

# 1

## Introduction

JAN MONTEFIORE

Cities and Thrones and Powers  
Stand in Time's eye  
Almost as long as flowers  
Which daily die.<sup>1</sup>

Kipling's brief elegy for the vanity of human deeds brings together three themes of this collection of essays: the subjection of his own work and reputation to those processes of time and change of which his poem warns; his relationship to historical institutions of rule and dominance named as 'Thrones and Powers'; and his many-sided artistry, manifested in this ironic vision of the fall of ancient empires mediated through echoes of Milton and Herrick.<sup>2</sup>

An account of Kipling 'in Time's eye' necessarily begins with the changes in his reception, here represented in capsule form by the first three essays from G.K. Chesterton (1905), George Orwell (1942) and Randall Jarrell (1961). His reputation has been notoriously changeable since he arrived in London in 1890 as the young genius from India who in one year had had 'more said about his work, over a wider extent of the world's surface, than some of the greatest of England's writers in their whole lives',<sup>3</sup> in 1895 was sounded out as a possible successor to Tennyson as Poet Laureate,<sup>4</sup> and whose near-death from pneumonia in 1899 was headline news in three continents. Praise was never undiluted: his 'vulgarity' was mocked by Oscar Wilde and attacked by Robert Buchanan and, more devastatingly, Max Beerbohm,<sup>5</sup> and as Kipling's imperialist opinions became more strident after the Boer War he lost the

esteem of British literary intellectuals, whom he in turn despised (his close friends included no fellow writer except Rider Haggard, author of thrillingly mythopoeic imperialist fantasy novels). Though Kipling was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1907 for his contribution to world literature, was immensely popular in Britain and the USA and much admired in France, the beginning of his declining reputation at home can be seen in G.K. Chesterton's brief but telling 1905 critique which, while taking Kipling's importance for granted, finds his vision profoundly flawed by its fascination with the seductive machinery of power and speed. This decline increased after the First World War; Kipling's identification with right-wing patriotism did him no good with the disillusioned ex-soldiers Edmund Blunden and Siegfried Sassoon who, as Harry Ricketts shows here, received both his *History of the Irish Guards* and his war poems less than enthusiastically, while his stories' contribution to the post-war literature of mourning was largely ignored. Although the *Jungle Books*, the *Just-So Stories*, the 'Puck' books and *Kim* continued to be widely read and loved by British middle-class children throughout the twentieth century, Kipling's work for adults was increasingly read in terms of 'plain man' conservatism, and the sermonising or demotic poetry which had made him a national institution in late Victorian England became a standing joke to intellectuals. Virginia Woolf mocked his 'Sowers who sow the Seed, and Men who are alone with their Work, and the Flag';<sup>6</sup> T.S. Eliot's more complex views ranged from mockery and affectionate parody to creative engagement with the numinous stories, and an edited anthology of Kipling's poems with a long preface deliberating on his status as a writer, concluding equivocally that his 'great verse' occasionally rose to poetry.<sup>7</sup> Orwell's response to Eliot's anthology indicates how low Kipling was rated in the early 1940s; arguing that for fifty years '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', his critical but even-handed discussion of Kipling's politics ends by defining him as a 'good bad poet' whose virtues and faults belong to popular culture rather than literature. (Orwell has little to say about Kipling's fiction apart from criticising its 'crudity').

Kipling's literary reputation began to recover once critics turned their attention to his prose.<sup>8</sup> Reappraisals of Kipling published around the centenary of his birth focus not on his success or failure as an ideologue but on his achievement as a writer of stories. Randall Jarrell's preface to his 1961 selection of Kipling's stories, 'On preparing to read Kipling', praises Kipling's extraordinary imagination and verbal finish, discussing him as an artist comparable

with Chekhov and Goya; the same point was made, less flamboyantly, in the title of J.M.S. Tompkins' *The Art of Rudyard Kipling* (1959), and repeated with variations by C.A. Bodelsen (1964), and Andrew Rutherford (1964),<sup>9</sup> who all emphasise Kipling's achievement as a writer of imaginative prose, as does Elliott Gilbert's study of his stories *The Good Kipling* (1972).<sup>10</sup> Jarrell also made a persuasive post-Freudian case for reading Kipling's conscious identification with authority as the effect of a traumatised childhood, an approach followed a generation later in Sandra Kemp's study of his stories (1988) and Zohreh Sullivan's psychoanalytic account of his Indian fiction (1993).<sup>11</sup> The critics of the 1960s all emphasised Kipling's standing as a major literary figure because they couldn't take this for granted. Twenty-first-century readers on the whole do; none of the contributors to this book, whether or not they approve of Kipling's politics, feels it necessary to make a literary case for him. (Hugh Brogan's defence of his poetry in the First World War, the sole apparent exception, is concerned with not with Kipling's literary artistry but with his political intelligence.)

But Kipling's changing reputation is only one aspect of his place in history, the overriding theme of this book. Unlike Caroline Rooney's and Kaori Nagai's 2010 collection of post-colonial readings of Kipling's work which relate the 'imperialist nostalgia' of his work to the politics of globalisation, or the collective overviews of Kipling's *oeuvre* in *The Cambridge Companion to Rudyard Kipling* edited by Howard Booth (2011),<sup>12</sup> the recent and new essays in this book read Kipling's work in terms of his relation to different aspects of history. These include his response to and understanding of colonial and pre-colonial India, addressed in different ways by Lisa Lewis, Harish Trivedi, Charles Allen and me; his views of the South African War, discussed by Dan Jacobson, and of the First World War, by Hugh Brogan; his apprehension of the traditions of rooted Englishness, approached in different terms by Harry Ricketts and Daniel Karlin; the cultural politics of his literary awareness and of his ideal of masculinity analysed respectively by Kaori Nagai and Howard Booth; and Bryan Cheyette's analysis of the relation between the racial prejudice against Jews that appears in his work and the fortunes of British imperial power in his lifetime. All draw in different ways on the previously uncollected and/or unpublished work which has become available since the mid-1980s thanks to the ongoing work of editors, especially Thomas Pinney (whose three-volume edition of Kipling's poetry by Cambridge University Press is about to come out as I write in 2012). Andrew Rutherford's 1985 edition of Kipling's *Early Verse* showed the youthful Kipling as an

