

THE
KIPLING JOURNAL



UNIVERSITY OF KENT 2007 CONFERENCE

PUBLISHED BY THE KIPLING SOCIETY, LONDON

VOLUME 82

APRIL 2008

No 326

ISSN 0023-1738

THE KIPLING CONFERENCE 2007

THE UNIVERSITY OF KENT, CANTERBURY
SCHOOL OF ENGLISH
7 and 8 SEPTEMBER

This Conference was held to commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the award of the Nobel Prize for Literature to Rudyard Kipling in 1907, '... **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**'.

Dr Jan Montefiore and Dr Kaori Nagai of the U.K.C. School of English organised the Conference which was sponsored by The Kipling Society, with help in funding from the School of English and the British Academy. The intention of the conference was defined as being

to encourage new approaches to Kipling scholarship, and to foster dialogues between two different kinds of Kipling's readers in the twenty-first century, who are too often separate: on the one hand, experts and enthusiasts of Kipling's life and writings, and on the other, the increasingly influential exponents of postcolonial criticism.

This publication contains the programme together with some of the papers that were given there. Regrettably we do not have the space available to publish them all in this Supplement to the *Kipling Journal*, and so an edited selection has been made by Dr Jan Montefiore and David Page (Editor, *Kipling Journal*). It is hoped that these will give some impression of the breadth and quality of the material presented to Delegates.

Abstracts of papers and biographies for almost all speakers are now available on the Kipling Society website, and the full texts of papers are being posted there as they become available. They can be accessed via either "The Society" or "The Readers' Guide" pages at:

<http://www.kipling.org.uk/>

THE KIPLING JOURNAL

*published quarterly since 1927 by the Kipling Society
(6 Clifton Road, London W9 1SS)
and sent free to all members worldwide*

Volume 82

April 2008

Number 326

CONTENTS

THE KIPLING CONFERENCE 2007 – INTRODUCTION	1
CONFERENCE PROGRAMME	3-5
<i>REWARDS AND FAIRIES</i> AND THE NEO-ROMANTIC DEBT by Paul March-Russell	6-13
SYNTHESIS AND FRAGMENTATION: PANORAMIC VISUALITY IN <i>KIM</i> by Charlotte Joergensen	14-21
TRAFFICS AND RE-DISCOVERIES: RUDYARD KIPLING COLLECTIONS AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS by Debra D. Wynn	22-31
KIPLING AND SHELL-SHOCK: THE HEALING COMMUNITY by George Simmers	32-39
"TIN FISH": TWO TEXTS, TWO READINGS by Daniel Karlin	40-47
FINDING ONE'S WAY THROUGH <i>ACTIONS AND REACTIONS</i> by Elodie Raimbault	48-55
"ain't goin' to have any beastly Erickin'": THE PROBLEM OF MALE FRIENDSHIP IN <i>STALKY & CO.</i> by Carolyn Oulton	56-61
IF ANY QUESTION WHY HE DIED: JOHN KIPLING AND THE MYTHS OF THE GREAT WAR by Dorothea Flothow	62-68

Rudyard Kipling Copyright by The National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or
Natural Beauty.

Cover Image with Acknowledgements to Macmillan & Co Ltd

*All rights are reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without prior permission
in writing from the Kipling Society, London.*

KIPLING CONFERENCE 2007 PROGRAMME

DAY 1 Session 1

Panel 1 Kipling and the Uncanny (Chair: Florian Stadler)

- Jo Collins**, Kipling, policing India and the Uncanny
Elizabeth Welby, Swirling in the Vortex of Abjection in Kipling's 'The City of Dreadful Night'
Erin Louttit, *The Light of Asia* and the Law of the Jungle

Panel 2 Among the Children (Chair: Peter Havholm)

- Adrienne E. Gavin**, "neither borne nor lost": Kipling's "They" and the Edwardian Cult of Childhood
Mary Hamer, The Five Nations: RK's turning point.
Inger K. Brogger, 'Little Children Crowned with Dust': A Reading of Rudyard Kipling's "The Story of Muhammad Din"

Session 2

Panel 3 Colonial Visions (Chair: Shirley Chew)

- Hedley Twidle**, Dream Topographies: Kipling in Cape Town, 1891-1908
Martha Addante, Mapping the Outreaches of the Empire in "The Man who would be King"
Kaori Nagai, Quotations and Boundaries: *Stalky and Co.*

Panel 4 Kipling's Literary Descendants (Chair: Harry Ricketts)

- Eleni Loukopoulou**, The finest stories in the world told by Kipling and Joyce...
Mary Conde, A Literary Descendant: Iris Murdoch's 'A Word Child'
Paul March-Russell, 'All Art is One': Kipling and Neo-Romanticism

Session 3

Panel 5 Kipling and the Edwardians (Chair: Jan Montefiore)

- Harry Ricketts**, The Kiplingisation of Rupert Brooke
Muireann O'Cinneide, Kipling & Surtees: Exotic Englands, Familiar Indias
Simon Humphries, What Was Kipling Doing on 17 July 1897?

Panel 6 Kim's Indian Descendants (Chair: Abdulrazak Gurnah)

- Charlotte Jorgensen**, Centre and Periphery: Panoramic Visuality in *Kim* and *The Impressionist*

Florian Stadler, Hybrid identities, torn loyalties, ambiguous relationships – Reading Kipling, Reading Rushdie
Charles Allen, Ruddy and the Gods: the Young Kipling and Religion

Session 4 Keynote Lecture (Chair: Jan Montefiore)

Christopher Hitchens, 'Kipling as the bard of the special Anglo-American relationship'

Session 5

Panel 7 Collecting and Annotating Kipling

David Alan Richards, Kipling and the Bibliographers

Debra D. Wynn, Traffics and Re-discoveries: Rudyard Kipling Collections at the Library of Congress

John Radcliffe and John Walker, The New Readers' Guide.

Panel 8 War (Chair: Sarah Wood)

George Simmers, Kipling and Shell-Shock: The Healing Community

Anurag Jain, Behind Asian Eyes: Kipling's Indian Soldiers and British Propaganda of the First World War

Daniel Karlin, "Tin Fish": Two Texts, Two Readings

DAY 2 Session 6

Panel 9 Kim (Chair: Jan Montefiore)

Paula M. Krebs and Tricia Lootens, *Kim* is an American Novel. No, *Kim* is an African Novel

Amanda-Jane Eddleston, Kipling's Concentric Selves

Sue Walsh, Kipling's Children and the category of 'Children's Literature'

Panel 10 Modernism and Communications (Chair: Paul March-Russell)

Elodie Raimbault, Finding one's way through *Actions and Reactions*

John Lee, Kipling's Literary Traffics and Scientific Discoveries: " 'Wireless' "

Andrew F. Humphries, The relationship between technology and the supernatural in Kipling's *Traffics and Discoveries*

Session 7

Panel 11 Kipling and Gender (Chair: Robert Hampson)

Carolyn Oulton, "ain't goin' to have any beastly Erickin' ": the problem of male friendship in *Stalky & Co.*

Bradley Deane, Rethinking Race and Masculinity in Kipling's Verse

Roberto Di Scala [Read by Ben Grant], Women on the verge of a cultural breakdown. The case of Kipling's "Lispeth"

Panel 12 Intertextuality (Chair: Harry Ricketts)

Joanna Kokot, On the borderland between two epochs.

