



UNIVERSIDAD DE JAÉN
Centro de Estudios de Postgrado

Master's Dissertation/
Trabajo Fin de Máster

*The Transgression of Boundaries in
A Passage to India
and
Heart of Darkness*

Student: Ramírez Manzano, Fátima

Tutor: Dr. Paula García Ramírez
Dpt.: English Philology

November, 2017

DEDICATION

This master dissertation and all of my academic achievements
are dedicated to my beloved parents.

Thanks for your patience, encouragement, and unconditional love.

Your example will forever inspire me and guide me in life.

Table of Contents.

ABSTRACT	3
RESUMEN	3
INTRODUCTION.	4
1. BIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES.....	6
2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.	9
3. COLONIAL AND POSTCOLONIAL CONCEPTS IN HD AND PI.	13
3.1. The self and the other in <i>Passage to India</i>	15
3.2. The self and the other in <i>Heart of Darkness</i>	20
4. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE COLONIZER AND THE COLONIZED.....	25
4.1. Indians and Anglo-Indians.....	26
4.2. Niggers and Whites.....	33
5. THE EFFECTS OF IMPERIALISM IN THE COLONIZER AND THE COLONIZED..	42
6. CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS, AND FURTHER RESEARCH.....	47
BIBLIOGRAPHY	51
Primary Sources.....	51
Secondary Sources.....	51

ABSTRACT.

J. Conrad and E.M. Forster are considered colonialist writers and their masterpieces *A Passage to India* and *Heart of Darkness* are often criticized by postcolonial authors for consolidating and perpetuating the myths and racial stereotypes upon which colonialism rested. This dissertation has focused on the critique of imperialism that can be glimpsed in both literary works to determine how these outstanding authors contributed to reshape the perception of colonialism from the cultural sphere. Colonialist stereotypes are present in the books, however, the systematic association of the *self* with mediocrity, abusive acts, unfair judgements, and racial segregation, has a dehumanizing effect on the *self*, not on the *other*. Civilization turns into an agent of destruction and corruption and only the different mindset of the transgressive characters seems to point out into the right direction: a liberal mind and a desire to coexist and learn from each other.

RESUMEN.

J. Conrad y E.M. Forster son considerados autores coloniales y sus obras maestras *A Passage to India* and *Heart of Darkness* son criticadas a menudo por autores postcoloniales por consolidar y perpetuar los mitos y estereotipos raciales en los que se basaba el colonialismo. Esta disertación se ha centrado en las críticas al colonialismo que se pueden entrever en ambas obras literarias para determinar cómo estos sobresalientes autores contribuyeron a redefinir la percepción del colonialismo desde la esfera cultural. Los estereotipos coloniales están presentes en los libros, sin embargo, la asociación sistemática del *yo* con mediocridad, actos abusivos, juicios injustos y segregación racial termina por deshumanizar al *yo*, no al *otro*. La civilización se convierte en un agente de destrucción y corrupción y sólo la mentalidad diferente de los personajes transgresores parece apuntar en la dirección correcta: una mente liberal y el deseo de coexistir y aprender del otro.

INTRODUCTION.

The personal experiences that Joseph Conrad and Edward Morgan Forster lived in Africa and India, respectively, made it impossible for them to ignore the atrocities of Imperialism beyond any economic, political or moral justification. This acknowledgement led them to expose the situation lived in these colonies and, as a result, they wrote two of the greatest works of the 20th century and their masterpieces: *Heart of Darkness* (HD) and *A Passage to India* (PI). Both works have been widely criticised in the postcolonial era for portraying a distorted image of Africa and India; and for promoting and perpetuating -in an open or subliminal way- those aspects and stereotypes of Imperialism that they intended to denounce and condemn in the first place. During a lecture at the University of Massachusetts in 1975, Chinua Achebe went as far as to define Joseph Conrad as “a bloody racist”, and HD as “an offensive and deplorable book”. Likewise, but in a less aggressive tone, C. S. Venkatachar (in Prakash, 1994:12) highlights Forster’s inability to understand “the mind of Asia” and Shmoop Editorial Team decries Forster’s “Orientalist attitude [...] even in a novel that is sympathetic to them [Indians]”.

Historical and ideological progress play on the side of postcolonial literature but the anti-colonial nature of HD and PI cannot be turned down or dismissed as a mere attempt. It is true that HD and PI were written by white English authors during the great time of the colonies and that many different preconceptions had to be rattling in their minds before their contact with the colonies. It is true that Conrad and Forster experienced a short stay in the countries they decided to write about and that all the existing myths, cultural misinterpretations and racial distortions raised by colonialism definitely influenced them and, to some point, even impeded the complete success of their liberal enterprise and denouncement. However, they cannot be denied their role in raising social and political awareness of the brutalities and injustices committed in the colonies, and their role as forefathers to the subsequent postcolonial novels that would succeed depicting Africa and India from a clearer understanding without the East-West colonial barrier. As Prakash (1994:258) explains: “A set of definitions tends to change and get clarified in the long perspective through successive redefinitions. Thus, within a span of less than two centuries, the change and development in perception through the

English and Anglo-Indian novels have been spectacular". The same can be said of African novels. Time and progression have closed the paths opened by Conrad and Forster and even better works are expected to come.

This dissertation intends to prove how colonialism was developed in different spheres and the cultural one was in the hands of men like these outstanding literary authors, their detachment from the social, racial and cultural prejudices of their colonial era, their exploration and comprehension of these countries and their people, and their unbiased view of the colonial reality.

First, it seems necessary to include some biographical references in order to explain the presence of J. Conrad and E.M. Forster in these remote places of the world during the 1900s, to compare and situate the books as part of their respective literary works, and to understand their critical approach towards colonialism.

In chapter two, a historical introduction to the political, social, and economic situation of India and the Congo as colonies is offered, in order to situate both literary works in their historical context. The similarities and differences of colonialism in sub-Saharan Africa and in the Indian sub-continent are highlighted with the intention to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the novels.

The third chapter addresses and analyses HD and PI through the prism of different concepts related to colonialist and postcolonial literature, namely: the self and the other or the subaltern, and dehumanization and the savage.

Chapter four evaluates the different types of transgressive relationships established between the colonizers and the colonized in India and in the Congo. A special reflection on the denouncing role of interracial relationships and on the possibility to succeed or not is also included in this chapter.

Chapter five is devoted to an inspection of the different consequences that the transgression of roles implied and of the negative effects of imperialism on the colonizer and the colonized in both writings. This is done through the analyses of the changes in personality, attitude, and/or quality of life of the most representative characters of each literary work.

The closing chapter brings a conclusion and comments on the limitations of the novels regarding both the characters and the settings taking into account the

postcolonial critiques and point of view, together with further ways to continue exploring these masterpieces in a future doctoral thesis.

1. BIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES¹.

Edward Morgan Forster and Joseph Conrad lived during the late 19th century and early 20th century, the period of the European empires and the great colonies. Their personal experiences drove them to India and Congo for different reasons and under different circumstances but, as a result, their masterpieces *PI* and *HD* came to life. The novel *PI* was published in 1924, and the novella *HD* in 1902. Both were written in different periods and both are set in different types of colonies under the domination of different empires, -the British and the Belgian-. However, both portray the life in the colonies realistically and their authors had but to adopt a position towards colonialism, the colonizers and the colonized. As members of the colonizing culture, their ideology in relation to the role of the Empire and the racial and cultural differences must have been shaped in favor of colonialism and the benefits it was supposed to bring to the colonies. However, once they experienced life in the colonies, both had the same response: they criticize Imperialism and portray an anti-colonial attitude. This critical response cannot be fully understood if their personal life experiences are not considered as the path that led to it.

Edward Morgan Forster was born in London, England, in January 1879 and died in Coventry, England, in June 1970. His father died when he was still a baby, so he was brought up by his mother, Alice Clara, with whom he always kept a close relationship. She educated him with an open mind while his father's family tried to impose a high sense of morality. When Forster entered King's College, in Cambridge, in 1897, he experienced a liberation that opened the way to his self-realization as a philosophical, social and literary critic and to his first steps as a writer. At college, he studied classics and history and forged lifelong friendships, including some of the later members of the Bloomsbury Group. He remained attached to Cambridge for the rest of his life and was elected Honorary Fellowship of King's College. In the following years, Forster travelled

¹ Unless indicated otherwise, all biographical information on E.M. Forster and J. Conrad comes from the websites Encyclopaedia Britannica and Cambridge University Press.

to Italy, Turkey, and Greece and, during the First World War, he served as a volunteer for the Red Cross in Alexandria, Egypt. His college experiences and colleagues, together with his trips to different Mediterranean countries provided him with a more skeptical and liberal mind that would allow him to analyze his contact with Indians and their country from a critical position.

In 1906, he started tutoring a young Indian student for his graduation in Oxford: Syed Ross Masood. Forster never declared his homosexuality publicly, but his diaries and his epistolary exchanges with close friends reveal his deep love for Masood. Even though it was an unrequited love, their friendship lasted for decades. According to Damon Galgut (The Guardian, 2014), it was Masood who sowed the seeds for writing a book about India. In fact, Forster travelled to India for the first time in October 1912, only a few months after Masood returned to India. As Forster recognized "But for him [Masood], I might never have gone to his country, or written about it ... I didn't go there to govern it or to make money or to improve people. I went there to see a friend." (Galgut, 2014). Their long conversations about India, the places Forster visited and the people he met during these three months trip, are present in one way or another in *A Passage to India*. They can be traced in the settings, the characters, their quotes and their ideals. Forster started writing the novel in July 1913 and abandoned it two months later. He would not retake it and finish it until 1922, after returning from his second trip to India. This time he travelled around the country for almost a year as a private secretary to the Maharaja of Dewas State Senior, -whom he befriended during the first trip to India. Different scholars have suggested different reasons why it took Forster 11 years to complete the novel. Be that as it may, *A Passage to India* was finally published on June 4, 1924 and it was unanimously acclaimed by the critics. Nowadays it is considered one of the greatest works of the 20th century English literature.

Józef Teodor Konrad Korzeniowski was born in a Polish region under the Russian Empire, in December 1857. He died as an English citizen in Kent, England, in August 1924. His father, Apollo Korzeniowski, was a writer, translator and fervent political activist for the independence of Poland, who instilled in Conrad his love for literature and for Poland. It is not by chance that his third given name, and the one he

chose for his literary career, was Konrad, like the hero of the poem Konrad Wallenrod². His childhood was marked by political oppression and rebellion, the reading of renowned English authors translated to French and Polish, several moves and an exile to north Russia. Orphaned at the age of eleven, Conrad moved with his maternal uncle Tadeusz Bobrowski who, after some vain attempts at tutoring and schooling his nephew, helped him become a sailor. The adventures he lived as a seaman, the people he encountered and the places he visited are recreated in his book in a quite faithful manner. As the Encyclopaedia Britannica defines him, he was “the novelist of man in extreme situations”.

In 1874, Conrad started working for the French merchant navy. For the next four years, he travelled around the West Indies in different ships. In 1878, his marine career continued with the British merchant navy, sailing mainly to the East Indies. In 1889, he took a three year break and became associated with a Belgian Trading Company to pursue his childhood dream: travelling to Africa. His four months visit to the Congo, as the commander of a steam boat, changed his perception of Imperialism forever. As Liesl Schillinger explains (The New York Times, 2012), Conrad “had come to Africa buoyed by the conviction that European colonization would bring moral and social progress to the continent and free its inhabitants from slavery, paganism and other barbarities.” However, the atrocities he witnessed there marked a turning point and inspired the novella *Heart of Darkness* (1902). According to the Encyclopaedia Britannica, “He suffered psychological, spiritual, even metaphysical shock in the Congo, and his physical health was also damaged; for the rest of his life.” As Megroz explains (1964:74), the moral situation that Conrad lived in the Congo forced him to resign and return to Europe with a “profound gloom of spirit” and a very deteriorated health due to malaria and gout. His backstory as an exile to an oppressive Russia and his sense of guilty for not staying and continuing his father’s fight for independence (Megroz 1964:235), are definitely crucial factors in his empathy with these other oppressed peoples. They also explain somehow his pessimistic view of human nature, the analysis

² A narrative poem written by the Polish Adam Mickiewicz that inspired the Polish activists rising up against Russia.

of his characters as individuals and their relation to the world and his lack of faith in democracy and world fraternity.