unexpectedly playful, literary and self-conscious as well as prolific poet; Pinney's editions of his early journalism in *Kipling's India* (1986), of *Something of Myself* (1990) with unpublished autobiographical material, and especially of the six volumes of Kipling's letters (1990–2004),<sup>13</sup> give invaluable new information about Kipling's experiences, relationships and opinions. It is now possible to compare Kipling's own account of his 'Seven years' Hard' in India as a young journalist with contemporary evidence of his opinions and movements. The later letters to Rupert Gwynne, Max Aitken and Lord Milner reveal a great deal about his engagement with public events, notably the Boer War and the First World War, sometimes in ways Kipling's admirers may not welcome; Kipling's bald statement to Max Aitken – quoted here by Bryan Cheyette about 'Gehazi', his allegorical satire on Rufus Isaacs' insider dealing in the Marconi Affair – that 'I wrote it for that Jew-boy on the Bench' nails the poem as incontrovertibly anti-Semitic.<sup>14</sup> These letters, and the increased knowledge of Kipling's historical, family and political context and of his contemporary critical reception made available in recent biographies by Andrew Lycett (1999) and others,<sup>15</sup> have been crucial for historicist and post-colonial readings of Kipling's work and its relationship with contemporary debates and power struggles. To be aware, for instance, that the Indian National Congress first met and named itself in December 1885, which happens to be the month when Kipling published 'The Strange Ride of Morrowbie Jukes', and that the furore aroused three years later by Kipling's intensely hostile report of the Congress' meeting in December 1888 in the *Pioneer* helped to prompt his departure from India in 1889,<sup>16</sup> points up the political anxiety implicit in the characterisations of the sinister Gunga Dass in 'Morrowbie Jukes' and the more subtly comic Hurree Babu of *Kim* (which is not, of course, to say that either is simply reducible to his creator's fear and anger at Indian nationalism).<sup>17</sup> The discussions by Dan Jacobson of Kipling's responses to the Boer War and its implications for the British Empire, by Howard Booth of his conceptions of sexual identity and of masculine friendship, by me of the 'Letters of Marque', and by Bryan Cheyette of the attitudes to Jews in Kipling's fiction throughout his lifetime, all draw on this new evidence, especially that of the letters.

The movement towards historicised readings of Kipling's work is, of course, itself part of much broader changes in biographical writing and literary historiography. The difference between Carrington's fairly reticent authorised biography (1955) and the new accounts of Kipling's life by Lycett, Ricketts and others belong to a general turn by British biographers since 1980 towards

detailed, deeply contextualised, sexually candid life-writing, while recent biographies of Kipling's mother and her sisters, his son John and his wife Carrie<sup>18</sup> are part of a widely based move to retrieve the stories of marginalised lives. Kipling has also been the subject of what Max Saunders calls 'biografiction',<sup>19</sup> sympathetically in Jane Gardam's poignant re-working of Kipling's story 'Baa Baa Black Sheep' in her novel *Old Filth* (2004) and, less subtly but probably more influentially, in David Haig's 1997 play *My Boy Jack*,<sup>20</sup> which casts Kipling as an Oedipal stage villain in the form of a jingo father blindly destroying the son in whom he invests his hopes. These are not scholarly works (as Hugh Brogan points out, Haig distorted the facts to suit his own version of the Kiplings' family history), but the play's success on the stage and TV has doubtless influenced popular perceptions. It is a poignant irony that the man who wrote the accusatory couplet for the war dead 'If any question why we died / Tell them, because our fathers lied',<sup>21</sup> should have been known to viewers only as the self-deceiving embodiment of his own epigram.

Another change in the interpretations of Kipling's work is a new emphasis on its relations with modernism, especially in the stories he wrote during the first decades of the twentieth century, which are commonly regarded as the 'moment' of modernist writing. This is not just a matter of the fascination with new technologies of transport and communication noticed by Chesterton, which inspired Kipling to celebrate speed in the poems 'The Secret of the Machines' and 'Deep-Sea Cables'; the abolition of spatial distance by cinema, the motor car, and air transport in the stories 'Mrs Bathurst', "'They'" and 'With the Night Mail'; and the exploration of the uncanny power of radio and of the Fleet Street Press in 'Wireless' and 'The Village that Voted The Earth Was Flat'. The son of a couple whose courtship began by swapping quotations from Browning<sup>22</sup> became from his mid-teens both an accomplished writer of parody, a genre whose self-conscious literariness links Victorian and modernist literature, and a brilliant stylistic magpie who borrowed as easily from music-hall songs or Lewis Carroll as from the King James Bible and Anglican hymns. The quotations in his stories, whose political implications in *Stalky & Co.* Kaori Nagai analyses here, very often 'place' their speakers' taste, as when the would-be writer Charlie in 'The Finest Story in the World' responds to Longfellow's poetry with compelling memories of an earlier life, until he falls in love with a second-rate girl who inspires him to ecstatic sub-Swinburne spoutings (taken from Kipling's own juvenilia).<sup>23</sup> The pared-down, ironic stories narrated by his not-always-reliable

'I', and the multiple voices of his poems which are only rarely to be identified with Rudyard Kipling the author, show an awareness of their own artificiality associated with classic modernist texts. Kipling indeed has much in common with some practitioners of high modernism: his stagy performances of demotic coarse vitality in *Barrack Room Ballads* anticipate the work of his admirer Bertolt Brecht, and his poetry's different voices and brilliant parodies, together with his intimations of a numinous 'horror of great darkness' in the most ordinary of middle-class lives, links his work with that of T.S. Eliot. Moreover, as the term 'modernism' has itself been re-worked and historicised in critical narratives which contest both the dominance of a narrow canon of high modernist literature produced between 1900 and 1930 and the binary opposition 'modernist/realist', preferring to read both Victorian and twentieth-century texts as 'cultural formations' inflected by specific socio-historical conditions,<sup>24</sup> so Kipling's work looks less solidly Victorian and more like 'cross-over' writing. Kipling's connections with modernist literature appear here both in Daniel Karlin's reading of the interlinked short stories of *Actions and Reactions* as an ambivalent celebration of an Englishness associated with 'different forms of inauthenticity', and Harry Ricketts' analysis of Kipling's literary links with the poets of the Great War, tracing his imprint both on the 'Georgian' Siegfried Sassoon and Rupert Brooke and the 'modernist' Ivor Gurney and David Jones. A more historicist emphasis is evident in Bryan Cheyette's analysis of Kipling's post-war representations of Jews as increasingly disturbed and paranoid responses to successive crises in British imperial power.