Autothematic issues in Rudyard Kipling's short stories

Beatrix Hesse, Metatextuality in Kipling's Short Fiction

David Sergeant, The Mowgli Stories: a Genealogy of Kipling's Fiction

Panel 13 Empire (Chair: Harish Trivedi)

Laurence Davies, Kipling's Other Empire: The Aerial Board of Control

Peter Havholm, A Suitably Reserved Emotion

Judith Plotz, How "The White Man's Burden" Lost its Scare Quotes; Or Kipling, Madness, and the New American Empire

Session 8

Panel 14 Kipling and Postcolonialism (Chair: Caroline Rooney)

Richard Ambrosini, Kipling, the Historians, and Postcolonial Criticism

Claire Westall, What They Know of Nation and Empire: The Questioning of Rudyard Kipling and C. L. R. James

Harish Trivedi, A New Orientalism?: Edward Said on Kipling

Panel 15 Commemoration (Chair: John Walker)

Michael Aidin, Kipling and Memorials to the War Dead

Dorothea Flothow, If Any Question Why He Died: John Kipling and the Myth of the Great War

Ivan Wise, Kipling and Shaw's attitudes to war

Session 9 Keynote speech (Chair: Lyn Innes)

Benita Parry, 'Limits to the renewals of possibility in Kipling criticism'

Session 10

Panel 16 Masculinity and Blindness (Chair: Benita Parry)

Shirley Chew, Blindness and the Idea of the Artist in Kipling and Ondaatje

Jan Montefiore, Being a Man

Robert Hampson, Kipling and Masculinity: *The Light That Failed*

Howard J. Booth, Kipling among the Uranians

REWARDS AND FAIRIES AND THE NEO-ROMANTIC DEBT

By PAUL MARCH-RUSSELL
(University of Kent)

'All art is one' was the maxim of the British film director, Michael Powell, the filmmaker whose interests most closely corresponded to the Neo-Romantic art of the 1940s (see Mellor). Yet, 'all art is one' is also a quotation from "The Wrong Thing" from Rudyard Kipling's collection, *Rewards and Fairies* (1910). The phrase implies that all crafts amount to a form of art and that all arts are the manifestation of an eternal and timeless craft. The respective figures of the artist and the artisan, then, combine to become a single and indivisible entity. For both Kipling and Powell, the elision of artistry and craftsmanship inform their sense of artistic freedom. Despite the universalising claims of 'all art is one', Kipling's text does not necessarily offer an exclusively essential or timeless vision of England. Instead, the idealising tendencies of English mythology are set against a profound awareness of historicity, which results in a troubling sense of what is real and unreal, true or fictional within an historical account of what it means to be English. This tension can also be seen as the chief characteristic of the Neo-Romantic impulse, for example, in Powell's film, *A Canterbury Tale* (1944). Of particular note is that both texts seek to reforge Anglo-American relations by 'evoking a period before the independence of the modern USA' (Moor 2005: 147).

Like Kipling, the Anglo-Indian and self-made man, Powell had an outsider's perspective, being at odds with the documentary realism of his contemporaries and the wartime militarisation of the countryside. He was also viewing the landscape of his childhood through the eyes of his Hungarian co-writer and producer, Emeric Pressburger. Kipling was one of Powell's favourite childhood authors, in particular, *The Jungle Books* (1894-5), the *Just So Stories* (1902) and *Puck of Pook's Hill* (1906). Amongst Powell's many unrealised projects was an ambition to adapt Kipling's story, "They" (1904). The film historian, Ian Christie, has noted that Kipling and Powell share an 'innate interest in "how things work", an ability to perceive mystery in the apparently commonplace, and an almost literal sense of the constant presence of history' (Christie 1994: 6). It is no accident that Powell's meditation upon the imaginative resources of English history should engage deeply with Kipling's Puck narratives.

In his autobiography, Kipling comments of the writing of *Rewards and Fairies*:

Yet, since the tales had to be read by children, before people realised that they were meant for grown-ups; and since they had to be a sort of balance to, as well as a seal upon, some aspects of my 'Imperialistic' output in the past, I worked the material in three or four overlaid tints and textures, which might or might not reveal themselves according to the shifting light of sex, youth, and experience. . . . So I loaded the book up with allegories and allusions . . . It was glorious fun. (Kipling 1937: 190-1)

The book, then, was designed to appeal to different readerships in different ways and at different times. Kipling describes its composition as a jest in which he reverses the principle of 'Higher Editing'. Instead of selecting and paring his material, Kipling liberates himself as a writer by expanding his text to a point of excess. In contrast with the proto-modernist emphasis upon the ineffectuality of language in stories such as " 'They' ", Kipling revels in the ambiguities that his playful method of writing generates.

As in *Puck of Pook's Hill*, *Rewards and Fairies* features a combination of stories and poems. The poems, including the most well-known "If—", exert a framework upon the stories, in which the demi-god Puck, 'the oldest Old Thing in England' (Kipling 1906: 8), revives a series of mythical and historical figures for the children Dan and Una. In practice, however, the poems introduce an additional narrative layer to the stories that act as performance pieces in which tales are retold, conversations are conducted, and magic and history, as in the stories "Cold Iron" (*Rewards and Fairies*) and " 'Dymchurch Flit' " (*Puck of Pook's Hill*), are blurred. The poems, then, become only another perspective, rather than the defining point of view, through which to read the kaleidoscopic structure of Kipling's text, in which narrative elements are rearranged in relation to one another from one piece to the next.

The montage-like effect of *Rewards and Fairies* is, above all, a dialogue between characters, times and places. This dialogic tendency unsettles the writing of history as a monolithic narrative or *grand récit*. Furthermore, the structure of the text disturbs Kipling's own attempt at a dialogue between himself and his renewed sense of English identity following his arrival in the Sussex countryside (see Trotter). In writing *Puck of Pook's Hill* and *Rewards and Fairies*, Kipling is in one sense attempting to write himself into an English landscape that he elsewhere regards as 'marvellous' and 'foreign' (Kipling 1996: 113). In another sense, however, what is retained from a reading of these texts is a sense of wonder, an awed fascination with an historical past that is mystical and sublime, and yet estranges the reader from the source of

that fascination. To this extent, the reader is placed in the same position as Dan and Una from whom all memory of what they have seen and heard is erased by Puck even as they repossess and take 'seizin of Old England' (Kipling 1987: 55), referring both to the process of reclaiming history and the literal chunk of soil that Puck gives to Dan.

Knowledge, then, is predicated upon a paradoxical state of unknowing, of self-division, or to misquote Kipling, 'who knows of England who only England knows?' Instead of retreating from the present and into the past, and thereby reifying the mysterious origins of England, Kipling views English history from a series of estranged perspectives. These points of view include the itinerant figures that Dan and Una encounter, amongst them a changeling, a shaman, a smuggler and an apothecary. While political figures are presented as duplicitous, even where as in the cases of Charles Talleyrand and George Washington duplicity is shown to be necessarily expedient, only workers are depicted as thoroughly trustworthy. Artisans are given a special place in Kipling's pantheon since they create a vision of the future from materials, such as iron and wood, which come immediately to hand. In what amounts to an echo of the Romantic image of the artist, the creative imagination acts as a bridge between knowledge and ignorance, the past and the present, the individual and the whole. Yet, in concert with Kipling's recurring representation of the artist as a trickster from "Baa Baa, Black Sheep" (1888) to "Dayspring Mishandled" (1928), this emphasis also suggests an affinity between imagination and illusionism, in which the artist enchants his/her audience by conjuring a vision, a something other made from disparate or incongruous elements. The artistic exercise of the imagination, then, also implies a close association between art and magic. Art exposes the magical embedded within history while the writing of historical narrative is cast as an illusion.

The key to Kipling's use of illusionism is the act of reading itself. Both *Puck of Pook's Hill* and *Rewards and Fairies* are immersed in secret languages, including forgotten words for places and objects. For example, in the opening story of *Puck of Pook's Hill*, Puck reminds the children that Beacon Hill was once Brunanburgh and that Willingford Bridge was once Weland's Ford (Kipling 1906: 17, 19). While Dan and Una are enchanted by Puck, the reader is placed in a privileged position from which to see the magical process in operation. The reader witnesses Puck's magic from the internal point of view of the child and the external perspective of the adult. Reading is not only bound to the function of magic, since it is only by knowing the true names of things that the spell can be successfully cast, but it also offers a vantage-point from which the work of enchantment can be observed. Far from offer-

ing an essentialist vision of English identity as a mystical given, the supernatural elements of Kipling's prose reveal the charm of nationhood to be a material process, a cultural and historical activity to which Kipling's readers also contribute.

Powell's films exhibit a similar sense of national identity as both an embodiment and a performance, for example, in the opening transformation sequence to *A Canterbury Tale*, in which a medieval falcon returns as an RAF spitfire. The temporal abridgement recalls the ghostly echo of Kipling's poem, "The Way through the Woods":

You will hear the beat of a horse's feet
 And the swish of a skirt in the dew,
 Steadily cantering through
 The misty solitudes,
 As though they perfectly knew
 The old lost road through the woods. . . .
 But there is no road through the woods.

(Kipling 1987: 106)

Kipling's vision of a hidden history shadowing the present moment is reproduced in Powell's film by the local squire, Thomas Colpeper (Eric Portman). Colpeper's affinity with the countryside and his, by turns, mischievous and mysterious double life parallel Kipling's Puck. Yet, his name invokes the apothecary, Nicholas Culpeper, whom Puck affectionately mocks in *Rewards and Fairies*.

