CONCLUSION
The affinity between India and England influenced both the countries in the fields of politics, philosophy, military, medicine, science and technology, spiritualism etc. The experience of nearly three hundred years is rich and varied enough to set off a researcher to explore the possible fields of interest. The world of letters is one such field of interest that throws up an opportunity to study and compare the experiences. The field is very vast with a large number of books produced on the subject. Much of this field remained 'an area of Darkness' until very recently. M.K. Naik writes:

Anglo-Indian fiction offers many examples of English men and women for whom a happy childhood spent in India has forged a special bond, so that it could never be an alien land to them. The intimate Indian connection affects the characters in different ways.  

The long years of alien rule and exploitation have left an impression on the mind of the colonised, especially in the Post-colonial context, that all this literature is mainly imperialistic in nature. And anything that is imperial becomes abominable and thus not worth taking note of. But human relationships are not that simple enough to either accept or reject totally. There is always an admixture of both in varying degrees in various contexts.

The colonial experience is too complex to sift and sort into two extreme categories. Though it is true to a larger extent that the Anglo-Indian writing is written against the backdrop of imperial experience, it certainly does not reflect only hatred and spew venom of dislike. The realm of imperial experience covers likes and dislikes, love and hate, care and cure, learn and unlearn so on so forth. Now the time has come to take a balanced approach to this intricate experience and express ourselves in less emotional outbursts so that a fresh look might help us to take a holistic view of the entire experience. Things like education, scientific facilities, eradication of superstitions like sati and thuggee, or the very set up of modern democratic structure are the boons provided by the English to the Indians. The sacrifice that has gone behind these achievements cannot be ignored easily. The transformation is traumatic. So also is the experience of the transformer. It does not mean that taking a softer look towards the colonialist would undo the harm at one stroke. The fresh look, from a less emotional perspective, might only help us take a better and balanced decision. We are in a time when psychologists like Daniel Goleman speak of the advantages of Emotional Intelligence. The concept of Emotional Intelligence has gone from the East to the West. In any case, imperialistic attitude and Anglo-Indian literature go hand in hand. The connotation of the terms like ‘colonial’ or ‘imperial’ needs to be reinterpreted
because, so far, both the words have a sense of derogatory value attached to them.

The second chapter in this study has attempted to go into the interpretations of the terms like 'imperialism' and 'colonialism'. The two terms have always led to a sort of confusion whether both would mean the same or have different connotations. There is an attempt made to delve into the etymological roots of the two terms used in the study. The terms have also been looked from the angles of historians, economists, literary critics, and post-colonial thinkers.

The study on the novels of John Masters proposes to go into the nuances of imperialistic attitudes. The choice of Masters is made on the basis that he represents the entire Anglo-Indian experience. His ambitious plan to 'write a saga' of the British stay in India beginning from the 18th century till their exit, makes him important from the historical perspective. There is one continuous family of Savages operating as protagonists in all his novels on the Indian theme. No other writer of Anglo-Indian genre has attempted this on such a scale.

Masters is no exception to the use of imperial theme. Masters himself makes no secret of his imperialistic lineage. He not only confides and
confesses, but also explains how he derived it in his blood, training, education, and environment. He makes no qualms about it. The frankness, with which Masters admits it is to be appreciated. The influence of Kipling and Forster on his writings is undeniable. In fact, he admits that his experience of India and his love for India began with the reading of Kipling in his school days. Many of the critics are of the view that Kipling and Forster influence the entire Anglo-Indian writing. Quoting Leonard Woolf, Allen Greenberger writes how it is difficult to decide “whether Kipling moulded his characters accurately in the image of Anglo-Indian society or whether we were moulding our characters accurately in the image of Kipling’s story”. The influence is so great that Anglo-Indian writing is not complete without mentioning the names like Kipling and Forster. But, even these writers were not free from the idiosyncrasies developed by the imperial theory.