In 1894, Conrad's career as a marine and merchant gave way to his career as one of the greatest writers of English literature. He settled in England, got married and had two children. Despite the fact that he was native-fluent in Polish and French, he chose his third language, -the one that he started learning in his twenties-, to become a writer. Even though writing was a painful physical activity, he became a prolific novelist and essayist whose genius was acknowledged and praised during his lifetime. His powerful, eloquent and elaborate descriptions and his realistic depiction of the human psyche mark him as a central figure of Modernism and a big influence for future generations.

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.³

The late 19th century and the early 20th century in Europe can be defined as a ferocious race of the developed countries to explore and conquer as many colonies as possible for their subsequent economic exploitation. This immoral conduct needed a justification to the eyes of the entire world and it came in the form of a moral duty: these underdeveloped countries needed the presence and guidance of the advanced, civilized countries. Sadly, the truth is that the only goal that guided the construction of the great empires was economic profit and that the methods used for colonization always implied military intervention. As Achille Loria explains in his article *Les deux notions de l'impérialisme* (in Semmel 1960:132), two different types of imperialism can be identified according to the process of annexation that the countries underwent in the hands of the colonizers, and the following relationships established between the mother country and the colony. These two types are economic imperialism and commercial colonialism. The former implied a "violent annexation on the part of old and well-populated states of thinly populated states which because of special conditions -tropical climate, for example- cannot be colonized". The latter used "the strengthening of bonds between the mother country and its colonies -it might mean an all-out fiscal union or simply the granting of

³ Unless indicated otherwise, the historical data on India and the Congo has been extracted from *An Anthology of Colonial and Postcolonial Short Fiction* (Baldwin and Quinn, 2007) or from the website Encyclopaedia Britannica.

tariff preference". The process of violent colonization carried out by Belgium in the Congo corresponds to economic imperialism; while the initially peaceful agreement between Britain and India can be identified as commercial imperialism. Although Loria ends up concluding that commercial imperialism is "un phénomène dérivatif" of economic imperialism, -only distinguished in the form but not in the content, - his original differentiation is still valid to understand the different processes of colonization that India and the Congo underwent and that are depicted in HD and PI.

Ironically enough, when the British first arrived in India at the end of the 17th century to establish commercial trade, they found "a rich and highly cultured subcontinent, whose civilization was older by centuries and more accomplished in nearly every respect than Europe's" (Baldwin and Quinn 2007:513). The centuries that followed were marked by internal dynastic battles, the establishment and ejection of French, Portuguese and Dutch trading centers, an undercover control of the country through commerce with the East India Company, the threat of Russian expansion and a subsequent increase of British military presence. The Company always abused Indian labor to the point of slavery but, during the 18th century, it tried to govern India under a facade of respect for their traditions, religion, language and literary movements. This changed with the turn of the century and the imposition of new policies that would separate forever Indians and whites. Two of the most harmful policies were the establishment of education in English and the arrival of European women (Baldwin and Quinn 2007:515). The former openly manifested the superiority of the English language, literature and culture over the Indian ones, and the latter stopped and prevented any type of racial union, whether it was sentimental or social. Furthermore, it resulted in a failed attempt at independence, the Mutiny of 1857. Certain gains in the political and religious spheres followed but, even so, India was openly declared a crown colony in 1858. The damage caused by the British policies and the attempted revolt was never repaired, it only grew and turned from reluctance to fear and hate. Queen Victoria promised the advent of qualified Indians in the civil service, but this was never fully accomplished.

Even though thousands of Indians fought with England during World War I and Indian independence did not seem to be close, the nationalist sentiment continued

growing. The internal political situation turned even worse when hindus and muslims became more and more at odds with one another. This social and political landscape is the setting portrayed in Forster's novel *A Passage to India*.

After World War I, Gandhi called for pacific protests and strikes, but violence continued. This time, self-government promises were not enough and India proclaimed itself independent in 1929. Finally, actual independence was secured in 1947.

The daily life of Indians and whites in the colony during the late 19th and early 20th century is masterfully depicted in PI. Forster had contact with British, Hindus and Muslims in India before and after World War I. Even though he might be accused by postcolonial critics of being a mere tourist in India, he actually got a clear sense of the social and political relations and tensions of the period and reflected them in the characters of the novel. Both Indian and British characters reveal the sentiments towards each other: the superiority of the white *self* and their hate and fear, the abused situation of the colonized *other* and their desire for independence and liberation, and the impossibility to bridge the gap between these resented positions.

The African continent had remained quite unexplored during the time of the great empires because of the difficult access to the different areas and the dangerous diseases that plagued the continent. This changed in the late 19th century, when King Leopold II of Belgium proposed to the Belgian civil government the exploration of the unknown Congo River basin with the intention to establish a Belgian colony. The government ignored his proposal but he did not give up in his aspiration to create a Belgian Empire. He associated with different European bankers and hired the English explorer Henry Morton Stanley, who had already been exploring Africa from 1874 to 1877. With the collaboration of the European investors and Stanley, Leopold II created the Committee for Studies of the Upper Congo, later renamed the International Association of the Congo, in 1878. During the next four years, the Association, led by Stanley, succeeded in opening their way through the jungle up the Congo River and establishing different administrative and trading stations for the future trade with Europe. This was mostly achieved thanks to the alliance with numerous African leaders who ceded their sovereignty rights to the Association in exchange for other supposed privileges. In 1884, at the Berlin West Africa Conference, the United States and most

European powers granted King Leopold II the sovereignty of the territories that had been explored and conquered under the government of the Association of the Congo. The Congo Free State was created and its brutal exploitation started.

The Congo Free State did not keep the traditional local rulers to govern the colony. The Association divided the territories into administrative divisions and Europeans were sent to direct them. Military intervention was introduced in the 1890s under the Force Publique, troops of African men led by European officers. As different tribes were overran, a railway route to the interior developed together with the navigability of the upper river by steamboat. The flow of capital and white European men into the colony was continuous. Military force, racial segregation, white superiority, and a poor government of the administrative divisions resulted in terrible, chaotic situations. As Thornton (1985:76) explains, "These things [chaos and abuse] were bound to spring from a lack of control, a lack of imperial governance. Where there was no such governance, civilised vice rather than virtue was the first lesson learned by native races. From this they must be protected". The chaotic colonial situation in the Congo was dominated by slavery, (in the plantations and for the exploitation of different materials, like ivory), tortures, mutilations, rapes, and slaughters, always on the hands of the military enforcers or the European colonizers. This is the colonial situation that J. Conrad lived in the Congo during his commandment of a Belgium steamboat up the Congo River and the one that is reflected in his novella *Heart of Darkness*.

It was precisely a British association, the Congo Reform Association, the one that denounced the brutalities of the Belgian regime and, finally, forced the civil government of Belgium to take control of the area. In 1908 the colony was renamed as Belgian Congo. The exploitation of mines and plantations by foreign corporations continued. Rebellions and riots for independence never stopped and independence was finally granted in 1960 with the subsequent creation of the nowadays Democratic Republic of the Congo.

As E. M. Forster, J. Conrad has also been accused by postcolonial critics of having spent only four months in the Congo, that is, not enough time to get to know the real situation of the colony. However, the horrors that he witnessed necessarily forced him to resign his post, altered his high preconceptions about the imperial mission, and

would accompany him for the rest of his life. In fact, he was no longer the same after this brutal experience. His accurate memories were captured in *Heart of Darkness* which, despite its briefness, describes the mediocre men and women sent to organize the colonial territories, the exotic and uncertain atmosphere of the area to the newly arrived, the greed that guided the colonising mission, and the brutalities committed in the name of civilisation.

3. COLONIAL AND POSTCOLONIAL CONCEPTS IN HD AND PI.

Imperialism and, by extension colonialism, was a consolidated idea and cause within society. As Thornton (1985:xxx) explains, “imperialism was a faith and an emotion before it became a political programme; and even when its enemies had successfully overturned the political programme the faith and the emotion survived”. This great imperial idea needed to be promoted, and colonialist literature played an important role in this endeavour.

By definition, colonialist literature integrates the writings that the colonizing Europeans wrote during the colonial period. It was designed to promulgate the imperialists’ point of view and legitimate the superiority of the European countries, as well as their role and right over the lands that they colonized (Boehmer 2005:3). Strictly speaking, Forster and Conrad fit in this definition as long as they wrote about the colonies, from the perspective of the colonizer, and during the great time of the colonies. However, a deeper analyses of the characters in PI and HD, reveal inconsistencies that make it hard or, at the very least, unfair to classify them as colonialist authors. For obvious reasons, they cannot be classified as postcolonial authors, who reject the imperial ideal, subvert its foundations, and give voice to the colonized. Therefore, in order to understand the position held by Forster and Conrad, it is necessary to demystify the opposition colonial-postcolonial. As Boehmer (2005:4) explains “the colonial need not always signify texts rigidly associated with the colonial power. Colonial [...] writing was never as invasively confident or as pompously dismissive of indigenous cultures as its oppositional pairing with postcolonial writing might suggest.”

The construction of the colonies rested on the idea that it was the moral duty of the Empire to bring civilization to those remote parts of the world. What is not often told

is that this civilizing mission was always accompanied by deprivation of rights, destruction and often massacres. In order to reaffirm themselves in their actions and justify their acts at the same time, the colonizers needed to establish a difference between themselves and the colonized people. This differentiation was depicted in colonialist literature through the establishment of the *self* and the *other*, being the *self* the colonizer, and the *other* or *subaltern* the colonized. Considering that colonialist literature had the purpose of promoting and justifying the Empire, this binary opposition is not only one of its most salient characteristics but a fundamental one.

The term *other* was first used by the postcolonial author Frantz Fanon in his book *Black Skins. White Masks* (1952, 1986), in order to explain the effects of the colonial contact between the colonizer and the colonized. “When the Negro makes contact with the white world, a certain sensitizing action takes place. If his psychic structure is weak, one observes a collapse of the ego. The black man stops behaving as an actional person. The goal of his behavior will be The Other (in the guise of the white man) for The Other alone can give him worth” (Fanon 1986:154). Since the *self* of colonialist literature reassures himself through the definition of the *other*, he needs to be understood as all that is not me. In order to justify the presence and the acts of the *self*, colonialist literature presents the *other* in an inferior and negative way, as a wild, irrational, dehumanized man, that is, a savage. As Street (1975:5) explains, scientific theories on the superior nature of the white race “provided a framework of thought with regard to primitive peoples which justified the action of imperialists”. Science ensured that the abuses and atrocities committed on the name of the Empire were exempt of any moral judgement, both for the well-being of the colonizers in the colony and the citizens in the mother country. Even if these theories had been developed in a “pre-imperial world of science”, they became the perfect tool to undercover racism and legitimize the colonising *self*.

Forster’s and Conrad’s preconceptions of Imperialism and its role, before their contact with the colonies, are a great example of the imperial “faith and emotion”. As explained in chapter 2, Forster envisioned British businesses in India as related to government, economic profit or improvement of the living conditions of the Indian people. Schillinger (The New York Times, 2012) explains that, similarly, Conrad

envisioned colonialism as a tool to “bring moral and social progress to the continent and free its inhabitants”. Based on these initial beliefs, both authors introduced in PI and HD characters that represent the colonizers who embarked in the colonial adventure guided by their same Imperial ideal. However, the writers’ personal experiences in the colonies reshaped their initial preconceptions and resulted in the portrayal of characters that are more critical with the colonial enterprise. This chapter analyses the depictions of the colonizer and the colonized informed by the Imperial ideology in HD and PI, whereas chapter four focuses on those characters who question this same ideology. The analysis here is done through concepts associated to colonial and postcolonial literature, namely: the *self* and the *other* or *subaltern*, and dehumanization and the savage.

