhism.
Although ‘Buddha at Kamakura’ started with the simple and potentially dismissive subheading ‘and there is a Japanese idol at Kamakura’, the body of the poem was substantive and sensitive. Unlike Carrington, Birkenhead, Wilson, Ricketts and Gilmour, Lycett was one of the few Kipling biographers to mention this ‘dignified poem’.53 The poem involved criticism of Christianity, positive profiling of Buddhism in Japan and elsewhere, criticism of Hinduism, and criticism of Western cultural projections, as a closer look at its lines shows.

In terms of criticism of Christianity, the poem verses 1–2 opened ‘O YE who tread the Narrow Way/ By Tophet-flare to Judgment Day’. The ‘Narrow Way’ was exclusivist Christianity and its positioning itself as the sole path to salvation in which other religions were seen as inherently flawed or false and non-salvific by definition, to be damned on Judgement Day. Such attitudes underpinned Christian missionary activities and ideologies in Asia, and were typified in 1899 with Reverend John Barrows’ The Christian Conquest of Asia. Such narrow Christian exclusivists would behold at Kamakura, the giant Buddha who, verses 9–10, ‘neither burns . . . Nor hears ye thank your [Christian] Deities’. The burning referred to the traditional assumptions of hellfire and damnation reserved for those ‘heathen’ who had rejected Christianity; but in this case a Buddha/Buddhism unaffected by such Christian strictures. Kipling saw Christianity as characterised too often by theological exclusivity, rigidity, and missionary presumptions; only too ready in verse 46 to ‘pass to strife’.54 Instead, Christian exclusivists, the ‘zealots’ in verse 39, were admonished in verses 3–4 ‘Be gentle when “the [so called] heathen” pray / To Buddha at Kamakura’; verses that Whitlark considered were ‘satirizing [Christian] evangelical imperialists’.55

In the poem, Kipling deliberately alternated, and thereby contrasted, negative satirical lines on Christianity with his positive perceptions of Buddhism at Kamakura. In terms of positive profiling of Buddhism, the Buddha was the one attracting respect in verses 5–8: ‘To him the Way, the Law, Apart, / Whom Maya held beneath her heart, / Ananda’s Lord, the Bodhisat, / The Buddha at Kamakura’. Kipling’s ‘Way’ and ‘Law’ translate the Buddhist terms marga and dharma. Kipling was oblivious to the fact that the Kamakura figure was in fact Amitabha, the Pure Land school’s Buddha of Infinite Light; instead he assumed the figure to be the historical Buddha, Shākyamuni. As such, his summation was then accurate enough for Shākyamuni. Maya was the Buddha’s mother, Ananda his close disciple, while ‘Bodhisat’ refers to Bodhisattva, a correct enough term.
for the young Shākyamuni who on achieving enlightenment became a buddha. Popular devotion was not decried at Kamakura; verses 12 and 15–16 read ‘Ye have not sinned with such as these, / His children at Kamakura / ... The little sins of little folk / That worship at Kamakura’. In contrast to Calvinist emphasis on the crushing burden of sin, Kipling talked of the insignificant sins of ordinary Buddhist devotees, sins able to be compassionately understood. This took Kipling back to the central figure at Kamakura, verses 20–4 being through ‘the Master’s eyes – / He is beyond the Mysteries / But loves them at Kamakura’. Thus the giant profile of the Kamakura Buddha was revealed for Kipling, as one beyond the mysteries of mundane existence. Such a master had many lives; verses 28–31 telling ‘Yea, every tale Ananda heard, / Of birth as fish or beast or bird, / While yet in lives the Master stirred, / The warm wind brings Kamakura’. As the Enlightened One, the Buddha was beyond the cycle of rebirths, but in previous lives had been reborn in varied animal forms, as retold in the popular Jātaka tales. In a final summation, outrageous language for fundamentalist Christian opinion of the day, Kipling concluded in verses 49–52, ‘But when the morning prayer is prayed, / Think, ere ye pass to strife ... / Is God in human image made / No nearer than Kamakura?’

