

Kipling, the Orient, and Orientals: “Orientalism” Reoriented?

DAVID SCOTT
Brunel University

EAST-WEST encounters have been a significant feature of modern world history, and a feature that has attracted much commentary in recent decades. With East-West encounter as the background theme, this article sets out to analyze the views on the “Orient” (the “East,” in other words, Asia) of a then leading figure on the East, Rudyard Kipling, the well-known author of “The Ballad of East and West” (1889). Kipling’s views on the Orient are found in his travel accounts, letters, novels, and poetry. Such views of Kipling are juxtaposed with another later influential framework for considering Western views of the Orient, the framework set out by Edward Said in his book *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (1978), and maintained by Said in its republishing in 1995 and 2003.¹

Both Said’s *Orientalism* and Kipling have been extensively written about in their own right, yet there has been little written on how far Kipling actually reflects Said’s Orientalism framework. This study aims to do that. In particular, Kipling’s views on the Orient outside India have not been matched against Said’s Orientalism framework; this article sets out to do so. Consideration of Kipling’s views on the Orient shows the need to adjust—to reorient—Said’s Orientalism framework. The reorientation is partly geographical; Said’s Orientalism works better for the Middle East than for the Far East. The reorientation is partly

¹ Edward Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 2003). Said did not change his main text but appended separate new prefaces.

with application; Said was too sweeping. This general point is not new, but it is not a criticism previously linked to the example of Kipling, who appears in Said's writings as an example of Said's Orientalism framework, but yet on closer analysis now rather seems to question it from a retrospective setting. Such "reorientation" of Said's approach is not debunking it. Said's insights on the relationship between art/literature and ideology, between culture and imperialism, remain valuable a lot of the time. However, they should not be accepted automatically for application to all Western figures. Because Said used historical sources to reconstruct historical time periods, he can also perhaps be considered against standards expected from historians.

Said's analysis was one in which he saw inherent limits and constraints having shaped Western writers (his "Orientalists") on the Orient. He saw such Orientalist writers as being bound by established assumptions about the Orient, assumptions reflecting a dominant ideology (his "Orientalism") in which Western imperial power shaped images in the West, and in which the individual writer seems insignificant. It was a question for Said "of saturating hegemonic systems like culture," with figures like Kipling thereby operating within such a saturated milieu.² In Said's view, "Orientalism imposed limits upon thought about the Orient. Even the most imaginative writers of an age . . . were constrained in what they could either experience of or say about the Orient," such that "every writer on the Orient . . . saw the Orient as a locale requiring Western attention, reconstruction, even redemption."³ Said's analysis was forceful on "Orientalism as a dogma that not only degrades its subject matter but also blinds its practitioners," but is this too simplistic to apply to "every writer" (Said's own words) on the Orient?⁴ What about Moore-Gilbert's argument of the "relative autonomy" and the "integrity" in play from a "great writer" whereby, in India, "Kipling, then [ultimately] transcends an obvious affiliation to imperial discourse which Orientalism [initially] suggested"?⁵

Said ended *Orientalism* with the lament about Orientalists "having to take up a position of irreducible opposition to a region of the world it considered alien to its own."⁶ From the beginning of the critical response to *Orientalism*, Said has been faulted for such sweeping and

² Said, *Orientalism*, p. 14.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 206.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 319.

⁵ Bart Moore-Gilbert, "Culture, Imperialism and Humanism," *Wasafiri* 11, no. 23 (1996): 8–13.

⁶ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 328.

overly rigid binary-dichotomous frameworks.⁷ Said himself was well aware of this criticism; indeed he later talked about “interdependent histories” and “the problem of homogenization.”⁸ The only problem is that his *Orientalism* text was reprinted unaltered in 1995 and 2003, and still maintained the fairly homogenous portrayal of the West seen in 1978. This continuing main text was unaffected by his extra prefaces in 1995 and 2003, which maintained the original validity of his *Orientalism* framework. Consequently, Said’s original comment that “every European, in what he could say about the Orient, was consequently a racist, an imperialist, and almost totally ethnocentric” remained intact in 1995 and 2003, along with the rest of the original 1978 *Orientalism* text. From a historical point of view, to talk of “every” European as having particular characteristics is immediately suspect in terms of basic history methodology.

In his book *Culture and Imperialism* (1993), Said maintained his earlier *Orientalism* framework. In his own words, he tried to “expand the arguments of the earlier book [*Orientalism*]” through “non–Middle Eastern materials drawn on here” [in *Culture and Imperialism*]. “European writing on Africa, India, parts of the Far East, Australia . . . discourses, as some of them have been called, I see as part of the general European effort to rule distant lands and peoples and, therefore, as related to Orientalist descriptions of the Islamic world” earlier propounded in *Orientalism*.⁹ Said did acknowledge some limitations in his *Orientalism* framework: “what I left out of *Orientalism* was that response to Western dominance which culminated in the great movements of decolonizations . . . never was it the case that the imperial encounter pitted an active Western intruder against a supine or inert non-Western native; there was always some form of active resistance.”¹⁰ However, the resistance presented by Said in *Culture and Imperialism* was from non-Western sources, such as Indian nationalism, with the exception of his chapter on Yeats, in which Irish nationalism was pitted against British imperialism.

This article thus has a twofold argument. First, it argues that despite

⁷ For critiques of Said’s binary categorization see Robert Irwin, *Dangerous Knowledge: Orientalism and Its Discontents* (Woodstock: Overlook Press, 2006); Daniel Varisco, *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007); Ibn Warraq, *Defending the West: A Critique of Edward Said’s Orientalism* (New York: Prometheus Books, 2007). Kipling is not particularly used in such discussions and critiques.

⁸ Said, interview (*Radical Philosophy*, 1993), repr. in *Power, Politics and Culture. Interviews with Edward W. Said*, ed. Gauri Viswanathan (London: Bloomsbury, 2005), p. 220.

⁹ Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), p. xi.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. xii.

such modifications by Said, he continued to leave out countercurrents within British circles that do not fit the Orientalism paradigm, and of which Kipling is an important but rather overlooked example. Consequently, looking at Kipling more closely brings out the need to adjust Said's Orientalism paradigm. Second, given the importance of Kipling in his own right, consideration of his views on the Orient serves as a significant avenue for discerning East-West encounter outside British India. Frequent juxtaposition will now be carried out between the two main primary sources here for the Orient, Kipling's and Said's writings, again giving this study some distinctiveness.

SAID ON KIPLING

Said remained clear-cut on Kipling. One can choose between various statements by Said in *Culture and Imperialism* about Kipling: "few more imperialist and reactionary than he," "Kipling, who finally saw only the politics of empire," "when we come to Kipling . . . the empire is everywhere a crucial setting," or "his fiction represents the empire and its conscious legitimization."¹¹ Such assessments kept Kipling firmly ensconced in the imperialist camp, with the dichotomous position advanced in *Orientalism* still intact for Said with regard to Kipling. Thus, Said's 1987 introduction to Kipling's novel *Kim* was also reprinted, unchanged in *Culture and Imperialism*, as section 5, "The Pleasures of Imperialism," within the imperialist chapter 2, "Consolidated Vision," with the counter-imperial examples collected elsewhere, in chapter 3, "Resistance and Opposition." Said's material on *Kim* remained unchanged in *Culture and Imperialism*, maintaining Said's firm identification of *Kim* as an Orientalist production by Kipling serving the ends of empire.

There were only limited references—three in effect—to Kipling in Said's book *Orientalism*. First, Said noted, in passing, Kipling's assertion of Western command and authority: "an order of sovereignty is set up from East to West, a mock chain of being whose clearest form was given once by Kipling."¹² This points to Kipling's story "Her Majesty's Servants" (1894). Second, Said saw Kipling material as "a sort of elaboration of latent Orientalism" feeding into wider public perceptions, in which "their imaginative perspectives were provided principally by their

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. xi, 63, 146.

¹² Said, *Orientalism*, p. 45.

illustrious contemporary Rudyard Kipling, who had sung so memorably of holding ‘dominion over palm and pine.’”¹³ The “imaginative perspectives” were the varied works of fiction that had propelled Kipling to the forefront of late Victorian writers. The “dominion over palm” phrase picked out by Said comes from Kipling’s poem “Recessional” (1897).¹⁴ Third is Said’s argument that “as he appears in several poems, in novels like *Kim*, and in too many catchphrases to be an ironic fiction, Kipling’s White Man, as an idea, a persona, a style of being.”¹⁵ Said argued that “it was of this tradition . . . that Kipling wrote when he celebrated the ‘road’ taken by White Men in the colonies . . . ‘Oh, well for the world when the White Men tread / Their highway side by side!’”¹⁶ The poem is Kipling’s “A Song of the White Men” (1899), which Said used to show Western colonial solidarity on the part of Kipling, a poem that has passed into continuing racist political commentary.¹⁷

Kipling is also encountered via Said’s editing in 1987 of the republishing of Kipling’s major novel *Kim* (1901), to which Said added his own introductory essay. As already noted, this was an essay that was later reprinted in Said’s *Culture and Imperialism*, under the title “The Pleasures of Imperialism.” With regard to Kipling’s *Kim*, Said argued that “*Kim* is a major contribution to this Orientalized India of the imagination.”¹⁸ Said considered the orphan Irish boy *Kim* as the real leader in the novel rather than the Tibetan Buddhist lama; “throughout the novel Kipling is clear about showing us that the lama . . . needs *Kim*’s youth, his guidance, his wits.”¹⁹ The ending of the novel, and Kipling’s description of Buddhist meditational transformation, is described (or rather dismissed) by Said as “mumbo jumbo, of course.”²⁰ As to the role of such religious elements, Said argued that Kipling was not so much interested in religion for its own sake, but merely used such religious material in *Kim* to add “local colour” and “exotic detail” to a general Orientalist narrative.²¹

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

¹⁴ All poems from Rudyard Kipling, *Rudyard Kipling’s Verse: Definitive Edition* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1940).