Cheyette's essay also shows how literary readings of Kipling have become increasingly politicised, as he has become the target of critiques from members of those social, racial or sexual categories which were excluded from power by the imperial hierarchy which he idealised, and which appear in his work as despicable, or sinister, or marginalised – or all three, like the Jews in his late stories. Since the illuminating studies by Sandra Kemp and Nora Crook (1990) of the association of women with numinous forces and with the powerful currents of unconscious desires and fears in Kipling's stories,<sup>25</sup> not much has been written on Kipling's representations of women, probably because his antifeminism is too obvious to invite comment.<sup>26</sup> (Not that Kipling was a misogynist; his stories contain many admirable, tough and likeable female characters, and genuine sympathy is implied in his 'Harp-Song of the Dane Women' and 'My Boy Jack' for the hard lot of their anxious female speakers; while the harrowing chapter 'Memorial Day' in *Captains*

*Courageous* explicitly insists on the heavy price paid by wives and mothers in loneliness and frequent bereavement for the masculine freedom, skill and camaraderie celebrated in this novel. But sympathy with suffering is not the same thing as allying oneself with the sufferers, and Kipling had little time for women's rights.) The question of masculinity in Kipling's writings, however, has been much discussed; the cult of manliness which he shared with other conservative late Victorian male writers of adventure stories analysed by Lyn Pykett (1995), Joseph Bristow (1991) and Kucich (2007)<sup>27</sup> is raised both in Kaori Nagai's discussion of the formative values of the imperial officers in the making during their schooldays in *Stalky & Co.* and in Howard Booth's analysis of Kipling's fierce repudiation of homosexuality and of the uneasy relationship with contemporary homosexual sub-cultures implied in the nostalgia for army masculinity and male friendship which informs *The Light That Failed*.

Still more influential on the reception of Kipling's writings has been the work of post-colonial critics since Edward Said's dissection of the notion of the 'White Man' in *Orientalism* (1978), and the ideal of timeless, conflict-free India in *Kim*<sup>28</sup> followed by Suleri (1992) and Sullivan analysing the conflicted anxiety and vulnerability underlying these colonial ideals, and Don Randall (2000) and John McBratney (2002) discussing the ambivalence and hybridity of Kipling's imperialist mythologies.<sup>29</sup> These readers, like the Marxist Brecht who admired Kipling for writing directly and unapologetically about power and imperialism, do not agree with Auden that 'Time . . . pardoned Kipling and his views' because he wrote well,<sup>30</sup> arguing conversely that the lasting interest of Kipling's work lies precisely in his imperialist 'views' (which they do not pardon) and in the questions which these raise about identity and representation, power and knowledge – all still issues of debate and violence in our contemporary political world.<sup>31</sup> Post-colonial criticism is most obviously represented here in Kaori Nagai's analysis of knowledge and authority in *Stalky & Co.* and Harish Trivedi's lively scrutiny of Kipling's understanding (or not) of Indian 'vernacular' while an alien and critical eye is brought to bear on Kipling's racism by Dan Jacobson explaining how Kipling's conception of 'racial' divisions between Dutch and English settlers and his total indifference to black Africans ('Kaffirs'), appears to one who grew up in a racially divided South Africa, and by Bryan Cheyette tracing Kipling's representations of Jews, those white men who aren't really white, from early ambivalence through a brief moment of 'philo-Semitism', to outright hatred and contempt.

In structuring this essay collection I have followed Andrew Rutherford's landmark critical anthology *Kipling's Mind and Art*, starting with some key early assessments from G.K. Chesterton contesting Kipling's credentials as a national poet, George Orwell's retrospective assessment of his 'bouncing vulgar vitality' and his one-eyed but real 'sense of responsibility', and Randall Jarrell's case for the artistry of his short stories. These early overviews are followed by a mixture of reprinted essays, some from the 1990s and some more recent, by Dan Jacobson, Hugh Brogan, Lisa Lewis, Daniel Karlin, Charles Allen and Kaori Nagai, and new material written for this book by me, Harish Trivedi, Harry Ricketts, Howard Booth and Bryan Cheyette. These appear in more or less chronological order, with some exceptions to allow for connections of theme, so that Hugh Brogan on Kipling's poetry of the First World War is followed by Harry Ricketts on Kipling and the war poets, Ricketts' discussion of 'Albionism' by Daniel Karlin on Kipling's vision of England in *Actions and Reactions*, and Kaori Nagai's essay on the politics of quotation in the 'Stalky' stories follows Harish Trivedi's account of Kipling's less than scholarly knowledge of Indian vernacular languages.

Chesterton's brief but seminal essay 'Rudyard Kipling', first published in *Heretics* (1905), a book of theologically based cultural criticism (the essay on Kipling appears between an attack on the emptiness of 'modern morality' as compared with the wisdom of the Church and a critique of Shaw's limitations as a secular thinker<sup>32</sup>), shows how Kipling struck an anti-imperialist Christian contemporary. The first to salute the importance of Kipling's 'philosophy of steam and slang' which makes poetry of taken-for-granted ordinariness, Chesterton was also the first to perceive the centrality of discipline in Kipling's thinking (an insight later expanded by C.S. Lewis analysing the significance of work and discipline in the essay 'Kipling's World'):<sup>33</sup> 'What attracts Mr Kipling to militarism is not the idea of courage but the idea of discipline . . . The modern army is not a miracle of courage . . . but it is really a miracle of organisation, and that is the true Kiplingite ideal.' Like Orwell, Chesterton grants Kipling's disciplinarian ethic a certain grip on the realities of life ('We may fling ourselves into a hammock in a fit of divine carelessness. But we are glad the net-maker did not create the hammock in a fit of divine carelessness'), and he anticipates recent critics in locating Kipling among the modernists – but for him this is not a compliment. He calls Kipling a cosmopolitan without roots, a worshipper of the State machine who 'admires England because she is strong, not because she is English', utterly seduced by the modern 'motor-car civilisation going on its triumphant way, outstripping



time, consuming space, seeing all and seeing nothing'. The unfairness of this accusation that Kipling has no interest in traditional Englishness is obvious (he was to celebrate the 'Old England' of his corner of Sussex in *Puck of Pook's Hill* only a year after this essay appeared) but also telling. Envisaging Kipling as part of the development of a global modernism superseding everything local and rooted, Chesterton's appeal to 'the real life of man' going on in fields and homes untouched by modernity rests on the conservative ideal, which both men shared, of a richly storied, immemorial England opposed to the rush and hurry of globalised modernity. Chesterton's critique of Kipling's modernity thus obliquely makes an implicit case for the Englishness of the 'Puck' books; he had more in common with his opponent than he realised.