In addition to its Chaucerian echoes, *A Canterbury Tale* also alludes to Shakespeare and to Elizabethan England, a point of reference reinforced in *A Matter of Life and Death* (1946). In one of the many memorable scenes, a group of American servicemen are shown rehearsing a production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, the play that Dan and Una are performing in *Puck of Pook's Hill* when they unwittingly summon-up the demi-god. The blurring of dream and reality in Shakespeare's comedy is also true of *A Canterbury Tale*. Powell's original shooting script makes further allusion to Shakespeare, describing the village of Chillingbourne as 'awful and mysterious, full of strange shapes, stranger sounds, menacing shadows' (Moor 2005: 146). Compare this description with the 'strange shapes', 'marvellous sweet music' and 'monstrous' shades in *The Tempest* (III.iii. 18-32), a play steeped in the colonial experience just as Powell's enchanted isle is opened up to new types of invader: the army, Londoners, Americans and land girls.

In *Rewards and Fairies*, Kipling too returns to the era of Gloriana. Elizabeth I appears before Dan and Una disguised as a lady of the royal

court. At a more profound level, Elizabeth is always already disguised since, except in the poem, "The Looking-Glass", which follows the story (and which, consequently, the children do not receive), her private self is never on view. In "The Looking-Glass", Kipling draws, in part, upon a representation of Elizabeth associated with dramatic texts such as Friedrich Schiller's *Mary Stuart* (1800) where Elizabeth is depicted as lonely and guilt-ridden, the victim as much as she is the embodiment of a monarchical system that she has come to despise. Kipling, however, emphasises Elizabeth's stoicism by facing the mirror and declaring, 'Yet I am Harry's daughter and I am England's Queen!' (Kipling 1987: 85) In concert, however, with the other poems that frame the collection, "The Looking-Glass" attempts to rationalise what is otherwise not so clear-cut in the preceding story with regards to both Elizabeth's characterisation and political function.

The narrative of "Gloriana" turns upon a dramatic monologue, delivered in the third person while Elizabeth performs 'a silent, swaying, ghostly dance' (Kipling 1987: 80), in which she recounts her contest with Philip II of Spain. Elizabeth's stately, elegant and seductive pavane enacts her public role while shrouding her private self. The performance also dramatises Elizabeth's own sense of self-divison, a necessary symptom of the corruption, hostility and political suspicion, which Schiller for example describes in his play, while also portraying femininity as a masquerade. In this respect, Kipling was also following, albeit equally unwittingly, the insights of New Woman writers of the 1890s, such as the story "A Cross Line" (1893), in which George Egerton's heroine fantasises dancing like Salome to a rapturous audience (Egerton 1993: 58-9). In contrast, there is nothing fantastical about Elizabeth's dance: she reveals that her competition with Philip turned upon rival claims of ownership to settlements in the Americas and that he posed a genuine threat to the precariously balanced English nation. Egerton's heroine, though, imagines herself as a pastiche of Salome, thereby working upon a received archetype of female sexuality, and furthermore imagines the response of the audience: their applause seals both the performance and her own creative act of imagination. Kipling's characterisation of Elizabeth, however, is viewed from the outside since, as in the subsequent motif of the looking glass, the private and public faces of Elizabeth have become one. While, on the one hand, Kipling depicts femininity as a masque, on the other hand, there seems to be nothing there but the disguise, a 'masked head that seem[s] to have nothing to do with the busy feet' (Kipling 1987: 79). The lack of interiority is re-emphasised by Elizabeth's third-person narration in which she views herself as an object inside her own monologue, a discourse that in many ways does not originate with her

but is instead produced by the conflict of ideological forces: the political context of paranoia and anxiety, smoke and mirrors. Elizabeth's performance, then, reproduces an illusion in which she is at once subject and object, agent and conduit; in other words, a revenant, a ghost that appears to be alive, a past that appears to be present, a form that is nothing but an image or an idea of its former self.

In contrast with the relative sympathy of Kipling's poem, "Gloriana" portrays Elizabeth not only as an absence but also as an abyss, a void into which her listeners may tumble: 'The sunshine caught the jewels on her many rings and made them flash till Una's eyes dazzled' (Kipling 1987: 84). Here, Elizabeth is less like the protagonist of Egerton's "A Cross Line" and more like Kipling's serpent, Kaa, who uses his tessellated body, 'soft, oozy triangles that melted into squares and five-sided figures' (Kipling 1994: 52), to mesmerise his victims. Both Elizabeth and Kaa feel no compunction about killing as a form of survival. Although Elizabeth's actions are based upon necessary and justifiable expediencies, unlike the *realpolitik* of Talleyrand and Washington in "A Priest in Spite of Himself", Elizabeth's machinations are undercut by her representation as *afemme fatale* like classical demons such as Lilith, John Keats' "Lamia" (1820), and perhaps to those sexualised women, Mrs Bathurst and Mary Postgate, in Kipling's own adult fiction. The question uttered by Culpeper in electing to stay and treat the plague in "A Doctor of Medicine", 'What else could I have done?' (Kipling 1987: 216), acts as the leitmotif to the collection. Here, though, it is rephrased by Dan as 'She was bound to try to stop him'. The effect resembles in a musical composition where the leitmotif is in turn affected by the changing context in which it appears. In concert with the kaleidoscopic structure of the text, the leitmotif does not resolve all of the component parts into a comprehensive unity: instead, while lending a pattern to the whole as one protocol of reading, its relationship to the whole remains reciprocal. Consequently, it is significant in the context of "Gloriana" that it is Dan, who has fallen under the spell of Elizabeth, who utters the leitmotif but only after a series of questions from Elizabeth that effectively act as prompts: 'Were I Queen, I'd make you Minister' (Kipling 1987: 83). Although Una's suspicion of Elizabeth, 'I think this is rather creepy ... I wish she'd stop' (Kipling 1987: 79), is in part motivated by jealousy for the hold that Elizabeth has over Dan, her position parallels that of the implied reader for, although both children are enchanted by Puck, Una is *not* charmed by Elizabeth. Consequently, Una is for once in a similar position to that of the reader by being able to see in practice the work of enchantment as the glamour of Gloriana seduces Dan. Instead, Una is permitted to counter Dan's registration of the leitmotif by

responding, 'We don't play that game' (Kipling 1987: 84). Elizabeth's mocking laugh as she vanishes, almost like Lewis Carroll's Cheshire Cat, either suggests that Una is naive and unsophisticated or that it is she, Elizabeth, who has so totally intermingled fact and fantasy that she has lost her moral bearing. Although in "The Tree of Justice" De Aquila affirms that 'one cannot build a house all of straight sticks' (Kipling 1987: 259), Kipling's fictionalisation of Elizabeth's political role allows him to question the rightfulness of England's claim to the Americas. This is not to suggest that Kipling views Philip's claim as superior. Rather, as in Powell's cinema thirty years later, it enables Kipling to rethink the relationship between Britain and the USA. Arguably, this is why a text so concerned with English identity is also bound up with American history, for example, the stories "Brother Square-Toes" and "A Priest in Spite of Himself" and the poem "Philadelphia". In demystifying Elizabeth's actions, Kipling undercuts the historical moment when England began to define itself through international rivalry and colonial acquisition.

A Canterbury Tale complements Kipling's view of history. Like Elizabeth, the magisterial figure of Colpeper is undercut by not being permitted redemption so that, although his occult knowledge of English history acts as the film's keynote, his voice is only one amidst a hierarchy of discourses. As in much of *Rewards and Fairies*, the accent falls upon unsung figures, in this instance, servicemen and non-combatants such as the land girl, Alison (Sheila Sim), arguably a more fully articulated version of Kipling's Una. The armed forces are regarded as a necessary but unwelcome intrusion into the English countryside. The film's overall perspective is upon what will endure from the past and into the future: the world to come after the War ends. Consequently, the film's predominant themes are the need for redemption, as experienced by the modern-day pilgrims, and the continuance of art amidst political and military turmoil. The affinity that emerges between the American soldier, Bob Johnson (John Sweet), and the local blacksmith, Ned Horton (George Merritt), parallels the spiritual kinship between Sir Harry Dawe and Mr Springett in Kipling's story, "The Wrong Thing". These respective pairings embody the expression that 'all art is one'. Yet, in another sense, the timelessness of art exposes the fullness of time within the historical context of *A Canterbury Tale*. Powell's film does not reify history by turning it either into myth or a linear, plot-based drama. Instead, like Kipling's excavation of the Sussex landscape, *A Canterbury Tale* is aware of itself as occurring at a significant juncture in English culture where the forces of myth are ranged against historical narrative. As Kipling's protagonists continuously ask, what else can creative individuals, such as

Powell and Pressburger, choose to do within options preconditioned by the ideological circumstances of their time? In that sense, while *A Canterbury Tale* can be taken as an example of Neo-Romantic art, the movement can also be seen as indebted to Kipling's influence.