¹⁵ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 226.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 226.

¹⁷ For example, the poem approvingly hosted and cited on sites like Caucasian Nation (<http://caucasiannation.wordpress.com>), Vanguard News Network: White Nationalist Poems at (<http://www.vnnforum.com>), and Stormfront (<http://www3.stormfront.org>), all as accessed November 2009.

¹⁸ Said, “Introduction,” in Kipling, *Kim*, ed. and comm. Said (Penguin: Harmondsworth, 1987), p. 28.

¹⁹ Said, “Introduction,” p. 15.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.*

Having pinpointed these appearances of Kipling within Said's Orientalism analysis, we can now look more directly at Kipling's own treatment of the Orient in general before looking at his Orient beyond India, in the shape of Burma, China, Japan, and Tibet.

KIPLING AND THE "ORIENT"

Kipling was initially known as a young journalist, novelist, and poet, replete with sound bites, a colorful profile, irony, and caricature of British India.²² Kipling was well aware of the general figure of the Orientalist scholar of his day, the image of "a profound Orientalist and a fluent speaker of Hindustani" ("Route Marchin," 1890) in India. For Kipling this was an academic network of discussion and dissemination of ideas; "every Orientalist in Europe would patronize it [the doctrine of metempsychosis] discursively with Sanskrit and Pali texts."²³ Varied scholars of the Orient were known by Kipling. Some were "travellers, savants, specialists, etc. on their way through India who sooner or later would stay for a time in my father's house (I mention Darmesteter 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. You will easily see how this atmosphere and these surroundings impressed and coloured my outlook."²⁴ Kipling's mention, when visiting pagodas in Burma in 1889, of "the neatly bound English books that we read on Buddhism" was probably a reference to Max Muller, professor of comparative philology at Oxford, whom Kipling described as a reputable "authority," and whom Said considered to be an example of "academic Orientalism."²⁵

²² Louis Cornell, *Kipling in India* (London: Macmillan, 1966); Charles Allen, *Kipling Sahib: India and the Making of Rudyard Kipling* (London: Abacus, 2007).

²³ Kipling, "The Finest Story in the World," *Contemporary Review*, July 1891, repr. Kipling, *Many Inventions* (New York: D. Appleton, 1893), p. 133.

²⁴ Kipling to André Chevrillon, 6 October 1919, *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling, Volume 4: 1911-19*, ed. Thomas Pinney (City of Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 1999), p. 574. Kipling had written a short review on Leon's study *La Civilisations des Arabes* (1884) in the *Lahore Civil and Military Gazette* on 6 February 1885. It would be interesting to know what Kipling would have made of LeBon's *Les Lois psychologiques de l'évolution des peuples* (1894), which Said sees as a "locus classicus" for imperial subjugation, *Orientalism*, p. 207. James Darmesteter, *Lettres sur l'Inde* (Paris: Alphonse Lemerre, 1888), included sentiments like "le gouvernement de l'Inde est une des belles choses qui soient dans le monde d'aujourd'hui," p. vii, and the Bengali *babu* as "moralement inferieure," p. xvi.

²⁵ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea* (London: Macmillan 1900), p. 1: 234; Kipling, "The Bisara of Pooree," in *Plain Tales from the Indian Hills*, p. 267; Said, *Orientalism*, p. 18, Muller later mentioned pp. 246, 252, 364-365.

Kipling's departure from India brought in another genre, his travel accounts during 1888–1889 and again in 1892. In looking at such material, we can compare it against Said's comments that "when a learned Orientalist traveled in the country of his specialization, it was always with unshakable abstract maxims about the 'civilization' he had studied; rarely were Orientalists interested in anything except proving the validity of these musty 'truths' by applying them, without great success, to uncomprehending, hence degenerate, natives."²⁶ We can further consider how far Kipling's travels reflected Said's sense that "every European traveler or resident in the Orient has had to protect himself from its unsettling influences."²⁷ Said does not make any reference to Kipling's travel accounts, which may reflect the general criticism that "Said narrows down a broad range of travel accounts to focus narrowly but intensively on texts that support his thesis," thereby ignoring other travel accounts that do not support his Orientalism thesis.²⁸ Amid Kipling's evocation of "the glory and mystery of the immemorial East," what judgments did he actually make?²⁹

The importance of Kipling's materials is that they show Kipling encountering a wider Asia, as his travels took him through Southeast Asia, China, and Japan, and across the Pacific. In his original 1987 introduction to *Orientalism* Said acknowledged the geographical constrictions within his Orientalism model: "I limited that already limited (but still inordinately large) set of questions to the Anglo-French-American experience of the Arabs and Islam, which for almost a thousand years together stood for the Orient. Immediately upon doing that, a large part of the Orient seemed to have been eliminated—India, Japan, China, and other sections of the Far East."³⁰ Said felt, for personal reasons perhaps, that "for me the Islamic Orient has had to be the center of attention."³¹ However, the Islamic Orient was not the focus of Kipling's Orient, which was South Asia and the Far East, that "large part of the Orient" that Said "eliminated" from his analysis. Kipling's comments on this wider Asia, this Orient outside India, present a sometimes different picture from that given by him in British India, and do not fit into Said's Orientalism in various ways.

²⁶ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 52. Also Mary Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2007).

²⁷ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 166.

²⁸ Varisco, *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid*, p. 226.

²⁹ Kipling, "The Enlightenments of Pagett, M.P.," in *Under the Deodars* (New York: P. Collier and Son, 1888), p. 183.

³⁰ Said, *Orientalism*, pp. 16–17.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 25–26.

This article does not dispute the way that Kipling was ready enough to make casual sweeping generalizations about the “Orient” and “Orientals;” for example:

- “Impassive as Orientals always are” (*The Phantom Rickshaw*)
- “Natural Oriental eccentricities” (*Letters of Travel*)
- “Being an Oriental it makes no protest” (*Letters of Travel*)
- “The Oriental as a guide is indiscriminating” (*Letters of Marque*)
- “Kim lied like an Oriental” (*Kim*)
- “If there is one thing that the Oriental detests more than another, it is the damnable Western vice of accuracy” (*Letters of Travel*)
- “Politely cheated in each one, that the Japanese is an Oriental” (*Letters of Travel*)
- “Destruction—the one thing the Oriental understands” (*The Naulakha*)

Such sweeping comments are the sorts of generalizations noticed by Said in his Orientalist examples, though Said has in turn also been subject to frequent enough criticism over making his own sweeping generalizations about the “West” and the “Orient.”

Said’s *Orientalism* pointed out the widespread presence of racism in Western comments, assumptions, and constructions of “the Orient,” from people like Arthur de Gobineau and others.³² This can also be linked up to the growth of late Victorian “scientific racism.”³³ Kipling himself was not immune to this current of fin-de-siècle uncertainties, opinion, and assumptions.³⁴ His poem “Recessional” (1897) had the lines juxtaposing “Dominion over palm and pine” with “lesser breeds without the Law.” His poem “The White Man’s Burden” (1899) talked of “new-caught, sullen peoples, Half-devil and half-child.”³⁵ It is no surprise to have already found that it is this race angle of Kipling, his setting up and privileging of the “White Man” that Said had invoked in *Orientalism* when mentioning Kipling. Kipling seemed adverse though to interracial mixing, his famous advice in “Beyond the Pale” (1888)

³² Gobineau mentioned in Said, *Orientalism*, pp. 8, 99, 150, 151, 206, 228, 340.

³³ Christine Bolt, *Victorian Attitudes to Race* (London: Routledge Kegan Paul, 1971), pp. 1–28; Nancy Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain, 1800–1960* (Hamden: Archon, 1982).

³⁴ Stephen Arata, “A Universal Foreignness: Kipling in the Fin-de-Siècle,” *ELT* 36, no. 1 (1993): 7–38, esp. pp. 9–16 for racial and imperial angst.