3.1. The self and the other in *Passage to India*.

Most of the Englishmen and women who are established in Chandrapore live secluded in the civil station, an exclusive British area situated in the high part of the city. The elevated location of the civil station stands as a metaphor for the superior position of the whites in the Indian colony, and its physical separation from Chandrapore as the insurmountable barrier between the *self* and the *other*. The civil station has been designed as an English town within the colony. Like its inhabitants, the station is isolated from everyone that is not a colonizer, and closed to any other civilization. The station represents the immobile position of the *self*. As Mr Fielding observes, “the club moved slowly” and, worse, “it declined to change” (Forster 1984:68). As Street (1975:28) explains, “the social exclusiveness of British colonial society [...] sustain them in a foreign land [...] but also] obviate the need for them to come to further terms with what they characterise as alien”.

At different moments in the novel, the English are portrayed as the stereotyped *self* of colonialist literature. They are the defenders of the Imperial idea and the providers of its civilizing mission. Thus, the City Magistrate, Ronny Heaslop, utters his role as peace and justice keeper in Chandrapore; and the director of the hospital, Mr Callendar, justifies his presence as an attempt to establish a decent health-care system. They seem to be guided by an important, even humanitarian, mission in the colony and express it so. However, their daily acts show no noble patriotic cause in their exile and

they do not seem to keep any hope for progress towards civilization from the natives. On the contrary, they undermine and scold every single individual and every single aspect of the Indian culture. No matter how educated or civilized they might be, Indians are and always will be inferior beings settled in the ugly, dirty, and hopeless Chandrapore. At the very beginning of the novel, this assumption of the Anglo-Indians⁴ is clearly stated via Mrs McBryde's lapidary sentence: "the kindest thing one can do to a native is to let him die" (Forster 1984:25).

The fact that the English are often presented in their bungalows and their exclusive club, spending their days safe and secluded to avoid any contact with the *other*, and hopeless of any progress from the colonized, leads the reader to question the real reasons that encouraged those colonizers to travel to faraway, uncivilized places and stay there for years. The answer to this question is simple: profit. Along the novel different characters show the authentic reasons that guide their colonial adventure. Young and middle aged men like Mr Heaslop, Mr Turton, Mr McBryde, Major Callendar, and even Mr Fielding, have seen their professional careers grow by leaps and bounds in the colony. They enjoy a high quality of life and occupy profitable leadership and management positions in the judicial, educational, political, police, and health spheres. If they had stayed in Britain, they would have never attained these positions or, at least, it would have taken them longer.

From a postcolonial perspective, the lack of hope in Indian progress might be seen as the perfect excuse to justify the disdainful acts of the superior white *self* and the derogatory portrayal of the Indian *other*. However, this must be understood as Forster's criticism of colonialism and of the colonizers who were sent to develop it, that is, unsuccessful men and women who were eager of career success and social status. A good example of Forster's criticism takes place in chapter IX, when Mr Fielding is asked how is England justified in holding India and if it is fair than an Englishman occupies a job, when there are well-qualified Indians who also need the job (Forster 1984:120, 132). The response in his mind is the one expected from the colonial *self*: "England holds India for her good", for her inability to govern herself and guide Indians towards a

⁴ The term Anglo-Indian designates an English person who came to India as an individual or as part of a community, or who was born in India.

liberal civilization. However, his response expresses the real truth behind colonialism: he was there because he needed a job and he was first to get it. At that very moment, we see Dr Aziz regret this answer. His friend's frankness of speech manifested, one more time, the dangerous usurper role of the colonizer. According to Memmi (1991:9), foreigners like Mr Fielding enjoy a double illegitimate status in the colony as long as he has "succeeded not merely in creating a place for himself but also in taking away that of the inhabitant". Still, Mr Fielding must be conceded the benefit of being the only colonizer established in Chandrapore who actually enjoys the city and the culture and interacts with the colonized, that is, the only *self* transgressing the frontier with the *other*, as will be explored in chapter four.

The colonized characters in PI represent the stereotyped *other* as long as they are being described by the colonizing *self*. Most times, they are presented as the subject race, with their spouses behind a misconceived purdah and always abused and oppressed by their bosses, like Dr Aziz by Major Callendar or Hamidullah by Mr Heaslop. They complain privately but they always seem to end up accepting this subjugating situation and any attempt to vindicate their identity is soon dissipated. A good example is the scene when Dr Aziz, an Indian physician at the British hospital, is enjoying an idyllic dinner among his friends with music and poetry and he is called by Major Callendar, the head doctor. He is recommended by his friends to clean the pan from his teeth, to which he responds "I am an Indian" (Forster 1984:13). These words need to be read as his refusal to lose his identity and change his customs to an intruder, to an usurper who abuses him just to show his superiority. However, on the way to Major Callendar's he cleans his teeth, remaining so in his subservient role.

After many years of British domination, Indians seem to be resigned to the scornful attitudes of the colonizers and to have accepted their subjugating inferior position. They have learned that, no matter how good intentions the Englishmen have when they arrive, they all end up changing after the real encounter with India. As Hamidullah explains in chapter II: "They all become exactly the same, not worse, not better. I give any Englishman two years [...]. And I give any Englishwoman six months. All are exactly alike" (Forster 1984:7). Englishmen are described by the *others* as skillfully corrupt and Englishwomen as haughty and venal beings, even more dangerous

to the natives than their husbands. In the novel, the spouses of the colonizers play a negligible role in relation to the colonial enterprise. They are depicted as parasites that enjoy the profit that their successful husbands are making at the expense of the hatred colonized. In fact, Englishwomen utter the most derisive, scornful and brutal comments about natives along the novel. Hence Adela's fear, as a "new arrival", to become one of them. One of the cruelest female interventions is delivered by Mrs Turton in relation to the trial and the sentence that should be enforced. When Major Callendar affirms that "nothing is too bad for those people", she replies full of wrath that "they [Indians] ought to crawl, from here to the caves on their hands and knees whenever an Englishwoman's in sight, they oughtn't to be spoken to, they ought to be spat at, they ought to be ground into the dust, we've been far too kind". In spite of the lack of a guilty verdict against Dr Aziz, her cruelty and contempt towards all Indians are designed to turn against her and dehumanize her to the eyes of any reader.

Any disruptive situation is used by the colonizers as an opportunity to justify their presence in the country. So, when the confrontations between Mohammedans and Hindus escalate, the presence of the *self* fully assumes its meaning: "the British were necessary to India" (Forster 1984:102). According to Ronny, their deputations and conciliation committees are the only means to avoid barbaric bloodshed during the celebration of Mohurram in Chandrapore. Indians in the role of the *other*, seem to have assumed their deficiencies and complain, at different moments of the novel, about their inability to govern themselves due to their character. Thus, Hamidullah charges against the Indian delay for getting things done ("This is why India is in such a plight, because we put off things" (Forster 1984:11), and Dr Aziz is convinced that the country will never advance unless they get rid of their superstitions and ghosts (Forster 1984:107). However, Forster refuses to portray Indians as simple subdued being who have assumed their inferiority. In fact, one of the most differentiating aspects of PI is that Forster gave a voice to the *others*. He enabled them to denounce their subject and abused situation, and to express their desire to be left alone to solve their own internal differences. At the end of the novel, Dr Aziz explicitly tells Mr Fielding, "Clear out, all you Turtons and Burtons. We wanted to know you ten years back -now it's too late" (Forster 1984:360). Aziz represents the voice of the colonial *other* that is tired of being told what

to do by an invading nation. To his understanding and based on his own personal experience, England has only brought suffering to their country. He expresses his belief that the Indians will take revenge on England in the next European war, that is, Indians will not support England in any other war, like they did in World War I. Indians are tired of supporting a country that only subjugates them in reward. In the final chapter, Aziz describes his dream of an Indian nation, with Hindus and Moslems united as one, without foreigners (Forster 1984:361).

Ironically, the English take pride in their necessary civilized interventions to avoid bloodshed but, at the same time, they also deny the Indians any democratic rights. This limitation of rights is another necessary characteristic for the success of the colonial enterprise. The final goal of Imperialism was economic profit and the limitation or denial of rights played a central role to keep the *self* in a superior and safer position to that of the *other*. When Dr Aziz is allowed to be judged by an Indian judge, those who were supposed to bring and grant civil rights to the oppressed, condemn the situation and blame it on “the fruits of democracy” (Forster 1984:216). The *self* openly wishes to deny the rights of the *other*, and laments that this would have never happened before. After all, Dr Aziz is lucky because, at some other time, he would have been found guilty straight away. In fact, this trial transcends the personal sphere and turns into a racial conflict, the colonizer versus the colonized, the *self* versus the *other*. As the narrator explains, “The issues Miss Quested had raised were so much more important than she was herself that people inevitably forgot her” (Forster 1984:240). It is an open manifestation of the separation between the *self* and the *other* and the impossibility to come together.

One more argument used for the differentiation self-other in colonialist literature and constantly present in PI is race. Racial stereotypes and their associated scientific theories were one of the tools of the Empire to subjugate the other. Indian reactions are analysed by the *self* as “natural gestures of an inferior race” (Forster 1984:247) and when Aziz thinks that Fielding has betrayed him and is going to marry Adela, he blames it on being “members of another race” (Forster 1984:312). However, race is also mocked and criticised in PI. When Dr Aziz is accused of assaulting Ms Quested, Mr McBryde presents an explanation in the form of an oriental pathology: the darker races

are physically attracted by the fairer, but not vice versa (Forster 1984:243). The funny thing is that Dr Aziz has never seen Adela as an attractive woman, due to her physical appearance. When he first meets her, he even pities her for being so ugly, and he wonders “how God could have been so unkind to any female form?” (Forster 1984:71).

As has been analysed, all the attempts of the *self* to dehumanize the *other* in order to justify their presence in the colony and their acts, end up having the opposite effect. It is the colonizer the one who is dehumanized through their seclusion, their abusive acts, their unfair judgements, their racial segregation and their hatred comments. Forster turns contemporary stereotypes around, so that it is the white Europeans, not the Indians, who are deprived of their human qualities, hence seen as inferior beings without moral or principles. Their acts define themselves and end up not only dehumanized but mocked and even pitied by the reader for their lack of humanity.

3.2. The self and the other in *Heart of Darkness*.

The opening scene of HD might be interpreted as a tribute to the great civilised nations that adopted the imperial ideology as their moral duty and fell for the colonising mission. The anonymous narrator starts describing, in an epic, quasi romantic manner, the glorious past of the River Thames. Postcolonial critics, like Chinua Achebe (1990:4), envision this introductory chapter as the means to contrast civilized Europe and bestial Africa from the very beginning. The greatness of the River Thames, with its “ages of good service done to the race that peopled its bank” (Conrad 1981:4), and the Congo River, which seems to take you “back to the earliest beginning of the world” (Conrad 1981:49). However, the magnificent description is soon interrupted by Marlow to remind the narrator that, the glorious river also “has been one of the dark places of the earth” (Conrad 1981:6). This introductory imagery of the English river needs to be seen as Conrad’s first criticism of the contradictory nature of Imperialism and of the implied moral superiority of civilised countries. In Watt’s words (1983:198), this is one of “the most brilliant ‘false starts’ in literature”. In fact, HD narrates the experiences of Charles Marlow during his journey up the Congo River. That is, the audience of sailors at the anchored ship -apart from Marlow- do not take action in the story, England has nothing to do with

the colonisation of the River Congo basin, and the apparent greatness of the civilising empires is put into question as the chapters follow.