Kamakura, and its Buddha, had certainly become a popular excursion for Westerners after the opening up of Japan. In part, this was because of the sheer size, in part it was because of the artistry of the Buddha figure. Hence Kipling’s sense at Kamakura of ‘the delights of the eye, colour that rejoices, light that cheers, and line that satisfies the innermost deeps of the heart ... Ah, if the Bodhisat [the Buddha at Kamakura] had only seen his own image!’56 Kipling’s appreciation of the Kamakura Buddha was mirrored by other sympathetic Western observers of the time, in which were exemplified sympathetic Western attitudes to Buddhism.57 Edwin Arnold had been impressed in 1889 with his sight of the Kamakura Buddha, ‘the expression of ineffable calm upon the ancient effigy’.58 As has been seen, in his youth Kipling had read with enthusiasm Arnold’s account of Shākyamuni Buddha Light of Asia; and Andrew Lycett thought that Arnold had probably recommended that Kipling visit Kamakura during 1892.59 Elsewhere in Japan, Lafcadio Hearn was struck by his own sights of the Kamakura Buddha: ‘the immense repose of the whole figure – are full of beauty and charm’.60 He was also struck by Kipling’s portrayal: ‘Kipling’s little sketch of Kamakura ... perfectly controlled, subtle, didactic ... the delicacy of him ... the beauty of that sketch of the Daibutsu’.61
Kipling anchored Japanese Buddhism into a still wider Buddhist framework across Asia. Consequently, Kipling’s *Buddha at Kamakura* proceeded in verses 29–32 to Burma: ‘Till drowsy eyelids seem to see / A-flower ‘neath her golden htee [umbrella, i.e. spire] / The Shwe-Dagon flare easterly / From Burmah to Kamakura’. This evoked his earlier descriptions of the Shwe-Dagon pagoda at Rangoon. Kipling’s poem then moved in verses 37–40 from Burma to Tibet, where ‘Down the loaded air there comes / The thunder of Thibetan drums, / And droned – “Om mane padme hums” / A world’s width from Kamakura’. The thunder of Tibetan drums is a fair description of the frequent use of such musical accompaniments and pitch, the droning was the set formulaic chanting *Om mane padme hum*, that ancient Sanskrit Buddhist mantra at the heart of Tibetan Vajrayana ritual and practice.

A final twist in *Buddha at Kamakura* was with regard to threats to Buddhism from Hinduism in India; verses 41–4 imagery that ‘Brahmans rule Benares still, / Buddh-Gaya’s ruins pit the hill / . . . threaten ill / To Buddha and Kamakura’. Bodhgaya, the scene of the Buddha’s Enlightenment, had by Kipling’s time become a tumbled down backwater under the control of the local Hindu priests. This was echoed in Kipling’s description in *Kim* of the ‘Buddh Gaya . . . grass-tangled ruins’.

Edwin Arnold visited Bodhgaya in 1885, and in a public letter to the Government decried its ‘sad neglect’, with its central building ‘desecrated in the middle, by the Brahmans’, with ‘numberless beautiful broken stones tossed aside’ and with ‘fragments . . . lying in dust and darkness’.

Criticisms of Western cultural triviality can also be seen in *Buddha at Kamakura*. Kipling’s call in verse 13 was ‘spare us still the Western joke’; with his cry in verses 41–4 being ‘A tourist-show, a legend told, / A rusting bulk of bronze and gold, / So much, and scarce so much, ye hold / The meaning of Kamakura?’ In his letter sketch from Kamakura, Kipling further lamented how ‘they sell photographs of him [the Buddha figure at Kamakura] with tourists standing on his thumbnail, and apparently any brute of any gender can scrawl his or her ignoble name over the inside of the massive bronze plates that build him up. Think for a moment of the indignity and insult!’