³⁵ Patrick Brantlinger, “The White Man’s Burden’ and Its Afterlives,” *English Literature in Transition* 50, no. 2 (2007): 172–191.

was “a man should, whatever happens, keep to his own caste, race, and breed. Let the White go to the White and the Black to the Black.”³⁶ However, it is worth mentioning Kipling’s own seeming “sympathies” in that story being given to the young Hindu window Bisesa rather than the older white male Trejago.³⁷ Racial fears can certainly be seen, and are elaborated further on in this article, in Kipling’s comments on China and the Chinese, in which he shared similar concerns with Gobineau.³⁸

Racially charged supremacism can be seen in Kipling’s frequent denigration of the *babu* figure, the Bengali intellectuals that were in the vanguard of the Indian nationalist movement in the late nineteenth century.³⁹ Kipling’s dismissal was crude enough of them in “The Enlightenments of Pagett, M.P.” (1890), “a parcel of baboos . . . as never did a day’s work in their lives” but who still pushed the agenda of the “callow” Indian National Congress; “black apes were more efficient workmates, and as for the Bengali babu—tchick!”⁴⁰ Kipling dismissed the *babu* figure as a “black Bengali dog . . . a hated and despised animal.”⁴¹ A speech in the Bengal Legislative Council by “a heavily built Babu, in a black gown and a strange headdress” was concluded, for Kipling, by a sense of “hopeless fog . . . a whiff of the Stink.”⁴² This sense of smell, literally but also geo-racially, pervades Kipling’s description of Calcutta and its inhabitants.

Said was quite explicit in seeing “Orientalism as an exercise of cultural strength” by the West that reflected and furthered the exercise of political power by the West: “So far as the West was concerned during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, an assumption had been made that the Orient and everything in it was, if not patently inferior to,

³⁶ Kipling, “Beyond the Pale,” in *Plain Tales from the Hills*, p. 171. See generally John McClure, *Kipling and Conrad. The Colonial Fiction* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981), chap. 2, “Unbearable Burdens: Kipling in the Eighties” for Kipling’s bitter sympathy on “The White Man’s Burden” in India.

³⁷ Bart Moore-Gilbert, “Cultural Transfer in Kipling’s Writings,” *Kipling Journal* 70, no. 277 (1996): 16.

³⁸ See Gobineau’s warnings on China’s military revival and Chinese migration in his essay *Events in Asia* (1881); see also Gregory Blue, “Gobineau on China: Race Theory, the Yellow Peril, and the Critique of Modernity,” *Journal of World History* 10, no. 1 (1999): 93–142.

³⁹ Kipling, *Tale of Two Cities*.

⁴⁰ Kipling, “The Enlightenments of Pagett, M.P.,” pp. 195, 216. For Indian contexts, see Shruti Kapila, “Race Matters: Orientalism and Religion: India and Beyond c. 1770–1880,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 41, no. 3 (2007): 471–513.

⁴¹ Kipling, “The Head of the District,” in *Life’s Handicap*, p. 130.

⁴² Kipling, “City of Dreadful Night” (1888), in *From Sea to Sea*, pp. 2: 222, 2: 224.

then in need of corrective study by the West . . . Orientalism, then, is knowledge of the Orient that places things Oriental in class, court, prison, or manual for scrutiny, study, judgment, discipline, or governing."⁴³ Kipling is of course well known as a supporter of the imperial "governing" cause in general.⁴⁴ In 1900 Walter Besant had already quickly dubbed Kipling the "Poet of the Empire," while in 1942 George Orwell considered Kipling as "the prophet of British imperialism in its expansionist phase."⁴⁵ Kipling himself talked of some of his own stories being "an allegory of Empire."⁴⁶ The overt face of imperialism can be seen in Kipling's poems like "Ave Imperatrix" (1882), "Loot" (1890), "The English Flag" (1891), and "The White Man's Burden" (1899), as well as British India stories like "The Enlightenments of Pagett, M.P." (1890) and "The Head of District" (1891). Kipling's novel *Kim* is set in maintaining British political control of India against internal pressure from Indian nationalists and external machinations of Russian imperialism.⁴⁷

On the one hand, the British imperial cause in India was appropriate, Kipling argued, given what he considered the childlike nature of India and its inhabitants: "fate looks after the Indian Empire because it is so big and helpless," an imperialism-legitimizing stereotype by Kipling that is the sort of general Western stereotype noticed in Said's *Orientalism*.⁴⁸ On the other hand, a more nuanced, complex sense of imperialism and its internal tensions and conflict within India can also be seen in Kipling's poems like "The Masque of Plenty" (1888) and in his stories like "Lispeth" (1886), "On the City Wall" (1888), "Beyond

⁴³ Said, *Orientalism*, pp. 40–41.

⁴⁴ Benita Parry, "The Content and Discontents of Kipling's Imperialism," *New Formations* 6, no. 1 (1998): 53 for "Imperialism's scribe." A "positive Imperial Idea fascinated Kipling, and it forms one of the most important factors in the shaping of Kipling's mind, art, and vision," Shamsul Islam, *Kipling's Law: A Study of His Philosophy of Life* (London: Macmillan, 1975), p. 48; pp. 48–85, chap. 4, "The Imperial Order." Generally see H. L. Varley, "Imperialism and Rudyard Kipling," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14, no. 1 (1953): 124–135; David Gilmour, *The Long Recessional. The Imperial Life of Rudyard Kipling* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002).

⁴⁵ Walter Besant, "Is It the Voice of the Hooligan?" *Living Age*, 17 February 1900; George Orwell, "Rudyard Kipling" (1942), *Critical Essays* (London: Secker and Edburg, 1946), p. 102.

⁴⁶ Kipling, "Naboth," *Life's Handicap*, p. 394.

⁴⁷ Christine Bucher, "Envisioning the Imperial Nation in Kipling's *Kim*," *Journal of Commonwealth and Postcolonial Studies* 5, no. 2 (1998): 7–17; Brigitte Craft, "Apprentice to Empire, or, 'What is Kim?'" *Journal of Commonwealth and Postcolonial Studies* 5, no. 2 (1998): 18–35; Clara Park, "Artist of Empire: Kipling and *Kim*," *Hudson Review* 55, no. 4 (2003): 537–561; Jess Taylor, "Kipling's Imperial Aestheticism: Epistemologies of Art and Empire in *Kim*," *ELT* 52, no. 1 (2009): 49–69.

⁴⁸ Kipling, *Plain Tales from the Hills*, p. 122.

the Pale" (1888), "Without Benefit of Clergy" (1890), and "At the End of the Passage" (1890). The latter is also but one example of Kipling's ongoing criticisms of Christian theological claims and missionary presence in Asia. This ongoing criticism of Christianity can be seen not only in Kipling's travel accounts and personal letters but also in his writings like "Lispeth" (1886), "The Conversion of Aurelian McGoggin" (1887), "The Judgement of Dungara" (1888), and "The Naulahka" (1891–1892).⁴⁹ Kipling may have denigrated the nationalist Bengali *babu*, but yet there is much in his writings where he does identify with India and its peoples.⁵⁰ Moreover, as a counternarrative within Kipling, it is also fair to point out his hesitancy and forebodings over the fragility of British imperialism. This was shown in Kipling's "What the People Said" (1887), "Mogul, Mahratta, and Mlech from the North, and White Queen over the Seas—God raiseth them up and driveth them forth," a sense also apparent in "Recessional" (1897), "all our pomp of yesterday, is one with Nineveh and Tyre!"⁵¹ The "Mark of the Beast" (1890) also suggested the bankruptcy of imperial knowledge.⁵²

We are left with a final paradox that while Kipling was an avowed proponent of British imperial rule in India, but not of Christianity, his comments on and in the wider Asia domain do not really fit Said's model. Said's argument on this entwinement of Orientalist images and perceptions with political control was clear enough: "Orientalism reinforced, and was reinforced by, the certain knowledge that Europe or the West literally commanded the vastly greater part of the earth's surface. The period of immense advance in the institutions and content of Orientalism coincides exactly with the period of unparalleled European expansion. From 1815 to 1914 European direct colonial dominion expanded from about 35 percent of the earth's surface to about 85 percent of it. Every continent was affected, none more so than Africa and Asia."⁵³

⁴⁹ See Sandra Kemp, "'Your Cold Christ and Tangled Trinities': The Critique of Christian Discourse," in *Kipling's Hidden Narratives*, by Kemp (London: Basil Blackwell, 1988), pp. 82–100; Douglas Kerr, "Kipling and the Missionaries," in *Eastern Figures: Orient and Empire in British Writing* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2008), pp. 23–33.

⁵⁰ See critique of Said's labels of Kipling by Ibn Warraq, "Rudyard Kipling, India and Edward Said," *New English Review*, March 2010, http://www.newenglishreview.org/custpage.cfm/frm/58685/sec_id/58685.

⁵¹ For Kipling's unease, pessimism, and anxiety for the British presence in India, see Moore-Gilbert, "Rudyard Kipling: Writing and Control," in *Literature and Imperialism* (London: Roehampton Institute, 1983), pp. 93–117.

⁵² Paul Battles, "'The Mark of the Beast': Rudyard Kipling's Apocalyptic Vision of Empire," *Studies in Short Fiction*, 33, no. 3 (1996), http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2455/is_n3_v33/ai_20877859/.

⁵³ Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, p. 41.