The setting changes from England to Brussels and the Congo Free State when Marlow takes charge of the narration and starts telling his experiences as captain of a Belgian steamboat in the River Congo. During his voyage, he comes across different European colonizers, as well as abused Congolese natives. The colonized characters in HD are mostly built according to the characteristics of the stereotyped *other* from a postcolonial perspective. However, an analysis of the European colonizers in the novella results in the impossibility to identify the stereotyped *self*. The explanation is simple: the Belgian enterprise never had the intention to bring civilisation to this remote part of the world, the only interest in the Congo was the exploitation of its resources and the use of the natives as enslaved workers. Therefore, the colonizers involved in this colonial mission did not have a civilising goal, they were unscrupulous individuals guided by their own profit, and so they are depicted in HD.

The Company's offices in Brussels are the first stop for Marlow. The magnitude of the building from where an over-sea empire is run, contrasts with the presence and attitude of the people in charge. The two secretaries and the Company's director are necessarily related to the colonial enterprise but none of them exhibits any of the stereotyped characteristics of the imperialists and colonizers. The director makes a brief appearance, just to sign the contract, and the secretaries are described as decaying, sinister figures in the dim light, knitting as their lives pass by, and "full of desolation" (Conrad 1981:14). His recruitment marks the beginning of his colonial adventure but he feels uneasy and complains that "there was something ominous in the atmosphere" (Conrad 1981:14). Before leaving Europe, Marlow goes to say goodbye to his aunt, who helped him get the job in the Company. Her view of Marlow's role in the colony, "weaning those ignorant millions from their horrid ways" (Conrad 1981:17), represents the imperial "faith and emotion" described by Thornton (1985:xxx). Still, he does not take pride on it. On the contrary, he judges her attitude as naive because he knows that his mission in the colony is not humanitarian but profitable. The contradictory visions of colonialism held by aunt and nephew are Conrad's critique of the double moral of

Imperialism and its sectarian endeavour. Imperial colonizers will get to the African colony not with a civilising mission but a lucrative one.

The process of colonization in Africa was always guided by commercial interests and this was also reflected in the type of housing provided for the colonizers themselves. Most of the colonizers that Marlow encounters during his journey in the Congo are presented onboard different steamships or in the outer, central, and inner stations along the river. Far from resembling the civil station in PI, these trading stations are simple wooden buildings in the middle of the jungle where the different materials from the mines and the plantations were collected, stored, and distributed back to the coast. Marlow is not impressed by any of the colonizers he encounters, instead, what is impressing is the fact that he does not mention any good qualities or gestures of any of these men. They are often described as inefficient workers with no regard for human life. Their only purposes in novella seem to be to warn Marlow against the harmful effects of the wilderness ahead and to inform him about the conspiracies for escalating job positions in the Company.

For the first part of the voyage towards the mouth of the Congo River, Marlow travels in a French steamer. The ship makes continuous stops to pick up and send down soldiers and custom-house clerks, which gives Marlow an idea of the magnitude of the Belgian colonial enterprise. For the second part of the journey to the outer station, he travels in another steamer and has a chance to talk to the Swedish captain. He is told that, a few days ago, another Swedish man hanged himself on the ship as they were travelling up the river and that the only feasible reasons seem to be “the sun” or “the country” (Conrad 1981:21). He finally gets to the outer station and meets the chief accountant, an elegant man dressed in white in the middle of the wilderness who was in charge of all the bookkeeping of the colony. He is actually efficient in his job but he is heartless towards a dying “invalid agent from up the country” (Conrad 1981:26), who is interrupting his clerical work with his groans. The general manager at the central station is described as a conspiratory character whose only value seems to be his resistance to disease. The conversations of the manager with his uncle, another colonising official, show their disposition to kill any colonizer who threatens their authority. The brickmaker

at this station takes Marlow for an influential man, with contacts in the offices at Europe, and gets closer to him with the hope of getting information or a promotion.

On his narration, Marlow continues to describe more characters and absurd situations that point out the systematic inhumanity, inefficiency and greediness of the colonizer *self* in HD. The mediocrity of these colonizers is explained by Memmi (1991) as a consequence of the impossibility of the better prepared for the civilising mission to justify their presence and role in the colony: “the best go away. Either for ethical reasons, not being able to justify profiting from daily injustice, or simply out of pride, because they feel they are of better stuff than the average colonizer” (Memmi 1991:48). The continued loss of the best colonizers leaves the colony with the mediocre ones. Marlow is soon aware of the mediocrity that surrounds him in the Congo and, as an inevitable effect, he turns into a transgressive character, as will be analysed in chapter four.

The threat of tropical diseases, the unbearable heat, the dangers of the wilderness, the lack of value of life, the conspiracies, and the deplorable conditions in which the colonizers live, make the readers question their reason to stay. The answer is the same for the colonizers in PI and HD: they are guided by their personal profit, both economic and professional. There is no humanitarian reason, no imperial faith or emotion in the Congo. They are working for the profit of the Empire and, in turn, for their own. Marlow is not different in this respect, like Mr Fielding, he openly explains from the very beginning that he decided to accept the job in the steamboat because he needed a job. After six years of sailing at the “Indian Ocean, Pacific and China Seas [... he got] tired of resting [and] began to look for a ship” (Conrad 1981:9-10). Given that he could not find a sea ship and that he had been attracted to the unexplored Africa since he was a child, he decided to move to the Congo and work for a Trading society of Continental concern, that is, he decided to work for the Empire. The only difference between Marlow and the different European colonizers in the Congo is that he is not ready to do anything to get his little fortune. As the Swedish captain notes, “It is funny what some people will do for a few francs a month” (Conrad 1981:21). But Marlow refuses to become a mediocre colonizer.

Conrad has been criticised by postcolonial authors for denying a voice to the colonized *other*. As a matter of fact, Africans are denied a voice in HD. They only intervene to clearly express their cannibalism and to announce Kurtz's death. However, the topic of cannibalism is mentioned both in relation to the crew in the steamboat and to Kurtz, and it is clearly stated that the only cannibal who "lacked restraint in the gratification of his various lusts" (Conrad 1981:87) was Kurtz, not the crew. Maybe Conrad's intention was not to demonize this characteristic of some African tribes but just to show its existence as an impressive and disturbing tradition, and this is why he chose to relate it to the alien in the culture rather than the natives. In addition, Mr Kurtz is the omnipresent character in the novella and being in charge of announcing his death should not be regarded as a low mission.

Conrad has also been criticised for portraying colonized people as a mass. As Memmi specifies, one of the characteristics of colonialist literature is the depiction of the colonized with "the mark of the plural". "The colonised is never characterised in an individual manner; he is entitled only to drown in an anonymous collectivity" (in Loomba 2015:142). Achebe (1990:5-6) envisions Conrad's depiction of the natives in HD as an insult. However, Conrad deserves the benefit of having experienced a completely different culture and landscape in a very limited amount of time. He must have tried to make an understanding of what he was witnessing, but he also must have lacked the capacity to do so. As Marlow explains, "we were cut off from the comprehension of our surroundings" (Conrad 1981:53). He is simply describing to his audience what he sees from the moving steamer and cannot understand: "a glimpse of rush walls, of peaked-grass roofs, a burst of yells, a whirl of black limbs, a mass of hands, clapping, of feet stamping, of bodies swaying, of eyes rolling". The natives and their customs were probably as alien to Marlow as Marlow and the steamer were to the natives.

In HD there are also some colonized characters who are portrayed individually, like the fireman, the crew of cannibals or the woman in the beach. Once again, Conrad might be accused of portraying a stereotyped image of the *other*. However, it cannot be overlooked that for every stereotyped individual he also adds some positive comment. The fireman is said to be a "really fine chap" (Conrad 1981:54) who did his job conscientiously, and the cannibals as presented as hard workers and they are praised

by Marlow in their restraint to attack them and eat them, despite their malnourishment and their greater number, thirty cannibals versus five white men. Before the ship is attacked with arrows from the coast, Marlow and the crew are disturbed by their outrageous clamour. The cannibals remain in alert but quiet, whereas the pilgrims are quarreling violently. Marlow is trying to make sense of what he sees and, although he does not succeed, he realises that the Europeans are responsible for taking these savages out of their natural way of life, misplacing them and misleading their lives and culture. The individualized character that is most powerfully depicted is the African woman that comes to the beach to say goodbye to Kurtz. Marlow cannot understand her either, he cannot guess the reason of her sorrow, but he can feel her strength and her feelings in her body gestures. She is described as a powerful woman “wild and gorgeous”, “her head up”, “savage and superb, wild-eyed and magnificent” (Conrad 1981:91). She is denied a voice to express her feelings but it is obvious that she is suffering. “Her face had a tragic and fierce aspect of wild sorrow and of dumb pain” and she was surrounded by “an air of brooding” (Conrad 1981:92).

If there is one clear thing in PI and HD is that both authors succeeded in turning the contemporary stereotypes around and dehumanizing not the colonized but the colonizers. The imperial arguments of racial and moral superiority amount to nothing when left in the hands of the mediocre. Passages in which the white Europeans apply their brutal physical violence over the supposedly inferior savages have a reverse effect. It is not the Africans who are deprived of their human qualities but the white colonizers. In their greedy race to make a fortune they have lost their moral and principles, no human life has value in this environment and no humanity seems to be left in them. Their acts define themselves as inhuman savages.

4. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE COLONIZER AND THE COLONIZED.

Forster's and Conrad's personal experiences in India and the Congo, and the people they met, made them question the colonial enterprise and those who were sent to develop it. The result of their questioning is present in PI and HD, and it is voiced by the characters who cannot be fully associated with the stereotyped *self* and *other*. These characters cope with the colonial situation with a complete different mindset and

trespass the line between the *self* and the *other*. As Street (1975:29) points out “Forster, along with Conrad, [...] is one of the few writers of this period who treats the members of a “backward” country with the seriousness and sympathy considered necessary for an anthropological understanding by modern standards”. The transgressing *other* tries to establish relationships with the colonized, despite the conflict with his own cultural background. The transgressing *self* is opened, or at least partly opened, to the new culture and tries to understand it and enjoy it through the establishment of relationships with the *other*. Their task was not easy to initiate, sustain or accomplish because they were usually left alone in their mission. In fact, they represented a threat to those colonizers who are established in the colony and have found a way to justify their abuses and maintain their privileges without moral conflict.

In addition, the transgression of the line between the *self* and the *other* always entailed some kind of consequence. In colonialist literature, crossing this line, or going native, could only bring terrible consequences for the *self*. PI and HD are not different in this respect. However, the most interesting thing is that, these individual characters are the ones that voice the authors’ critique of colonialism and the only ones that seem to offer a real alternative for the success of colonialism. Their good intentions, their liberal points of view, their desire to coexist and learn from each other, whether it is out of pure curiosity or sincere feeling, seem to point out into the right direction towards colonization. Their transgression brings them closer to the natives than any enforced ideology or any forced policy did. Unfortunately, their relationships with the natives are not envisioned as achievements by the stereotyped colonizer, and their individual efforts and accomplishments will prove useless against the destructive Imperial power.

4.1. Indians and Anglo-Indians.

The historical situation in India, -analysed in chapter two-, had brought about different episodes and situations that favoured the establishment and separation of the *self* and the *other*. As explained in chapter three, the definitions and roles of the colonizer and the colonized were perfectly clear in most cases, and there was no intention on any of the parts to become closer to each other. On the other hand, there were English colonizers who sympathised with the Indians and were opened to some

kind of relationships with them. These liberal colonizers often found their counterparts in the Indian students and civil servants that aspired to become English. Baldwin and Quinn (2007:515) explain this aspiration with the fact that India was ruled by the British Empire, and English was the language of education, literature, and culture. This daily influence encouraged the appearance of “wannabe” Englishmen, who sympathised with the English and were opened to them. Therefore, there were situations and relations in which the difference between the *self* and the *other* was intentionally blurred and the separating line transgressed.

The transgressive characters in PI are Cecil Fielding, Miss Adela Quested and Mrs Moore. A difference must be established between Mr Fielding and the two ladies based on their role and time in the colony. Whereas Mr Fielding is an established colonizer in Chandrapore, Mrs Moore and Miss Quested are new arrivals. In fact, Mrs Moore is just a temporary visitor, a travel companion to Adela who, in turn, is a possible settler, if she finally decides to marry Mrs Moore’s son, Ronny Heaslop.