Kamakura remained in Kipling’s mind and fed into his construction of *Kim*. Kipling ‘introduces his own commentary, most notably through the evocation of respectful deference to the “heathen” Buddhists’, through using verses from ‘Buddha of Kamakura’ as chapter headers in *Kim*. Thus, Kipling’s opening chapter of *Kim* started with the opening four lines from *Buddha at Kamakura*: ‘Oh ye who tread the Narrow Way / By Tophet-flare to Judgement Day, / Be gentle when
the heathen pray / To Buddha at Kamakura!’ Kipling maintained this linkage by having chapter two in *Kim* start with verses 21–24 from *Buddha of Kamakura*: ‘For whoso will, from Pride released, / Contemning neither creed nor priest, / May hear the Soul of all the East / About him at Kamakura’. Chapter three of *Kim* started with a further heading from Kipling’s *Buddha at Kamakura*: ‘Yea, voice of every Soul that clung / To Life that strove from rung to rung / When Devadatta’s rule was young, / The warm wind brings Kamakura’. *Kim* further evoked *Buddha at Kamakura* when Kipling had the Lama chant ‘the wonderful Buddhist invocation: “To Him the Way – the Law – Apart – / Whom Maya held beneath her heart / Ananda’s Lord – the Bodhisat”’, that is to say verses 5–7 of the poem. All this brings us to *Kim* (1901), Kipling’s most substantial novel.

**Kim (1901)**

Kipling’s regard for Tibetan Buddhism was most clearly shown in his novel *Kim*, published in 1901. In it, a Buddhist-associated sense of an inward ‘Empire of the Self’ was juxtaposed and in some degree ultimately prioritised over external territorial empires of the day. The book took its title from Kim, a young boy around whom the ambiguities of identity issues have caused continuing debate in postcolonialism discussions. However, in the novel, Kim existed in tandem with the other main figure, the Tibetan Lama. Through him came an array of Buddhist details and constructions by Kipling: ‘counter-hegemonic side effects of the other knowledge, configuring the Buddhist subtext’ of the novel. In comparative terms, Kipling ‘fashioned, in the narrative of *Kim*, a portrayal of Buddhism that exceeds in sympathy even Edwin Arnold’s *Light of Asia*’. As to Arnold, one can note how Kipling incorporated Arnold’s account of the Buddha’s ‘Trial of Strength’ with Sinhahanu’s bow and arrow, which became Kipling’s device to set up the Lama’s quest to find the site where the arrow fell.

Kipling drafted *Kim* during the 1890s. Its plotline is well known for the Great Game political intrigues; but as Leoshko noted, ‘how Kipling used Buddhist elements receives little serious attention, even though Buddhism is far more than exotic window dressing in the novel’. Certainly close inspection of *Kim* shows a systematic, detailed and sympathetic portrayal of Buddhism by Kipling; channelled through the voice and presence of the Tibetan Lama, ‘Teshoo Lama’, including the finale of the Lama’s meditation-generated enlightenment. Carrington considered that ‘the lama has no literary ancestry or progeny; he is Kipling’s final comment on Buddhist Asia’. For Anand
this reflected gerontification, in which ‘it is often the place, not the people, that is rendered wise on account of its age’. This process is noticeable in the twentieth-century images of Tibet, but was already prefigured in Kipling who ‘through his lama figure in Kim’ was instrumental in bringing together the idea of Tibet with the search for wisdom and spirituality’.75

Whilst Kipling was drafting Kim, something of a Buddhist vogue was already noticeable in Western circles: ‘thousands of late-Victorian Britons went around with [positive albeit vague] images of the Buddha floating in their heads’ in the ‘Buddhism-steeped Nineties’.76 In 1890, Reginald Copleston, the Bishop of Colombo, reluctantly acknowledged ‘the enthusiasm for Buddhism which has been aroused of late years’ amongst Westerners.77 Henry King wrote, in 1895, Shall We Become Buddhists?, given the ‘great religious unrest among us, and a growing dissatisfaction with Christianity, [so] that people are longing for another more satisfying faith’.78 Such a prospect was one that Rhys Davids, one of Kipling’s academic ‘authorities’, had seen with equal vigour in 1900, but with more sympathy as ‘the quiet but irresistible way in which Buddhism is making its influence felt, quite apart from any religious propaganda, in the thought of the West’.79 In America, the World Parliament of Religions brought the charismatic Buddhist figure of Dharmapala to Chicago in 1893. Elsewhere in America, Paul Carus’ The Gospel of the Buddha of 1894 was followed by Henry Warren’s Buddhism in Translations of 1896 in the Harvard Oriental Series. Consequently, in 1902, Edwin Robinson described such Buddhist advocacy as ‘nineteenth century Nirvana-talk’.80