The trouble is that this linkage works well enough in some areas but not so much in others. Said's Orientalism framework mostly used the Middle East/North Africa for most of its British and French examples of construction of the Orient and of Orientalism, with negative portrayals of Islam therein. This does indeed reflect a frequent position in those regions of "direct colonial dominion," though it is worth noting that Kipling's comments on Islam are sympathetic enough in his travel account "Egypt of the Magicians" (1913), as indeed they were in his India-set stories. In contrast to Said, Kipling's "Orient" not only included colonial zones in India and Southeast Asia (Burma, Malaya, Singapore), they also included other Asian zones like Tibet, China, and Japan, which for various reasons had not succumbed to such "direct colonial dominion" by the West. This seems to lie behind Kipling's sense that "Asia is not going to be civilised after the methods of the West. There is too much Asia."⁵⁴ Tibet proved too remote and alluringly elusive, China though battered and humiliated remained too big to carve up, and Japan through resourceful modernization was able to embark on its own colonial expansionism by the end of the nineteenth century—which does not fit into the Said's Orientalism paradigm.⁵⁵ Such an Orient was a different Orient than the one Said drew in the Middle East, and Kipling reflects that contextual difference. It is to Southeast Asia (Burma), the Far East (China and Japan), and Central Asia (Tibet) that we can turn.

Kipling and Burma

Kipling was positively struck by Burma, the first leg of his travels into wider Asia: "I love the Burman with the blind favouritism born of first impressions. When I die I will be a Burman."⁵⁶ Some of this was relatively trivial reflections of the traditional allure of the East: "seriously, the Burmese girls are very pretty."⁵⁷ However, Ricketts's suggestion that

⁵⁴ Kipling, "The Man Who Was," p. 99.

⁵⁵ Generally see Arif Dirlik, "Chinese History and the Question of Orientalism," *History and Theory* 35, no. 4 (1996): 96–118; Richard Minear, "Orientalism and the Study of Japan," *Journal of Asian Studies* 39, no. 3 (1980): 507–517; Daisuk Nishara, "Said, Orientalism and Japan," *Alif* 25 (2005): 241–253.

⁵⁶ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea*, p. 1: 221.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* Other comments on Burmese women, "girls," pp. 221, 229, 232. See Sheridan Presso, *The Asian Mystique* (New York: Public Affairs, 2005), for allure of Asian women in Western images of the East. This is aesthetic-exotic on the part of Kipling in Burma and Japan, rather than the degenerate-erotic "sexual experience" pinned to European travelers by Said, *Orientalism*, p. 190.

Kipling's Burmese comments merely represent "comic copy" romantic interludes for his *Pioneer* (Allahabad) readership ignores the varied serious positive religious comments from Kipling about Buddhism in Burma and elsewhere.⁵⁸ As he moved out from India, and his denunciations there of Hinduism, he encountered a different Asian religious tradition, Buddhism, to which his response was much more positive.

Rangoon's Shwe-Dagon pagoda was thus described by Kipling as one of "the wonders of the earth."⁵⁹ A Buddhist pagoda at Moulmein attracted further positive comments from Kipling as "a place of great peace, dotted with Burmese images, spotlessly clean" with "a beautifully gilt image of Buddha in it," with Buddhism "an amiable creed . . . a genial one, however. To begin with, it is quiet," and with Kipling describing himself as "sitting in meditation" while his Western globetrotter companion was dismissed by him as a "brute."⁶⁰ That Buddhist pagoda was recalled in Kipling's poem "Mandalay" (1892) and its call "Ship me somewheres east of Suez" to Burma "where there aren't no Ten Commandments," a further criticism of Christianity; "for the temple-bells are callin', an' it's there that I would be—By the old Moulmein Pagoda."⁶¹ As Kipling continued his eastern voyage, a very different Orient was encountered, that of China and the Chinese, which evoked a very different response from him.

Kipling and China/the Chinese

At the most general level was Kipling's own admission "I do not like Chinamen."⁶² This was a dislike based on fear and may be reflected in his talk in "Loot" (1890) of "shove your baynick down the chink." Whereas Said's *Orientalism* generally stressed a fear/threat felt by the West toward an alien Islamic/Arab "Other," for Kipling any such "Other" role was represented by China and the Chinese, wrapped up in what Kipling generally called "the Chinese question."⁶³ In his travels across the Asia-Pacific, Kipling reiterated negative portrayals of Chi-

⁵⁸ Harry Ricketts, *The Unforgiving Minute: A Life of Rudyard Kipling* (London: Pimlico, 2000), p. 121.

⁵⁹ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea*, p. 1: 219.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 1: 233–235.

⁶¹ Kipling's lines from the *Mandalay* poem were the focus for John Curtin [Vigilant], "The Lure of the Orient," *Westralian Worker*, 20 July 1917, who considered Kipling an "ambassador between East and West."

⁶² Kipling, *From Sea to Sea*, p. 1: 332.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 333. See also Zhang Longxi, "The Myth of the Other: China in the Eyes of the West," *Critical Inquiry* 15, no. 1 (1988): 108–131.

nese communities in Malaya (Penang and Singapore), China (Canton and Hong Kong), Japan (Yokohama), Canada (Vancouver), and the United States (San Francisco and The Dalles).

Kipling's fear of China and the Chinese was quickly shown at Penang. Military imagery was mixed up for Kipling with cultural-racial imagery—all negative, where talk of “the first army corps on the march of the Mongol [i.e., Chinese]” was mixed with his talk of “a horror of the Chinese—of their inhumanity and their inscrutability.”⁶⁴ The Chinese were a people “without morals,” with Kipling recounting his suspicions of babies being “boiled and eaten” and admitting how “the faces of the Chinese frightened me more than ever.”⁶⁵ This sense of demographic power, the numberless masses, was reiterated by Kipling at Singapore with “the swarming Chinaman.”⁶⁶ At Canton, it was the case that “the March of the Mongol is a pretty thing to write about in magazines . . . hear the tramp of the feet on the granite blocks of the road . . . Watch the yellow faces that glare at you . . . and you will be afraid, as I was afraid.”⁶⁷ Kipling's own awareness of this wider Western literature is shown by his reference to “magazines,” probably Dunlop's profile of China's rising economic and military power “The March of the Mongol,” which had just appeared in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review* in 1889.⁶⁸ Such alarmist warnings about China and the Chinese were not found just in Kipling's public writings, being reiterated in a 1903 letter he wrote to his old naval friend W. J. Harding: “glad you feel about the Chink as I do. Frankly I'm afraid of him.”⁶⁹

Kipling's loathing and caricaturing of China, the Chinese people, and their culture, religion, and language was evident in Hong Kong: “the people were so very many and so unhuman . . . in the gloom of an ancient curio shop, where nameless devils of the Chinese creed make mouths at you from back-shelves, where brazen dragons, revelations of uncleanness, all catch your feet as you stumble across the floor . . . and the breaking wave of human speech, that is not human!”⁷⁰ Such loathing of the Chinese echoes some of Said's alienness of the “Other,” as well as general Yellow Peril “race paranoia” images that were so wide-

⁶⁴ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea*, p. 1: 245.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1: 249.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1: 255.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 1: 305–306.

⁶⁸ William Dunlop, “The March of the Mongol,” *Asiatic Quarterly Review* 7 (January–April 1889): 19–45.

⁶⁹ Cited in Hugh Cortazzi and George Webb, eds., *Kipling's Japan: Collected Writings* (New Jersey: Athlone Press, 1988), p. 272.

⁷⁰ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea*, pp. 1: 305–306.

spread elsewhere in the West in Kipling's time.⁷¹ Around the Pacific in Canada, Australia, and the United States, fear over Chinese migration was entwined with concerns over a resurgent reformed China, heightened by the picture painted in Zeng Jize's profile "China, the Sleep, and the Awakening" (1887), which had appeared, like Dunlop's "The March of the Mongol," in the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*. In California, invasion fears were widely expressed in legislative debates, as well as in novels like Perton Dooner's *Last Days of the Republic* (1880) and Robert Wolner's *A Short and Truthful History of the Taking of California and Oregon by the Chinese in the Year A.D. 1899* (1882). Similarly, in Australia, invasion fears were widely expressed in legislative debates, in widely read reports like Charles Pearson's *National Life and Character: A Forecast* (1893), as well as in novels like William Lane's *White or Yellow? A Story of the Race War of A.D. 1908* (1888) and Kenneth Mackay's *The Yellow Wave* (1895).⁷² As such, Kipling does reflect Said's sense in *Orientalism*, where "[Orientalist] dogma is that the Orient is at bottom something . . . to be feared (the Yellow Peril, the Mongol hordes)," though Said left such Yellow Peril images unexplored.⁷³ However, Kipling's sense of China was not so much a sense of China's weakness, which would have fit into Said's "Orient equals weak" *Orientalism* paradigm of "the strength of the West and the Orient's weakness—as seen by the West. Such strength and such weakness are . . . intrinsic to Orientalism."⁷⁴ Instead, it was a sense for Kipling of China's latent and worrisome strength, as "the richest land on the face of the earth."⁷⁵

The economic challenge posed by the Chinese concerned Kipling, "these people work and spread . . . They will overwhelm the world" for they are "yellow people with black hearts—black hearts . . . and a devil-born capacity for doing more work than they ought."⁷⁶ Such an economic challenge does not fit into a Said-style stereotype of the backward inert Orient but was behind some of the virulent anti-Chinese racism that swept the U.S. Pacific shorelines. Kipling admitted in San

⁷¹ Stanford Lyman, "The 'Yellow Peril' Mystique: Origins and Vicissitudes of a Racist Discourse," *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society* 13, no. 4 (2000): 683–747; Urmila Seshagiri, "Modernity's (Yellow) Perils: Dr. Fu-Manchu and English Race Paranoia," *Cultural Critique* 62 (Winter 2006): 162–194.