Orwell's 1942 essay answers Chesterton's critique, though not intentionally, by reading Kipling not as a modern power-worshipper but as a conservative whose enduring claim to be taken seriously lies in his understanding of the realities of power and responsibility: 'One may disagree to the middle of one's bones with the political attitude implied in 'The Islanders', but one cannot say that it is a frivolous attitude.' He too reads Kipling as an ideologue, looking for the 'message' of his poems (neither man has much to say about Kipling's prose). Unlike the pro-Boer Chesterton, he has a clear understanding of the economic forces of imperialist expansion, arguing that 'Kipling does not seem to realise, any more than the average soldier or colonial administrator, that an empire is primarily a money-making concern', but also insisting that Kipling's identification with rulers gave him a grip on reality not shared by those who have never 'tried to imagine what action and responsibility are like'. Arguing that Kipling appeals not despite but because of his 'vulgarity' so that enjoying his poems is a guilty pleasure like preserving in adulthood a taste for 'cheap sweets', Orwell's commentary on the demotic language of *Barrack Room Ballads* insists that their emotional power depends on its exploitation of cliché and formula, so that his essay also represents an early reading of Kipling's 'good bad poetry' as part of popular culture.

Randall Jarrell's 'On preparing to read Kipling' focuses on appreciating the qualities of Kipling's prose, while viewing his psychology as a man who 'never got over' the experiences of his childhood and youth. He argues that 'Kipling's world had been torn in two and he himself torn in two: for under the part that extenuated everything, blamed for nothing, there was certainly a part that extenuated nothing, blamed for everything – a part whose existence he never admitted, most certainly not to himself' (a view followed by later

post-colonial analysts of the contradictions in Kipling's work). This unconscious internal division, says Jarrell, flaws Kipling's art, which can 'see far down into the infra-red, but is . . . blind to some frequencies normal eyes are sensitive to' (which sounds like a coded version of Orwell's balder 'Kipling was only half civilised'). Yet Jarrell insists on the power of Kipling's art to interrogate readers who would prefer to turn away from knowing the depths of pain and horror in the world and in themselves, with which Kipling was all too familiar: 'To our *Are you telling me the truth, or are you reassuring yourself?* . . . he sometimes can say truthfully, *Reassuring you*'. His essay is the subtlest as well as the liveliest of all twentieth-century defences of Kipling the artist.

Dan Jacobson's 'Kipling in South Africa' discusses Kipling's romanticised view of South Africa, his political affiliations and his relationships with political leaders, including his hero-worship of Rhodes, his hatred of the Boers and indifference to black Africans, and the anxieties about the future of the British Empire which the Boers' resistance had raised. For Jacobson, Kipling's commitment to South Africa made for good verse but poor fiction, because 'poetry lends itself more directly to expressing political passions than fiction ever can' since a poet 'can speak directly to the reader . . . whereas the conflicts at the heart of any successful piece of fiction have to be acted out by seemingly autonomous characters with an interior life of their own'. This Kipling could not concede to Britain's Boer enemies, who appear only in the embittered, oversimplified perspective of the loyalist Sikh narrator of 'A Sahibs' War' as treacherous hypocrites with a contemptible idiot son (a far cry from the sympathetically rendered Sussex 'Bee Boy' who 'is not quite right in his head' but can do anything with bees in 'Dymchurch Flit'<sup>34</sup>). Jacobson's point about the superiority of Kipling's South African poems over his propagandist fictions is borne out in Bryan Cheyette's essay, which shows how as Kipling grew more hostile to Jews after the war, equating them with Germans as threats to civilisation, his stories individualised them much less, to the detriment of his art. Complex and interesting figures like Kadmiel with his cynical wit and his passion for justice in 'The Treasure and the Law', or the shrewd but vulnerable Maxwell M'Leod in 'The House Surgeon' (also discussed by Daniel Karlin), are unsatisfactorily replaced by 'the Jews' as a vaguely menacing presence in the margins of the late stories, whereas the rancorously anti-Semitic poems 'Gehazi', 'The Waster', whose coded refrain ingeniously brackets 'the Jew' with 'the Hun', and 'The Burden of Jerusalem', all possess aesthetic virtues (of a dark kind) in their powerful rhythms and verbal vitality. For Jacobson the lasting value of Kipling's South African

writings lies in his poems of nostalgia for its landscape, and the dark post-war prophecy of future menace in 'The Dykes': 'We are surrendered to night and the sea – the gale and the tide behind!'<sup>35</sup>

The historian Hugh Brogan assesses the politics of Kipling's poetry of the First World War – unlike Jacobson, endorsing Kipling's views, though with considerable reservations, in his examination of the attitudes to the German invasion of Belgium and France in 1914 as articulated in Kipling's war poetry. Whereas Harry Ricketts focuses principally on the peacetime vision of 'Englishness' in the 'Puck' books which Kipling shared with the war poets, Brogan addresses those public war poems which some readers might be tempted to dismiss as simple propaganda. Attacking a common view of the First World War according to which 'admirals, generals and air marshals [were] vicious incompetents' and servicemen were 'passive victims like sacrificial sheep', yet those 'sheep were heroes who died nobly for their country', Brogan assesses Kipling's grasp on the issues at stake in 'For All We Have and Are' and later poems. He weighs Kipling's ignorance of the German state, his virulent and indiscriminating hatred of the German people (a point also made by Dan Jacobson), his misprision of Kaiser Wilhelm II, who was 'not the genius of pure Evil Kipling thought him', and his credulous acceptance of 'too many of the tall tales' of atrocity, against his realistic grasp of the strategic and moral case for British belligerence. Conceding that the poems he cites are not those which 'have guaranteed [Kipling's] hold on posterity' he is less concerned to discuss Kipling's war record as a poet than to defend his record as a thinker and a citizen.

