

Západočeská univerzita v Plzni

**Fakulta pedagogická
Katedra anglického jazyka**

**Bakalářská práce
Kipling a Orwell - Shody a Neshody**

Petr Komínek

Plzeň 2023

University of West Bohemia

**Faculty of Education
Department of English**

**Bachelor Thesis
Kipling and Orwell - Concurrences and Divergences**

Petr Komínek

Plzeň 2023

Prohlašuji, že jsem práci vypracoval/a samostatně s použitím uvedené literatury a zdrojů informací.

V Plzni dne.....

.....

Petr Komínek

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor, PhDr. Magdaléna Potočňáková, PhD., for the guidance and time she offered me in support of my thesis, but also for her undying enthusiasm for literature she always kindly shared with me and anyone else willing to listen and discuss.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my family and friends for their patience and unconditional support.

ABSTRACT

Komínek, Petr. University of West Bohemia. April, 2023. Kipling and Orwell - Concurrences and Divergencies.

Supervisor: PhDr. Magdaléna Potočňáková, PhD.

The subject of this undergraduate thesis is the comparison of Rudyard Kipling and George Orwell regarding their literary works concerned with the British Raj. Both authors shared a similar background in the British colonies and expressed their experiences in their writing. The thesis outlines their relationship with the imperial colonies, their approach to writing about them, examines their works focused on the topic and George Orwell's relationship with Kipling's work. It focuses on elements of imperialism and orientalism in the authors' writing, mainly their attitudes towards the native populations and women as portrayed in their works.

Keywords: George Orwell, Rudyard Kipling, imperialism, orientalism, British Raj, postcolonialism, Burmese Days, Kim

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
LIVING IN THE SHADOW OF THE EMPIRE.....	3
WAYS OF WRITING.....	10
WAYS OF READING - IMPERIALISM AND ORIENTALISM IN TEXTS INSPIRED BY THE RAJ....	15
ORWELL ON KIPLING.....	24
CONCLUSION.....	26
REFERENCES.....	28
SHRNUTÍ.....	31

INTRODUCTION

Rudyard Kipling is known today as one of the classics of English literature. His works include short stories, poems, novels, and stories for children. Many of his works also include elements that demonstrate his positive viewpoint on British imperialism and nationalism, which resulted in his reputation as an imperialist or jingoist. Eric Arthur Blair, better known under his pen-name George Orwell, is similarly recognised as one of the most prolific authors of his time, publishing nonfiction books, novels, essays and more. His work is centred around dealing with the ideas of totalitarianism and societal issues, but his earlier works were also influenced by British colonial rule and his approach to the topic of native people can be considered controversial. Albeit being separated by a time gap of close to half a century, the lives and careers of Kipling and Orwell share a number of similarities, including their upbringing and career choices. Culturally and politically ultimately stood opposed to one another in their perceived opinions on imperialism, but both Orwell and Kipling show signs of Orientalism, Western supremacy and native stereotypes.

The intrigue of this topic lies in the perceived incompatibility of the two authors. If we take into account *Kim*, arguably Kipling's key novel concerned with India, and compare it to Orwell's *Burmese Days*, the message of both is contradictory. Despite this, in the descriptive elements of the novels themselves, critics such as Edward Said, David Scott or Paul Melia point to similarities. The portrayal of the colonies in their respective bodies of literature ultimately signifies a shift caused by the worsening state of the British empire culminating in its eventual downfall, in other words, the end of British imperialism. But it also serves as a careful reminder of the humanitarian impact of the colonial era itself, even if the authors did not intend it in their own time.

This thesis is aimed at exemplifying the contrasting approach to writing about the British Raj by examining the authors' backgrounds in the colonial holdings of the British Empire, the way they expressed their experiences and the interpretation of their works concerned with these experiences in regard to the ideas of imperialism and orientalism. It takes into account the elements of the authors' lives which shaped their opinions, the correlating nature of their approach in contrast to their methods which differ, and aspects of their works directly concerned with the topic at hand which fit the definitions of imperialism and orientalism and Orwell's own attitudes towards Kipling.

The first chapter examines the authors' initial lives and later careers in the colonies as well as the instances where they revisited them in their writing later in life. The second

chapter is focused on their approach to writing and the differences and similarities in the topics and forms of literature they chose. The third chapter exemplifies specific elements of their works focused mainly on the British Raj in the context of their comparison and the broader sense of imperialism and orientalism. The last chapter describes Orwell's personal relationship with Kipling, as described in his essay dedicated to him.

LIVING IN THE SHADOW OF THE EMPIRE

The son of a curator of the Lahore Museum (located in present-day Pakistan) John Lockwood Kipling and his wife, Alice Macdonald, Kipling was born on the 30th of December 1865 in Mumbai (Stewart, 2019). Stewart also states that Kipling's father influenced his work significantly and Kipling himself reminisced fondly about his father and his employment at the museum, as presented in his famous novel *Kim*, where the Lahore Museum is directly mentioned and the curator greets the titular protagonist and his companion:

‘Welcome, then, O lama from Tibet. Here be the images, and I am here — he glanced at the lama's face — ‘to gather knowledge. Come to my office awhile.’ The old man was trembling with excitement. (Kipling, 1994)

His familial background offered Kipling connections of great importance for his later life - three of his aunts married Sir Edward Burne-Jones, a renowned painter, Sir Edward Poynter, also a painter, and Alfred Baldwin, the future father of Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin, respectively (Stewart, 2019). Even though his family had access to the highest circles of the Anglo-Indian social system, Kipling never took a more significant interest in his roots - his family historically resided in West Riding (one of the three subdivisions of Yorkshire) for more than 200 years, but Kipling himself did not feel a strong connection to Yorkshire and merely tolerated when his ties to this city were mentioned (Gilmour, 2003, p. 20). During childhood, he spent a significant portion of his time with native Indian servants, and as such his English was limited only to conversations with his parents. Kipling could be considered a typical example of an Anglo-Indian child of his period - he spoke the Hindu language fluently, because he used it to communicate with staff of the family residence, and was described as a spoiled child prone to tantrums (Gilmour, 2003, p. 23).

Eric Arthur Blair was born 38 years later than Kipling on June 25th 1903 in Motihari, India. Much like Kipling, his heritage affected his upbringing. The Blair family has at this time been long established in the imperial Indian society, but by the time of his birth has lost most of its fortune and prestige - as Taylor (2015, p. 25) lays down in his biography of Orwell, the Blair family profited from the opium trade, but the family influence did not last, and Orwell's father worked as an official in the civil service in the department of the opium trade. As Woodcock (1999) points out, Orwell viewed their social status as that of “the landless gentry”, essentially implying a higher social standing with little connection to the material situation of the family - “impoverished snobbery”. This proved to have a long-lasting effect on Orwell's life and career, as he struggled with the label of an upper-middle-class

writer. In this sense, Orwell's upbringing and familial background share similarities with Kipling, but Kipling's initial social status could be considered more prestigious. His family also lacked the material potential Kipling was provided, and they likewise lacked the connections in social circles Kipling could take advantage of.

After living in India from his birth up until the fifth year of his life, Kipling spent roughly ten years of his life in England, along with his younger sister (Gilmour, 2003, p. 24). According to Gilmour, he spent this time in a British boarding school, and during this time, was separated from his parents - he did not see his mother for about five years, and his father for nearly seven. "Exiling" children to England was common practice in British India, and the broadly accepted reason for this practice was that the Indian climate was not suitable for young children, but Kipling himself later in life suggested that there were most likely other reasons for this, such as raising the children in their "real home" in England and teaching them proper British Victorian manners and habits (Gilmour, 2003, p. 24). Both Gilmour and Stewart (2019) point out that Kipling often mentioned the Lorne Lodge boarding house in his memoirs as a house of desolation, and indirectly expressed that he felt left behind and betrayed by his parents in his story *Baa, Baa, Black Sheep* when the main character returns to his mother, yet remains distressed and distrustful:

There! Told you so,' says Punch. 'It's all different now, and we are just as much Mother's as if she had never gone.'