⁷² Kipling's views on China, Zeng Jize, Australian and California invasion fears discussed in D. Scott, *China and the International System, 1840–1949* (New York: State University of New York Press, 2008), pp. 84–114.

⁷³ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 301.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁷⁵ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea*, p. 1: 275.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 1: 274, 1: 307.

Francisco: "I understand why the civilised European of Irish extraction kills the Chinaman in America. It is justifiable to kill him. It would be quite right to wipe the city of Canton off the face of the earth, and to exterminate all the people who ran away from the shelling. The Chinaman ought not to count . . . This people ought to be killed off because they are unlike any people I ever met before."⁷⁷

This geocultural and geoeconomic loathing of China and the Chinese reflected racism, but it also reflects political awareness of China as an independent realm that had buckled but had not broken before Western imperialism. China was an uncomfortable presence for the West in the international system of the late nineteenth century, down but not out, resentful, and with evident long-term potential for future rise. In the 1920s, Chinese nationalism and its push for renegotiating unequal treaties and recovering concessions granted to the European powers was rejected by Kipling as a "hell-broth."⁷⁸ All in all, in Kipling's eyes, China presented a latent threat to the West, in ways that Said's Middle East/North Africa did not; "what will happen when China really wakes up, runs a [railway] line from Shanghai to Lhasa, starts another line of imperial Yellow Flag immigrant steamers, and really works and controls her own gun-factories and arsenals?"⁷⁹ Such a range of negative portrayal of China and the Chinese can though be juxtaposed with much more positive comments by Kipling on Japan and the Japanese.

Kipling and Japan

Kipling was attracted by Japan: "here was colour, form, food, comfort and beauty enough for half a years contemplation . . . I would be a Japanese."⁸⁰ Kipling certainly felt the differentness of Japan. He commented on "the surpassing 'otherness' of everything round me," though this was a positive enough "Other," in which Ricketts argued that Kipling was "excited by what he called Japan's otherness" in the cultural and aesthetic area.⁸¹ Whereas Kipling had virtually fled China in horror, he arrived in Japan with the sense of "the joy of touching a

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 1: 306.

⁷⁸ Kipling to Elsie Bambridge, 29 June 1925, *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling. Volume 5: 1920–30*, ed. Thomas Pinney (City of Iowa: University of Iowa Press, 2004), p. 240.

⁷⁹ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea*, p. 1: 294.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 1: 327.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1: 319; Ricketts, *The Unforgiving Minute: A Life of Rudyard Kipling*, p. 126.

new country, a completely strange race and manners contrary . . . I was in Japan—the Japan of cabinets and joinery, gracious folk and fair manners.”⁸² He also lost his heart to a Japanese geisha girl, O-Toyo, whom he encountered at a Japanese tea-ceremony: “I looked around at that faultless room, at the dwarf pines and creamy cherry blossoms without, at O-Toyo bubbling with laughter . . . and at the ring of Mikado maidens . . . I have left my heart with O-Toyo under the pines.”⁸³ Her memory lingered in the rougher American milieu: “I had left the innocent East far behind . . . Weeping softly for O-Toyo . . . O-Toyo was a darling.”⁸⁴

This 1888 trip was followed by a second trip in 1892. Kipling’s viewing of the giant Buddha at Kamakura led to his poem “Buddha of Kamakura.”⁸⁵ Although “Buddha at Kamakura” starts with the simple and potentially dismissive subheading “and there is a Japanese idol at Kamakura,” the body of the poem is substantive, sensitive, and positive on Buddhism. In “Buddha at Kamakura,” there was criticism of Christian missionary exclusivism in the opening quatrain: “O ye who tread the Narrow Way / By Tophet-flare to Judgment Day, / Be gentle when ‘the heathen’ pray / To Buddha at Kamakura!” This criticism was maintained in another quatrain in the poem: “And whoso will, from Pride released, / Contemning neither creed nor priest, / May feel the Soul of all the East / About him at Kamakura.” It is of further significance that these two quatrains, complete with their underlying criticism of Christian condemnatory pride, are also the epigraphs for the opening two chapters of Kipling’s *Kim*.

Western tourists and travelers in Japan were again, as in Burma, criticized by Kipling as “Globe Trotters.”⁸⁶ Kipling saw such Western tourists at Kamakura as, again, “brutes” giving “indignity and the insult” to the local population.⁸⁷ Kipling argued in his poem “Buddha of Kamakura” that:

⁸² Kipling, *From Sea to Sea*, p. 1: 314.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 1: 327.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 1: 482, 2: 3.

⁸⁵ Shizen Ozawa, “Representing Empire: A Reading of ‘From Tideway to Tideway,’” *Comparative Literature Studies* 39, no. 4 (2002): 293–304, ignores the presence of the “Buddha of Kamakura” in Kipling’s first travel report, “The Edge of the East,” and instead focuses on the imperial unity themes found in the other parts of the 1892 travel account that was eventually published in 1920 in *Letters of Travel*.

⁸⁶ See Kipling, “The Edge of the East,” in *Letters of Travel*, pp. 36–37 for globetrotters “scuffling for guides” in Yokohama.

⁸⁷ Kipling, “The Edge of the East,” p. 44.

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?
 But when the morning prayer is prayed,
 Think, ere ye pass to strife and trade,
 Is God in human image made
 No nearer than Kamakura?

The “strife and trade” phrase would seem a further barb against Western missionary strife and mercantilist policies.

Elsewhere in Japan, Kipling visited a Buddhist monastery at Kobe. He considered it “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.”⁸⁸ Kobe’s peaceful meditative atmosphere was complemented for Kipling by the “Procession of the Cherry Blossom” at Chion-in. There, “the priests of Buddha excelled the priests of the Pope . . . very slowly and solemnly, as befitted their high office . . . In solemn calm the books were unrolled, and the priests began chanting Pali texts . . . this splendour of ritual and paraphernalia.”⁸⁹ The comparison, to the advantage of Buddhism, with Roman Catholicism is an interesting aspect of this passage.

The other aspect of Japan that struck Kipling was its Meiji modernization-cum-Westernization. Insofar as explicit Western models, albeit picked from different Western nations, were being adopted by Japan as a matter of deliberate state policy, one could argue this still reflected Said’s sense of the strength of Western cultural imperialism. However, ultimately this was to enable Japan to develop its own imperialism to cut across, challenge, and undermine Western colonialism in Asia.

Kipling’s comments on Japan’s modernization are complex. Extra-territorial and customs privileges enjoyed by the West in Japan were supported by Kipling, his imperialism coming to the fore. However, he decried stereotypical Western dismissals of Japan:

The Overseas Club puts up its collective nose scornfully when it hears of the New and Regenerate Japan sprung to life since the ’seventies. It grins, with shame be it written, at an Imperial Diet modeled on the

⁸⁸ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea*, pp. 1: 342–343.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1: 370–372.

German plan and a Code Napoléon à la Japonaise. It is so far behind the New Era as to doubt that an Oriental country, ridden by etiquette of the sternest, and social distinctions almost as hard as those of caste, can be turned out to Western gauge in the compass of a very young man's life. And it must be prejudiced . . . Was there ever so disgraceful a club!⁹⁰

Kipling was not though immune to his own superioristic-sounding comments about Japan's eclectic modernization: "He was a Japanese Customs Official. Had our stay been longer, I would have wept over him because he was a hybrid—partly French, partly German, and partly American—a tribute to civilisation. All the Japanese officials from the police upward seem to be clad in European clothes, and never do those clothes fit. I think the Mikado made them at the same time as the Constitution. They will come right in time."⁹¹ The saving grace is perhaps Kipling's sense that it would come all right for Japan, "in time."

Meanwhile, Kipling's sense of Japan's own national rise is discernible. Within Said's *Orientalism*, Japan hardly registers. However, Japan's encounter and responses to the West was far from any passive Orientalism-style weakness. In adopting elements from the West, Japan was also adapting them. Japan was on the geopolitical rise, a rise not really featuring in Said's passing references to Japan, but one that Kipling seemed already aware of: "the Japanese Government is about as enterprising a Government as you could wish, and a good one to have dealings with. When Japan has finished reconstructing herself on the new lines, she'll be quite a respectable little Power."⁹² In military terms, "the Japanese . . . men-of-war demand serious attention."⁹³ The Japanese army was a force with potential strength, "first class," and "as good as any troops recruited east of Suez."⁹⁴ Once Japanese expansion had begun, at the expense of China, Kipling did not seem too worried; "British, French, Italian, Japanese, and American forces in China were strengthened in face of continued [Chinese] agitation against the commercial treaty."⁹⁵ Japan was a fellow imperialist? The "Yellow Peril" for Kipling came from China, not from Japan, in which the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 strengthened a positive enough image of Japan in Britain.

⁹⁰ Kipling, "Our Overseas Men," in *Letters of Travel*, p. 52.

⁹¹ Kipling, *From Sea to Sea*, p. 1: 315.

⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 1: 396–397.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 1: 412.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 1: 431–432.