Cecil Fielding is a fully established colonizer, in the sense that, he also enjoys the privileges that his English citizenship provide for him in the colony, and that these privileges are always granted to the detriment of the colonized. He openly expresses his inability to fully understand India, however, he cannot be fully ascribed to the colonial *self*. He is not closed to the Indian culture and he does not commit abusive or racist acts against the Indians. In fact, he is the only colonizer who shows respect and compassion for the colonized and treats them on an equal to equal basis, not as inferior, dehumanized beings. He works as a principal and a teacher of a government-run college for Indian students and he lives in a house close to it, in Chandrapore, not in the civil station. Therefore, he is in continuous contact with the Indian culture and its people. He enjoys the company and the conversations with the Indians, he has established a friendship with them and he is delighted to be in the colony. His answer about the legitimacy of England and his own role in India, - described in chapter three, - pictures him perfectly. He is visiting his ill friend, Dr Aziz, in his house and he is the only Englishman in the crowded room. His first reaction is to answer that England holds India for her good. This response comes to him automatically because it is the moral justification that the Empire has been using to indoctrinate the colonizers. However, his

uttered answer is honest to his own ideology: he is there because he needed a job, the colony offered him that opportunity, and he took it. Then he openly speaks up his own thoughts and doubts about the colonial enterprise: "I cannot tell you why England is here or whether she ought to be here. It's beyond me" (Forster 1984:120). Therefore, Fielding can be defined as a colonizer who cannot fully accept the role of the colonising *self*.

Mr Fielding's relationship with Dr Aziz is one of the great themes in the novel. They meet at a tea party that Fielding holds in his house. The purpose of this party was to provide a chance for the newly arrived ladies to meet some Indians, and Fielding seemed to be their only hope. This reunion is one of the first situations in which the English characters transgress the line that separates the *self* and the *other*. The magic moment is abruptly broken by the presence of Ronny, the colonizer *self* that interprets this act as a threat and separates them by taking the ladies back to the civil station. Fielding and Aziz continue to see each other and their friendship grows as they share conversations about literature, music, religion, and the relationship of India and England.

Their sincere friendship is tested out when Aziz is accused by Adela of sexual harassment. The scene when Aziz is arrested at the train station stands as a turning point for Fielding's impossibility to maintain his conciliatory role. At first, he tries to defend his friend, they emerge "arm in arm" (Forster 1984:179) and he asks for a warrant. But, the abused colonized is denied any civil rights and the white colonizer is called to reason by "the authoritative tones of Mr Turton" (Forster 1984:179). Finally, Fielding abandons Aziz and he is taken to prison alone. The subsequent speech of Mr Turton about the negative consequences of transgressing the line between the *self* and the *other* is a clear apology for the defense of the Empire:

And during those twenty-five years I have never known anything but disaster result when English people and Indians attempt to be intimate socially. Intercourse, yes. Courtesy, by all means. Intimacy-never, never. [...] I have been in charge of Chandrapore for six years, and if everything has gone smoothly, if there has been mutual respect and esteem, it is because both people kept to this simple rule. Newcomers set our traditions aside, and in an instant [...] the work of years is undone. (Forster 1984:182)

Mr Turton excuses Fielding initial defense of Aziz for being "imbued by modern ideas" (Forster 1984:182). However, Fielding stands firm to his beliefs and supports his

friend during the trial. This decision is condemned by the Englishmen in the club as a betrayal to his own people and, as a consequence, he is scorned and removed from the club. By contrast, the Indians welcome him as a friend of Aziz. At this point, the trial transcends the personal sphere and turns into a racial confrontation of the *self* versus the *other*. Forster's first draft of the novel declared Dr Aziz guilty but, finally, the author sets him free. This can be interpreted as his personal prediction of the aftermath of all the tensions of the historical period or maybe even a wish for the independence of India.

The sincere friendship between Dr Aziz and Mr Fielding does not continue after the trial. Adela is rejected by her own kind and Fielding feels the moral duty to host her in his house until she can go back to England. This, and other misunderstandings, are envisioned by Aziz as another betrayal of their fellowship. Fielding also returns to England and ends up marrying Mrs Moore's daughter from a second marriage. They visit India two years after the trial and the old friends reunite again for a horse ride. They seem to go back to their old relationship "as if nothing had happened" (Forster 1984:356). However, the end of the novel presents their relationship as an impossible dream. Their will, "what I want, [...] what you want" (Forster 1984:362), cannot surpass the power of the Empire. Politics and racial segregation impede their union. Aziz's only hope is to wait for an independent India because, even if it takes five hundred years, he knows that they will get rid of England and then, "you and I shall be friends" (Forster 1984:362)

According to Memmi (1991:17) the newly arrived Miss Quested and Mrs Moore also have to be considered colonizers because, whether they wish it or not, from the moment they landed, they have been enjoying the privileges that the colony offers to all Europeans. However, they are not depicted as the stereotyped *self*. Actually, they seem to be ready to cross the line that separates the *self* from the *other*. They have arrived with a romantic idea of India in mind and they are eager to experience the Indian culture without any colonising mission or any personal profit in mind. On the contrary, they are bored and "disappointed at the dullness of their new life" (Forster 1984:23). Since their arrival, they have been secluded in their bungalows and the club and the only experiences that they have enjoyed include club parties, English plays and dinners.

Their curious and liberal attitude is justified by their compatriots as the result of their new arrival and their lack of knowledge of the real India. For the colonizers, there is only one way to deal with the colonial situation and that is one of complete separation from the colonized, based on their moral and racial superiority. The excitement of the new arrivals is always contraposed by the comments of those who claim to know India. Mrs Moore and Miss Quested are continually dissuaded to establish any type of relationship with the colonized and they are reminded of their superiority to anyone in India several times. Like Mrs Turton's remark "You're superior to them, anyway. Don't forget that. You're superior to anyone in India except one or two of the Ranis, and they're on equality" (Forster 1984:42). Any type of intimacy or social contact is beyond question, as Ronny puts it "I prefer my smoke at the club amongst my own sort" (Forster 1984:28). Still, the ladies' wish to meet Indian people is granted by their compatriots on different occasions, like Mr Fielding's tea party or Mr Turton's bridge party at the civil station.

It is not long until Adela becomes horrified by the situation lived in the colony and the cynicism of their compatriots. She is ashamed of her countrymen and women, especially of Ronny and his change of attitude in India. Her excitement for the bridge party is soon swept away. She cannot believe that, after inviting the Indian guests to the party, the English are "not treating them properly" (Forster 1984:47). The party was far from bridging the gulf between the East and the West. It is true that the Indians act timidly and remain separated from the group but, after all, it is the first time that they are allowed to enter the civil station. Their lack of confidence is strengthened by the bigotry of the English. Adela's impression of the party was as if "the East, abandoning its secular magnificence, was descending into a valley whose farther side no man can see" (Forster 1984:39). Yet, she decides to stay in the colony and become an Anglo-Indian under the consent that she "would never get like that" (Forster 1984:49). She wants the label and the privileges involved but not the mentality but she does not want to be "ungenerous or snobby about Indians" (Forster 1984:161). However, she herself admits that she might not be strong enough to resist her environment and avoid becoming like the other women in Chandrapore. In Memmi's words, Adela represents the colonial who

does not want to become a colonizer and “decides to remain, vowing not to accept colonization” (1991:19).

The incident in the Marabar Caves somehow proves Adela’s lack of resistance to the influence of the colonizer *self*, and turns around her perception of the Indian culture and the colonized. In fact, her accusation worsens the colonial situation and opens the breach between the *self* and the *other* even more. The trial is not about her anymore, as Mrs Moore remarks, “she has started a machinery; it will work to its end” (Forster 1984:229). There is no going back, the inevitable is going to take place and everyone in the colony will end up inexorably affected by it.

Until the day of the trial, Adela was kept in the station, isolated from anyone who could make her change her argument. However, Mrs Moore’s attitude towards her, makes her question for the first time what really happened in the cave. At the decisive moment of the trial, Adela withdraws the charges and Dr Aziz is declared innocent. The burst of applause on the Indian side is opposed to the feeling of betrayal of the English. As Hamidullah asserts, “a great deal has been broken, more than will ever be amended” (Forster 1984:269). In her act, Adela has helped reunite the “general Indian”, a temporary Hindu-Moslem entente, “irrespective of their creed” (Forster 1984:296) but, at the same time, she has “renounced her own people” (Forster 1984:257). Ronny breaks up their engagement and she is abandoned to her own luck. Fielding advises her to keep to her own people, but she cannot. She feels without virtue and she is valueless to them. He never really liked her character, but he recognizes her humility after the trial and feels sorry for her. To him, she is getting “the worst of both worlds” (Forster 1984:288). Her transgression of the line between the *self* and the *other* leaves her astray in India and her consequence is rejection and solitude. Adella is repelled by English and Indians alike and suffers a psychological crisis that will accompany her for the rest of her life, even after she abandons India for England.

Mrs Moore stands out as the most conciliatory character in the novel and the only one who stays true to her principles. Her first contact with Dr Aziz in the mosque announces the sincere affection that they will profess to each other until the final outcome. At first, Aziz is confused by her attitude and he can only explain it through the fact that she is new to the country and has not been corrupted by the colonizers and

their separating ideology yet. She talks to him politely, she shows respect for the Moslems and their traditions, she sympathizes with Indians, and she even criticizes the attitude of Englishwomen. Aziz defines her as “an Oriental” and in his moan, “Oh, if others resembled you” (Forster 1984:21), he is stating that her respectful, conciliatory attitude and her culturally opened mind is the only cure for the situation lived in India and the only way for the success of colonialism. In fact, Mrs Moore never acts like a colonizer and she reprimands Ronny’s judgements and acts against Indians. He cannot understand her lack of contempt for the colonized and he asks her not to influence Adela in her sympathy for the natives. Adela is a colonizer-to-be and she should not be questioning whether the natives are being treated fairly or not.

During the excursion to the Marabar Caves, Mrs Moore does not feel completely comfortable, however, she shows a grateful attitude to Aziz because she can feel his excitement and realizes the effort he has made to please her and Adela. He is honoured to have them as guests. He knows that they are dependant on him for a few hours and that “his honour was involved in their happiness, and every discomfort they endured would tear his soul” (Forster 1984:157). The final outturn of this trip is fatal for Aziz, his affection and his grateful acts are rewarded with an accusation that would dishonour and follow him to the end of his life. Mrs Moore is unable to internalize the harm made to this good man. Adela’s accusation triggers her inability to cope with the situation in the colony. She does not speak up her thoughts but her acts speak for her. She is disappointed and irritated, she cannot even hold hands with Adela, she feels repelled by the cause of harm, and refuses to be in the witness-box. “Her Christian tenderness had gone, or had developed into a hardness, a just irritation against human race” (Forster 1984:221). Actually, she was not repelled by the human race, she was repelled by the colonizer *self*, by the cruel reality of Imperialism, its gratuitous racism and its corruption. From a postcolonial perspective she can be accused of being passive, she does not joins Aziz in his defense, like Fielding does, and she only admits his innocence once in front of Ronny and Adela. According to Memmi (1991:19), Mrs Moore represents the colonizer astonished by the injustice and cynicism of her fellow citizens, the one who “finds himself unfit for this role [colonizer], and soon leaves”. As Sandison (1967) points out, Mrs Moore truths and moral definitions never blur or diffuse into meaninglessness,

on the contrary, she she is able to acknowledge the moral destructiveness of India through her “cool clarity of mind” (Sandison 1967:79). She is unable to recover from her disillusion, she has the need to abandon India and return to England. She cannot be part of colonialism and, as a consequence, she ends up dying in her need to escape its injustice and brutality.