Lawrence Waddell’s book, The Buddhism of Tibet or Lamaism, which appeared in 1895, was known to Kipling, particularly with regard to Waddell’s details on the Buddhist bhava-chakra ‘Wheel of Life’.81 Correspondence was established by Kipling with William Rockhill, who commented on ‘the gentle and humane teachings of the Buddha Shakyamuni’ and had travelled around eastern Tibet in 1888 and 1890 in attempts to reach Lhasa.82 In an 1897 letter to Rockhill, Kipling expressed ‘many thanks for the extra jātakas … Some of the Ceylonese tales and legends are very curious; and I believe many are still unexploited’.83 jātaka material was described by Kipling as ‘truly beautiful’, with some being incorporated into Kim.84

Indeed, Kim contains a wealth of Buddhist teachings. Leoshko was ‘struck by the richness of the Buddhist details used by Kipling’ and the ‘complex web of Buddhist elements present in Kim’ which indicated substantial and quite accurate knowledge of Buddhism by Kipling.85 A comprehensive range of Buddhist ethical, doctrinal and meditation
tenets was given in the story by Kipling; for example denunciation of caste, the ‘wheel of rebirth’, Buddhism as the ‘Middle Way’, the ‘Four Holy Places’, Vinaya ‘Rules’, the Dharma ‘teachings/law’, the ‘Pali Canon’, ‘mindfulness’ breathing exercises, and the role of ‘meditation’. In addition, various specific traits of Tibetan Buddhism also appeared in *Kim*. These included mention of the Dalai Lama at Lhasa, the ‘Old Law’ Nyingma and ‘Reformed Law’ Gelugpa schools, elements and meanings within the Buddhist ‘Wheel of Life’ (*bhavachakra*) imagery, the practice of the Lama walking in meditation whilst clicking a rosary bead, Tibetan prayer-wheels, the Lama’s recitation of the *Om mane padme hum* (‘Hail the Jewel in the Lotus’) mantra, the sacredness of drawing, and the existence of Tibetan devil-dance masks. Whereas Kipling’s portrayal of Buddhism in Burma and Japan had been somewhat generalised, these features in *Kim* caught the distinctive features of Tibetan Buddhism more clearly. Such was the range and sympathetic projection of the Lama in *Kim* that the literary critic Shamsul Islam felt that ‘the Lama at times seems to be a mouthpiece for Kipling himself’.86 On being awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1907 there was official recognition that ‘among the large number of Kipling’s creations, *Kim* (1901) deserves special notice, for in the delineation of the Buddhist priest...there is an elevated diction as well as a tenderness and charm’.87 Such features in Kipling’s *Kim* challenge Edward Said’s *Orientalism* paradigm.

**Orientalism challenged?**

Mention has been made elsewhere of the varied ways that Kipling’s wider testimony on the Orient challenges the label put on Kipling in Edward Said’s *Orientalism*; a label which was maintained, despite other adjustments, in Said’s *Culture and Imperialism*.88 Kipling’s challenge to Said’s subsequent Orientalism labelling includes Kipling’s criticisms of Christian missionaries and some positive estimation by Kipling of aspects of Islam. In his subsequent, reprinted, essay about *Kim*, Said argued that Kipling was not so much interested in religion for its own sake, but merely used such material to add ‘local colour’ and ‘exotic flavour’ window dressing to his general Orientalist narrative.89 However, a significant part of Kipling’s challenge to Said’s Orientalism framework comes from Kipling’s positive and cumulatively substantive Buddhism-related material which goes beyond surface window dressing. In cultural terms Buddhism also provided a different picture to the Orientalist one of automatic Western superiority. In the wake of his travels through Buddhist Asia, it is perhaps no surprise
to find Kipling noting in 1890, in an otherwise satirical blast against
the Indian Congress Party ‘The Enlightenments of Pagett, M.P’, that ‘when
Europe was a jungle half Asia flocked to the canonical conferences of
Buddhism’.  