⁹⁵ Kipling, *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling. Volume 5: 1920–30*, p. 337.

Kipling and Tibet

A further Asian setting neglected by Said is Tibet. Of particular interest is 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."⁹⁶ Kipling seems to have been quite attracted to aspects of Tibet, an area adjacent to his own Himalayan stamping grounds at Simla. Anand sees a process of *gerontification* in which Kipling was "instrumental in bringing together the idea of Tibet with the search for wisdom and spirituality."⁹⁷

Kipling's regard for Tibetan Buddhism is most clearly shown in his most substantial novel *Kim* (1901), where a Buddhist-associated sense of an inward "Empire of the Self" is juxtaposed and in some degree ultimately prioritized over external territorial empires of the day.⁹⁸ Kwon's sense of *Kim*'s "counter-hegemonic side effects of the other knowledge, configuring the Buddhist subtext" of the novel is correct in terms of the counter-hegemony aspect, yet actually a bit understated with regard to the role of Buddhism in *Kim*, where the repeated appearance of Buddhism and its tenets in the novel makes Buddhism more than a subtext; it is central and sustained in the text itself.⁹⁹

After all, the novel *Kim* literally finishes on a high note, not with Kim, but with the Tibetan lama, who is shown coming out of traditional transformational Buddhist contemplation; "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]."¹⁰⁰ Admittedly,

⁹⁶ Peter Bishop, *The Myth of Shangri-La. Tibet, Travel Writing and the Western Creation of Sacred Landscape* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), p. 145.

⁹⁷ Dibyesh Anand, "Western Colonial Representations of the Other: The Case of Exotica Tibet," *New Political Science* 29, no. 1 (2007): 39.

⁹⁸ See J. Jefferey Franklin, "Buddhism and the Empire of the Self in *Kim*," in *The Lotus and the Lion: Buddhism and the British Empire* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2008), pp. 128–176. Also Bruce Shaw, "The Tibetan Wheel of Life Versus the Great Game in Kipling's *Kim*," *Kipling Journal* 69, no. 276 (1995): 12–21; Janice Leoshko, "What Is in *Kim*? Rudyard Kipling and Tibetan Buddhist Traditions," *South Asian Research* 21, no. 1 (2001): 51–75.

⁹⁹ Young Hee Kwon, "The Buddhist Sub-text and the Imperial Soul-making in *Kim*," *Victorian Newsletter* 111 (Spring 2007): 20.

¹⁰⁰ Kipling, *Kim*, p. 338, being the very end sentence. Benita Parry thus argues that "the Lama grows in the passage of the tale," his early "immaturity" (emphasized by Said and Sullivan) gives way to impressive maturity so that "as the book draws to a close, his stature as both as a mystic and as a complete man is confirmed when he [the lama] renounces

Kipling's finale of the lama's Buddhist-evoking description of post-meditation enlightenment vision attracted Said's description of "some mumbo-jumbo, of course," a dismissive evaluation by Said that perhaps reflects Said more than Kipling.¹⁰¹ Given such an end sentence, Charles Allen argues 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 . . . 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*."¹⁰² The Buddhist underpinnings in the story are further shown by Kipling having the earlier quoted couple of quatrains from his poem "Buddha of Kamakura" serve as epigraphs to open chapters 1 and 2 of *Kim*.

While the story title *Kim* refers to Kim, an orphaned Irish boy, the other main figure is this Tibetan Buddhist lama. Some commentators see the novel as rather postcolonial in its thrust in elevating the lama.¹⁰³ The lama is positively portrayed by Kipling in *Kim* as someone who had "gentle kindness" and "quiet dignity," and was "wise and holy," a "scholar removed from vanity, as a Seeker walking in humility, as an old man, wise and temperate, illumining knowledge with brilliant insight."¹⁰⁴ On the one hand, Said argued that there was a marginaliza-

Nirvana out of concern for others," *Delusions and Discoveries. Studies of India in the British Imagination 1880–1930* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 246–247.

¹⁰¹ Said, "Introduction," p. 19. Ann Parry similarly dismissed this end episode as a "senile . . . bizarre state of mind" on the part of the lama, "Recovering the Connection between Kim and Contemporary History," Kipling, *Kim*, ed. Zohreh Sullivan (New York, Norton, 2002), p. 316. Similarly, Zohreh Sullivan considered the lama's "world of contemplation" as "some other dubious truth" and sheer "absurdity"; *Narratives of Empire: The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 158, 175. In contrast, one voice from the Orient, K. Bhaskara Rao, considered that the lama "dominates the entire novel" as "the pivotal character in the novel," where "it is the journey of the Lama that is important" with the book's "main theme, a religious search" by the lama, a Buddhist religious search that is seriously, sensitively, and sympathetically enough portrayed by Kipling; see Rao, "Kim and the Indian Synthesis," *Rudyard Kipling's India* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967), pp. 134–136.

¹⁰² Allen, *Kipling Sahib*, p. 362.

¹⁰³ Feroza Jussawalla, "(Re)reading Kim: Defining Kipling's Masterpiece as Postcolonial," *Journal of Commonwealth and Postcolonial Studies* 5, no. 2 (1998): 117. Similarly Moore-Gilbert, "I Am Going to Rewrite Kipling's Kim: Kipling and Postcolonialism," *Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 37, no. 2 (2002): 39–58, reflecting how "Kipling's relationship to postcolonialism might be enabling, rather than simply antagonistic," p. 39.

¹⁰⁴ Kipling, *Kim*, pp. 55, 59, 60, 305. Fikret Aranguç, "Representations of the 'Self' and the 'Other' in Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*," *Journal of Social Sciences* 3, no. 31 (2003): 13–20 treats *Kim* as an Orientalist novel, yet totally ignores the role of the lama.

tion of the lama and what he represented by Kipling, with Said seeing the lama as a dependent figure on Kim.¹⁰⁵ On the other hand, in terms of authority, it is significant that Kim is repeatedly described throughout the novel as a *chela* “disciple” of the lama.¹⁰⁶ One further “authority” indicator for the lama surrounds Hurree Babu, the Westernized but nationalist Bengali *babu* figure, who was derided by Kipling as the typical weak clinging infantile Oriental and who fits Said’s Orientalism paradigm. However, the Tibetan Buddhist lama is shown as exerting religious-cultural effects for the better on this otherwise derided Hindu figure. Consequently, Kipling described how, radiating from the lama, “there lay a wisdom beyond earthly wisdom—the high and lonely lore of meditation. Kim looked on with envy,” 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.”¹⁰⁷

The lama was certainly not dismissed by Kipling’s contemporaries in 1901. Millar argued then that “in the background there is always the impressive figure of the lama, whose mysterious apophthegms about the Wheel and the most Excellent Law form a deep and solemn accompaniment, as it were, to the music of the whole composition.”¹⁰⁸ Payne noted “the winning personality of a Thibetan holy man” whereby “the Buddhist attitude toward life is very sympathetically figured [by Kipling] in this venerable character.”¹⁰⁹ The Swedish Academy, when awarding Kipling the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1907, argued that “*Kim* (1901) deserves special attention, for in the delineation [by Kipling] of the Buddhist priest . . . there is an elevated diction as well as a tenderness

¹⁰⁵ Similar marginalization-dependency argument by Patrick Williams, “Kim and Orientalism,” *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), p. 484.

¹⁰⁶ Kipling, *Kim*, where the *chela* “disciple” description of Kim appears in chapters 2–5, 7–15. Consequently, Michael Hollington considered that the lama “is the most authoritative truth-teller of all in the novel . . . and has his own authority. It is his voice that dominates the concluding pages,” “Storytelling in *Kim*,” *Kim*, ed. Sullivan, pp. 388, 392. Moore-Gilbert discerned that “Kim’s relationship with the lama is, crucially, an educational one,” *Kipling and Orientalism* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), pp. 126–127.

¹⁰⁷ Kipling, *Kim*, p. 275.

¹⁰⁸ J. Millar, “Recent Fiction,” review in *Blackwood’s Magazine* 170 (December 1901): 794.

¹⁰⁹ William Payne, “Recent Fiction,” *Dial*, 31 (16 November 1901): 368; repr. “Mr Kipling’s Enthralling New Novel,” in Kipling, *Kim*, ed. Sullivan, p. 285.

and charm.”¹¹⁰ Despite his own trenchant criticism of Kipling and the jingoistic imperialism that Kipling espoused, E. M. Forster, the author of East-West encounters in *Passage to India* (1924), nevertheless felt impelled to admit that “*Kim* is Kipling. It is the one book that we must bear in mind when we are trying to estimate his [Kipling’s] genius” for it shows a “gift of mysticism . . . and India has given it to Kipling . . . the India of Buddha,” leading Kipling “to admire Buddhism.”¹¹¹ For Forster there “remains the mystic passionless face of India and the Lama saying to Kim, ‘Just is the wheel! Certain is our Deliverance. Come!’”—a scene of “supreme beauty” penned by Kipling.¹¹²

SAID’S USE OF HISTORY

Said’s perceptions, and perhaps misperceptions, of Kipling raise discipline issues over Said’s use of history. As an eventual professor in the Department of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia, Said was by trade a literary theorist and cultural critic, rather than a professional historian. It can be argued though that Said should nevertheless be judged under history-discipline grounds, given his focus on historical time periods, given his deployment of a wide range of historical sources, and given the historical impact of *Orientalism* on historical debate during the last thirty years.¹¹³

This generates advantages and weaknesses. On the one hand, Said’s non-history academic background gave him the sensitivity and the imagination to use and contextualize a battery of literary-artistic sources for reconstruction of attitudes from earlier time periods. Such a history-oriented interest in attitudes and sources for reconstructing attitudes was also seen in Robert J. C. Young’s *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West* (1990). As Said pointed out in his *The World*,

¹¹⁰ C.D. of Wirsén, “Nobel Prize for Literature, 1907,” repr. Kipling, *Kim*, ed. Sullivan, p. 293.