4.2. Niggers and Whites.

The lucrative nature of the Belgian enterprise in the Congo Free State implied the establishment of purely commercial relationships between the colonizers and the colonized. The lack of civilising mission and the prevalence of racial stereotypes prevented any other type of relationship. Racial superiority by nature was the biggest asset of the Belgian Empire to justify and legitimize the exploitative role of the colonizer and the submissive role of the colonized. The white *self* dehumanizes the black *other* and turns him into a forced labourer by means of slavery and brutal violence. The colonized *other* is a savage, he is not a human being, he has no civil rights, and his life has no value. As explained in chapter three, only the mediocre could stand these conditions and stay in the colony as the performing agents of the empire. In HD there are no liberal characters opened to sympathize and establish closer relationships with the other, there is no intention on any of the sides to voluntarily transgress the line that separates them. However, the constant inefficiency of the colonizers and the incessant brutality against the colonized make Marlow and Kurtz reflect on their own legitimacy and roles in the colony. As a result, both end up crossing the separating line between the *self* and the *other* and suffering a consequence for it. A difference must be established between them taking into account the actual relationships that they established with the *other*. In this sense, Marlow is transgressive mostly in his thoughts, comments and digressions, whereas Kurtz shows these same qualities but he also adds real and deep interaction with the *other*.

As Franklin Walker (1981) states in his introduction to HD, it is widely accepted now that the main character in the novel is not Mr Kurtz but Marlow. He narrates his intricate voyage up the Congo River to meet the omnipresent Mr Kurtz but, after all, it is him the one who is experiencing a vital voyage that will turn upside down any

preconception of his westernized mind. He announces the deep impact of this colonial adventure when he explains to his audience in the *Nellie*: “I don’t like work—no man does—but I like what is in the work—the chance to find yourself” (Conrad 1981:42). Furthermore, the similarities of Conrad’s real life and experiences in the Congo with Marlow’s fictional story lead to the acceptance of the analogy Marlow-Conrad. Therefore, it can be concluded that *Heart of Darkness* deals with Conrad’s “maturing through an arduous and soul-searching initiation, for it is clear that Conrad was writing about the impact of Africa in himself” (Walker 1981: xii).

When Marlow embarks in the colonial adventure, he is fully aware of the commercial purpose of the Company. However, he is not prepared to assimilate the mediocrity of the colonizers conducting the mission and their brutal tactics. After witnessing different situations in which the *self* defines himself as inefficient and inhuman, he starts questioning the whole situation. He wonders about the anthropological symbolising of the sounds that he hears, about the incomprehensible surrounding, about the human nature of the natives, about the evolution of races and peoples. His doubts and his attempt to understand might be related to Darwin’s evolutionary theory in *Origin of Species* (1858) which came to reinforce “the inferiority of the native [...] and the notion of the survival of the fittest”, but also to “pay more serious attention to to what had previously been dismissed as irrational, trivial and superstitious” (Street 1975:9). Be as it may, as the journey progresses, Marlow’s attitude becomes more and more critical with the empire, hence, transgressive.

One of the most striking aspects in HD is the systematic and brutal abuse of the *other* and the continuous disregard for any human life. No reader, of any period or ideology, can or should remain impassive when faced with the heinous crimes of genocide and acts against humanity committed in the Congo Free State. The colonizer *self* in HD has completely assumed his racial superiority and has reduced the colonized *other* to inferior beasts. During the climb to the outer station, Marlow comes across two groups of natives. The first is a group of six chained men guided by another native with a rifle. The previous warnings of the colonizers make Marlow think that they might be dangerous men or criminals. After observing them in detail, it is obvious to him that “these men could by no stretch of imagination be called enemies” (Conrad 1981:22). He

tries to get away from that disturbing vision and walks towards the shade of some trees, only to find himself stepping “into the gloomy circle of some Inferno” (Conrad 1981:23). He sees a group of dying native laborers and, for the first time, he fully realises the truth of colonialism in the Congo:

“Black shapes [...] in all attitudes of pain, abandonment, and despair. [...] this was the place where some of the helpers had withdrawn to die. They were dying slowly. [...] They were not enemies, they were not criminals, they were nothing earthly now. [...] Brought from all the recesses of the coast in all the legality of time contracts, lost in uncongenial surroundings, fed on unfamiliar food, they sickened, became inefficient, and were then allowed to crawl away and rest” (Conrad 1981:24)

No human being can read this paragraph and not feel complete disgust for the colonizers and the refusal of Imperialism. Marlow is clearly torn by this view and in his futile attempt to deny or amend the terrible act he is witnessing, he offers a cookie to one of the dying men. His heartbreaking descriptions are not the product of a sick mind, they are the account of the events that Conrad actually witnessed in 1889 and that would leave him with a psychological and spiritual crisis for the rest of his life.

Marlow defines himself as not being particularly tender, but these scenes have a horrifying effect on him and, as he announces, this is not the worst that he would witness in his voyage. He explains that, due to his life as a sailor, he has seen and even committed violent acts on the name of violence, greed, and hot desire. However, the devils that guide these colonising men are worst. He is facing a “flabby, pretending, weak-eyed devil of a rapacious and pitiless folly” (Conrad 1981:23), that is, Belgian imperialism is being carried out by foolish and inefficient colonizers, by empowered violent men who are guided by their greed but have no idea of what they are doing.

Postcolonial critics, like Achebe, have accused Conrad of being the feeder and “purveyor of comforting myths” and of “inducing hypnotic stupor in his readers through a bombardment of emotive words” like “frenzy”, “inscrutable”, “unspeakable” or “mysterious” (Achebe 1990:5). It cannot be denied that the use and abuse of these adjectives definitely creates an image of the atmosphere of Africa in the reader. It is common of colonialist literature to portray the colonial surrounding as something incomprehensible because this “unreadability of the other” helped the colonizers hide

their insecurities and separate themselves from the other (Boehmer 2005:89). However, Marlow's inability to understand his surrounding is not necessarily connected with the intention to feed the myth. It can be Conrad's resource to make the reader feel the uncertainty and mixed feeling that these unknown, exotic, mysterious lands evoked to the eyes of a thirty-two year old European sailor. He might be trying to transmit to his western readers, in the most realistic possible way, what he felt when confronted with this "black incomprehensible frenzy". It takes a lifetime to understand a culture that is not your own and Conrad's lack of knowledge or understanding of the Congo might have resulted in these uncertain but vivid descriptions of many aspects of the Congolese culture. In HD everything happens too fast and everything is too unfamiliar to be understood. Still, Marlow tries to make sense of his new surroundings and, from the very beginning, he doubts whether these sounds so "weird, appealing, suggestive, and wild [might have] as profound a meaning as the sounds of bells in a Christian country" (Conrad 1981:28-29) or if they really are related to savageness.

Marlow continues to reflect on the natives and, despite the fact that he cannot identify himself with them physically or culturally, he finally ends up admitting their humanity, something that had been denied to them by all the colonizers: "[...] and the men were —No, they were not inhuman" (Conrad 1981:53). In the middle of the wilderness and brutality, Marlow is able to see them with conciliating eyes, he is able to overcome the imperial ideology and the western stereotypes that have guided him all his life. He sees the humanity in the *other* and should not but be praised for it. He continues his speech and directly addresses his western audience to make them understand as well.

Well, you know, that was the worst of it—the suspicion of their not being inhuman. It would come slowly to one. [...] what thrilled you was just the thought of their humanity—like yours—the thought of your remote kinship with this wild and passionate uproar. Ugly. Yes, it was ugly enough; but if you were man enough you would admit to yourself that there was in you just the faintest trace of a response to the terrible frankness of that noise, a dim suspicion of there being a meaning in it which you—you so remote from the night of first ages—could comprehend. (Conrad 1981:53)

The word “ugly” in this passage has been often interpreted as a racist sign, but another interpretation is also possible. Marlow is defending their humanity, he is thrilled not because of being related to them, he is thrilled because these human beings have been abused like animals and this, this is a really “ugly truth”. A truth that can only be admitted to oneself if you are honest and brave enough to question the imposed imperial ideology.

Marlow tries to understand what is it that makes them different from each other and he finally concludes that what really separates them is civilization. They are still in “the night of the first ages”, untouched by progress and it is this progress what differentiates them and impedes their mutual comprehension now. This argument is used by Marlow to understand what separates him as a human being from the natives, however, it also distances him from a complete feeling of equality with the *other* because, he recognizes their humanity but he still considers them a primitive version of the western civilisations. As Loomba (2015:142, 143) explains, Freud’s associations “between European male adulthood, civilisation and rationality on the one hand, and non-Europeans, children, primitivism and madness on the other” were used as pathologized arguments to differentiate Europeans and Africans culturally and racially. Still, Marlow is subtly raising the question that the transgressive characters in PI openly raise throughout the novel: civilisation implies corruption. It is the civilised men in HD the ones who excel in inhumanity, inefficiency and greediness. Their corruption can be economic, political or of one’s character and those civilised characters who realise it or react against it suffer different consequences -as analysed in chapter five.

The corruption of the European colonizers has an inevitable effect on Marlow and, as he continues to question his role in the Congo and the imposed belief that Africans are to be considered savages, he starts isolating himself from the pilgrims and the Company’s officials in the steamboat. He never admits his friendship with the helmsman, he is probably not even ready to cross the transgressing line between the *self* and the *other* to that point. However, when the helmsman dies, he admits to his audience his deep feelings for his only real mate in his voyage up the River Congo. His first reaction when he sees his shoes covered in the native’s blood is running to throw them away. However, as he describes the scene when he throws the native overboard,

disgust turns into guilt. He rushes this act because he does not want his mate to be devoured by the cannibals or to be buried by the hypocritical pilgrims. He had to close his eyes to jerk the spear out of his body and, before throwing him overboard, he “hugged him from behind desperately” (Conrad 1981:77). It is hard to let his mate go. He describes his body as being “heavier than any man on earth” (Conrad 1981:77), which can be also a metaphor for the weight of guiltiness. He admits how much he misses him: “I missed my late helmsman awfully -I missed him even while his body was still lying in the pilot-house.” (Conrad 1981:76). He tries to justify his deep sorrow to the eyes of his westernized audience, and probably to himself, he is trying to understand how “a savage who was no more account than a grain of sand in a black Sahara” (Conrad 1981:76) could cause him such pain. He justifies it with a bond between captain and worker, but he knows deep inside that it was much more. It was the bond of human beings and that is why “the intimate profundity of that look he gave me [Marlow] when he received his hurt remains to this day in my memory -like a claim of distant kinship affirmed in a supreme moment” (Conrad 1981:76). His sorrow for the loss of his only real companion in the steamboat confirms to him the humanity of the natives, their kinship as human beings, and the cruel nonsense of Imperialism. He revives his death in his memory and he doubts whether Kurtz’ life was worth the life of his helmsman. For Marlow, the helmsman was not just a savage, it was the life of a man for another man. At the end of the journey, when the boat is finally returning to the coast, Marlow tries to save the natives on the shore bidding their farewell to Kurtz. The pilgrims are getting ready to shoot at them but he blows the whistle of the steamboat and the natives run terrified. There is a contrast between the disconsolate natives who are seeing their friend part and their lives at risk and the “imbecile crowd” of pilgrims who complain disconsolately for missing their chance to kill savages and have some “little fun” (Conrad 1981:102).

There is no turning back for Marlow. He has transgressed the line between the *self* and the *other* with his little friendly acts and his refusal of mediocrity and brutality. He cannot but isolate himself from these dehumanized, corrupted *self*. Isolation in remote and alien settings is also considered one of the causes of madness so, as he affirms, in his attempt to maintain his sanity and keep his mind somewhere else, he focuses on his work and starts developing a fictional recreation of Mr Kurtz. He turns his

colonizing mission into a rescue mission of the only colonizer who might represent the idealised *self* of the imperial ideology, the one that he expected to encounter in Africa, the colonizer with a civilising mission guided by the goal of bringing light into the darkness.