One issue is the direct linkage that Kipling made in *Kim* to his earlier
poem *Buddha of Kamakura*. As already mentioned, the first three
chapters of *Kim* started with extracts from the earlier poem. Given
the positive profiling of Buddhism in the poem, this is an important
feature. Yet Said, in his own commentary on the *Kim* text, ignored
Kipling’s explicit linkage. Despite Kipling sourcing, and flagging,
his opening lines as being ‘Buddha of Kamakura’, Said ignored
its appearance as Kipling’s own earlier poem. Instead Said restricted
himself to making the general comment ‘Kamakura: place of
pilgrimage in Japan to the giant Buddha’. This is true enough, but
Said ignores the whole Kipling dynamic, the thrust of the earlier
*Buddha of Kamakura* poem, Kipling’s sentiments expressed there on
Buddhism, and sentiments to be developed further in *Kim*.

With regard to Kipling’s *Kim*, Said argued that there was a
marginalisation of the Lama and what he represented, with Said
seeing the Lama as a dependent figure on Kim. Said considered Kim
as the real leader in the novel; ‘throughout the novel Kipling is
clear about showing us that the lama … needs Kim’s youth, his
guidance, his wits’.  
A similar marginalisation-dependency argument was made by Williams in his profile ‘Kim and Orientalism’; in which he
dismissed the Lama as ‘childish, unthinking’ in a setting where
‘without the help of the white man [Kim], the native [i.e. the lama] has
no hope of reaching enlightenment’. However, Kipling was clear
enough in showing the Lama attaining enlightenment through
traditional Buddhist meditation breakthrough in which Kim played
no part. Moreover, in terms of authority, it is significant that Kim is
repeatedly described throughout the novel as a *chela* ‘disciple’ of the
Lama. *Kim* looked up to the Lama; radiating from the Lama, ‘there
lay a wisdom beyond earthly wisdom – the high and lonely lore of
meditation. *Kim* looked on with envy’.  
One further ‘authority’ indicator for the Lama came from Hurree Babu; the westernised but
nationalist Bengali *babu* figure who was portrayed by Kipling as a weak
clinging infantile Oriental, fitting into Said’s Orientalism paradigm.
However, the Tibetan Buddhist Lama was shown as exerting positive
religious-cultural effects on this otherwise derided Hindu figure, a
portrayal of the Lama that cuts across Said’s Orientalism paradigm.
Kipling described a transformation wrought by the Lama whereby
‘the Hurree Babu of his [Kim’s] knowledge – oily, effusive, and
nervous – was gone . . . There remained – polished attentive – a sober, learned man of experience and adversity, gathering wisdom from the lama’s lips’.95