Not altogether, O Punch, for when young lips have drunk deep of the bitter waters of Hate, Suspicion, and Despair, all the Love in the world will not wholly take away that knowledge; though it may turn darkened eyes for a while to the light, and teach Faith where no Faith was. (Kipling, 2022c)

This story directly reflects his time in England, and although his feelings of abandonment might have been exaggerated, it can be concluded that this experience left a long-lasting sense of unjustness in Kipling.

Similarly to Kipling, Orwell was sent to Britain for education as well. In 1911, he started at the St Cyphrian's school in Eastbourne. He revisits the school in his essay *Such, Such Were the Joys*, and much like Kipling, he expresses his negative experience, focusing on the harsh realities of separation from his family and the conditions in the school:

Nowadays, I believe, bed-wetting in such circumstances is taken for granted. It is a normal reaction in children who have been removed from their homes to a strange

place. In those days, however, it was looked on as a disgusting crime that the child committed on purpose and for which the proper cure was a beating. (Orwell et al., 1968)

Taylor (2015) proposes a certain amount of exaggeration in Orwell's horrific account of St Cyprian's School, citing accounts of other pupils, which are generally more positive, and states that the resentment may have been fuelled by Orwell's sensitivity (p. 43). It is easy to see the similarities in the emotionality of *Baa Baa, Black Sheep* and *Such, Such Were the Joys*, and the degree of objectivity is questionable with both of these accounts. Naturally, as is the case with Kipling, the effect of Orwell's time in St Cyprian's was significant. Taylor and Woodcock (1999) both describe Orwell as an introverted, withdrawn, yet an intellectually gifted boy.

According to Gilmour (2003), Kipling's family could not afford to support him in his studies at a university, and their financial situation made his further stay in England impossible. resulting in an ultimate decision to return to his family in India (p. 30). In this regard, Orwell was more successful and moved on to study first at Wellington and later at Eton College - Taylor (2015) points out Orwell's later denouncement of Eton, exemplified by Orwell's own descriptions of himself for referencing, where he often argues that during his studies, he did not learn much and did not feel a sense of progress (p. 52) . He could to some extent be considered advantaged in comparison to Kipling due to his classical education, despite the fact that did not graduate from Eton and ultimately made the decision to move on to a career instead of further studies. Nevertheless, it is during this time Orwell started publishing, mainly in school periodicals (Woodcock, 1999).

After reuniting with his family in India, Kipling began a career as a journalist in Lahore - his official occupational title was assistant editor of *The Civil and Military Gazette*, and his responsibilities included mostly proofreading and editing articles or gathering news and topics to publish, on rare occasions, he was allowed to write reviews and editorial notes. This allowed Kipling to gain a sense for literature, even though his supervisor, Stephen Wheeler, did not appreciate Kipling's prowess and enthusiasm for writing himself. The roots of Kipling's later alleged bigotry start coming to light when examining this part of his life. It is around this time he concluded that the Indian population needs strong, British leadership (Gilmour, 2003, p. 40). Eventually, *The Gazette* allowed him to publish some of his early poems and short stories, as well as articles relating to the politics and economy of the region. After Wheeler left *The Gazette*, he was replaced by Edward Kay Robinson and Kipling's freedom in publishing became greater. It is worth noting that it was Robinson who

encouraged Kipling to move back to Britain, recognizing his talent and potential (Gilmour, 2003, p. 44). Around this period of his life, most of his early short stories and poems were written and published, including *The City of Dreadful Night or Plain Tales from the Hills*. A significant portion of his early works was also published as a part of Wheeler's Indian Railway Library series, a collection of books intended as accessible literature sold at Indian railway stations - this publishing venture gained Kipling a great deal of attention. Similarly to Orwell, his standing in Anglo-Indian society was complicated, as was his relationship with the imperial system itself. It seems likely that he grew disillusioned with the local figures of authority and members of clubs, whom he found uninteresting. Kipling also used his position in *The Gazette* to attack the Viceroy Lord Ripon in poems published in the paper. This was in reaction to Ripon's proposed policies, which were intended to extend Indian participation in the establishment. Upon the viceroy's resignation, Kipling only increased his ferocity and went as far as publishing a poem titled *Lord Ripon's Reverie*, mocking the viceroy and celebrating his departure:

I shall leave it in a little - leave it ere my term has run.

Of the millions that I govern, who will wish me back? Not one. (Kipling, 2021a)

Orwell's return to the colonies after leaving College was different in its execution. As Taylor (2015) mentions, his parents came to Britain to retire, and thus the Blair family ties to Burma have been severed (p. 27). Orwell instead chose to return to Burma in a professional capacity and joined the India Police at the age of 19. Taylor also states that Orwell passed the entry exam with exceptional marks and did well in his training course, especially regarding the Burmese and Hindu languages (p. 74). He was perceived as an eccentric, reclusive person by his peers in Anglo-Indian society (Taylor, p. 84). Unfortunately, Orwell's initial career choice resulted in an intermission of his work as a writer. Unlike Kipling, he did not produce or publish during his career in the colonies. Taylor does mention letters written to Orwell's childhood friend, Jacintha Buddicom, where he expresses his dissatisfaction with Burma and documentation of the India Police concerning Orwell's career and whereabouts - unfortunately, the letters did not survive and were later described by Buddicom herself as "a lament along the lines of 'You could never understand how awful it is if you hadn't been here'" (p. 81). Despite this, many elements of *Burmese Days* can be traced back to his career as a policeman. In Burma, Orwell was assigned mostly officer duties, and his initial postings during the probation period mostly entailed commanding police units in remote areas of the British holdings. This changed in 1924 when his probation period ended, and he was promoted to Assistant District Superintendent in Syriam. Syriam's proximity to the Burmese

capital was one of the main benefits of this promotion, as it allowed Orwell access to Western amenities and society. Much of his later career was spent in an official capacity in the regions surrounding Rangoon. Both Taylor and Woodcock mention Orwell as an initially very effective imperial official, but a reclusive and eccentric person at the same time. Based on his later descriptions of his time in Burma, especially, *Shooting an Elephant*, it can be deduced his dissatisfaction expressed in letters to Jacintha Buddicom only grew over time. In 1927, Orwell, while on medical leave from his posting, ultimately decided to resign from the India Police, and did so in July of that year (Taylor, 2015, p. 88, 99).

In 1889, at the age of 23, Kipling returned to Britain. In doing so, he discovered a joy for travelling and a passion for parts of Asia other than India - most notably Burma and Japan (Scott, 2011, p. 315). Travel would ultimately become one of the main sources of his inspiration and many of his works, including propagandistic poems celebrating the Royal Navy, or *From Sea to Sea*, a collection of articles that were inspired by his voyages, including his initial journeys through other parts of colonial Asia (Burma) or Japan. This episode of his life, however, also seems to have sparked some of his contempt for certain nationalities, which would also affect his views and literary work. A good example of this would be a series of his articles on the American people, where he candidly expressed his idea of them being greedy and corrupt, an opinion he formed even before reaching the US himself (Gilmour 2003, p. 101-102), or Kipling's description of the Chinese in *From Sea to Sea*: "I had taken one fair look at the city from the steamer, and threw up my cards. "I can't describe this place, and besides, I hate Chinamen." (Kipling, 2010, p. 283). Kipling himself most likely considered his relocation back to England as "the official start of his literary career" - after moving into a flat in London, he quickly rose to prominence, being already known for the stories published in the Indian Railway Series (Gilmour 2003, p. 103). During this period of his life, he published his first novels - *The Light That Failed* and *The Nalauhka*, both tied to India, the latter one in collaboration with the brother of his future wife, Caroline Balestier. The pair married in 1892 and eventually had one child, a son named John Kipling.