Mr Kurtz is the omnipresent character in the novella. He is given a voice but he never expresses his own personal guidance for the colonial enterprise. Originally, he was a highly regarded and appreciated man for his services to the imperial cause, not only in the colony but also in Europe. No doubt, career advancement opportunities and economic profit must have been some of his initial aims at the beginning of his incursion in Congo, but he is also defined as a humanitarian. In fact, he was in charge of writing a report for the International Society for the Suppression of Savage Customs for the future guidance of the colonial enterprise. The result was a seventeen pages writing “vibrating with eloquence” (Conrad 1981:74). However, his contact with the natives turns him into a completely different human being with terrible consequences, as analysed in the next chapter.

Marlow first hears from him at the outer station, when the manager describes him as “a first-class agent”, “a very remarkable person” in charge of the most important station, and able to send “as much ivory as all the others put together” (Conrad 1981:27). Considering the economic pursuit of the Belgian enterprise, Marlow only sees Kurtz as a highly efficient colonizer, for whom the Council in Europe seems to have plans of advancement in the Administration. Marlow gets really interested in Kurtz at the central station, after seeing an oil painting that he had made a year ago, before leaving for his inner station. The painting pictured a blindfolded woman with a lighted torch over a black background. The same as Marlow, Kurtz has also realised that the Belgian mission in the Congo is guided by blind men and that light will not be brought to the natives. Upon Marlow’s questioning about who this Mr Kurtz really is, the brickmaker describes him as “a prodigy”, “an emissary of pity and science and progress” (Conrad 1981:37). In the midst of mediocrity and brutality, these descriptions of Kurtz, together with the message in the painting, are probably the seeds for Marlow’s fictional recreation of Kurtz as the only alternative and hope of imperialism.

Marlow's idealised characterisation of Mr Kurtz grows as he overhears a conversation between the manager at the central station and his uncle complaining about Kurtz's methods and ideas. They explain that Kurtz asked the manager not to send him any more men "of that sort" (Conrad 1981:46), that is, inefficient. They add that Kurtz has the intention to turn each trading station into centre for "humanizing, improving, instructing" (Conrad 1981:48) the natives. To Marlow's eyes, Mr Kurtz turns into the ideal colonial *self* and he "gets excited at the prospect of meeting [him]" (Conrad 1981:49), but most importantly, of talking to him. The idealised man continues to develop in his head as "a gifted creature, and that of all his gifts the one that stood out preëminently, that carried with it a sense of real presence, was his ability to talk, his words -the gift of expression, the bewildering, the illuminating, [...] the pulsating stream of light, or the deceitful flow from the heart of an impenetrable darkness" (Conrad 1981:71). Kurtz's legend gives Marlow a reason to continue his voyage and the means to alienate himself from the mediocre colonizers in the steamboat. After the attack to the steamboat, the thought that he might be dead gives him "a sense of extreme disappointment" (Conrad 1981:70).

The last character that talks to Marlow about Mr Kurtz before he finally meets him is the Russian trader. He comes aboard the steamboat when they get to the inner station, while the manager and the pilgrims go to rescue Kurtz. His description of Mr Kurtz comes to confirm his legend and contradict it at the same time. He deeply admires the man and he justifies every aspect of his personality and every act that depicts him as a dehumanized savage or a madman. On the positive side, he is presented as an eloquent source of knowledge. He portrays Kurtz as the man who has enlarged his mind through his monologues on love, justice or conduct of life, because "you don't talk with that man -you listen to him" (Conrad 1981:80). On the negative side, he has been taking care of him through two illnesses and, instead of being close friends, Kurtz spends most of his time alone in the wilderness and, instead of being thankful, Kurtz has got as far as to try to kill him for a small lot of ivory. In addition, the Russian also lets Marlow glimpse Kurtz's delusions of white god to the natives and his share in savage practices and rituals. Yet, the admiration of the trader is such that he justifies Kurtz and excuses him explaining that "You can't judge Mr Kurtz as you would an ordinary man" (Conrad

1981:84). The Russian ends up seeing in Marlow an ally for the defence of Mr Kurtz's reputation in Europe and passes him the responsibility to safeguard his memory. It is not clear why, but Marlow decides to accept and stay next to Kurtz, despite the acknowledgement of his madness and depravity. What is clear is that his fictional recreation of this man has helped him stay sane in his journey through the wilderness and has given him a reason to believe in colonialism. What he finally finds is not what he expected, but still, it is a better option than the dehumanized, brutal, and greedy colonizers that he had encountered so far.

The colonizers confirm Mr Kurtz as a transgressive character in relation to his humanitarian ideas and future purposes for the natives in the colony. However, the Russian trader's description of his transgressive actions seem to lack any humanitarian purpose. It is not stated how the first contacts with the natives started or with which intention. It can be deduced that in his initial attempts to exploit ivory, and maybe bring civilization to the different tribes, he started becoming closer to them. Whether it was just for economic profit or for civilising purposes, the final result had nothing to do with it. Kurtz ended up obsessed with ivory and guiding the tribes around the inner station in his raiding incursions. He became their God and his white race and the "thunder and lightning" (Conrad 1981:84) from the rifles were the symbols of his deity. At some point he lost control of his own actions and emotions, he participated in expeditions that lasted days and in cannibal rituals in his honor. He acquired their customs, he blended into the environment and, despite his moments of lucidity when he understood that he had to leave, he was not able to leave his followers. When Marlow confronts him in the jungle in the middle of the night and tries to make him come to a sense of what he is doing, Kurtz somehow recognizes the depravity of his acts against the "immense plans" (Conrad 1981:99) that he originally had. He finally listens to Marlow and chooses to go back to the steamboat, to civilization, to Europe, before he is lost, utterly lost. Once in the boat, he regrets not being able to return to Europe before dying and wants to make sure that his ideas get to Europe through Marlow.

Everything related to Mr Kurtz is very contradictory, his acts and ideas always oscillate between the humanitarian colonizer and the deified ivory raider. Furthermore, his switch from humanitarian idealist to cannibal God can be envisioned as a symbol for

the emptiness of the moral and humanitarian ideals of Imperialism, which are a mere facade to justify invasion, usurpation, and exploitation. His final words “The Horror! The Horror!” (Conrad 981:105) have given way to many interpretations because, despite their eloquence and meaningfulness, they are unclear and vague at the same time. Of all of the possible interpretations, those two presented by Watts (1983:205) seem especially relevant: the words either call for the horrible corruption of which he is a prisoner or for the horrible things that he has witnessed during his colonising experience and his isolation in the jungle. Mr Kurtz will always be an eternal contradiction.

5. THE EFFECTS OF IMPERIALISM IN THE COLONIZER AND THE COLONIZED.

Imperialism was supposed to be guided by the moral duty of bringing civilization to every corner of the world. Civilization was envisioned as the liberating tool of imperialism that would end with the physical and moral barbarities that the uncivilized natives were suffering. The critical position towards imperialism of both, *A Passage to India* and *Heart of Darkness*, question this perception of civilization and present it as an agent of destruction and corruption. Destruction of India and the Congo through the systematic bigotry, racism, cruelty and exploitation that the colonized suffer. Corruption through the decrepit characterization of the colonizers who seem to suffer a transformation after their contact with the colonies and the worst human defects get hold of them. As Jean-Paul Sartre’s reflection magnificently presents it: “if colonization destroys the colonized, it also rots the colonizer” (in Memmi, 1991: xvii)

The only positive outcomes of civilization in PI and HD seem to be the very same characters who criticize imperialism, that is, Mr Fielding, Mrs Moore, Miss Quested, Mr Kurtz and Marlow. Their good intentions, their liberal points of view, their desire to coexist and learn from each other, -no matter if it is out of pure curiosity or sincere feeling, - turn them into the only positive exports and achievements of the greedy western civilization in the colonies. Being the literary works part of the colonialist tradition, their acts could not be overlooked and, -as has been analysed in chapter four,- their transgression of the frontier that separates the *self* and the *other* is always punished with some kind of consequence.

In PI, all the Englishmen and women at the civil station, as well as the Indians who have accepted their inferior and subdued role, could serve as good examples of the negative effects of colonialism. Even so, the corruption of the colonizer and the destruction of the colonized are best exemplified by Ronny Heaslop and Dr Aziz respectively. Mrs Moore and Adela's observations over the change in character of Ronny are key to understand how the Englishman has undergone a transformation after his contact with India. He had defects of character that were noticeable before he arrived in India, but his contacts with the colony and the colonizers seem to have accentuated them. After her encounter with Dr Aziz at the mosque, Mrs Moore is interrogated by her son on the premise that Aziz might be a suspicious character who needed to be reported. His arguments against Indians make her realise that he is not the one talking, he is just repeating the words of the older officials. He even admits to himself that he does not feel quite sure about those arguments, still, he uses them. As Boehmer (2005:153) explains, the conservatism of the British system was "preserved by the rootedness of formality and habit. As a closed system it provides a hothouse atmosphere for the spread of ideological contagion". Ronny is in the process of change; he is integrating the colonial thoughts to his daily life in an attempt to justify his acts against the natives. Upon his mother's accusation, "You never used to judge people like this at home", his answer is that "India isn't home" (Forster 1984:33). As a servant of the government, he has the power to do good in India, he is there to keep justice and peace, but he will not bother to do it pleasantly, it will be done by force. He is not "a missionary or a Labour Member or a vague sentimental sympathetic literary man" (Forster 1984:52), he is an imperial colonizer. Ronny's complacency in this god-like attitude towards *his* subordinates is also criticised by Mrs Moore. She knows that her son should regret his attitude for his own good and for India's, but she knows that there is no going back for him. "One touch of regret -not the canny substitute but the true regret from the heart- would have made him a different man, and the British Empire a different institution" (Forster 1984:53). He has been abducted by the imperial ideology of the colonizers around him, he has been indoctrinated and he is not even aware of it. No matter how hard she tries to make him understand his mistake. As Sartre explains, it

seems that “the colonizer alone is qualified to speak of the colony [and] the rest of us, who live in the mother country, do not have his experience” (in Memmi 1991: xxi).

Dr Aziz’s first appearance is marked by his liveliness, positive energy, friendliness and enjoyment of life. He is a very emotional and sentimental character, able to see the good in people, whether they are Indians or English. His initial attitude towards the colonial situation might be described as indifferent. His friends often criticize the empire in private conversations but he is never passionate about it. However, Adela’s accusation and the injustices he suffered as a subordinate of the empire will change him forever. His indifference towards England turns into pure hate and resentment. As he shouts to Fielding, “The approval of your compatriots no longer interests me, I have become anti-British, and ought to have done so sooner, it would have saved me numerous misfortunes” (Forster 1984:279). This comment is also interesting because, despite his love for his friend, the whole situation also has started to separate him from Fielding. He has decided to break with British India and the Englishmen so that they cannot insult him or hurt him anymore. This together with other actions, rumours, and misunderstandings relating Fielding and Adela, will end up breaking their friendship. His transgressing role is now envisioned as “the end of a foolish experiment” (Forster 1984:328). He proclaims that he is never going to befriend a white person again, that he is “an Indian at last” (Forster 1984:329), and that his heart is for his own people henceforward. The jovial Indian “grew harder and less approachable” (Forster 1984:298) and desists in his attempt to join India and Britain. He realises the impossibility of this mission and turns into an independentist mood, as the only option to regain respect for his people and his culture. At the end of the novel, he dreams of an independent India for his sons and daughter. In light of Fielding’s mocking attitude towards his thought of a united India, he responds in rage “we might hate each other but we hate you most” (Forster 1984:361).

In HD, Europe is seen as the grown up sister of Africa, the original seed from which something great was grown. However, as the reader progresses, a feeling of deceit starts to grow. Europe does not seem to be the one who evolved into something bigger, quite the opposite, it seems to have taken “the raw and vigorous truth [that once they had and have] adulterated and concealed” it (Watts, 1.983:200). All the European

colonizers at the trading stations as well as the abused natives are good examples of the negative effects of colonialism on both the colonizer and the colonized. Still, the corruption of the colonizer and the destruction of the colonized are best exemplified by Mr Kurtz and the enslaved natives as a whole.