This is a shortened version of my paper, 'Kipling, Michael Powell and Neo-Romanticism'. I would like to thank Jan Montefiore for her assistance in editing the manuscript.

WORKS CITED

- Ian Christie, *Arrows of Desire: The Films of Michael Powell and Emeric Pressburger* (London: Faber, 1994).
- George Egerton, "A Cross Line", in *Daughters of Decadence: Women Writers of the Fin-de-Siècle*, ed. Elaine Showalter (London: Virago, 1993), pp.47-68.
- Rudyard Kipling, *The Jungle Books* (1894/5; London: Penguin, 1994).
- *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*, vol.3, ed. Thomas Pinney (London: Macmillan, 1996).
- *Puck of Pook's Hill* (London: Macmillan, 1906).
- *Rewards and Fairies*, ed. Roger Lewis (1910; London: Macmillan, 1987).
- *Something of Myself* (London: Macmillan, 1937).
- David Mellor (ed.), *A Paradise Lost: The Neo-Romantic Imagination in Britain, 1935-55* (London: Lund Humphries, 1987).
- Andrew Moor, *Powell and Pressburger: A Cinema of Magic Spaces* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2005).
- Michael Powell, *A Life in Movies* (1986; London: Methuen, 1987).
- and Emeric Pressburger, *A Canterbury Tale* (1944; Carlton DVD, 1999).
- William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, ed. Anne Righter (London: Penguin, 1968).
- David Trotter, 'Kipling's England: The Edwardian Years', in *Kipling Considered*, ed. Phillip Mallett (London: Macmillan, 1989), pp.56-70.

SYNTHESIS AND FRAGMENTATION: PANORAMIC VISUALITY IN *KIM*

By CHARLOTTE JOERGENSEN
(Royal Holloway)

INTRODUCTION

This paper seeks to show how a Victorian popular medium of entertainment is a fundamental part of Rudyard Kipling's novel *Kim* from 1901. *Kim* is considered a definitive work of fiction about the British Empire, because it gives imaginative form to quintessential British ideas about India. Kipling makes India exhilaratingly exotic, yet reassuringly familiar at the same time, and it is my argument that part of this feat is achieved through the use of a mode of representation well-known to a Victorian readership: the panorama. This popular pictorial phenomenon was a major cultural presence in nineteenth-century Europe, Russia, America, and the British colonies, and showed views of both European and Oriental towns and landscapes as well as forming a part of theatrical performances, fictional writings, scientific documentation, fairground and home-entertainment, and illustrations in the popular illustrated magazines. However, the most interesting thing about the panorama is not its subject-matter, but how it conditioned the gaze of not just its immediate audience but of Victorian society, a gaze which is closely linked to notions central to imperialism. The panoramic gaze is recognisable throughout *Kim*, and it is thus not only a story which narrates the Empire, but is very much a fiction springing from Victorian culture. Yet when Kipling wrote *Kim*, new pictorial entertainments had surpassed the panorama, so why did he use a declining medium? What is the significance of his use of the panorama to the narrative? The answer to these questions is related to imperialism's strained ideals at the turn of the nineteenth century.

PANORAMAS

In 1787 the Briton Robert Barker patented what in 1791 became known as a "panorama" after he had solved the problem of how to reproduce a correct perspective on a curved surface (Altick 132). The technique he had patented was a cylindrical building on whose outer inside walls a gigantic painting on canvas was hung. The visitor to this panorama would enter the building from below, walk to the centre and then walk up to the viewing platform. This platform would be constructed in such a way that the top and the bottom of the canvas would be hidden from the spectator's view, adding to the illusion of reality the panorama tried to create. The panoramas were painted with minute attention to detail

as part of the realistic movement and growing interest in history. Semantically the word "panorama" would come to denote a cornucopia of metonymically listed information and details while retaining the appeal to the visual imagination.

The first permanent panorama building opened in Leicester Square in 1794 and had its heyday together with other panoramas in the first two decades of the nineteenth century and continued, until it finally closed down in 1863. The size of this panorama was ninety feet, or approximately thirty meters in diameter. An even bigger panorama which compels attention was the painting in the London Colosseum which showed London as it could be seen from the top of St. Paul's Cathedral in 1821. This was 134 feet, or approximately 45 meters in diameter, and was painted directly in the wall. The viewing platform was accessed in a lift. The London panorama opened in 1829 but was only popular for a few years. Yet the building, still showing the panorama in an increasingly derelict condition, was used for other entertainment purposes, until this also closed down in 1868.

The panoramas were the newsreel of the day, illustrating what the papers wrote about. Therefore the topics included battle scenes from France, the Crimea, Egypt, and India, all showing a victorious British army carving out the emerging British Empire, which was thus given visual expression by the panoramas.

The panorama generated other "-oramas", which however lost the circumferential form. Its two main descendants were the moving panorama and the diorama. The moving panorama was a long canvas which would be rolled very slowly from one side to the other in a show, which could last for up to two hours. This would be ideal for imitating travel in the exotic places, which the British army had conquered in earlier panoramas. A lecturer would guide the audience through the trip. The diorama was one or two canvases, which were illuminated to create a dynamic effect. Daguerre, the inventor of photography and in his early career a panorama painter and by 1822 a theatre painter (Oettermann 77), had developed this technique by painting on both sides of a canvas with a combination of opaque and transparent colours. Depending on from which side the canvas was lit, two different scenes of the same place could be created.

It would only be the original panorama, which enwrapped the spectator completely in a total pictorial experience. Since the panorama was painted with the audience's point of view in mind, a significant characteristic of the panorama was its ability to centre the spectator. This centring emphasised the dominant position held by the British, their successful culture, its conquests and achievements. In nineteenth-century Britain the Euro-centripetal force was increased by the massive

presence of the various kinds of panoramas, which set up exotic places as a passive object for a British audience's gaze, a gaze which was confirmed by the centrality of Britain's own successful agency. In addition, the hugeness of the panorama gave the spectator the impression that the world stretched out unchangeably, and that it was a fixed, static landscape with unmoving people on a continuous horizon, exposed to the ever-present curiosity of the West. This horizon structure of the world has been theorised by Merleau-Ponty who bases his idea on Husserl, but places greater emphasis on the body, as his basic tenet is that our awareness of our body influences the way we perceive the world. He describes the horizon of the world which is ever present in our visual field thus: "The world, which I distinguish from myself as the totality of things or of processes linked by causal relationships, I rediscover "in me" as the permanent horizon of all my *cogitationes* and as a dimension in relation to which I am constantly situating myself (Merleau-Ponty xiv). This seems to suggest that the panorama created a sense of synthesis in the viewer. However, we must also notice that due to the dissolution of the normal vanishing point a panorama in Jonathan Crary's words 'stood for a permanent activation of the optical periphery at the expense of a stable centre of focused attentiveness' (Crary 3). Such 'a permanent activation of the optical periphery' is akin to an activation of the geographical periphery of an expanding British power, a boundary we could call the "colonial periphery." This activation of the periphery turns out to provide an interesting perspective on Kipling's use of the panoramic.

KIM

The panorama had from its early days a considerable influence on the British cognition of the world, a cognition which was ideal for supporting imperial ideas. So how are the panoramic and the imperial linked in *Kim*? How does Kipling use these panoramic elements and to what ends? First of all the narrative is structured by Kim's tours round the northern half of India in the company of the lama and Mahbub Ali, with whom he even sails across the Arabian sea. And Kim and the reader's consciousness is further protended when travelling on the railways with the telegraph poles flashing by; when viewing the broad and wide vistas of the plains with the foothills of the Himalayas in the background – a motif which is frequently repeated – and when travelling on the Grand Trunk Road, '[t]his broad smiling river of life' (*Kim* 109), which is also a 'seeing all India spread out to left and right' (111). All these lines and horizons embrace the wish-fantasy which is *Kim*.