Harry Ricketts in 'A Kipling-conditioned world' addresses Kipling's connections with and reception by younger war poets. Beginning with Kipling's response to the First World War and the versions of his war poetry as these have been remembered (or constructed) by editors of anthologies and to a lesser degree by literary critics, Ricketts explores the connections between Kipling and the war poets Sassoon, Thomas, Brooke, Gurney and David Jones (quoted in his title), all conventionally thought of as his opposites. Emphasising Kipling's pervasive presence in literary culture during the formative years of these poets, whose minor peers can sound 'more Kipling than Kipling', Ricketts traces both the effects of a patriotic 'Kiplingesque stance' in some of the war poets and the passion for defending 'English earth' against the invader, which they share with Kipling. (Hugh Brogan, who also notices this trope, remarks on its disconnection from the actual intentions of the German High Command). Ricketts traces the connections between Edward Thomas'

'Albionism' and adoption of a 'Kiplingesque stance' and the Englishness hymned by Kipling in the 'Puck' books, showing how much these influenced Ivor Gurney's poetry of place and David Jones' perception of the presence of England's past within the modern present. He shows also how Rupert Brooke's experience of visiting the colonial Pacific in 1912 moved him from simply mocking the cliché of the 'White Man' to a slightly ironic acceptance of a 'Kiplingesque persona', how distaste at the 'Marconi Affair' disenchanted Brooke with liberalism, and how the famous war sonnet 'If I should die' echoes, consciously or not, Kipling's call to battle 'For All We Have and Are'. He also shows how for all Sassoon's overt disapproval of Kipling as 'terribly tub-thumping', his war poetry bears the imprint of the early ironic *Departmental Ditties* and the demotic *Barrack Room Ballads*.

Daniel Karlin addresses Kipling's notion of Englishness in his close reading of *Actions and Reactions* from the angle of peacetime. Noting the stories' responses to the political tensions of Edwardian England, especially the antagonisms existing within the middle class, he points out how wrong the prophetic elements of the book turned out to be: the global development of air traffic did not produce the peaceful world of 'With the Night Mail', and the political hopes of 'An Habitation Enforced' proved as baseless as the fears of 'The Mother Hive'. But, for Karlin, Kipling is 'not a propagandist but a great artist', and for him *Actions and Reactions* 'as a whole represents one of Kipling's most sustained efforts to understand and represent' the complex, imperilled life of his country, its colonial and imperial themes being 'linked to the great overarching structures that [he] discerned in English history, in English nature, and in the English character'. Karlin unpicks the implications of the book's construction, the placing of its stories and the way they echo or modify one another's themes. Pointing out the repeated motifs of home and homecoming, his close reading of the book's opening and closing stories 'An Habitation Enforced' and 'The House Surgeon' (which unlike Bryan Cheyette he finds humanely free of anti-Semitism) interprets the two stories of the regeneration of two English country houses, a beautiful near-ruin and a modern villa, as a dialogue, the ironies generated by their contrasts and parallels producing not an idealized England but a 'contest . . . between two kinds of inauthenticity'.

Lisa Lewis in 'Rikki-Tikki-Tavi and Indian history', the first of four essays on Kipling's Indian writings, probes the historical subtext of this much-loved children's fable about the mongoose and 'the great war which [he] fought single-handed'.<sup>36</sup> Like the other stories in the *Jungle Books*, 'Rikki-Tikki-Tavi'

is an animal fable which is also a realist story, which allows Kipling both to imagine a non-human world in detail and depth, and to dramatise human moral and political types (as he would do more explicitly in the later adult fables of corruption and reform ‘Below the Mill Dam’ and ‘The Mother Hive’). After probing the sources and inspirations of this animal fable in Kipling’s own experiences, his childhood reading and the ancient Indian *Panchatantra* cycle of beast-fables, Lisa Lewis probes what she calls the ‘deep undercurrent’ of historical reference in the story set in a bungalow very like ‘Belvedere’ in Allahabad where Kipling lived in 1887–88, a city with a bloody history of massacres and reprisals during and after the 1857 Indian rebellion known to the British as the ‘Mutiny’. In this political subtext the animals in this fable stand for the ‘subject’ race of Indians, so that the snakes represent native insurgents hoping to repossess their territory and Rikki the defender of the English family stands for loyalist Indian troops. (It would be entirely characteristic of Kipling’s hatred of the enemies of British power to personify them as a poisonous serpent, that ancient European emblem of evil). Showing how each of the *Jungle Books* contains ‘Mowgli’ stories, animal fables of colonial India and one ‘Arctic’ story, she argues that ‘Rikki’ corresponds to another story of the Mutiny in the *Second Jungle Book*: ‘The Undertakers’ in which the ancient ‘Mugger’ crocodile reminisces about his long-ago feasting on English corpses in the river below Allahabad during what the narrator calls ‘the terrible year of the Mutiny’, followed during the reprisals by endless multitudes of Indians when ‘every ripple brought more dead’, until he is shot by a white child who has escaped him and grown up to become a railway engineer bent on getting rid of this devouring nuisance.<sup>37</sup> In both stories the rebels are represented by reptiles who meet satisfactorily violent ends, the anxiety of the memory of the rebellion being contained in (relatively) cosy children’s fables in which ‘the heroes triumph and the guilty perish’; although Lisa Lewis stresses that the appeal of the story goes well beyond the colonial moral of its subtext.

Charles Allen’s essay focuses on the story of the attraction to Eastern religions which forms an undercurrent to Kipling’s overt religious identity as a ‘God-fearing Christian atheist’<sup>38</sup> who deified a transcendent ‘Law’ which holds chaos at bay. As a biographer of the young Kipling, Allen keeps close to the story of his life, unpicking his lifelong attraction to Islam, first articulated in the praise for the muezzin’s ‘splendid cry’ in ‘The City of Dreadful Night’ (1885), his equally lasting hostility to Hinduism and the idealised version of Buddhism much influenced by Edwin Arnold’s long poem *The Light of*

*Asia* (1879), which pervades *Kim*. Unlike most commentators on *Kim*, Allen argues that its narrative consistently moves away from the 'Law' embodied in patriarchal authority figures like Mahbub Ali and Colonel Creighton towards the domination of the feminine represented by the 'unassertive, compliant Tibetan lama' and the women who 'mother' Kim, and that the boy's awakening after his breakdown at the end of the book points not to a return to the 'Great Game' of spying but to the Buddhist 'acquisition of peace of mind'. He concedes that the enlightened 'flirtation with the Middle Way' represented by *Kim* was transitory, and would be followed by Kipling's return to the Narrow Way of 'Christian atheism'. Yet like Daniel Karlin interpreting 'The House Surgeon' as a story that transcends the anti-Semitic attitudes expressed by Kipling in his letters, Allen reads the ending of *Kim* as the triumph of the wisdom of the lama's 'Most Excellent Law' over the patriarchal Law which Kipling so often preached elsewhere.