Orwell's colonial career had an almost exact opposite effect on his literary career, and caused a complete hiatus in his writing - Orwell's main focus decisively shifted towards becoming a writer only after returning back to Europe and leaving the India Police, which effectively means that the era of Kipling's latest publishing overlaps the time period of Orwell's first major published books. During the 1930s, his work consisted of both expressing his experiences from Burma and shifting towards works concerned with societal issues, a theme relatively unparalleled in Kipling's work. Taylor (2015) describes *Burmese Days* as a

commentary on imperialism and its negatives, but also as an attempt by Orwell to channel out the effect Burma had on him personally (p. 81). Politically, this part of his life is a turning point for Orwell as well. Soon after his return from Burma, Orwell declared himself an anarchist, and in order to gather material for his future writings, he commenced a series of excursions into the midst of the poorest classes, which would eventually gather enough material for his first books (Woodcock, 1999). He would go on to publish several novels and nonfiction books by the start of World War II, however only one of them - *Burmese Days* - was directly influenced by his time in Burma. Woodcock also points out the decision to change his political label once again, from an anarchist to a socialist, but it is important to keep in mind that he never took the imaginary next step of declaring himself a communist. From this point on, the ideas of anarchism and socialism place Orwell on a completely different sphere of the political spectrum in comparison to the relatively conservative Kipling.

After spending some time in the US, specifically, Vermont, where they moved in 1892 and settled on Mrs Kipling's estate, the Kiplings eventually returned to England in 1896. According to Gilmour (2003), it is reasonable to deduce that the motivation for their return came from the place of unwillingness to adapt to life in the US due to Kipling's conservative tendencies, but most likely even more so from the place of international tensions between the US and England, along with the US political climate of this period (p.126). Despite these complications, one of Kipling's most famous works closely tied to India was written during his American years - *The Jungle Book*. In 1902, Kipling eventually acquired a house in Sussex, which would remain his home for the rest of his life, and the region of Sussex became an influence for much of his later work (Stewart, 2019). At this time, it would seem, his nationalistic views have been fully formed and cemented - as Stewart further mentions that after leaving the US, Kipling continued to treat Americans with disdain, similarly to the French - aside from them, he believed that only "lesser breeds" are born beyond the English Channel, as suggested in one of his most controversial poems, *Recessional* (Kipling, 2022b, par. 4). Stewart suggests that his imperialistic views might have also been influenced by his frequent visits to South Africa. where he was given a house by Cecil Rhodes, a South African politician in the diamond business.

It is easily deduced that the year 1907 would mark a pivotal event in Kipling's life, as this year brought his nomination and the awarding of his Nobel Prize for literature. The Nobel Foundation's official webpage states that the 1907 Nobel Prize for literature was awarded to him "in consideration of the power of observation, originality of imagination, virility of ideas and remarkable talent for narration which characterize the creations of this world-famous

author". It would be safe to assume that this is the point of his life where his popularity peaked. Gilmour (2003) describes this part of Kipling's life leading up to the Great War as an era of both a great public interest in his person and a significant influence from his perspective, and he was still very active in politics (p. 220-234). Upon the outbreak of the Great War, his tenacity only increased, and Kipling shifted his focus and efforts towards propagating the British war effort and supporting the troops, which ties jingoism into his imperialist narrative. Aside from his renewed journalistic fervour, the war also brought a personal blow to Kipling himself when the war claimed his son as a casualty. Even though both Kipling and his wife were fully aware of their son's physical shortcomings, they anticipated John to join the military, and after he failed to be accepted into the Royal Navy, Kipling himself arranged through his connections for him to be drafted into the army (Gilmour, 2003, p. 257-258). Nevertheless, his son's demise was a longtime source of great pain for Kipling, which he channelled into his writing.

In the years after the great war, Kipling kept writing, but his popularity and renown slowly declined due to his image as an imperialist/jingoist - by this point in his life he also mostly withdrew from the public eye (Stewart, 2019). Rudyard Kipling died on January 18, 1936, aged 70. George Orwell published a short article responding to his demise in *The New English Week* paper, in part paying tribute to him and in part criticising his imperialist outlook and his writing (Orwell, 1968a, p. 159-160).

In comparison to Kipling's military-focused journalism, Orwell's experience in war was firsthand. By the time of his service in the Spanish Civil War, his books had already gathered recognition. He joined the Republican side of the conflict, which was a splintered faction including many leftist elements (Taylor, 2015, p. 115, 215). After returning from Spain, Orwell kept steadily working, publishing and writing. He was rejected from service in World War II and headed the Indian branch of BBC (Taylor, 2015, p. 320). The position at BBC did not satisfy him, however, and he eventually joined the editorial staff of *The Tribune*, a left-wing socialist newspaper (Taylor, 2015, p. 341). There, he had the opportunity to address the issue of imperialism on a more theoretical level, as opposed to prose. The 1940s can be considered Orwell's journalistic prime, and many of his best articles, essays and reviews were written in this period (including his long-running series of articles *As I Please*, where he often discussed his opinions and views, also published in *The Tribune*). Orwell's writing kept a steady pace until his death of tuberculosis in 1950.

WAYS OF WRITING

Both authors, Orwell and Kipling, were very active writers and started writing early on in their lives. This is one of the points of similarity between them, but they differ in the frequency and methods used when expressing themselves.

If we take a look at his bibliography (for example at the website of the Kipling Society, assembled by William Duhigg based on David Alan Richard's bibliography of Kipling), it can be established that in Kipling's case, his favoured forms of fiction are short stories, of which a significant portion was re-released in collections over the years, after first being published in periodicals, often chapter by chapter. Kipling's tales were always influenced by his own life, his surroundings and his experiences, naturally - India, or at the very least, the Central Asian region, is present throughout much of them. Perhaps his most famous collection of stories for children, *The Jungle Book*, refers to India directly on multiple occasions, for example when mentioning the city of Seoni (Seeonee) in the story Mowgli's Brothers, one of the first stories in the series to be written (Slater, 2007). John Slater, of the Kipling Society, notes Seoni and several other real locations and landmarks, including the Waingunga River or the Oodeypore palace, as the general setting Kipling used for the stories, but as Gilmour (2003) mentions, *The Jungle Book* was not written in India but in the USA (p. 120). In all likelihood, the setting for the stories was conceived in part from Kipling's knowledge with the aid of research. However, the fondness of imperial India perceived in his writing is often affected by his views, and the general tone of his storytelling comes across as unbalanced when his imperialist opinions come to light. For example, in *The Bridge-Builders*, the quality and advanced design of a bridge built by white men over the Ganges allows it to withstand a great flood - however, the engineer responsible for the building is given opium after getting injured and hallucinates "the old gods" of India, and upon seeing them, realizes that even though the bridge and its survival offended them, it does not matter in the grand scheme of history (Kipling, 2023). The ostentatious manner in which the Western qualities defy the perceived deities is hardly not noticeable. The mention of opium is also interesting, as Gilmour (2003) mentions Kipling's fondness for the drug (p. 35).