The grouse of critics like M.K. Naik is that these great writers did not understand India and the Indian completely. They tried to revolve around their own familiar part of the Indian experience rather than probing the depth of Indian psyche or Indian rural heart. M.K. Naik writes:

Yet most of Anglo-Indian novelists would appear to have had ample opportunities to do their homework, though under conditions which varied a great deal. A considerable number Anglo-Indian novelists had the good fortune to be born in India and to spend first seven years of their childhood (the customary age at which English children were normally sent home to England for their education) in India. Since these early impressionable years are, in some ways, the most formative ones in the life of a creative writer (as the example of Dickens shows), these novelists may be said to have started with a great initial advantage. To this category belong Rudyard Kipling (born in Bombay), George Orwell (born in Motihari, Bengal), and John Masters (born in Calcutta).\textsuperscript{191}

M.K. Naik argues that in spite of all these opportunities, however, Anglo-Indian fiction as a whole, betrays very large areas of ignorance in matters of great and small, as far as India and Indian life and character are concerned; and those who had never been 'East of Suez', and those who actually had, but had really seen little are both guilty in this respect. Most of these writers saw India only in the northern peninsula above the Vindhyas. For them, the South did not exist at all.

Kipling believed in something that was ambivalent. His words, like 'East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet', uphold the supremacy of the West on one side, and his longing for 'Mandalay' pulling
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him on the other side. Greenberger says that this problem was not unique to
Kipling alone. Most of the Anglo-Indian writers had it. Commenting on the
last phase of the British stay in India (Era of Melancholy), Greenberger writes:

Although most of these writers were friendly towards the historical Empire
they were not particularly concerned with evaluating the successes or
failures of the British in India. To them the position of the Empire in
India was no longer a living question. More than this they were interested
in the personal position of the English in India. They show a one-sided
concern with their own fates. Through this they express a deep love for
their India and also a conflict between their love and their recognition
that India no longer wants them.\(^{192}\)

Sujit Bose, in his article, "Explicit Imperialism: Kipling", argues in detail
about how Kipling stood for the cause of the British staying in India as a
means of divine right to reform the natives. He writes that the sharp contrast
between the administration of an Englishman and that of an Indian makes
Kipling's opinion clear that in order to save the subcontinent from falling into
uncontrollable chaos, it is imperative that the English must continue their
presence in the country.\(^{193}\) M.K.Naik states that Kipling suffered from a
'composite personality'.


On the other hand the attitude of Forster towards India was softer. Critics like Shamsul Islam treat Forster as an ‘anti-imperialist’. Sujit Bose would like to assert that Forster’s stance was doubtful. He writes:

Throughout Forster’s *A Passage to India*, it is visible that Angli-Indian relation is characterised by the attitude of hatred and master-servant relationship. This is quite contrary to the generally accepted belief that the British ruled India by consent.194

D.C.R.A. Goonetilleke writes that perhaps the most difficult problem in responding to and assessing Kipling’s work is his politics. Though, critics like Shamsul Islam or Nirad C.Chaudhuri claim that Kipling’s idea of imperialism is not an essential ingredient of his writings, Goonetilleke opines that Kipling’s politics have to be faced squarely: they lie behind, if not in the forefront of, his writings and pervade his work.195 Goonetilleke is of the opinion that the term ‘imperialism’ itself needs careful definition and that the meaning of the term has changed with the times. Instead of making sweeping statements that Kipling was an imperialist, it would be useful to assess him in his background.

Kipling boldly deals with intimate inter-racial relationships between sexes, an aspect of life in a colony which Forster skirts in *A Passage to India*. Kipling's works have it, just as Forster's novel does, that Easterners and Westerners in a colony do not usually connect, but whereas in Kipling this failure derives basically from his imperial view, in Forster it derives from a realistic view of human nature in colonial context. Furthermore, Forster is not fatalistic and does not think that connection is impossible.196

Replying to the criticism on Kipling as an imperialist, Louis L. Cornell writes that Kipling's works have to be assessed for their artistic qualities rather than indulging in politics. He writes that the controversy over Kipling's value - a controversy of some seventy-five years' standing - has been singularly barren of insight into the principles of his artistry.197

In a similar tone, Goonetilleke writes about Forster's *A Passage to India*. He writes that "the philosophical considerations in the novel are important, but to regard them as forming its central theme is to miss the main life of the fiction. The novel is rooted in the colonial context, though its significance is not limited to it. The racial and social connections of each character, whether British or Indian, matter in his or her affairs within or outside his or her group; these connections matter in the conversation, actions, thoughts and

---

feelings of everyone. ... Forster does not rate philosophical matters as intrinsically more important than social matters."

Thus, we see that controversies, claims and disclaims, fly back and forth. They continue to persist even in future. What we cannot perhaps ignore is the fact that these works of art have played the role of cultural emissaries between the two countries. It is in this background that we have to gauge the worth of the works of art. Idiosyncrasies have always been there as Somerset Maugham has put it.