¹¹¹ Edward Forster, “Kipling’s Poems (1908),” ed. Michael Lackey, *Journal of Modern Literature* 30, no. 3 (2007): 21, 23.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 23.

¹¹³ See John MacKenzie, “Edward Said and the Historians,” *Nineteenth Century Contexts* 18, no. 1 (1994): 9–25, inc. “Historians who feel more comfortable with analysis firmly grounded in an empirical base have tended to avoid [the] highly theoretical disputes” occasioned by *Orientalism*. MacKenzie in emphasizing the sheer instability, heterogeneity, and porosity of Western imperial culture, criticizes Said for creating a stereotypical image of the West. See also Aijaz Ahmad, “Between Orientalism and Historicism,” *Studies in History* 7, no. 1 (1991): 135–163.

the Text, and the Critic (1983), “the point is that texts have ways of existing that even in their most rarefied form are always enmeshed in circumstance, time, place, and society—in short, they are in the world, and hence worldly.”¹¹⁴ If this is applied, then all of Kipling’s literature is “worldly” and thus usable by the historian. In Said’s quest to reconstruct the “power political (as with a colonial or imperial establishment), power intellectual (as with reigning sciences like comparative linguistics or anatomy, or any of the modern policy sciences), power cultural (as with orthodoxies and canons of taste, texts, values), power moral (as with ideas about what ‘we’ do and what ‘they’ cannot do or understand as ‘we’ do)” operating in East-West encounter, Said got away from what he dubbed the “archival vacuum” of restricted Rankean official-political/diplomatic sources.¹¹⁵ This enables Said’s Orientalism to point to a wider *histoire totale* in the Braudelian culturally oriented broader sense of what historical flows can involve. That pointer was, and remains, valuable for the historian and wider circles.

Said was ready to identify himself with historical schools of thought, more specifically, “Hayden White’s *Metahistory*, where there’s a shift away from the contents of history, which are the historical experience of the historians that he talks about, to their form, their language, and their rhetoric.”¹¹⁶ However, this actually shows a questionable shift away from “content,” which surely should remain a prime concern in historical enquiry. Said described himself thus: “I am an Oriental writing back at the Orientalists . . . I am also writing *to* them, as it were by, dismantling the structure of their discipline, showing its meta-historical, institutional, anti-empirical, and ideological biases.”¹¹⁷ However, this ran the risk of Said merely showing his own unhistorical usage, his own anti-empirical selectivity, and his own ideological bias.

The problem is that when looked at from this history-discipline

¹¹⁴ Said, *The World, The Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983), p. 35.

¹¹⁵ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 13.

¹¹⁶ Said, Interview (*Boundary 2*, 1993), p. 187. This refers to Hayden White’s *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973), an interesting and analogous work on attitudes and images in the West. See also White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1987). But then, as White himself acknowledged, “*Metahistory* is something historians don’t like. But some people in other disciplines do, philosophy and literary critics” like Said. White, interview, *Diacritics* (Spring 1994): 92. See also White, “Criticism as Cultural Politics,” review of *Beginnings: Intention and Method*, by Edward Said, *Diacritics* (Fall 1976): 8–13.

¹¹⁷ Said, interview (*Diacritics*, 1976), repr. in Viswanathan, *Power, Politics and Culture*, p. 38.

point of view, there is a twofold problem with Said. With specific regard to India, Said incorporated it within his Orientalism paradigm, an application incorporated by scholars like Inden.¹¹⁸ However, Said's Orientalism paradigm has been criticized by other scholars as something of an ahistorical construct itself, as pointing to the Islamic Levant rather than South Asia. Kopf sees Oriental scholars and commentators as cutting across and at times against Eurocentric imperialism, reflecting a divergent juxtaposition between Said's "hermeneutics and history" in which "Said's notion of Orientalism does not necessarily fit the historical situation in those areas," and leaving a verdict of "as such Orientalism lacks historical precision, comprehensiveness and subtlety."¹¹⁹ Charges of "historical howlers" and "polemical errors" have been made with Said's portrayals of other Orientalist figures like Disraeli, and perhaps the same can be said for Said's treatment of Kipling.¹²⁰ With regard to Kipling, the problem is that Said's portrayal of Kipling is limited; his resulting evaluation of him is consequently flawed in parts, which casts doubts on the total dominance (in Said's earlier cited words, "saturation") of Orientalist modes. Having deployed a range of literary-cultural sources from time periods to back up his Orientalist thesis about the historical nature of East-West encounters, Said was partly right in arguing that "Orientalism brings one up directly against that question—that is, to realizing that political imperialism governs an entire field of study, imagination, and scholarly institutions."¹²¹ However, this was only partly right, as scrutiny of Kipling shows it does not cover the entire field of imagination.

Unfortunately, Said's use of history and of historical examples in his Orientalism thesis was just pushed too far, too comprehensively, too domineeringly, and too rigidly. In the swirl of ideas and East-West encounter, there are other historical dynamics also in play alongside Said's Orientalism. Later on, in *Culture and Imperialism*, Said incorporated the idea of political-cultural resistance to imperialism among

¹¹⁸ Ronald Inden, "Orientalist Constructions of India," *Modern Asian Studies* 20, no. 3 (1986): 401–446; *Imagining India* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990). Also Carol Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer, ed., *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993); Richard King, *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India and "The Mystic East"* (London: Routledge, 2002).

¹¹⁹ David Kopf, "Hermeneutics Versus History," *Journal of Asian Studies* 39, no. 3 (1980): 496, 497. Irfan Habib, "In Defence of Orientalism," *Social Scientist* 33, no. 1–2 (2005): 40–46, found Said's treatment "sloppy" and "confusing" with regard to India.

¹²⁰ Mark F. Proudman, "Disraeli as an 'Orientalist': The Polemical Errors of Edward Said," *Journal of the Historical Society* 5, no. 4 (2005): 462.

¹²¹ Said, *Orientalism*, pp. 13–14.

the oppressed groups, but he still did not really incorporate the idea of diversity within Western ranks, and the idea of cultural attractiveness, at times, of the Orient to the West. This is ultimately a poor deployment of history. The irony is that in *Culture and Imperialism* Said noted that “gone are the binary oppositions dear to the nationalists and imperialist enterprise . . . all empires are involved in one another . . . and [are] unmonolithic.”¹²² Yet his Orientalism framework did paint a too monolithic-binary picture of the West, into which the significant figure of Kipling does not fit.

CONCLUSIONS

Kipling’s famous refrain from the *Ballad of East and West* (1889), “East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,” has been frequently taken as the epitome of inherent fixed East-West division. However, its following lines actually suggest reconciliation of such East-West divides: “But there is neither East nor West, / Border, nor Breed, nor Birth, / When two strong men stand face to face, / tho’ they come from the ends of the earth!”¹²³ This was why Kipling himself, looking back, concluded: “I would charge you for the sake of your daily correspondence, never to launch a glittering generality, which an older generation used to call ‘Tupperism.’ Long ago I stated that ‘East was East and West was West and never the twain should meet.’ It seemed right, for I had checked it by the card, but I was careful to point out circumstances under which cardinal points ceased to exist.”¹²⁴ Another of Kipling’s poems, “We and They” (1926), also undercut binary divides and cultural supremacism. It started with conventional, Orientalism-style binary divides: “All good people agree, / And all good people say, / All nice people, like Us, are We / And every one else is They.” However, it then continues by undermining such binary divides: “But if you cross over the sea, / Instead of over the way, / You may end by (think of it!) looking on We / As only a sort of They!”

¹²² Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, p. xxv.

¹²³ One could of course subject Kipling’s talk of “two strong men,” and indeed Said’s *Orientalism*, to feminist analysis, but that would be a different question to pursue.

¹²⁴ Kipling, *Something of Myself* (London: Macmillan, 1937), p. 221. This is why Kerstin Shands argues that “surprisingly Kipling’s ‘arch-colonialist’ poem seems to suggest that East and West are self-deconstructing mental constructs”; “Neither East nor West: From Orientalism to Postcoloniality,” *Neither East Nor West: Postcolonial Essays on Literature, Culture and Religion* (Huddinge: Södertörns Högskola, 2008), p. 7.