In terms of Kipling's social descriptions of India, one of the most in-depth and colourful portrayals is without a doubt his novel *Kim*. The plot is set in Lahore, Kipling's home for much of his early life, and the character of the Lahore museum curator is almost certainly based on his father, but it is also concerned with a real historical event, the great game, taking place concurrently with the main character's journey (Kipling, 1994). In his introduction to *Kim*, Keskar (2021) of the Kipling Society also points out the similarities

between Kipling and *Kim*: “It is significant that Kim, like Kipling, was born in 1865,...”. Freemasonry is also a part of Kipling’s life that is mentioned as an underlying sub-theme in *Kim* - it can be established that in all likelihood he indeed was a freemason, and this is confirmed by the United Grand Lodge of England themselves on their webpage (United Grand Lodge of England, 2023).

In comparison to Kipling, Orwell’s prosaic work concerned with Burma and the Empire is much more limited, as Kipling stuck to the theme of imperial India for much of his life, but Orwell eventually shifted towards more socially aimed writing, and based on his accounts of his time in Burma denounced imperialism altogether. His only novel (a form of literature Orwell is primarily recognised for today) concerned primarily with Burma is the *Burmese Days*. Published in 1934, it conveys the story of a merchant living in 1920s British Burma, and similarly to *Kim* mimics Orwell’s own life experiences in the setting of the colonies. *Burmese Days* alludes to a location factually fictional, but similar to the one Orwell himself lived in when he was a part of the Indian Police in Upper Burma, and the protagonist’s life in the Anglo-Burmese society also closely resembles Orwell’s own. Melia (2015) mentions Orwell’s episodes of hop-picking and tramping, which he used in his writings, instead of simply collecting a second-hand account of actual hop-pickers and tramps (p. 15). Similarly, Orwell utilised his personal experience as a policeman in Burma, where he became a part of the system he later chose to portray in his prose concerned with this topic. In terms of shorter works concerned with his stay in Burma, Orwell wrote just two essays, titled *A Hanging* and *Shooting an Elephant*, which are told from Orwell’s point of view and are strictly biographical in nature. *A Hanging* describes the execution of prisoners witnessed by Orwell in Burma, and *Shooting an Elephant* tells the incident in which Orwell was forced to put down an elephant causing problems for the local Burmese (Orwell, 1968a, p. 44-49, 235-242). In these essays, Orwell also expresses his opinions of the local population, especially in *Shooting an Elephant*, and expresses the increasing discomfort he feels in his position.

An element of Orwell’s work that is unparalleled in Kipling’s is his “poverty-era-inspired” literature, which includes *Down and Out in Paris and London* and *The Road to Wigan Pier*. Woodcock (1999) describes *The Road to Wigan Pier* as Orwell’s first truly socialist work. His later novels, *A Clergyman’s Daughter* and *Keep the Aspidochelone Flying*, published in the two years following *Burmese Days*, signify and solidify a shift in Orwell’s target topics, and he strays further from the themes he shares with Kipling, abandoning Burma altogether. On the opposite side, Kipling’s work encompasses works

intended for children, with the overarching theme of India, *The Jungle Books* and *Just So Stories*, a type of work with no counterpart in Orwell's writing.

In terms of non-fiction, both authors were very active. An important medium for both Kipling and Orwell was the press. It is to be expected that Kipling crafted many articles and poems for publishing in *The Gazette* and *The Pioneer* during his era of imperial journalism, and would often use them to engage in the Anglo-Indian society, as was the case with the aforementioned *Lord Ripon's Reverie* (Kipling, 2021a). Similarly, Orwell was very active in journalism and published many articles and literary reviews (Orwell, 1968a). Upon leaving the BBC and joining *The Tribune*, he also published a long-running series of columns titled *As I Please*, which included 80 columns concerned with various topics (Orwell, 1968b). This series allowed Orwell relative freedom concerning topics, and he used it for expressing his views on various subjects, especially politics, but also allowed him to occasionally revisit the topic of Burma: "Nearly a quarter of a century ago I was travelling on a liner to Burma. Though not a big ship, it was a comfortable and even a luxurious one, and when one was not asleep or playing deck games one usually seemed to be eating." (Orwell, 1968b, p. 290).

Many of Kipling's later articles were war-related, which provides yet another analogy between him and Orwell. Reporting on the Great War, his war-related prose was not limited to articles - *The Irish Guards in the Great War*, a two-volume history of the Irish Guards regiment (the regiment in which Kipling's son served during the war) can be considered the pinnacle of his war-related prose, and its conception was likely motivated by the passing of his son. Orwell, who was personally involved in a different conflict, the Spanish Civil War, also reported on it, most notably in his article titled *Spilling the Spanish Beans*, where he tackles the misinformation regarding the war and attempts to explain the realities of the Spanish political situation and determine the outcome of the war (Orwell, 1968a, p. 269-276). For the most part, he remains grounded, and despite naturally siding with one party of the conflict, does not show more severe signs of nationalism or jingoism (Orwell 1968a, p. 269-276). Orwell's service in this conflict resulted in the publishing of *Homage to Catalonia* in 1938, which, although initially unsuccessful, was eventually rediscovered after his death and the success of his later novels (Buchanan, 2002). The difference in the approach to the topic of the army and the war is notably Kipling's detachment from the topic, as noted by Orwell in his essay dedicated to the topic of Rudyard Kipling, where he comments on his portrayal of the army in his *Backroom Ballads*:

If anything, Kipling overdoes the horrors, for the wars of his youth were hardly wars at all by our standards. Perhaps that is due to the neurotic strain in him, the hunger for

cruelty. But at least he knows that men ordered to attack impossible objectives are dismayed, and also that fourpence a day is not a generous pension. (Orwell et al., 1968, p. 133),

and goes on to explain that the image of a mercenary army in the colonies as described by Kipling may be truthful, but Kipling's alleged insensitiveness to the topic results in an excessively pro-militaristic tone - in essence, a trait of jingoism. This would mark the main difference between Kipling's and Orwell's approach to the military and nationalism. Orwell initially represents cautious pacifism, but ultimately moves on to rejection of pacifism due to World War II (Orwell et al., 1968, p. 157-158). Kipling's tendency to portray the military in a heroic manner was always strong:

For it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' 'Chuck him out, the brute!
But it's 'Saviour of 'is country' when the guns begin to shoot;
An' it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' anything you please;
An' Tommy ain't a bloomin' fool - you bet that Tommy sees! (Kipling, 2021c, par. 5)
as can be seen here, when he defends the common British soldier as a noble "saviour of his country".

Kipling's strength is undoubtedly not only in prose but also in poetry. The poems were written by Kipling number more than eight hundred, and apart from several poetry books and collections, he also published them individually in periodicals. His poems were based on many themes - his emotions and current events in his life, but also, more importantly, his political ideas - he often used poetry to provoke and comment on politics. Probably the best-known (in both the positive and the negative sense of the word) poem by Kipling is *The White Man's Burden*, which represents a part of his poetry work that could be considered propagandistic, and is a staple of discussions regarding Kipling's stances and attitudes because it emphasizes the idea of superior white saviours and savage natives. The poem is written as a rallying cry aimed at the Western population, which is supposed to subdue and supervise the native populations of colonies, and in this way help them (Kipling, 2022a). However, in the very same poem, Kipling demonizes the native population which is supposed to be aided, describing them as "Your new-caught sullen peoples, Half devil and half child...". This same quote was used by Scott (2021) in pointing out Kipling's racist attitudes (p. 306).