Mr Kurtz's moral and humanitarian ideals and his transgression of the line between the *self* and the *other* is punished with madness. This is not uncommon in the tradition of colonialist literature, which often used madness as a very useful resource to show the terrible consequences of going native and to justify the purpose of imperialism. Loomba (2015:142) interprets Kurtz's madness from a Freudian psychoanalytical perspective and envisions it as a regression to childhood and primitivism. This is explained because the native tribes in the Congo had not experienced the rational and social progress that civilization ensured, that is, they remained in a primitive state and any contact with them implied a transgression of group identities and a process of deculturation. From a colonialist perspective, this whole situation ends up portraying the natives in the Congo Free State as primitive people who could not govern themselves and depended on civilised nations to advance. However, the same as Kurtz's final words "The Horror. The Horror" are contradictory and opened to different interpretations, so is his madness. Mr Kurtz's experience with the natives is more complex than a simple transgression of boundaries, and his madness can be analysed as a critique to imperialism. The civilized colonizers in HD do not seem to bring any advancement or improvement to the colony. In fact, Kurtz refuses to assimilate the stereotypes of the colonizers in the colony and criticises these men as inefficient, racist, and brutal. He isolates himself from them and retires to his inner station where madness arises. Therefore, his madness can be interpreted as the result of his inability to cope with the cruel reality of colonialism. His realisation of the greedy nature of the colonizers, their corruption for the pursuit of wealthness, their racism, and their brutality to human race were too much for him to assimilate and he went mad. Marlow describes Mr Kurtz as the result of the reigning European Imperialism. No matter whether it was Belgium, Britain, Germany or France: "All Europe contributed to the making of Kurtz" (Conrad 1981:74) and eventually to his end. Once again, his final words lead to both interpretations and ultimately it is the reader who decides the reason for his madness in the colony.

One last shade that needs to be considered when questioning the reason for Mr Kurtz's madness is Conrad's "profound insight into the nature of man in his relation to the world and society" (Wiley 1966:10). He is considered by many scholars as "one of the great interpreters of the irrational in modern British literature, perhaps the greatest before the Freudian era" (Wiley 1966:212) and Kurtz is often analysed as a symbol for human decline. Unlike Marlow, he does not try to restrain his instincts and maintain his humanity. He allows himself to be carried forward by his most basic instincts and lusts. As Marlow describes it, his "intelligence was perfectly clear [...] but his soul was mad" (Conrad 1981:100), that is, he lost the harmony of mind and instinct that Conrad defended as essential for the complete individual (Wiley 1966:213). According to Wiley (1966:79), "For Conrad, man is severely limited, prone to evil rather than good; and [...] in attempting to transcend the humble state the individual is thrust back into full awareness of his limitations or down to a level below the human". This is the case of Mr Kurtz, whose corruption seems to arise from the natural decline of the civilized man when he falls away from the control of the community and is confronted with a chaotic situation.

The colonized men in HD are not given a voice to express the consequences that colonialism has brought to them, but the depiction of their situation in the hands of the colonizers speaks for itself. The arrival of the European civilisation to the Congo Free State has not implied any advancement for the colonized, conversely, it has only worsened their quality of life. They have been denied any civil rights, they have been dehumanized and enslaved for the profit of the colony. As Thornton (1985:74) explains, "the welfare of the "lower race" was subserved by the play of economic and political forces not primarily designed to secure that end". The vital damage suffered by the colonized people is highlighted by group of paddling natives that Marlow passes by on his journey up the River Congo. As Watts (1983:198) points out "of all the people described, by far the happiest, healthiest and most vital are the group of blacks seen paddling their canoe". "They shouted, sang; their bodies streamed with perspiration; they had faces like grotesque masks—these chaps; but they had bone, muscle, a wild vitality, an intense energy of movement, that was as natural and true as the surf along their coast. They wanted no excuse for being there. They were a great comfort to look

at" (Conrad 1981:19). The explanation to their happiness and vitality is their freedom and harmony with their environment. The vision of these black fellows comforts Marlow because in the middle of the brutality brought by the colonizers, they are the only natural and true entities in the Congo. They have not been chased by the European predators yet. They have not been in direct contact with the European colonizers, they have not been slaved under the pretext of "all the legality of time contracts", they have not been "lost in uncongenial surroundings, fed on unfamiliar food, [...] sickened, became inefficient, and [...] allowed to crawl away and rest" (Conrad, 1981:24).

6. CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS, AND FURTHER RESEARCH.

Joseph Conrad and Edward Morgan Forster are often defined as colonialist writers due to the fact that they were white English authors who lived in Europe during the time of the great Empires and who wrote about imperialism from the perspective of the colonizer. At some point in their lives, their personal circumstances drove them to the colonies, an experience that would change them forever and mark their personal, ideological, and artistic careers. It is true that the duration of their stay in India and the Congo was short. It is true that they believed in the faith and emotion that imperialism represented at the time. It is true that they were influenced by the cultural and racial prejudices on which colonialism was based. However, it is also true that they did not remain impassive by the atrocities and injustices that they witnessed. They took a critical view of imperialism and expressed it in their masterpieces *A Passage to India* and *Heart of Darkness*. Even if their denouncement was not complete, it cannot be denied either.

The main goal of the current study was to prove that colonialism was developed in different spheres and that the cultural one was in the hands of men like these outstanding literary authors. Their detachment from the social, racial and cultural prejudices of their colonial era, their exploration and comprehension of these countries and their people, and their unbiased view of the colonial reality needed to imply a change in the perception of Imperialism at the time. In order to do so, the different attitudes of the main characters in both literary works have been analysed taking into account whether they adjust themselves to the stereotyped depictions of the *self* and the

other of colonialist literature or whether they present a critical attitude towards the colonial ideology.

In PI the social and political relations and tensions of the period are clearly reflected through the characters of the novel and both, Indians and Anglo-Indians, are given a voice to express the sentiments towards the colonial situation and towards each other. The white *self* is characterised by racial superiority, isolation, hate, and fear. The colonized *other* is abused and denied equal civil rights, with a subsequent desire for independence and liberation. In HD, the economic pursuit of the colonising mission is clearly manifested. The colonizing *self* is characterised by his mediocrity and greed, his inefficiency to organize the colonial territories, and his brutal methods for economic exploitation. The colonized *other* is presented as a mass and cannot voice his impression of colonialism, he is completely dehumanized, denied any civil rights and treated as a working beast.

The process of *othering* the natives was necessary for the colonizers in order to justify their presence in the colonies and their acts. However, even though many of the colonial stereotypes continue to be present in Forster's and Conrad's characters, they manage to turn them around and end up dehumanizing the *self*. The imperial arguments of racial and moral superiority amount to nothing when left in the hands of the mediocre. It is so concluded that their isolation, their racist ideas and comments, and their abusive and brutal actions depict the white Europeans as inferior beings without moral or principles. Their acts define themselves through the books and they end up not only dehumanized but mocked and even pitied by the reader for their lack of humanity.

The characters who cannot be accommodated within the traditional role of the colonizer and the colonized are those who end up transgressing the separating line between the *self* and the *other* and decide to come closer to each other. Despite the conflict with their own cultural background, the transgressive characters confront the colonial situation with an open, or at least partly open, attitude towards the new culture. Following the tradition of colonialist literature, all the transgressive characters are victims of a terrible consequence. Still, they are also the characters that voice the injustices and brutalities of colonialism and, even more important, they are the only ones that seem to offer a real alternative for the success of colonialism. Unfortunately, their liberal mindset

cannot overcome the destructive power of imperialism and the gap between colonizer and colonized is never bridged.

The evidence of this study suggests that both PI and HD present a critical point of view of imperialism and of its supposed liberating tool: civilization. Far from helping to end with the physical and moral barbarities underwent by the natives in the colonies, civilization is presented as an agent of destruction and corruption. Nothing good arises from the civilised initiatives or the civilising agents in India and the Congo. The colonies and their peoples end up destroyed as a result of the racist, cruel and exploitative acts committed by the European colonizers against them who, in turn, end up corrupted in the colonies, guided by their own personal, professional, and economic profit and flaunting their worst human defects.

The limited space of this master thesis, has also limited the depth of analysis of both literary works. Considering that the main goal was to determine the critical position of both Forster and Conrad against imperialism, the analysis has been focused only on those aspects that prove it so. It has never been denied that both PI and HD continue to portray many of the stereotypes of colonialist literature. However, it was essential to enhance our understanding of the liberating enterprise of these great literary authors. The result of this analysis indicates their roles as forefathers of the subsequent postcolonial literary works that, after colonial independence, were able to openly attack imperialism, completely free from the East-West ideological barrier and influence. In this sense, and with a future doctoral thesis in mind, it would be interesting to analyse the depiction of the *self* and the *other* from the perspective of the colonized through a literary work pertaining to the post-independence period. *Palace of the Peacock* (1960) by Wilson Harris or *Things Fall Apart* (1958) by Chinua Achebe present themselves as excellent options for this endeavour.

Forster and Conrad represent the beginning of the change. They defied the illiberal European mind and the contemporary prejudices and opened the breach to liberalism with their denouncement of the injustices and brutalities committed in the name of Imperialism. They created two heartbreaking masterpieces that can leave no reader of any period indifferent, whether it was a British member of the bourgeois, a Belgian trader, or a 21st century OMIES student. Achebe (1990) asserts quite right that

“travellers with closed minds can tell us little except about themselves” but, after the deep analysis made in this dissertation, one can affirm that, during their travel to the colonies, Forster and Conrad were able to open their eyes to witness and their minds to denounce.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources.

Conrad, J. & Walker, F. 1981. *Heart of Darkness and the Secret Sharer*. New York: Bantam Books.

Forster, E. M. 1984. *A Passage to India*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Secondary Sources.

Achebe, C. 1990. *Hopes and impediments: selected essays*. New York: Doubleday.

Baldwin, D.R., Quinn, P.J. 2007. *An Anthology of Colonial and Postcolonial Short Fiction*. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Boehmer, E. 2005. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cambridge University Press

<http://www.cambridge.org/us/catalogue/catalogue.asp?isbn=9780521542524&ss=fro>

Encyclopaedia Britannica <https://www.britannica.com/biography/E-M-Forster>

Fanon, F. 1952, 1986. *Black Skins. White Masks*. London: Pluto Press.

Furbank P. N. 1977-78. *E. M. Forster: A Life*. 2 vols. London: Secker & Warburg.

Galgut, D. 2014. "EM Forster: 'But for Masood, I might never have gone to India'." *The Guardian*

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2014/aug/08/em-forster-passage-to-india-rereading>

Loomba, A. 2015. *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Maiese, M. 2013. "Dehumanization." *Beyond Intractability*. Eds. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess. Conflict Information Consortium, University of Colorado, Boulder.

<http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/dehumanization>

Megroz, R.L. 1964. *Joseph Conrad's Mind and Method. A Study of Personality in Art*. New York: Russell & Russell.

Memmi, A. 1991. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Prakash, B. 1994. *Indian Themes in English Fiction: A Socio-literary Study*. Mittal Publications.

Sandison, A. 1967. *The Wheel of Empire. A Study of the Imperial Idea in Some Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth-Century Fiction*. New York: Macmillan. St Martin Press.

Schillinger, L. 2012. "Traitor, Martyr, Liberator." *The Sunday Book Review in The New York Times*.

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/24/books/review/the-dream-of-the-celt-by-mario-vargas-llosa.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

Shmoop Editorial Team. 2008. "A Passage to India Theme of Race." *Shmoop*. Shmoop University, Inc. <http://www.shmoop.com/passage-to-india/race-theme.html>

Street, B.V. 1975. *Savage in Literature: Representations of "Primitive" Society in English Fiction, 1858-1920*. Routledge & Kegan Paul Books.

Thornton, A.P. 1985. *The Imperial Idea and Its Enemies: A Study in British Power*. St. Martin's Press Inc. New York.

Watts, C. 1983. "'A Bloody Racist': About Achebe's View of Conrad". *The Yearbook of English Studies*. 13:196-209.

Wiley, P.L. 1966. *Conrad's Measure of Man*. New York: Gordian Press Inc.