However, these long lines across India would not constitute a panoramic experience without the repeated extensive detailed descriptions,

the archaeology, of scenes and people of these scenes. Kipling provides the reader with several catalogues of people whom Kim sees and meets: in the bazar and the Serai after he has met the lama. Sweeingly, we are told that here are 'all the races of Upper India' (65). We also meet a small contingency of Indian cultures in the railway carriage, where people 'sit side by side with all castes and people' (76), and among the pupils of St. Xavier's (171-2), but it is on the Grand Trunk Road that the big catalogue unfolds. In this very abbreviated extract we have the strong-scented Sansis, fair-traders calling; a 'marriage-procession . . . with music and shoutings, and a smell of marigold and jasmine stronger than even the reek of the dust'(110).

Yet despite all the efforts by the narrator the persons do not quite come to life; it is all too nice and good to be real. Although we are provided with smells and sounds, we are only given details about the good smells: how the Sansis' scent, and what the dust reeks from, we are not told, we only told of the exotic flower smells ofjasmine and marigold. Likewise with the sounds: these may be loud, but they are overalljolly; there is no infernal, intimidating noise here on the Grand Trunk Road, and it does not quite ring true. Going back briefly to the London panoramas, the subject-matter in these was odourless and silent; any intended sound would come from accompanying music and a description by a lecturer. The ones providing the reek were the audience, who could be quite pungent, and they would no doubt have made quite a lot of noise too. However, this lack of unpleasant smells and noises is what makes the catalogues in *Kim* truly panoramic: These scenes and people are primarily for visual consumption; the smell of sweat from people's daily toil and what is in fact very pungent flower scents remain unregistered.

We find Kim in another panorama situation, when he wakes up on the Grand Trunk Road as part of the Kulu woman's retinue:

The diamond-bright dawn woke men and crows and bullocks together. Kim sat up and yawned, shook himself, and thrilled with delight. This was seeing the world in real truth; this was life as he would have it—bustling and shouting, the buckling of belts, and beating of bullocks and creaking of wheels, lighting of fires and cooking of food, and new sights at every turn of the approving eye. The morning mist swept off in a whorl of silver, the parrots shot away to some distant river in shrieking green hosts: all the shell-wheels within ear-shot went to work. India was awake, and Kim was in the middle of it, . . .

(*Kim* 121)

In this passage we have strong panoramic elements. We have the declared veracity of panorama paintings: 'This was seeing the world in real truth'; we have the method for visual consumption of a panorama: '[N]ew sights at every turn of the approving eye'; and we have the spectator and his reception of the spectacle in the panorama building: 'Kim was in the middle of it', 'thrilled with delight'. Kim, of course, is no ordinary panorama spectator; he is one of the colonisers, he is part of the imperial enterprise. He is in fact '[t]his one boy in all India' (138) around whose controlling eyes and ears his father's regiment moves.

When Kim is discovered by the Mavericks, his self-chosen identity comes under pressure. Already we read how his perception of India has begun to change when he considers escaping into the 'great, grey, formless India, beyond tents and padres and colonels' (143). Gone are all the people from the Indian canvas, gone is the canvas with the horizon, which provides the structure for Kim's life in India. Gone in fact is the idea, which Kim has of India, which is 'beautiful to behold' and 'beautiful to watch', a 'country full of good folk' (111). And he has his first serious identity crisis, when he is alone in a train compartment on his way to St. Xavier's. Invariably, he compares this to his joyful first train ride with the lama and now discovers loneliness for the first time in his life:

I go from one place to another as it might be a kick-ball. It is my *Kismet*. . . . I am a Sahib. . . . No; I am Kim. This is the great world and I am only Kim. Who is Kim?' He considered his own identity, a thing he had never done before, till his head swam. He was one insignificant person in all this roaring whirl of India, going southward to he knew not what fate.

(*Kim* 166)

The world has begun to turn at a speed Kim is unfamiliar with. It is no longer a beautiful, slow-paced, even inert spectacle of benevolent indifference or dumbstruck admiration for Kim. Instead, it is a lonely world of indifference, a world with which Kim only realigns himself at the end of the story.

There are more representations-in-the-round. The motif of the wheel reverberates throughout the narrative in horoscopes, well-wheels, cog-wheels and the lama's Great Wheel of Life. The panorama is furthermore uncannily present in the idea of the Intelligence Survey where the players of the Great Game watch India, but they themselves are watched by the leader of the Intelligence Service, Colonel Creighton. This is a reminder of Jeremy Bentham's idea for a prison,

the penitentiary panopticon, where all prisoners could be watched by guards who themselves would be watched by the prison director.

The panorama show-form is recognisable in other scenes in *Kim*, and there is one last scene in particular, which normally we would not think of as panoramic, but which I would like to consider as a spectre of a Victorian pictorial experience. This is when Kim is almost hypnotised by Lurgan Sahib into believing that a smashed water jug regains its form. In *Kim* the scene after Kim has smashed the jar is described thus with Lurgan Sahib as lecturer:

'Look! It shall come to life again, piece by piece. First the big piece shall join itself to two others on the right and the left—on the right and the left. Look!'

To save his life, Kim could not have turned his head. The light touch held him as in a vice, and his blood tingled pleasantly through him. There was one large piece of the jar where there had been three, and above them the shadowy outline of the entire vessel. He could see the veranda through it, but it was thickening and darkening with each beat of his pulse. Yet the jar—how slowly the thoughts came!—the jar had been smashed before his eyes.

(*Kim* 202)

This spectral experience could have been produced by a magic lantern, but it would also resemble a diorama experience, where, as described earlier, switching the direction of the illumination could change the situation in a scene. The jar could thus be broken in one diorama scene and be made whole in the next. What links this scene in *Kim* to the imperial positive is Kim's resistance to succumb to the subconscious and other such mumbo-jumbo: A diorama is merely the manipulation of light and colour, and he, Kim, is in control of it all as is the Victorian reader familiar with such a visual experience.

CONCLUSION

Is it significant that Kipling uses all these panoramic elements? No, in the sense that he merely uses a lot of visual metaphors for his descriptions of India, this is no more significant than the use of any other era's cluster of favourite tropes; the language at the end of the nineteenth century simply contained references to the plethora of machinery for visual entertainment, which thus makes *Kim* reassuringly and comfortingly familiar. The story is in this respect home scenes from abroad. Still the question is: Is his deployment of this pictorial and subsequently cognitive device of the panorama just one more narratorial instance and expression of the panorama? After all, Dickens and Hardy

also used the idea of panoramas and dioramas (Meisel 64 and Dean). No, I think Kipling had a very particular reason for using the panorama, though he probably did not use it consciously. Returning to my previous remark about the panorama being the newsreel of its day, the panorama would be an old, partly outdated mode of mass communication at the turn of the nineteenth century. In other words, and to a Victorian especially around this time, this kind of entertainment would be associated with a familiar world of yesterday. Therefore the panorama was ideally suited for Kipling's purposes, namely creating a wish-dream of the future of the British Raj. This fantasy would be ambiguously strained between nostalgia for a past which never was, and a bid for a future which was not to be either. So it seems from this that the use of the panoramic was ideal for Kipling, when he created his dream of British India.

The panorama perhaps became so popular, because it visualised both the growing sense of fragmentation, which the emerging modernity heralded, as well as the centrifugal force of the colonial periphery. This force is even more abstract to grapple with than modernity, since the colonies to a metropolitan panorama spectator would be "out there", whereas modernity was "back here". However, the subject matter of the panoramas brought the colonial into Victorian consciousness, so the perception of these events on the geographical periphery would, through the panorama experience described earlier, be relegated to the visual, and through this, to the cognitive periphery. The panorama experience would therefore support an impression of the colonial as not only belonging to the boundaries, but as seeking those boundaries due to the protension of the horizon structure.

Kim finds himself on the colonial periphery in Shamlegh from where he looks into the abyss into which anything useless to the Empire can be thrown without leaving any sign of where it ends. The Empire is based on capitalism and utility, and the bottomless pit at the back of the Shamlegh woman's house is the big void outside the imperial sphere, which threatens to swallow you up, if you do not adhere to its rules. Kim has by now been reduced to a player in the Great Game and is fully aware that he can be disposed of as his superiors see fit, and if you do not accept the proposed synthesis of imperial unity and ideas, you are in danger of being slung off the imperial wheel or the colonial periphery.