In contrast to Kipling, Orwell's work was much more prose-oriented, but interestingly, his first work published was a poem titled *Awake! Young Men of England*. First published in

1914 under Orwell's real name, its copy is archived by the British Library. The poem is an enthusiastic call to arms, intended to motivate British men to serve in the army, and it contains nationalistic motives (Blair, 1914). The tone of the poem is reminiscent of *The White Man's Burden* in its urgency and sense of pride.

WAYS OF READING - IMPERIALISM AND ORIENTALISM IN TEXTS INSPIRED BY THE RAJ

As evident, a significant portion of Kipling's work is tied in one way or another to the topic of British pride and imperialism, but perhaps most notably the British Empire's presence in India. According to Said (1994), *Kim* is an especially important piece of work for British literature, but also for Kipling himself, as it can be considered his highest-quality novel (p.132). Aside from *Kim*, Kipling had some difficulties when writing novels. The resemblance he shares with the titular character also foreshadows his view of a naturally imperial India, or, as Said puts it, "... Kipling assumes an uncontested empire." (Said, 1994, p. 134). It is evident from *Kim* that Kipling is of the opinion that the relationship between the natives and their imperial rulers is natural. An analogy to this can be carefully observed in the relationship between the lead duo of the novel - the Buddhist lama and the titular character of Kim. Even though the lama is an honourable and respectable character in his own right, Kim is the main driving force behind the plot, and the lama is mostly giving advice and is reduced to a semi-supporting role. This dynamic can be exemplified on many occasions throughout the novel, for example when the protagonists encounter a military detachment:

"Now," said Kim, picking his teeth, "we will return to that place; but thou, O Holy One, must wait a little way off, because thy feet are heavier than mine and I am anxious to see more of that Red Bull."

"But how canst thou understand the talk? Walk slowly. The road is dark," the lama replied uneasily.

Kim put the question aside. "I marked a place near to the trees," said he, "where thou canst sit till I call. Nay," as the lama made some sort of protest, "remember this is my Search—the Search for my Red Bull. The sign in the Stars was not for thee. I know a little of the customs of white soldiers, and I always desire to see some new things...", (Kipling, 1994, p. 69)

It seems strange that a child orphan would guide an adult, but the general atmosphere of *Kim* implies a reality similar to this mutual utility, a symbiosis between the imperial system and the native culture. In parallel, Kim begins working as a British agent in the Great Game and at the same time undergoes a philosophical journey. Also worth noting is Kipling's tendency to portray the military and British intelligence, which goes hand in hand with the imperialist narrative, in a more direct sense - the embodiment of this is the character of Colonel Creighton, who uses Kim as a spy with little regard for his safety. (Kipling, 1994)

An even stronger instance of the “native reliance” narrative is, of course, the infamous *White Man’s Burden*, but in this case, the relationship between the native element and their British counterparts is transparent:

Take up the White Man's burden -
And reap his old reward,
The blame of those ye better,
The hate of those ye guard - ... (Kipling, 2022a, par. 5)

Essentially stating the native population needs guidance, but actively refuses and hinders it - “... The hate of those ye guard ...”, which is then reinforced in a biblical metaphor: “Why brought ye us from bondage, Our loved Egyptian night?”, alluding to the Jews lamenting Moses for giving them freedom. *The White Man’s Burden* is unique in its degree of directness - what is described allegorically in *Kim* through the almost symbiotic relationship between *Kim* and the lama, *The White Man’s Burden* explicitly states. As such, it can be considered the best instance of Kipling’s expression of pro-imperialism. It describes his belief that for the betterment of the colonised nations, the presence of the “white man” is detrimental. The main issue of this poem is in its perceived extremity - it describes the native people as savages in a straightforward manner and emphasizes the nobility on behalf of the white colonisers. This is mostly unparalleled in Kipling’s prose, which at times alludes to these ideas, and could be considered potentially more dangerous - it emphasizes the idea that first and foremost, the colonisation process is not suppression and control, but rather a process of aiding the natives, in a humanitarian fashion.

In contrast to Kipling’s idea of a strong, untouchable empire, Orwell most likely viewed the British presence in Burma as temporary and probably anticipated the imperial system’s downfall - this can be safely established by the 1940s at the latest, based for example on his essay *Pacifism and the War* from 1942, where he openly denounces imperialism and suggest that *Burmese Days* predicted the future:

Mr Woodcock tries to discredit me by saying that (a) I once served in the Indian Imperial Police, ... With regard to (a), it is quite true that I served five years in the Indian Police. It is also true that I gave up that job, partly because it didn't suit me but mainly because I would not any longer be a servant of imperialism. I am against imperialism because I know something about it from the inside. The whole history of this is to be found in my writings, including a novel which I think I can claim was a kind of prophecy of what happened this year in Burma,... (Orwell et al., 1968, p. 159)

In this statement, he implies this stance is represented by *Burmese Days*, but he strongly hinted at this more directly in *Shooting an Elephant*: “I did not even know that the British Empire is dying, still, less did I know that it is a great deal better than the younger empires that are going to supplant it.” (Orwell, 1968a, p. 236). Based on these clues, it is logical to assume that Orwell never held fully imperialist opinions - the shift of opinion he underwent in Burma probably meant abandoning socialistic optimism and embracing anti-imperialism. Orwell’s relationship with the imperial colonies is objectively a complex one, especially earlier on in his career. In his first work concerned with Burma, *A Hanging*, Orwell describes an execution of an Indian convict in gruesome detail, yet it is clear he recognizes the morality of the situation:

“I had never realised what it means to destroy a healthy, conscious man. When I saw the prisoner step aside to avoid the puddle, I saw the mystery, the unspeakable wrongness, of cutting a life short when it is in full tide.” (Orwell, 1968a, p. 45)

However, *Burmese Days*, for example, is not completely convincing evidence that Orwell thought of the native population very kindly, or even considered the colonial rule completely wrong, even if he was sure of its temporality. In the *Burmese Days*, the general character of the native population evokes the image of a disorganized mass, and as Melia (2015) points out, the British characters tend to be portrayed in a different, more positive light. In terms of this dynamic, the relationship between the male lead and his mistress/prostitute is worth examining - it almost metaphorically alludes to the “native-dependency” tone which can be recognised in Kipling’s works. Initially, Flory is in a relationship of sorts with a Burmese prostitute, Ma Hla May, whom he in fact “purchased”: “He had bought her from her parents two years ago, for three hundred rupees.” (Orwell, 2014, p. 52). Their relationship is also described in a very controversial manner, as Ma Hla May is generally portrayed as being submissive in her relationship with Flory and openly states that she prefers white men:

“Master, I love you, I love you more than anything in the world. Why do you say that? Have I not always been faithful to you?”

“You have a Burmese lover.”

“Ugh!” Ma Hla May affected to shudder at the thought. “To think of their horrible brown hands, touching me! I should die if a Burman touched me!” (Orwell, 2014, p. 53)

Flory continues to command and mistreat Ma Hla May, until he becomes infatuated with a British girl arriving in Burma, he decides to terminate his relationship with Ma Hla May, insulting her and denying he knows her:

“Go away this instant. If you make any trouble I will afterwards take a bamboo and beat you till not one of your ribs is whole.”

Ma Hla May hesitated, shrugged her small shoulders and disappeared. And the other, gazing after her, said curiously:

“Was that a man or a woman?”

“A woman,” he said. “One of the servants’ wives, I believe. She came to ask about the laundry, that was all.” (Orwell, 2014, p. 89)

This results in her ostracization from the native community and the eventual scheme to tarnish Flory’s reputation, due to her inability to support herself without him, underlining her dependence on Flory. This is especially concerning, considering Flory could be considered one of the typical Orwell protagonists - a sensitive one, at the mercy of the system he is a part of - but mistreats a native woman.