Conversely, with regard to Said, there is his lament in *Orientalism* about the “regrettable tendency of any knowledge based on such hard and fast distinctions as ‘East’ and ‘West.’”¹²⁵ The trouble is one could well argue that Said’s own framework is too rigidly and sweepingly binary and oppositional, presenting the Orient/East and the West as rather hard and fast monolithic entities, and all too ready to use sweeping overgeneralized categories and bracketing of individuals and materials. He may have opened up his portrayal of the East in his *Culture and Imperialism*, but his profiling of a fairly uniform West remained pretty intact. This is not a new criticism of Said, but it is one made with fresh material to match against his portrayal of the West, in the surprising shape of Kipling.

Admittedly some aspects of Kipling relate quite closely to the Orientalism paradigm, such as Kipling’s advocacy of British political control in India, and his racially charged imagery. However, already within Kipling’s own particular Indian setting Moore-Gilbert discerned “strategic conflicts within Orientalism,” with an Anglo-Indian Orientalism angle to Kipling that “can be seen to challenge some of the basic tenets of metropolitan ‘Orientalism’” over economic issues and over religion, that was wary of Christian evangelization and ready to give some respect to existing indigenous religious tradition.¹²⁶ Moreover, outside India, Kipling seems to show large parts of Asia like China and Japan as not particularly weak, and he also seems to have had a quite positive estimation of Buddhism able to be juxtaposed against his persistent criticisms of the zealous Christian missionary and of the casual Western globetrotter tourist. In this context, Kipling’s comment that “western civilization is a devastating and a selfish game” has sympathetic undertones for non-Western cultures.¹²⁷ Kipling not only shows a positive Western variant, he also brings out different Orients.

It is no coincidence for this study of Said’s Orientalism framework and Kipling that Said’s framework seems to break down with regard to religion. Mellor argues that Said’s Orientalism paradigm is “a particularly unhelpful approach to religion . . . a theoretically flawed work offering a reductive account of religion and an impoverished view of human beings” and of human agency/free will.¹²⁸ Certainly, in the case

¹²⁵ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 46.

¹²⁶ Moore-Gilbert, *Kipling and Orientalism*, esp. pp. 111–125.

¹²⁷ Kipling, *Letters of Travel*, p. 247.

¹²⁸ Philip Mellor, “Orientalism, Representation and Religion: The Reality behind the Myth,” *Religion* 34, no. 2 (2004): 99.

of South Asia, it can be argued that Hinduism and the allure of the East could at times attract the West to a degree that Said's *Orientalism* does not allow for, with Buddhism having a further Eastern allure outside India onto and into the West.¹²⁹ This is why Mark Lussier talked of a "colonial counterflow from Orientalism to Buddhism."¹³⁰

Thus, while Kipling was not particularly personally attracted to Hinduism, he seems in various ways to have been attracted to some of the equally Oriental allure of Buddhism. Did not his friend George Beresford describe Kipling as "the apostle of Buddha"?¹³¹ Did not Kipling call the Buddhist *Jataka Tales*, and their ethical messages, "truly beautiful"?¹³² With regard to Kipling's varied and sustained appreciation of Buddhism in its Burmese (Kipling's travels), Japanese (Kipling's travels), and Tibetan (Kipling's *Kim*) contexts, Said's *Orientalism* framework seems to break down. If Kipling discerned attractive features in Buddhism, he was not alone in the West. Almond felt at a general level 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."¹³³ This was a different discourse involving a positive sense of "those heroic qualities of the Buddha, and the romantic ambience of Buddhism, that attracted so many Victorians" to Buddhism, such that "thousands of late-Victorian Britains went around with images of the Buddha floating in their heads" in the "Buddhism-steeped Nineties."¹³⁴

A final variant within discussion of Orientalism comes from Clark, who argues that "the rise and development of Orientalism in the West was closely tied to conditions . . . of cultural revolution and global

¹²⁹ David Smith, "Orientalism and Hinduism," in *The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism*, ed. G. Flood (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 60–61; Gregory Barton, "Abolishing the East: The Dated Nature of Orientalism in the Definition and Ethical Analysis of the Hindu Faith," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 29, no. 2 (2009): 281–290.

¹³⁰ Mark Lussier, "Colonial Counterflow: From Orientalism to Buddhism," in *Interrogating Orientalism*, ed. Dianne Hoeveler and Jefferey Cass (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2006), pp. 90–106.

¹³¹ George Beresford, *Schooldays with Kipling* (London: Victor Gollanz, 1936), p. 247.

¹³² Kipling, *Something of Myself*, p. 141. See also Peter Caracciolo, "Buddhist Teaching Stories and Their Influence on Conrad, Wells, and Kipling," *Comradian* 11, no. 1 (1986): 24–34.

¹³³ Phillip Almond, *The British Discovery of Buddhism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 5.

¹³⁴ Almond, *The British Discovery of Buddhism*, p. 3; J. Jeffrey Franklin, "The Life of Buddha in Victorian England," *ELH* 72, no. 4 (2005): 941.

expansion.”¹³⁵ Such “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.”¹³⁶ In other words, the geopolitical thread of political supremacy and empire building reflected Western technological and scientific power, which Said focuses on, but this military and economic hard power also masked a degree of spiritual emptiness, an existential crisis within which Eastern spirituality (soft power?) was able to enter and which Said loses sight of. Whereas Said’s Orientalism places emphasis on the geopolitical expansion of the West and its binary opposition in geocultural terms, it fails to give enough regard to the positive counteraction—in yin-yang terms, the East flowing back into the West, even as the West flows onto the East. On the one hand, Kipling represents some mutual West-East flows, with Kipling seeming to appreciate some aspects of the Orient. On the other hand, Said only really focused on one-way rather negative flows, the West to East power flow profiled in *Orientalism*, supplemented by the resistant East to West oppositional push back profiled in *Culture and Imperialism* and described elsewhere by him as “a kind of counter-Orientalism.”¹³⁷

A caveat could be expressed insofar as Said did acknowledge countercurrents in the West that could appreciate the East but only as (minor) exceptions that prove his general (Orientalist) rule. The problem with Said and Kipling is twofold. First, Said identified Kipling as representative of Orientalism, yet closer inspection indicates that Kipling does not always fit Said’s Orientalism paradigm, given Kipling’s varied critiques of Western elements and various positive evaluations of Eastern “Oriental” elements. Second, having a major figure like Kipling cutting across Said’s Orientalism paradigm is not a mere minor exception that thereby proves an otherwise dominant rule. Kipling was, in many ways, a (perhaps *the*) major figure in the nexus between British imperialism and images of the East. More than half a century ago, it was the case that “Rudyard Kipling with his unforgettable stories of ‘East of Suez’ . . . the ways of the East were made familiar to thou-

¹³⁵ John Clarke, *Oriental Enlightenment: The Encounter between Asian and Western Thought* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 34. See generally chap. 2, “Orientalism: Some Conjectures,” pp. 16–34.

¹³⁶ Clarke, *Oriental Enlightenment*, p. 34.

¹³⁷ Said, interview (*Wild Orchids and Trotsky*, 1993), repr. in Viswanathan, *Power, Politics and Culture*, p. 170.

sands of Westerners through his stories, there can be little doubt.”¹³⁸ In retrospect, for Alexander Macfie, an author on Orientalism, “it is Kipling who stands out as the presiding genius who, in the period of my youth (and no doubt for many years before), almost single-handedly created India and the East for the English (and also for the West).”¹³⁹ If such a major figure like Kipling does not match Said’s Orientalism paradigm, then it casts doubt on the pervasive saturation determinant claims of the paradigm.

Said’s sensitivity to the entwining of imperialism (and racism) to literary writings and images remains highly valuable and of rightful enduring impact. His paradigm often works. There is the twist that Said had an “irreverent approach” and acted as something of an “agent provocateur.”¹⁴⁰ Ironically this is also something that could be said of Kipling. Said himself noted that “*Orientalism* is theoretically inconsistent and I designed it that way.”¹⁴¹ He also noted that that “*Orientalism* is a partisan book.”¹⁴² The reason for that partisan, some would argue polemical, edge was that Said considered that “*Orientalism* is very much a book tied to the tumultuous dynamics of contemporary history,” the excesses of what he saw in U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East and in Orientalist advisors to the U.S. government in the 1990s, in which he argued “*Orientalism* once again raises the question of whether modern imperialism ever ended.”¹⁴³ It is as much then a political tract as a history exercise. Two consequences now seem valid in considering East-West encounter, if we return to Kipling’s earlier imperialism times. First, Said’s Orientalism framework needs reorientation to take account of the Orient beyond just the Middle East. Second, there needs to be recognition that the important figure of Kipling and his particular views of the Orient, especially positive on Buddhism, involved more than just political imperialism.

¹³⁸ Charles Braden, “The Novelist Discovers the Orient,” *Far Eastern Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (1948): 165.

¹³⁹ Alexander Macfie, “My Orientalism,” *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 45, no. 1 (2009): 87. Macfie was responsible for editing *Orientalism: A Reader* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000), and writing *Orientalism* (London: Longman, 2002).

¹⁴⁰ Haidar Eid and Khaled Ghazal, “Edward Said: Agent Provocateur,” *Nebula* 5, no. 3 (2008): 11.

¹⁴¹ Imre Salusinsky, *Criticism in Society* (New York: Methuen, 1987), p. 137 for interview with Said.

¹⁴² Said, *Orientalism*, p. 340.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. xii, xvi.