Kipling uses *Kim* to tell us about the problems of modernity through Kim's personal development, first by suggesting the pre-modern synthesis, which we have lost, in Kim's certainty about himself as a singular subject, who relates to his surroundings. Then, when modernity

sets in, we are no longer able to see the outline of things, which all become a big blur without clear connections; this is a world without signs and direction (Crary 126), where Kim loses his sense of self. Lastly, Kipling proposes what is in fact a modern solution to modernity's own dissolution of the subject, namely to re-establish your sense of subjectivity through action, and through this action re-establish your relationship with the world and a sense of synthesis. However, Kipling's use of the panoramic for his delineation of the nostalgia for a pre-modern subjectivity in itself problematises the imperial dream, which he proposes, because the vanishing point in an entertainment panorama has been reversed: It is the spectator, who is the vanishing point, him in whom all lines of perspective meet, so instead of seeing the world moving in one direction as the traditional vanishing point does, the panorama spectator sees the world moving from many fragmented directions. Therefore, the feeling of synthesis which Kipling creates in *Kim* is based on an imperialist vision, which was in itself already a manifestation of modernity and fragmentation and protension towards the colonial periphery. It is this co-existence of synthesis and fragmentation which makes *Kim* a quintessential imperialist vision.

REFERENCES

Primary

Kipling, Rudyard. *Kim*, 1901. Edited and with an introduction and notes by Edward Said., Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1989.

Secondary

Altick, Richard D. *The Shows of London*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, UK: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1978.

Crary, Jonathan. *Suspensions of Perception: Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England: The MIT Press, 2001.

Dean, Susan. *Hardy's Poetic Vision in the Dynasts: The Diorama of a Dream*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. First published in French 1945. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Meisel, Martin. *Realizations: Narrative, Pictorial, and Theatrical Arts in Nineteenth-Century England*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Oettermann, Stephan. *The Panorama: History of a Mass Medium*. Transl. Deborah Lucas Schneider. First publ. in German 1980. New York: Zone Books, 1997.

Images of panoramas

Images of the Leicester Square panorama, the London Colosseum panorama, dioramas, moving panoramas, and Jeremy Bentham's penitentiary panopticon can all be found on the internet.

TRAFFICS AND RE-DISCOVERIES: RUDYARD KIPLING COLLECTIONS AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

By DEBRA D. WYNN
(Library of Congress)

In the call for papers earlier this year the stated intention for this conference was to "encourage new approaches to Kipling scholarship and to foster dialogue between the two different kinds of Kipling readers". The conference organizers were very gracious to allow me to present a paper on a topic that would be of interest to all Kipling readers. As one of the catalog librarians assigned to work on the Kipling Collections at the Library of Congress, it is definitely in my personal interest to encourage all approaches to Kipling scholarship. It is also an honor and a great opportunity to meet with so many international Kipling scholars, critics and enthusiasts to talk about the Kipling Collections at the Library of Congress.

First, let me briefly describe the Kipling Collections that are in the Rare Books and Special Collections Division at the Library of Congress. A brief summary is also provided in your conference packets. The *Chandler Kipling Collection* was given to the Library in 1937 and 1938 by Rear Admiral Lloyd H. Chandler who gathered Kipling texts from 846 prose works and over 1,100 verse pieces in preparation for a Kipling bibliography. The library has the 294 loose-leaf volume typescript Admiral Chandler compiled in that endeavor which was never fully published. In 1930 an abbreviated bibliography "The Works of Rudyard Kipling, a special edition compiled and annotated by Lloyd H. Chandler" was published as the companion volume to the 1929 Grolier Club exhibition catalog on Kipling. The *Carpenter Kipling Collection* was presented to the Library in 1941 by Mrs Lucille Russell Carpenter and includes around 1,675 Kipling items owned by her husband William Montelle Carpenter, businessman, Kipling enthusiast and collector extraordinaire. In 1984 and 1987 the ca. 1,500 item *H. Dunscombe Colt Kipling Collection*, another extraordinary collection was given by Mrs H. Dunscombe Colt to the Library. Summary descriptions of the LC Rare Books and Special Collections Carpenter and Chandler Kipling Collections are at: <http://www.loc.gov/rr/rarebook/coll/134.html>

Less well known, but also of importance is the Library's own Kipling Collection. In 1870, the United States Congress passed a law that required authors who wanted copyright protection to deposit two

copies of every book, pamphlet, map, print, piece of music, recording, etc. printed or produced within the United States with the Copyright office, now conveniently centralized in operation for the United States at the Library of Congress. Many of the items in the over 500 item and still expanding Kipling Collection were acquired through past copyright deposits made in compliance to this law. In addition, there have been transfers from the Library's existing general collections and later individual item acquisitions of Kiplingiana specifically for the Rare Book and Special Collections Division either purchased or given by other donors.

These four collections, totalling over 6,000 items contain printed editions, printing variants, pirated editions, auction catalogs containing Kiplingiana, magazines and journals, association copies, manuscripts, letters, photographs, drawings, realia and ephemera either written by Kipling or related to Kipling's life and work. They have been a rich source for Kipling scholars in the past and we hope, by finally making our cataloging records for these materials online that new and returning users can better discover or re-discover the known or new treasures in these collections.

Of course, it should come as no surprise to any Kipling scholar or any true Kipling enthusiast that there are many, many Kipling materials to be found at the Library of Congress. The standard published bibliographies such as Florence Livingston's *Bibliography of the Works of Rudyard Kipling*, first published in 1927 and her Supplement published in 1938 and the 1959 *Rudyard Kipling, a Bibliographical Catalogue*, compiled by James McG. Stewart and edited by A.W. Yeats also list the writings, pirated editions and other Kipling rarities to be found in the Library of Congress' collections. These bibliographies as well as earlier bibliographies compiled by E.A. Ballard, E.W. Martindell and Lloyd H. Chandler reflect the strengths of their compilers and their own private collections. Many of these early collections were broken up and in part acquired by new collectors and have ended up in a myriad of private and public institutions. The Library of Congress Kipling collections remain a valuable resource and new generations of scholars are not just moving down well-worn paths but are lighting out into new territory in use of these collections. Recently Thomas Pinney published his 6 volume collection of *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*, the final volume being published in 2004. Andrew Rutherford's edition of *Early Verse of Rudyard Kipling, 1879-1889, Unpublished, Uncollected and Rarely Collected Poems* was published in 1986. New biographical and critical treatment of the life and works of Rudyard Kipling continue to be published. In the past some materials in our collections had restrictions placed upon

their use by either their sensitive nature or by the request of their donors. For example when Charles Carrington wrote *Rudyard Kipling, his Life and Work*, there is internal Library evidence that certain materials were withheld by intervention of the donors and their use was restricted in some instances to just a few select scholars. Many letters were not available for examination until after 1960, five years after the 1955 publication of Carrington's "official" Kipling biography. Over the passage of time circumstances around collections have changed. Just this year, in 2007, the world of Kipling scholarship has opened up; there are no longer any such donor restrictions on the collections and copyright for Rudyard Kipling's unpublished manuscripts are now in the public domain in the United States. Kipling would not have been pleased.

Yes, some things have not changed. The Kipling Society is alive and well and its members are actively engaged in continued understanding, interpretation, scholarship and promotion of Kipling's work. Scholars and the curious have managed at particular skill to navigate their way through the incredible wealth of material by and about Kipling with the help of these published bibliographies and, at the Library of Congress, through the card catalogs and typewritten lists of materials compiled when these collections were acquired. But we're in a new century now and the potential for online access to the catalogs and to the content itself is presenting new challenges and opportunities to the Library of Congress. My guess is that scholars and Kipling enthusiasts alike would welcome better access to the materials they've heard and read about and also to those rarities they may have guessed or suspected must be at somewhere in the Library of Congress.

Staff at the Library of Congress have recently begun to re-catalog the four major Kipling Collections in the Library of Congress Rare Books and Special Collections Division for inclusion into the Library of Congress online catalog. It had become apparent that many of the items in these particular collections needed renewed cataloging attention. The existing card catalog files for the Chandler, Carpenter and LC's own Kipling Collection had been compiled in the early 1960's. When the Colt Kipling Collection arrived in the mid and late '80s scholars only had access to a typewritten inventory list of materials but no true catalog yet existed for the entirety of these materials. In late December of 2006 a colleague and I were assigned to dedicate the majority of our time cataloging the Kipling collections. I am happy to report that we are making substantial progress. My colleague and I are finding incredible items of interest. I would now like to highlight some of the unusual unpublished items discovered or re-discovered in the process of cataloging these collections.