My own essay on 'Letters of Marque' also examines Kipling's response to his experience of India – here, the Rajasthan states he visited in late 1887 which inspired some of his liveliest early writing, as a neglected classic work. Unlike Harish Trivedi, who describes Kipling's experience of speaking a halting 'vernacular' to Indians as a brief humiliation which he preferred to forget, I argue that the long-term creative influence of these travels is visible in Kipling's re-workings of these 'Letters', particularly in his greatest and least prejudiced fictions of India, the *Jungle Books* and *Kim*. The well-known rewriting of his appalled encounter with the numinous 'Gau-Mukh' (Cow's Mouth) shrine at Chitor in *The Naulabka*<sup>39</sup> should, I argue, be read as an inter-text for the great, chilling scenes set in 'Cold Lairs' in the *Jungle Books*, which subliminally evoke a horrific past history of sieges and massacres in those romantic ruins. More benignly, the combination of beauty, remoteness and contact with Indians during his trip to Boondi (Bundi) fed his ability to imagine otherness with pleasure instead of anxiety in *Kim*, and I suggest that Kim's experience of healing sleep under a tree at the end of the novel, which Charles Allen reads as a re-working of the legend of the Buddha waking under a pipal tree, drew consciously or not on Kipling's deeply felt if brief moment of 'deep accord and fellowship with all things on earth'.<sup>40</sup> Both readings are readily compatible.

Harish Trivedi's detailed engagement with current scholarly debates about Kipling's knowledge and use of Indian languages in his discussion of 'Kipling's "vernacular"' makes a searching scrutiny of how Kipling's 'showed – or showed off' his knowledge of 'native' tongues. Trivedi's essay is the second longest

in this book, but, given the complex linguistic and political relationships of North Indian languages and their unfamiliarity to an English-speaking audience, it needs to be. He clarifies the relationships between ‘Urdu’ and ‘Hindi’, closely related languages spoken by different religious and ethnic groups, and ‘Hindustani’, a colonial patois used by the British to communicate with their subjects, and by servants in their households speaking different mother tongues as a *lingua franca*. He argues that when the six-year-old Kipling left for England, he forgot Hindustani and had to re-learn it from scratch (not, it seems, very well) when he returned to India ten years later. Discussing the current scholarly dialogues about Kipling’s ‘vernacular’ usage, he points out Kipling’s frequent mistakes in the Hindustani words and phrases he quotes, usually to comic effect, in his early poems and stories; it is a nice post-colonial irony that the writer who endlessly criticized ‘natives’ for slackness and in the voice of ‘The Eathen’ claimed they were defeated by British troops ‘all along o’ sloppiness, all along o’ mess, / All along o’ doin’ things rather-more-or-less<sup>741</sup> should be shown up as himself prone to linguistic sloppiness. Yet Trivedi finds Kipling’s creation of the Hindustani-speaking hero in *Kim* truly successful, for in this novel ‘Kipling invented a new language which is . . . subliminally inflected suffused and inflected by Urdu and Hindi, so that even when the words are in English, the syntax . . . [is] unmistakably Indian’. Like Charles Allen and me, Trivedi finds that in *Kim* Kipling goes beyond his prejudices, achieving a true understanding of Indian culture in ‘one of the supreme examples of radical multi-lingual transactions in English literature’. That said, Trivedi’s indictment of Kipling’s multiple errors makes it clear how fallible he was when not inspired by his ‘Daemon’.

Kaori Nagai’s detailed and closely read account of the imperialist significance of the play of quotations in *Stalky & Co.* complements this dissection of Kipling’s vernacular. Although her concern is not with the Indian subjects but their British rulers’ private dialect, her unfolding of the politics of the imperial archive clarifies the idealised fantasy of authority underpinning the linguistic practices which Trivedi dissects. Like him she emphasises the connection between knowledge of ‘native’ language and proverbs and mastery: Stalky managing the tensions between Sikh and Pathan by judiciously citing a ‘woman’s proverb’ that makes both men laugh. She redefines the notion of imperial ‘hybridity’ as developed in critiques of Kipling by Randall and McBratney, arguing that neither Stalky nor Kim is truly hybrid. Because ‘the coloniser, as he learns the syntax of the East, is not allowed to lose his markers as white . . . if he wishes to maintain his privileges as the White

Man', his encounter with non-Western cultures is 'not hybridisation, but . . . "quotation" – the sampling of other cultures, while interdicting the effects of cultural hybridity'. Kipling's imperial boys, she argues, are masters of quotation, which they use to control natives (they never get their quotes wrong even if, as Trivedi has shown, Kipling's own practice was another story) and to 'fix the Other as a stereotype', while their certainty about sources establishes their colonial authority. She shows how the remarkably well-read boys of *Stalky & Co.* use their knowledge both of books (not all literary) and of dialects to outwit their masters, benignly watched by the all-seeing 'Head', whose omniscient authority is embodied in his splendid library: 'To be summoned to his Office to be caned is to have a glimpse of his collection, and to have access to his books and, through them, to his power.' Gaining admission to this sanctum, the young Kipling thus becomes the librarian of an imperial archive that guarantees the 'authority and authenticity . . . of [the] myriad voices from other cultures and contexts' that will become the trademark of his writing.

A different kind of mastery is at issue in Howard Booth's analysis of Kipling's notion of the ideally masculine 'army man' in relation to contemporary late Victorian discourses and practices of same-sex passion. Pointing out that Kipling's life and career spanned a period 'when "the homosexual" was defined and associated sexual identities emerged', Booth shows how foreign the idea of homosexual identity was to Kipling, who perceived what he called 'beastliness' as a 'wrong choice which all might make', the rhetoric of revulsion that it called forth in his letters suggesting a temptation which needed consciously to be fought off. (Kipling was equally furious against lesbians; Booth quotes a 1926 letter to Joynson-Hicks complaining about a flier for *The Well of Loneliness* being sent to his daughter, which may have helped to trigger the novel's prosecution.) Booth suggests that Kipling retreated from the 'representational spaces' of his army stories when it became clear that his own celebration of close friendships between soldiers coincided with the object-choices of such emerging homosexuals as J.A. Symonds (who once entertained hopes of Kipling as a fellow-spirit). Emphasising the visibility of male prostitutes and soldier pick-ups in the early 1890s in the 'seething miles of vice' around Kipling's haunts in Soho and Piccadilly, Booth shows how Kipling's early soldier stories led Symonds to mistake them for 'coded references to same-sex passion'. Kipling's most prolonged exploration of masculinity in *The Light That Failed*, despite the hero's excitement at Tommies fighting – 'my men, my beautiful men!' – represents masculine friendship as



way to stave off loneliness, but this proved unsustainable in the increasingly visible presence of homosexual 'soldier-love'. It was no longer emotionally safe for a heterosexual man to long for the sight of 'an army man / Set up and trimmed and taut',<sup>42</sup> and the close untroubled comradeship of Parnesius and Pertinax in *Puck of Pook's Hill* exists only in an unrecoverable past.