The plot to discredit Flory is conceived by the main antagonist of the novel, a corrupt, local magistrate U Po Kyin, another representative of the native population. Regarding this particular character, Orwell’s socialist views can be observed coming to light, as the sensitive protagonist is pitted against a wealthy local figure of power. This is not unusual in Orwell’s works, but in this instance, the antagonist is also a native, and his portrayal is almost exclusively negative.

Rather interestingly, a character who also plays well in the narrative of a British-dependent native population is Dr Verawami, whom Melia (2015, p. 17) labels as “scarcely plausible”, and who throughout the novel is an advocate of the British presence in Burma. It is especially worth noting that he is not a British character, but rather a citizen of the British Raj. But paradoxically, he is portrayed positively - as Flory’s closest friend, he is trying to honestly better the situation, but is also ultimately sidelined by the main Burmese antagonist. A parallel could be drawn between the narrative of Kipling - a well-meaning imperialist defeated by an evil native.

A still negative general picture of the native people is portrayed in *Shooting an Elephant*, where Orwell himself is the protagonist, and where the natives are described as

mischievous people mostly hindering his work. It could even be argued that Orwell conveys a certain hopelessness from his point of view, in that one of his main objectives is to not be ridiculed by the local population in his position as a police officer: “In the end the sneering yellow faces of young men that met me everywhere, the insults hooted after me when I was at a safe distance, got badly on my nerves.” (Orwell, 1968a, p. 236). As *Shooting an Elephant* was written and published later than *Burmese Days*, this description of Burmese signifies a shift in Orwell’s attitude, not mainly in terms of his views on the native people themselves, but in terms of his relationship with the system he was a part of. Orwell’s feeling of helplessness in front of the crowds (who, in the essay, play a general role of a collective, deuteragonist mass) is a representation of his disillusionment with the imperial system in place in Burma: “All I knew was that I was stuck between my hatred of the empire I served and my rage against the evil-spirited little beasts who tried to make my job impossible.” (Orwell, 1968a, p. 236), or as Melia (2015) states: “The aspect of *Shooting an Elephant* that most clearly indicates disillusion with both the idea of the empire and the narrator’s role (as a policeman) within it is his resignation in front of the crowds.” (p. 16) But despite feeling a certain amount of resentment towards them, Orwell also describes feelings of sympathy for the natives, stating his understanding of their contempt for the British in the region: “Theoretically – and secretly, of course – I was all for the Burmese and all against their oppressors, the British.” (Orwell, 1968a, p. 236). The problem lies in the execution of the story, where Orwell essentially submits to the unspoken demand of the crowd and shoots the animal, which results in the idea that the native crowd pushed him to act, and the narrative shifts towards Kipling’s viewpoint of natives resistant to change and order. Melia points out that the metaphor can be perceived as the Burmese forcing Orwell to execute authority, killing the animal for the Burmese to tear its body apart, or as he states: “The painfully long process of the elephant’s death symbolizes its significance and reinforces how mistaken the crowd’s wish was. that they have destroyed what is best about their country...” (p. 17).

This is related to another aspect of the author’s experiences in the colonies which was already mentioned - both of them gained and used their observations differently. In this sense, Orwell is a remarkably empiristic author. His stories based on his account of Burma are either directly autobiographical (*Shooting an Elephant*) or mimic an environment similar to the one he knew (*Burmese Days*). In this regard, Kipling’s writing is more inventive. In *Kim*, for example, the autobiographical elements surface from time to time, such as similarities between Kipling and Kim, or the museum curator character based on Kipling’s father. But the main plot is set up based on a real historical event for which Kipling invented new, artificial elements for the sake of storytelling, as exemplified by the British spy service Kim joins.

There is no historical evidence suggesting that such an organization ever existed. A similar point can be made concerning cultural elements, which to some extent are realistic. But as Said (1994) mentions, the aspects of Buddhist imagery in *Kim* can be considered “mumbo-jumbo” for the sake of storytelling - the journey Kim undertakes along with the lama culminates in a moment of “spiritual enlightenment”, which, when confronted with realistic aspects of Buddhism, seems rather naive and laic in execution. Gilmour (2003) mentioned that Kipling denounced the Indian religion very early in his life, considering it the source of most of India’s societal problems (p. 73). This can be further visualised in the aforementioned story *The Bridge Builders* - as mentioned by John Radcliffe (2009) of the Kipling Society in the specific case of India, Kipling believed that “India will still be India” and that “the old gods will still be there”, implying that he felt certain futility in trying to further the Indian society. In his article, Scott followed up on Said when he pointed out that the Buddhist imagery is also utilized by Kipling as a tool to add an exotic element to *Kim*:

As to the role of such religious elements, Said argued that Kipling was not so much interested in religion for its own sake, but merely used such religious material in *Kim* to add "local colour" and "exotic detail" to a general Orientalist narrative. (Scott, 2011, p. 303)

The term Orientalism has been widely used in connection with Kipling and Said himself (1994) points to *Kim* as a typical example of Orientalism in literature (p. 132-162). Even though admitting that Kipling did make generalisations about “the Orient”, Scott (2011) also mentions Kipling’s later, travel-oriented works and describes his journey through Asia and the way he was “enchanted” by Burma or Japan, suggesting that the image of an Orientalist as proposed by Said may be flawed (p. 305). Kipling showed signs of a deeper understanding of the local culture in addition to his general support for colonial rule. This enchantment can be well-visualised in the way he describes the Burmese women, for example in his short story *Georgie Porgie*: “When all our troops are back from Burma there will be a proverb in their mouths, ‘As thrifty as a Burmese wife,’ and pretty English ladies will wonder what in the world it means.” (Kipling, 2021b) or his collection *From Sea to Sea*: “Seriously, the Burmese girls are very pretty, and when I saw them I understood much that I had heard about—about our army in Flanders let us say.” (Kipling, 2010, p. 206). Dismissing Kipling’s relationship with Burma as a simple matter of fancying Burmese women would not be accurate - *From Sea to Sea* includes numerous encounters with Kipling and the local culture, and Kipling’s willingness to appreciate it on these occasions, expressing appreciation of Burmese architecture:

At this point I stayed, because there was a beautiful archway of Burmese build, and adorned with a Chinese inscription, directly in front of me, and I conceived foolishly that I should find nothing more pleasant to look at if I went farther. (Kipling, 2010, p. 210),

or showing respect towards Buddhism practitioners in Burma:

I did not pray - I swore at myself for being a Globe-trotter and wished that I had enough Burmese to explain to these ladies that I was sorry and would have taken off my hat but for the sun. A Globe-trotter is a brute. I had the grace to blush as I tramped round the pagoda. (Kipling, 2010, p. 217)

Overall, Kipling does not completely fit Said's original definition of Orientalism, but his works do contain elements of exoticization and generalizations about the British colonial holdings and their citizens. Often ironically using the term "Oriental" itself, *Kim* alone contains examples of mocking the natives' alleged slowness: "Dynamite was milky and innocuous beside that report of C25; and even an Oriental, with an Oriental's views of the value of time, could see that the sooner it was in the proper hands the better." (Kipling, 1994, p. 16),

Swiftly - as Orientals understand speed - with long explanations, with abuse and windy talk, carelessly, amid a hundred checks for little things forgotten, the untidy camp broke up and led the half-dozen stiff and fretful horses along the Kalka road in the fresh of the rain-swept dawn. (Kipling, 1994, p. 119),

A quote used by Scott in his own work paints the natives as liars: Kim could lie like an Oriental. (Kipling, 1994, 17). In *Georgie Porgie*, the titular character's friend assumes all natives are inept like Georgie's maid, Georgina: "He had seen enough of Georgina in the old times to know that explanations would be useless. You cannot explain things to the Oriental. You must show." (Kipling, 2021b). The infamous depiction of native people in *The White Man's Burden* (Kipling, 2022a) is representative of this almost in its entirety. The examples are abundant.