There are a number of source materials such as photographs, letters, sketches, proofs, manuscripts, ephemera and printed editions related to Rudyard Kipling's *From Sea to Sea*, a round the world journey out of India through Asia, across North America and then to England in 1889. Foremost, are the non-book materials compiled by Mrs Edmonia Taylor Hill with the many photographs taken by her husband Samuel Alexander "Alec" Hill. An illustrated edition of stories based on the *Sea to Sea* articles Kipling was writing for the *Pioneer* newspaper back in India was envisioned using Mr Hill's photographs, but proved to be too expensive. According to a handwritten note by Mrs Hill three photograph albums were made from Mr Hill's photographs covering the India and Asian portions of the *Sea to Sea* trip. Throughout the Carpenter Collection in particular, much of the Hill materials acquired by William M. Carpenter have many of these very enlightening personal notes written by Mrs Hill which gives a different slant and provides further understanding to the interpretation of these source materials.

In addition, we have a small file of related images that were not included in the *Sea to Sea* photograph album that Mr. Carpenter acquired from Mrs Hill. These items and a few others that include Kipling portraits, caricatures and photographs are available for viewing through the Library of Congress Prints & Photographs online catalog on the Library of Congress website. There are dozens more visual items related to the 1889 *Sea to Sea* trip in the Carpenter Kipling Collection that are not yet in digitized form but the albums, photographs and scrapbooks related to this trip as well as other visual collections in all the Library's Kipling collections are being described in the Library's online catalog. This type of ephemeral material recognized as a rich resource today was not considered a high priority for attention in earlier cataloging practice. As a result, these materials have been forgotten and underutilized.

Kipling proceeded on his American portion of his *Sea to Sea* journey without the Hills and without Mr Hill's camera. He writes in a letter to Alec Hill on July 2, 1889 from Livingston Montana:

You should be with me. I haven't even a kodak and I'm moving among the lordliest scenery in a wilderness of Indians, cow punchers, herds of horses wandering loose over the prairie, pink and blue cliffs, cascades, tunnels and snow clad mountains that would make your very camera's mouth water with envy. (*The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*, edited by Thomas Pinney, 1990, vol. 1, pp. 326-327)

In one scrapbook compiled by William M. Carpenter, the collector takes Kipling's wish to heart and later attempts to re-create some of the North American leg of Kipling's 1889 *Sea to Sea* trip, this time taking photographs himself.

The Library of Congress is a big place. It is the largest library in the world and has over 130 million items. By chance, I had stumbled on the Carpenter Kipling Collection images in the Prints & Photographs Division database while working on another project. That also got me thinking: what else does the Library of Congress have that would be of interest to Kipling scholars that is outside of the known Carpenter, Colt, Chandler and Rare Book Kipling collections? I went to the Manuscript Division.

The Library of Congress Manuscript Division has over 50 million items (not all Kipling!). Their archivists are also involved in projects to convert their older finding aids from established collections and produce new online finding aids for newly acquired collections. With the help of their capable staff I was pointed toward a couple of in-house card files and databases where I could track down some references. As it happens, there are also scattered Kipling letters in various collections in their division. Many are now known as evidenced by inclusion in Thomas Pinney's monumental edition of Kipling's letters but some additional unrecorded letters have turned up in odd places. In a hand-out in your conference programs there is a brief list of the collections in the Manuscript Division that contain individual letters [appended to this paper – *Ed.*]. There are two Manuscript collections that I would like to mention in particular.

I would like to mention the papers of Theodore Roosevelt. It is no surprise to find Theodore Roosevelt papers in the Library of Congress; the Manuscript Division has the papers of twenty three American presidents. Not being particularly knowledgeable about Rudyard Kipling at the beginning of this project, it did come as a surprise to me to find a couple dozen letters between Roosevelt and Kipling. Additionally, there are the Kermit and Belle Roosevelt family papers which contain additional letters from Kipling to Roosevelt's son Kermit. In a letter addressed to Theodore Roosevelt on July 18, 1918. Kipling couldn't make out from the reports if Roosevelt's youngest son Quentin, a World War I pilot who had been shot down over France had been killed or if he was in enemy hands. Kipling and Roosevelt's bond of friendship and comfort Kipling tries to provide is very evident in this letter which was not found in the Theodore Roosevelt papers as would have been expected, but in the Roosevelt family papers. This particular letter is not included in Pinney's collected letters of Kipling [now see *Kipling Journal* No.325, March 2008, pp.61-2 – *Ed.*]. Now staying

with Roosevelt but returning to Rare Books and Special Collections there is a nice association copy of Kipling's 1919 poem "Great Heart" on the death of Theodore Roosevelt inscribed by Kipling to Roosevelt's son Kermit in the Colt Kipling Collection.

We are finding other surprises. Many of you may have heard the story about how one of Kipling's books stopped a bullet and saved a young man's life. This story was related in the July 1952 *Kipling Journal*. Maurice Hamonneau was a young soldier in the French Foreign legion in World War I. He narrowly escapes death due to his French translation of Kipling's *Kim* carried fortuitously in his left breast pocket. A grateful Hamonneau sends his battle-scarred copy of *Kim* along with his *Croix de Guerre* military medal he subsequently received to Rudyard Kipling. Kipling, of course, is flabbergasted and deeply moved. He accepts these valuable tokens on the condition that they would be returned once Hamonneau had a son. The collection of fourteen letters documents the budding friendship from the initial contact in 1918 until 1932 when at Hamonneau's request, Kipling returns the medal and the copy of *Kim* back to Maurice Hamonneau for Hamonneau's son Jean. This collection of items is in the H. Dunscombe Colt Kipling Collection, the special binding incorporates a *Croix de Guerre* medal on the inside front cover. The only access to the Colt Kipling collection was through an inventory list that was compiled on site from Library staff when the collection was acquired in 1987, but was only available on site. There is now a catalog entry for it now in the Library of Congress online catalog accessible by any library user anywhere with an internet connection. These letters are not included in Pinney's edition of Kipling letters.

My final example is from an item that I re-discovered the end of June, again described by William M. Carpenter in his "A few significant and important Kipling items!". This item is a hand lettered and illustrated theater program on a small 10 x 7 cm. card drawn by Rudyard Kipling for a performance of the 1853 Tom Taylor play "Plot and Passion". This card records the performance by an amateur theatrical group in Lahore, India (Pakistan) on December 20, 1883 starring Rudyard Kipling in the role of Desmarests, "Head of the secret department". William M. Carpenter indicates that this program card was given to Miss Plowden, a close friend of the Kipling family, on the morning of the performance. On the back of the card is a poem with twelve lines of verse from 1883. The text of this poem is included as the final two stanzas in "Preadmonisheth ye ghoste of Desmarests", a six stanza verse cited in Andrew Rutherford's *Early verse by Rudyard Kipling, 1879-1889*, but Rutherford fails to note this miniature program with the abbreviated poem with only the final two stanzas. The

abbreviated version is also not listed in Stewart's *Bibliography*. It was easy to overlook; I had to use a magnifying glass myself to read it:

What know ye of "Plot and Passion"—as we took their meaning
then?
When our Goddesses were women, and our men were more than
men;
When Life and Death were counters, and we slaked them boldly
both—
And the guillotine might follow on a lover's broken oath,
When the "ladies from the Fauberg" broke the bank of Petiot
At Paris of the Empire in the days of long ago.

Yet I linger for a moment—mark the progress of your play;
Watch some guileless little gamin act the part of Desmarests.
But your woods have lost their passion,
And your speech is strange and cold,—
You can neither love nor hate Sires, as we did in days of old.
Ah me for jaded glories of "Le Petit Denisot."
Where I schemed and died at Paris in the days of long ago.

My colleagues and I are usually amazed and delighted, sometimes puzzled at the unusual materials we're privileged to process at the Library of Congress. The Kipling Collections are no different in that regard. There is much rich material to use and much more to discover. Many items in LC's collections may already be well known to many of you. As scholars, critics, and enthusiasts, going back and re-reading Kipling can always reveal fresh insights. It shouldn't be any different that a library in reassessing, and reprocessing its collections wouldn't also achieve similarly insightful results and turn up new items along the way, even unpublished ones. We welcome renewed traffic to our Kipling collections and hope you will make some new discoveries as we share our rediscoveries with you.

**RUDYARD KIPLING MATERIALS IN THE MANUSCRIPT DIVISION,
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS**

Miscellaneous Manuscript Collection, Rudyard Kipling file

Correspondence

To Mrs Jackson Stoddard.

*TLS to Mrs Jackson Stoddard, League of American Pen Women,
Feb. 7, 1919.

TL to Mrs Jackson Stoddard, 1/30/1936? Unsigned, G.L. Nicholson,
secretary. Postmarked May 29, 1935.