A further strand of the Orientalism paradigm to be challenged is Said’s position that in Kim, the quest of the orphan boy Kim was more important than that of the Lama. In one sense this seems obvious and inherent in the book’s title! Plotz’ point that ‘though Kim starts off in Lahore as “Little Friend of all the World” he comes of age as a spy, as a secret agent’ is true enough. However, we can push this point further by also noting that though Kim’s involvement in espionage for the cause of the British Empire emerges by the middle of the book, the book goes on to finish with a very different strand centred around the Tibetan Lama.96 Hagioannu’s sense that in the ‘discomfiture of the Buddhist-Imperialist contact . . . Teshoo Lama resisted imperial assumptions’ points to Kipling deliberate portrayal of that Buddhist figure in ways that do not fit a standard simple imperialism-Orientalism schemata.97 A simple but telling point remains that though the book may have started with Kim sitting on top of the canon at Lahore, it ended with the Lama sitting in meditation. This evokes the scenes, and claims, made for the Buddha’s own meditation breakthrough profiled sympathetically in Arnold’s The Light of Asia. Consequently, in Kipling’s Kim, the final sentence comes from the Lama; ‘I was meditating . . . I am free’ . . . He crossed his hands on his lap and smiled, as a man may who has won salvation for himself and his beloved [Kim]’.98 Plotz’s sense that ‘clear vision in Kim belongs to the British’, can be supplemented by Kipling’s culminating description of an alternative Buddhist vision, generated from classic mediation breakthrough by the Lama.99 Indeed this is why Plotz finally argued that ‘Empire is far more problematic in Kim than in any of Kipling’s adult works because power here is imagined to coexist with states contrary to power’, with a consequent juxtaposition of ‘Western action with Eastern [i.e. Buddhist] contemplation’.100

The final Buddhist-centred scene attracted Said’s description of ‘some mumbo-jumbo, of course;’ a dismissive (‘of course’) evaluation by Said which perhaps reflects more about Said than it does about Kipling.101 Consequently, Charles Allen rightly argued that ‘there is no ambiguity, what few commentators and critics [for example Said?] have been unable to accept is that the novel ends . . . with Kim a committed disciple of a Tibetan Buddhist lama’.102 In other words, ‘a book that begins as a political allegory about the defence of British India, and, by implications, of Western values, has become the vehicle for a very different Law, that of the Buddhist Dharma’.103 Said’s evaluation
obscured the ultimately greater, and more significant, leadership and ‘authority’ shown by the Lama that Kipling allocates for the whole religious arena, where “I will teach thee other and better desires upon the road”, the lama replied in the voice of authority” to Kim.104

In short, much of what Said considered as Orientalist projections of political power based on assumptions of cultural and religious superiority over an exotic, decadent and ultimately inferior ‘Other’ does not fit Kipling’s own experiences and projections of Buddhism. Kipling’s portrayals of India, permeated by imperial considerations and dismissals of Hinduism, were portrayals of India where Orientalism applied to a noticeable degree.105 However, his comments on Buddhism outside India show a different, Buddhist, Orient generating non-imperial and appreciative comments and images from Kipling. Admittedly, Kipling’s sinophobic comments (which do fit Said’s Orientalism) on China and the Chinese, when juxtaposed with surrounding positive comments in Burma and Japan, speak to the complexity of Kipling’s attitudes toward the ‘Other’. The key point of this study is how Buddhism, in and across its various encountered forms, represents a generally positive sense of the ‘Other’ by Kipling. As such, Kipling certainly felt what he called in Japan ‘the surpassing “otherness” of everything round me’. Ricketts accurately noted how Kipling was ‘excited by what he called Japan’s otherness’ in the cultural and aesthetic arenas.106 We can though push Rickett’s cultural-aesthetic focus further by suggesting that also in the religious area Kipling was attracted by the ‘Other’ in the shape of Buddhism.

Almond judged that in Victorian Britain, the general ‘discourse about Buddhism did have a different flavour to that which Said discerned by virtue of his concentration upon Islam and the Middle East’.107 This involved a positive sense of ‘those heroic qualities of the Buddha, and the romantic ambience of Buddhism, that attracted so many Victorians’, in a way that Islam never did.108 Japanese Buddhism encountered by Kipling was a tradition also able to push back against Orientalist subordination.109 Of particular interest for its implications for Kim, comes Bishop’s general assertion that ‘Tibet seemed always to have the ability slightly to elude the total embrace of western Orientalism. It always sustained an independent Otherness, a sense of superiority, albeit limited’.110 Certainly, a closer look at Kipling’s Buddhist references in Buddha of Kamakura and Kim shows a different picture from Said’s Orientalism paradigm and his interpretation of Kipling.111
Conclusions