Orwell's portrayal of "the Orient", or in his case Burma, differs from Kipling's, and it is only natural considering his approach to storytelling. Orwell's tendency to draw inspiration from direct experience results in a description that is probably more realistic, but there is still a visible gap between him as the observer and the native population portrayed. This is striking especially in *Shooting an Elephant*. But as Shabanirad (2015) mentions in her article, the

relationship between Ma Hla May and Flory is once again a good example, proposing the idea of “double colonization” - the first one being the patriarchy and the second one being the colonial rule, which takes advantage of the women. In this particular case, the process of double colonization is clearly exemplified - at first, Ma Hla May is a citizen of the British Raj, and later, she is purchased by Flory, who then serves as her master of sorts. This idea is paralleled almost exactly in Kipling’s *Georgie Porgie* - Georgie purchases a maid, whose name he considers “not pretty”, and “Christens” her Georgina (Kipling, 2021b). Georgina is then taking care of Georgie and eventually falls in love with him, but he ultimately decides to leave for England and get married, taking his bride back with him, leaving Georgina in despair:

‘What is that noise down there?’ said the Bride. Both listened. ‘Oh,’ said Georgie Porgie, ‘I suppose some brute of a hillman has been beating his wife.’

‘Beating—his—wife! How ghastly!’ said the Bride. ‘Fancy your beating me!’ She slipped an arm round her husband’s waist, and, leaning her head against his shoulder, looked out across the cloud-filled valley in deep content and security. But it was Georgina crying, all by herself, down the hillside, among the stones of the watercourse where the washermen wash the clothes. (Kipling, 2021b)

Not only does this excerpt showcase the element of double colonisation and gap between the natives and their British counterparts - but the notion of a “wife-beating brute” is also interesting.

In terms of religion, in this particular case Buddhism, Orwell does not embrace it as much as Kipling does in *Kim* or *The Bridge-Builders*, but he still utilises it somewhat. In *Burmese Days* Buddhism is used to explain the main antagonist’s motives:

According to Buddhist belief, those who have done evil in their lives will spend the next incarnation in the shape of a rat, a frog or some other low animal. U Po Kyin was a good Buddhist and intended to provide against this danger. He would devote his closing years to good works, which would pile up enough merit to outweigh the rest of his life. Probably his good works would take the form of building pagodas. Four pagodas, five, six, seven — the priests would tell him how many — with carved stonework, gilt umbrellas and little bells that tinkled in the wind, every tinkle a prayer. (Orwell, 2014, p. 3-4)

Orwell simplifies Buddhism in order to paint U Po Kyin as a man of low values, but in doing so, he also (perhaps unintentionally) mentions the priests as receptive to this idea of low

morality. Overall, Orwell shows a different approach to religion, but ultimately misuses it to narrate his stories, just like Kipling.

ORWELL ON KIPLING

In examining the similarities and differences between the two authors, it should not be left without attention that Orwell himself addressed the topic of Rudyard Kipling and his ideas. In an aforementioned essay simply titled *Rudyard Kipling*, originally published in 1942 in *Horizon* magazine, Orwell addresses a preface to a collection of Kipling's poetry written by "Mr Eliot" (T.S. Eliot), who also published the book - in this essay, Orwell is not merely concerned with the contents of the preface itself, but addresses Kipling in a broader, political sense:

During five literary generations every enlightened person has despised him, and at the end of that time nine-tenths of those enlightened persons are forgotten and Kipling is in some sense still there. Mr Eliot never satisfactorily explains this fact, because in answering the shallow and familiar charge that Kipling is a "Fascist", he falls into the opposite error of defending him where he is not defensible. (Orwell et al., 1968, p. 128).

Orwell establishes that Kipling is not a fascist, but points out he is indefensible in other regards - his "jingo imperialism": "Kipling is a jingo imperialist, he is morally insensitive and aesthetically disgusting.", concluding that Kipling is "a pre-fascist". (Orwell et al., 1968, p. 128). Orwell, who at this point was strongly anti-fascist, treats Kipling with relative contempt, but also shields him from the portrayal of a contemporary fascist. He argues that Kipling is a person shaped by his era - the era of expansive imperialism and mighty British armies around the globe - and a person not willing to adjust his views in his later life: "Kipling belongs very definitely to the period 1885-1902. The Great War and its aftermath embittered him, but he shows little sign of having learned anything from any event later than the Boer War." (Orwell et al., 1968, p. 129). In this instance, Orwell demonstrates one of the main differences between him and Kipling - the degree of Kipling's conservativeness, unparalleled by Orwell, who evolved politically throughout his life.

Orwell occasionally comes to Kipling's defence as well, disregarding what is in his opinion simplistic misappropriation of his verse:

An interesting instance of the way in which quotations are parroted to and fro without any attempt to look up their context or discover their meaning is the line from "Recessional", "Lesser breeds without the Law". This line is always good for a snigger in pansy-left circles. It is assumed as a matter of course that the "lesser breeds" are "natives", and a mental picture is called up of some pukka sahib in a pith helmet

kicking a coolie. In its context, the sense of the line is almost the exact opposite of this. The phrase "lesser breeds" refers almost certainly to the Germans, and especially the pan-German writers, who are "without the Law" in the sense of being lawless, not in the sense of being powerless. (Orwell et al., 1968, p. 128-129).

Here, he tackles a verse from Kipling's poem *Recessional*, used to portray Kipling as a jingoist perhaps as often as the contents of *The White Man's Burden*, but is difficult to truly interpret. In a way, Orwell calls for a more objective approach to Kipling - he admits that Kipling did serve as a tool of propaganda, even going so far as proposing the label of "a publicity agent of Cecil Rhoades", but points out Kipling's quality in "never courting the public opinion" (Orwell et al., 1968, p. 131). Based on Kipling's frequent controversies and his presence in Anglo-Indian and later British society, it is a fitting statement. He also shows respect for him in circumstances he finds justified:

A humanitarian is always a hypocrite, and Kipling's understanding of this is perhaps the central secret of his power to create telling phrases. It would be difficult to hit off the one-eyed pacifism of the English in fewer words than in the phrase, "making mock of uniforms that guard you while you sleep". (Orwell et al. 1968, p. 130),

Here, for example, when he mentions Kipling's dissatisfaction with pacifism in British society, a viewpoint Orwell himself shared with Kipling to a certain extent.

It is needless to say Orwell's arguments may not be completely objective - after all, the essay was conceived and written in 1942, when World War II was still in full swing, and the issues of pacifism and German nationalism were controversial topics in contemporary political climate. But the overall message of the essay still delivers Orwell's general relationship to Kipling, which can be considered strongly negative, especially concerning Kipling's imperialistic views, which Orwell determines not only to be wrong morally, but ultimately also from a historical point of view, noting Kipling's reclusiveness at the brink of his life:

Kipling spent the later part of his life in sulking, and no doubt it was political disappointment rather than literary vanity that accounted for this. Somehow history had not gone according to plan. After the greatest victory she had ever known, Britain was a lesser world power than before, and Kipling was quite acute enough to see this. (Orwell et al. 1968, p. 128-130)

CONCLUSION

As this thesis illustrates, the lives and careers of Rudyard Kipling and George Orwell share a number of parallels. Both were born in British colonial holdings in the Indian subcontinent in British families and eventually went through education in Britain. After their education, they returned to the British colonial holdings where they started a career, only to return to the British Isles to focus on their respective careers in literature, revisiting their experiences from the colonies in writing later in life. Their periods were marked by global military conflicts, which affected them on a personal level, including their careers, and their experiences both in colonies and elsewhere affected their political and literary focus, with Kipling strengthening his resolve to promote the empire as opposed to Orwell's progress from an anarchist to a socialist.