John Masters is a serious writer. The fact that he took to writing to overcome his immediate financial problems, soon after emigrating to the United States from India, is no doubt true. But the artist hidden in him would not have woken up all of a sudden from out of blue. The circumstances have only acted as catalysts to plume forth the dormant talent.

His fictional autobiographies reveal how he was serious about his profession not only when he served military but also when he took to writing later. He followed a very strict schedule to sit down and write his works, or in preparing his groundwork for the next novel. He never compromised with

his profession. His professionalism was so perfect that he kept his personal
tastes and hobbies away from his writing. His love for mountaineering and
trekking went on without affecting his writing career. His devotion to the
family never got disrupted.

Masters was a very straightforward person. The transparent personality
sometimes led him to embarrassing situations. He never felt shy of criticising
what he did not like. For example, he did not like the English ways of hypocrisy
and class conscious attitude. For this reason only he chose to settle down in
the US rather than in England. He liked the American way of recognising a
person’s worth by his hard work rather than by his family background as it
was the case in England.

Even in the case of imperialistic attitude of the British, and the feelings
of nationalism among the Indians, he was quite open-minded. He narrates
his experience with his Indian friend called Reggie Sawhney in Bombay. He
frankly admits that the Indians were right in demanding freedom. He also
says that the Indians have paid back due respect to the English. Though
there are pangs of pain in losing supremacy, he does not rue over the
development.
Masters' plan to cover the entire British history of India in his novels is a bold step. The connection of his family with India, probably, gave him the inspiration.

As a writer, he also suffered from a few obsessions. The chief among them is the treatment of sex in his novels. He had to fight with his editor for this obsession. He also writes to his contemporary Anglo-Indian woman novelist, M.M.Kaye, on this subject. But, he defends himself in a letter written to his daughter Susan, on the eve of her wedding, that sex is the strongest bond to keep one's personal life safe. The frankness is worth appreciating. The works of Masters give us an impression that he was not in a position to feel the tender feelings of a woman. He is too rough and masculine in this respect.

On the contrary, the work of Forster or the works of any woman novelist like Valerie Fitzgerald or M.M.Kaye or even Flora Annie Steel, we find totally a different kind of treatment. Perhaps, the hardness of the military training had made Masters insensitive to emotional manifestation. In fact, one of the critics has rightly stated that the women Anglo-Indian writers knew the Indian life better than their male counterparts. Almost all the native women characters, be it Sumitra or Victoria Jones, are treated as if they existed to satiate his greed.
Another limitation of Masters is his ignorance of the real Indian life and style. His claim that he knew Indian life better than any of his contemporary writers does not hold much water if we go through his works. What he knew was mostly the secluded life of an army man in a remote cantonment. Except for the knowledge of his Gurkhalan regiment, his knowledge about hundreds of other communities and languages was very poor. His geographical knowledge of South India was also equally poor. Nevertheless, he could understand the predicament of the Indians in his time. His love for the Himalayas and a longing to trek through the hills express his sense of belonging to this country.

If we try to glance through the works of John Masters against the backdrop of imperialistic attitude and assess him, he probably, occupies a place somewhere between Rudyard Kipling and E.M. Forster. He has not hidden his feelings nor has he been ambiguous at any point. No other Anglo-Indian author has covered as wide a range of British attitudes as Masters has attempted to in his novels. His range covers the period beginning from the British entry into India in the 17th century, to the exit in the twentieth century. The technique he has used to achieve this is changing the theme of his every successive novel so that he could cover the entire gamut of Anglo-Indian life.

Forster, Meadows Taylor, Paul Scott or some of his own contemporaries have
only confined themselves to their own period. The courage and skill with which Masters takes up the plot is to be admired.

With regard to the artistic value of the works, Masters loses out to both Kipling and Forster. A man trained to handle a gun, cannot be expected to compete with those men who were born with the pen in their hands. The style of Masters is as simple and straightforward as his nature was. His language is robust and masculine as his physique probably was. Women writers like M.M. Kaye, Valerie Fitzgerald, or Flora Steel are far more nearer to the Indian soil.

On the whole, Masters' objective was to entertain and inform about the Anglo-Indian life. He has done it successfully. He does not seem to bother about other things. He enjoyed and lived his life as it came to him. He never gave himself to the pressures of stress and strain in the life. His past time hobbies besides writing, were his glass of Martini and long walks either on the beaches or deep into the forests.