Kipling’s East–West encounters have been mostly studied with regard to his Islamic-Hindu saturated Indian milieu. Japan and Burma subsequently provided not just the different cultural setting recognised by Ricketts, but also a different overlooked religious (Buddhist) milieu. Such a Buddhist-saturated milieu for encounter had been one explicitly recognised and emphasised by his contemporaries, like in Ernest Fenollosa’s collection of poems ‘East and West’ in 1892 and Edwin Arnold’s *East and West* collection of essays in 1896. Kipling’s deployment of substantive Buddhist elements in *Kim* can be explained quite simply as reflecting a personal sympathy towards Buddhist spirituality on the part of Kipling, in contrast to a lack of sympathy towards Hinduism.

A final variant within discussion of Orientalism comes from Clarke who argued that ‘the rise and development of Orientalism in the West was closely tied to conditions … of cultural revolution and global expansion’. Consequently, ‘these conditions helped, first, to create a painful void in the spiritual and intellectual heart of Europe, and, second, to beget geopolitical conditions which facilitated the passage of alternative world views from the East’. In other words, the geopolitical thread of political supremacy and empire building reflected Western technological-scientific power, which Said focused on; but perhaps such geo-political power masked a degree of spiritual emptiness, an existential geo-cultural crisis into which Eastern spirituality was able to enter, and which Said perhaps missed? Whereas Said’s Orientalism placed emphasis on the geopolitical expansion of the West and its binary opposition in geocultural terms, it failed to give enough regard to the positive counteraction. In *yin-yang* terms, through Buddhism the East sometimes geoculturally flowed back into the West, even as the West geopolitically flowed onto the East. Kipling represents some mutual West→East flows, with Kipling appreciating various Buddhist aspects of the Orient. In these situations post-colonialism has curiously embraced Kipling to an extent unforeseen by previous dismissals of him as an unreconstructed advocate of empire.

An irony though is that, in retrospect, in 1901 *Kim* represented Kipling’s nearest approaches towards Buddhism; a ‘new vision … an artistic triumph that … never occurred again’. Subsequent works by Kipling, like *They* in 1904, *The House Surgeon* in 1909, *In the Same Boat* in 1911, *The Dog Harvey* in 1914, showed a degree of ‘psychological illness … [reflecting] the conflict of his later years’. Kipling’s own illness and depression, together with the deaths of relatives and
friends, culminated in the particularly traumatic death of his son in 1915 as a soldier on the Western Front. This all brought further post-war disillusionment, as summed up in his brief 1918 *Common Form* poem, ‘If any asked you why they died, / Tell them that our fathers lied’, and in other works his 1924 *A Dead Statesman*. Moreover, Kipling was becoming more rooted in conservative and empire politics in England.

Having approached Buddhism and sensed something of its appeal, Kipling never then took the further steps into Buddhism that contemporaries like Fenollosa and William Bigelow did. By then Kipling had long since left Asia. Nor was Kipling drawn into the mystically tinged interfaith avenues pursued by Francis Younghusband in England during the 1920s and 1930s, which had been generated from Younghusband’s own encounters with Buddhism in his Himalayan and Tibetan travels between 1884 and 1905. Instead, Kipling drifted away from Buddhism and religion in general, though a trip to his house at Bateman’s (where he lived from 1902 onwards till his death) brings a view of his living room intact with his thirteen Buddha statues in it, his ‘household deities’.

Nevertheless, Kipling’s ‘approach’ from 1877–1901, almost a quarter of a century, was close enough for him to be considered an example of the impact of Buddhism on Western thought in the late nineteenth century. Kipling’s treatment of Buddhism also represents a subversion of Said’s Orientalism paradigm. East and West had met in Kipling’s openness and appreciation of Buddhism over two decades, as particularly reflected in his reading of *The Light of Asia* at *Westward Ho!* (1879–82), his travel reports (1889–92) on Burma and Japan, his poem *Buddha at Kamakura* (1892) and his opus *Kim* (1901). The twain had met, even if they subsequently drifted apart.
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