In their writing, Kipling exhibits more flexibility and his work is broader in nature, encompassing both prose and poetry. Orwell mainly focused on prose for the majority of his literary career. Both authors produced a significant amount of journalistic work. Kipling's works concerned with the topic of the colonies are extensive and his approach to it is more inventive and imaginative. Orwell based only three works solely on his experience with Burma and subsequently abandoned the topic in prose altogether, with occasional revisits in his press releases. His approach was more empiristic and grounded, and his works are either directly autobiographical or based on elements he realistically knew. Aside from their postcolonial literature, a common topic was the military and conflicts. Orwell once again utilised his first-hand experience and attempted to convey it objectively, whereas Kipling shifted towards a more nationalistically aimed portrayal.

Their literary works focused on the Raj are likewise a source of similarities and differences between Kipling and Orwell, mainly their views on British imperialism. Kipling is a passionate supporter of British domination over India and describes it as a noble humanitarian cause, deeming it a necessity for the prosperity of the native population. Kipling remained a supporter of imperialism for most of his life and can be considered more conservative. His imperialistic opinions were also often mixed with jingoism, as exemplified by his tendency to portray the British military in a heroic manner. Orwell on the other hand is receptive to the downfall of the British dominion in Burma and directly expresses his support for independent Burma, but in his works, the general message is interrupted by instances of orientalist narrative, which de facto counters his explicitly stated anti-imperialism. Orwell's general defiance of imperialism strengthened during his time in Burma and he cemented this when expressing his disgust for imperialism as propagated by Kipling. The connection

between their portrayals is their negative view of the native population, which shows elements of orientalism as it was defined by Edward Said, including the depiction of native characters as flawed and less moral than their British counterparts, morally questionable treatment of native women or simplification and distortion of Eastern religion.

REFERENCES

- Blair, E. A. (1914). *“Awake! Young Men of England” by George Orwell*. British Library.
Retrieved February 18, 2023, from
<https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/awake-young-men-of-england-by-george-orwell>
- Buchanan, T. A. (2002). Three Lives of Homage to Catalonia. *Library*, 3(3), 302–314.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/library/3.3.302>
- Gilmour, D. (2019). *The Long Recessional: The Imperial Life of Rudyard Kipling*. Penguin UK.
- Keskar, S. (2021, August 16). *Kim – an Introduction*. The Kipling Society. Retrieved April 13, 2023, from https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/readers-guide/rg_kim_intro.htm
- Keskar, S. (2022, March 14). *The Naulahka*. The Kipling Society. Retrieved April 12, 2023, from https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/readers-guide/rg_naulahka.htm
- Kipling, R. (1994). *Kim*. Wordsworth Editions.
- Kipling, R. (2010, June 5). *From Sea to Sea; Letters of Travel*. Project Gutenberg. Retrieved March 21, 2023, from
https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/32977/pg32977-images.html#Page_202
- Kipling, R. (2021a, April 14). *Lord Ripon’s Reverie*. The Kipling Society. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/poem/poems_ripon_reverie.htm
- Kipling, R. (2021b, August 8). *Georgie Porgie*. The Kipling Society. Retrieved April 3, 2023, from <https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/tale/georgie-porgie.htm>
- Kipling, R. (2021c, October 14). *Tommy*. The Kipling Society.
https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/poem/poems_tommy.htm
- Kipling, R. (2022a, February 13). *The White Man’s Burden*. The Kipling Society. Retrieved February 3, 2023, from https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/poem/poems_burden.htm
- Kipling, R. (2022b, February 21). *Recessional*. The Kipling Society. Retrieved March 22, 2023, from https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/poem/poems_recess.htm

- Kipling, R. (2022c, March 3). *Baa Baa Black Sheep*. The Kipling Society. Retrieved January 14, 2023, from <https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/tale/baa-baa-black-sheep.htm>
- Mehlin, H. (2022, October 24). *Nomination Archive - NobelPrize.org*. NobelPrize.org. Retrieved February 2, 2023, from <https://www.nobelprize.org/nomination/archive/show.php?id=2474>
- Melia, P. (2015). Imperial Orwell/Orwell Imperial. *Atlantis*, 37(2), 11–25. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24757780>
- Orwell, G. (1968a). *The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell: An age like this, 1920-1940*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt P.
- Orwell, G. (1968b). *The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell: In front of your nose, 1945-1950*.
- Orwell, G. (2014). *Modern Classics Burmese Days*. National Geographic Books.
- Orwell, G., Orwell, S., & Angus, I. (1968). *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: My country right or left, 1940-1943*. Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Radcliffe, J. (2009). *The Bridge-Builders*. The Kipling Society. Retrieved January 18, 2023, from https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/readers-guide/rg_bridgebuilders1.htm
- Rudyard, K. (2023, March 30). *The Bridge-Builders*. The Kipling Society. Retrieved February 8, 2023, from https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/readers-guide/rg_bridgebuilders1.htm
- Said, E. W. (1994). *Culture and Imperialism* (1st ed.). Vintage.
- Scott, D. (2011). Kipling, the Orient, and Orientals: “Orientalism” Reoriented? *Journal of World History*, 22(2), 299–328. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23011713>
- Shabanirad, E., & Marandi, S. M. (2015). Edward Said’s *Orientalism* and the Representation of Oriental Women in George Orwell’s *Burmese Days*. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.18052/www.scipress.com/ilshs.60.22>

- Slater, J. (2007). *Seeonee: The Site of Mowgli's Jungle?* The Kipling Society. Retrieved January 18, 2023, from https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/readers-guide/rg_junglebook_location.htm
- Stewart, J. I. (1998, July 20). *Rudyard Kipling* | *Biography, Books, Poems, & Facts*. Encyclopedia Britannica. Retrieved January 10, 2023, from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Rudyard-Kipling>
- The Kipling Society. (2023, February 22). *Kipling's Stories*. Retrieved January 16, 2023, from https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/bookmart_tales.htm
- United Grand Lodge of England. (2023). *Rudyard Kipling* | *United Grand Lodge of England*. Retrieved February 2, 2023, from <https://www.ugle.org.uk/discover-freemasonry/famous-freemasons/rudyard-kipling>
- Woodcock, G. (1999, May 4). *George Orwell* | *Biography, Books, Real Name, Political Views, & Facts*. Encyclopedia Britannica. <https://www.britannica.com/biography/George-Orwell>

SHRNUTÍ

Tématem bakalářské práce je srovnání Rudyarda Kiplinga a George Orwella s ohledem na jejich literární práce zaměřené na Britskou Indii. Staví vedle sebe fakta, že se oba narodili a posléze našli dočasná zaměstnání v indických koloniích britského impéria, jejich přístupy k psaní o koloniích, vyobrazení britsko-indické společnosti v jejich dílech a hodnocení Kiplingovy tvorby z pohledu George Orwella. Zvláštní pozornost je určena znakům imperialismu a orientalismu v jejich dílech, zejména v otázce jejich přístupu k původním obyvatelům a ženám.