Bryan Cheyette's 'A race to leave alone', the longest essay in this book, addresses the question of Kipling and racism by examining how Jews are represented throughout his *oeuvre* in poems and stories: some famous, others obscure. The starting point for Cheyette's complex and wide-ranging discussion of Kipling's work is Hannah Arendt's *Origins of Totalitarianism*, 'the first and best account of the links between the racism and dehumanisation of empire and of fascism with Kipling'. Discussing Kipling's engagement with 'Semitic racial discourse' deriving from 'a much broader history of differentiating Jews racially from other human beings', from the early ambivalence of *Plain Tales from the Hills* through Edwardian 'philo-Semitic' stories 'The House Surgeon' and 'The Treasure and the Law' to the outright virulence of the late stories and poems, Cheyette argues against a 'teleological' reading of Kipling's anti-Semitism as proto-fascist. Agreeing with Orwell, although for different reasons, that 'Kipling is not a fascist', his fascinating analysis of Jews and the remarks about them made by Gentile characters in his work follows Arendt in emphasising the links between racism and empire, showing how Kipling's antagonism to pro-Boer anti-Semites who attacked '[H]ebrew financiers' for supporting British rule in South Africa led him in 'The Treasure and the Law' to create the noble cynic Kadmiel, who by controlling England's money supply enables the establishment in Magna Charta of 'one Law for Jew or Christian'.<sup>43</sup> Like Daniel Karlin, Cheyette appreciates the sympathetically portrayed Jews in 'The House Surgeon', but reads the story's 'message' as a warning that replacing a 'spiritual covenant with empty materialism' leaves you vulnerable to primitive irrational forces, arguing that the disturbingly ambivalent figure of the Jew represents for Kipling both the modern universalism of Capital and the primitivism of the colonial subject. Cheyette shows Kipling moving from ambivalence to the outright hostility which he frequently expressed in his letters after the Marconi Affair (which, as Harry Ricketts shows, also moved Rupert Brooke towards right-wing politics) and he reads 'The Village That Voted The Earth Was Flat' as a pivotal text in which the blue-eyed Jewish impresario 'Bat' Masquerier promotes popular excitement and unrest which become 'disorder on a global scale'. Embittered by the First World War and the visible decline of British power,

Kipling like other supporters of the radical right came to think of Jews as 'global anarchists and financiers', at which point his racism did become fascist. Although not prepared to 'pardon Kipling and his views', Cheyette shows the richness and complexity of Kipling's treatment of what he would call the 'Unloved Race', in the early stories usually individualising his Jewish characters, which become much more marginal, and stereotypically unpleasant, in the later stories and poems. Cheyette sees Kipling 'in Time's eye' by locating his work in the history of the British Empire without allowing a false 'teleological' perspective to attribute to his *oeuvre* the opinions which affected his late work. In a sense, this move to historicise Kipling's changing world-view in relation to developments in British politics is a return to Chesterton insisting that what matters in Kipling's work is his 'message'.

### Notes

- 1 Rudyard Kipling, *Puck of Pook's Hill* (London: Macmillan, 1906), p. 139. This poem is quoted in full by Daniel Karlin in chapter 8 of this volume, p. 126.
- 2 See 'Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Powers' in *Paradise Lost* Book V, line 460, in E. Visiak (ed.) *Milton: Complete Poetry and Selected Prose* (Glasgow: Glasgow University Press, 1964), p. 191, and Robert Herrick's poem 'To Daffodils' in *Hesperides* 1648, in Alastair Fowler (ed.) *New Oxford Book of Seventeenth Century Verse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991). Kipling uses Herrick's image of the short-lived daffodil in stanza 2 of 'Cities and Thrones'.
- 3 Lockwood Kipling, quoted in Harry Ricketts, *The Unforgiving Minute: A Life of Rudyard Kipling* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1999), pp. 164–5.
- 4 Andrew Lycett, *Rudyard Kipling* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson 1999), p. 374.
- 5 Oscar Wilde, 'The critic as artist', *The Complete Works of Oscar Wilde* ed. Josephine M. Guy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) vol. 4, p. 199; Robert Buchanan 'The voice of the hooligan' (1899) in Roger Lancelyn Green (ed.) *Kipling: The Critical Heritage* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971) pp. 247–8; Max Beerbohm, 'P.C.X.36', *A Christmas Garland* (London: Heinemann 1912), pp. 11–20, parodying the Mulvaney stories, and *The Poets' Corner* (1904; London and New York: King Penguin, 1943), plate 24.
- 6 Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* (1929; London: Penguin 2004), p. 101.
- 7 T.S. Eliot (1919), collected in Green, *Kipling*, p. 322; *Old Possum's Book of Practical Cats* (London: Faber & Faber, 1937); *A Choice of Kipling's Verse made by T.S. Eliot with an Introductory Essay* (London: Faber & Faber, 1941), pp. 5–36, which discusses Kipling's 'development of the imperial imagination into the historical imagination', drawing on the 'Puck' books and 'later stories of contemporary Sussex, such as *An Habitation Enforced*, *His Son's Wife* [sic] and *The Wish House*, together with 'They' (p. 32). For the echoes of 'They' in 'Burnt Norton' and of 'Wireless' in 'The Waste Land', see Martin Scofield, *T.S. Eliot* (Cambridge:

- Cambridge University Press, 1988), p. 251n., and Jan Montefiore, *Rudyard Kipling* (Horndon: Northcote House, 2007), p. 141.
- 8 Edmund Wilson's pioneering reappraisal 'The Kipling that nobody read', *The Wound and the Bow* (1941; London: Methuen 1962), expresses admiration for his 'brilliant short stories' (p. 107).
  - 9 J.M.S. Tompkins, *The Art of Rudyard Kipling* (1959; London: Methuen 1964); C.A. Bodelsen, *Aspects of Kipling's Art* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1964); Andrew Rutherford (ed.), *Kipling's Mind and Art* (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1964).
  - 10 Elliott L. Gilbert, *The Good Kipling: Studies in the Short Story* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972).
  - 11 Sandra Kemp, *Kipling's Hidden Narratives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988); Zohreh Sullivan, *Narratives of Empire: The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
  - 12 Kaori Nagai and Caroline Rooney (eds), *Kipling and Beyond: Patriotism, Globalisation and Postcolonialism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Howard J. Booth (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Rudyard Kipling* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
  - 13 Kipling, *Early Verse by Rudyard Kipling 1879–1889: Unpublished, Uncollected and Rarely Collected Poems*, ed. Andrew Rutherford (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986); Kipling, *Kipling's India: Uncollected Sketches 1884–6*, ed. Thomas Pinney (London: Macmillan, 1986); *Something of Myself and Other Autobiographical Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*, 6 vols (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1990–2004). Because Kipling and later his widow Carrie burned most of his letters, Morton Cohen (ed.), *Rudyard Kipling to Rider Haggard: The Record of a Friendship* (London: Hutchinson, 1965) is the nearest thing to a surviving published correspondence.
  - 14 Kipling to Max Aitken, 14 November 1913, *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling, Volume 4: 1911–19*, ed. Thomas Pinney (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), p. 208. See also Bryan Cheyette, chapter 15 in this volume, pp. 250–84.
  - 15 See Lycett, *Rudyard Kipling*; Ricketts, *The Unforgiving Minute*; David Gilmour, *The Long Recessional: The Imperial Life of Rudyard Kipling* (London: John Murray, 2002); Philip Mallett, *Rudyard Kipling: A Literary Life* (London: Macmillan, 2002); Charles Allen, *Kipling Sahib: India and the Making of Rudyard Kipling* (London: Little, Brown, 2007).
  - 16 Allen, *Kipling Sahib*, pp. 202, 286–7.
  - 17 See the discussion of Hurree Babu in Montefiore, *Rudyard Kipling*, pp. 91–5; also Harish Trivedi's introduction to his edition of *Kim* (London: Penguin Classics, 2011), pp. xxxviii–xl.
  - 18 Tonie and Valmai Holt, *My Boy Jack: The Search for Kipling's Only Son* (Barnsley: Leo Cooper, 1998); Adam Nicolson, *The Hated Wife: Carrie Kipling 1862–1939* (London: Faber & Faber, 2001); Judith Flanders, *A Circle of Sisters: Alice Kipling, Georgiana Burne-Jones, Agnes Poynter and Louisa Baldwin* (London: Viking Press, 2001).

- 19 Max Saunders, *Self Impressions: Life Writing, Autobiografiction and the Forms of Modern Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 216.
- 20 David Haig, *My Boy Jack* (London: Nick Hern Books, 1997).
- 21 Kipling, 'Common Form' from 'Epitaphs of the War', *Works* (Ware: Wordsworth, 1994), p. 390.
- 22 Lycett, *Rudyard Kipling*, p. 25.
- 23 Kipling, *Many Inventions* (London: Macmillan, 1893), p. 126; *Wee Willie Winkie and Other Stories* (London: Macmillan, 1895), p. 271; *Early Verse*, p. 138.
- 24 Lyn Pykett, *Engendering Fiction: The English Novel in the Early Twentieth Century* (London: Edward Arnold, 1995), p. 1; see also David Trotter, *The English Novel in History, 1895–1920* (London: Routledge, 1993) and Trudi Tate, *Modernism, History and the First World War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998).
- 25 Kemp, *Kipling's Hidden Narratives*, pp. 100–23; see also Nora Crook, *Kipling's Myths of Love and Death* (London: Macmillan, 1990).
- 26 For a recent account of women in Kipling, see Kaori Nagai 'Kipling and gender' in Booth (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Rudyard Kipling*, pp. 66–79.
- 27 Pykett, *Engendering Fiction*, pp. 66–8; see also Joseph Bristow, *Empire Boys: Adventures in a Man's World* (London: HarperCollins, 1991), John Kucich, *Imperial Masochism: Fact, Fantasy and Social Class* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), and Montefiore, *Rudyard Kipling*, chapter 4, 'Being a Man'.
- 28 Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Routledge, 1978), introduction to *Kim* (London: Penguin Modern Classics, 1987), reprinted in *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Viking, 1992).
- 29 Sara Suleri, *The Rhetoric of British India* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992); Zohreh Sullivan, *Narratives of Empire*; Don Randall, *Kipling's Imperial Boy* (London: Macmillan, 2000), John McBratney, *Imperial Subjects, Imperial Spaces* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002). See also the discussions of Kipling by Thomas Richards in *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire* (London: Verso, 1993) and more recently by Douglas Kerr in *Eastern Figures: Orient and Empire in British Writing* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2007).
- 30 W.H. Auden, 'In Memory of W.B. Yeats' (1939), in E. Mendelson (ed.), *The English Auden: Poems, Essays, and Dramatic Writings 1927–1939* (London: Faber & Faber, 1976), p. 242.
- 31 See Judith Plotz's account of the resurrection of 'The White Man's Burden' by neo-conservative Americans in 'Kipling and the new American empire', in Rooney and Nagai (eds), *Kipling and Beyond*, pp. 37–57.
- 32 G.K. Chesterton, *Heretics* (London: John Lane, 1905), pp. 31–46.
- 33 *Ibid.* pp. 38–9; C.S. Lewis 'Kipling's world', in *They Asked for a Paper* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1962), pp. 72–92.
- 34 Kipling, 'Dymchurch Flit', *Puck*, p. 258.
- 35 Kipling, 'The Dykes', *Works*, p. 307, quoted by Jacobson in chapter 5 in this volume, pp. 100–1.
- 36 Kipling, *The Jungle Book* (London: Macmillan, 1895), p. 163.

- 37 Kipling, *Second Jungle Book* (London: Macmillan, 1895), pp. 132, 136.
- 38 Lycett, *Rudyard Kipling*, p. 520.
- 39 See Montefiore, *Rudyard Kipling*, pp. 28, 30.
- 40 Kipling, *From Sea to Sea* (London: Macmillan, 1899), vol. 1, Letter XIX, p. 192.
- 41 Kipling, 'The 'Eathen', *Works*, p. 451.
- 42 Kipling, *The Light That Failed* (London: Macmillan, 1891), p. 193; 'In Partibus', *Early Verse*, p. 472, quoted by Howard J. Booth in chapter 14 of this volume, pp. 232–4.
- 43 Kipling, *Puck*, p. 285.