**TLS to Mrs Jackson Stoddard, Dec. 6, 1935.

To Ambrose Poynter.

*ALS to "Ambo" Poynter, 4 p. dated Aug. 23, 1902 + typewritten transcript (2 p.), carbon copy.

Manuscript poems

Photostat copy of "Recessional" (manuscript) 2 leaves, 2 copies.

Ms. text of "The Last Chanty", 2 leaves. Ms. text of "The White Man's Burden", 1 leaf.

John Davis Batchelder collection of manuscripts, 1537-1944 (bulk 1800-1910).

Signed copy of printed poem "Recessional".

Catalog record searchable by title in Library of Congress website:
<http://catalog.loc.gov/>

Andrew Carnegie Papers

To Andrew Carnegie.

From Rudyard Kipling, June 25, 1899; to Andrew & Mrs Carnegie [1899, undated]; to Andrew Carnegie [1899, undated].

From Caroline Kipling to Andrew Carnegie, Oct. 19, 1899; Oct. 28, 1899. Information from Card file in Library of Congress, Manuscript Division Reading Room.

Papers of Lewis Nathaniel Chase, 1892-1941.

To Dr. Chase.

TLS July 7, 1933; TLS Oct. 29, 1935.

TL carbon May 31, 1917 from Chase to Kipling; carbon TL July 11, 1933 from Chase to Kipling; TLS Oct. 15, 1935 from Chase to Kipling.

To Samuel Loveman.

TLS from Kipling to Samuel Loveman, July 18, 1933. (Exchange of correspondence regarding Kipling's un-attributed "lifting" of a phrase in his poem "The File" from an earlier poem by Thomas Holley Chivers with Dr. Chase, a literature professor at Brown University).

Catalog record searchable by title in Library of Congress website:
<http://catalog.loc.gov/>

Papers of Moreton Frewen, 1871-1932.

To Moreton Frewen.

ALS June 15, 1900; July 31 1911; Jan. 28, 1917. 1 undated note.

Extracts of letters (typescripts): Oct. 7, 1905; May 6, 1906; June 11, 1906; Sept. 29, 1911; Feb. 2, 1912; Mar. 28, 1918.

Catalog record searchable by title in Library of Congress website:
<http://catalog.loc.gov/>

The Charles C. Hart autograph collection, 1476-1942.

**To George Frederick Kunz*, Signed by Kipling, letter dated April 26, 1919, 3 p. Photostat copy.

Catalog record searchable by title in Library of Congress website:
<http://catalog.loc.gov/>

Papers of Ken D. McCormick, 1882-1992. (Editor at Doubleday, Doran & Co.)

Boxes 62—65, 166. Business letters with some carbon copies of personal correspondence between Rudyard and Caroline Kipling and Nelson Doubleday. Includes information about copyright renewals, infringements, movie and adaptation rights, royalties, print runs and later re-publications of popular Kipling titles such as '*Captains Courageous*', *The Jungle Book*, *Kim*, *Something of Myself* and anthologies of Kipling works. 1927-1961.

<http://www.loc.gov/rr/mss/text/mccormc.html>

Papers of Louise Chandler Moulton, 1852-1908.

*ALS undated on Embankment Chambers, Villiers Street Strand letterhead to [Verschouten?].

*ALS undated on Embankment Chambers, Villiers Street Strand letterhead to Mrs. Chapman.

Catalog record searchable by title in Library of Congress website:
<http://catalog.loc.gov/>

Papers of Owen Wister, 1829-1966.

Box 26. About Kipling, 1 item <http://www.loc.gov/rr/mss/text/wister.html>

Correspondence of Alexander Woolcott, 1925-1968.

Typewritten transcript of letters (1941) from Woolcott to Edmund Wilson discussing Rudyard Kipling. Catalog record searchable by title in Library of Congress website: <http://catalog.loc.gov/>

Theodore Roosevelt Papers

23 letters from 1897 through 1918. See index to the Theodore Roosevelt papers.

From the Index: *Kipling R. from TR 1897 JA 5; *Kipling R. to TR 1897 MR 25; *Kipling R. to TR 1897 DE 21; Kipling R. to TR 1898 SE 23; *Kipling R. from TR 1904 NO 1; *Kipling R. from TR 1910 AP 21; *Kipling R. to TR 1911 JE 12; Kipling R. to J.B.

Gilder 1914 MY 25; Kipling R. to TR 1914 SE 15; *Kipling R. from TR 1914 OC 3; Kipling R. to TR 1914 OC 20; *Kipling R. from TR 1914 NO 4; *Kipling R. to TR 1914 DE 8; *Kipling R. from TR 1915 JA 16; Kipling R. to TR 1917 AG 5; Kipling R. to TR 1917 NO 12; Kipling R. to TR 1918 AP 21; *Kipling R. to TR 1918 MY 4; Kipling R. to TR 1918 NO 7; *Kipling R. from TR 1918 NO 23; *Kipling R. from TR 1918 NO 30; *Kipling R. from TR 1918 DE 28; *Kipling R. Table talk, 1914 verse. Also *ALS dated Sept. 21, 1918, not in index from Kipling to Roosevelt instructing TR: "I think you'd better burn this when you're through with it".

<http://www.loc.gov/rr/mss/text/roosvlt.html>

Kermit & Belle Roosevelt Family Papers:

Box 15: *ALS to Theodore Roosevelt from Rudyard Kipling, July 18, 1918.

Box 61: *Telegram, August 17 to Kermit Roosevelt from R.K. Aug.1, 1917.

*ALS to Kermit Roosevelt from R.K. Aug. 2, 1917. *ALS to Kermit Roosevelt from R.K. Sept, 3,1918.

<http://www.loc.gov/rr/mss/text/roosek3.html>

(* not in Pinney. *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*, edited by Thomas Pinney, 1990-c2004).

(** mentioned in note for 1936 letter but this letter not transcribed in Pinney).

Note

Digital images of some Kipling items are available from the Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division Online Catalog (PPOC) from the Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division website at: <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/pp/pphome.html>

All collections are searchable in the Library of Congress Online Public Access catalog at <http://catalog.loc.gov/> by either searching individual titles, authors, etc. or by browsing the collection names *Colt Kipling*, *Carpenter Kipling*, *Chandler Kipling* or *Kipling Collection* in the author/creator search box. Cataloging is not yet completed for all items in these collections. Images from the Carpenter Kipling Collection and other collections are searchable at <http://www.loc.gov/rr/print/catalog.html>, the LC Prints & Photographs database.

The materials listed above are not part of the four major Kipling collections at the Library of Congress (which was why I included it in the first place). They represent a very small fraction, and of the total, about 25-30% of which have been transcribed by Prof T. Pinney in his *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling*. For example, of the collection of 15 original letters written by Kipling to Maurice Hamonneau in the Colt Kipling Collection which I mentioned in my paper, only a holograph draft of one Kipling-Hamonneau letter at the University of Sussex is the only item published in Pinney's work from that significant collection of correspondence.

KIPLING AND SHELL-SHOCK: THE HEALING COMMUNITY

By GEORGE SIMMERS
(Oxford Brookes University)

I have a dream—a dreadful dream—
A dream that is never done,
I watch a man go out of his mind,
And he is My Mother's Son.

They pushed him into a Mental Home,
And that is like the grave
For they do not let you sleep upstairs,
And you're not allowed to shave.

In the poem "The Mother's Son" (first published in *Limits and Renewals*), Kipling is putting himself imaginatively into the mind of a soldier who has been damaged by War. He was not alone in finding this a potent and important theme. The realisation, from 1914 onwards, that some men had been so traumatised by war that they presented strange and disturbing hysterical symptoms was one that alarmed soldiers, mystified doctors and frightened the general public. Over the past ninety-odd years much has been written about the subject, and I apologise for the fact that what I am going to say now is a gross simplification, but here is a two-minute history of shell-shock.

At first there was much confusion about how to deal with it. The military had four categories in which soldiers were placed – fit, wounded, sick or mad. How do you categorise a man whom exposure to conflict had rendered trembling, obsessive and hallucinating? The first impulse of some soldiers was to say — this man is fit and unharmed, therefore malingering and subject to military discipline. This was hardly a satisfactory solution, though, for men who were clearly not in control of their reactions or their behaviour.

Doctors claimed it as a medical condition, and proposed a variety of cures – those who had used painful electric shock therapy on hysterics before the war developed its use with soldiers; Neurologists who in pre-war years had prescribed the Weir Mitchell treatment, rest, a milky diet and regimentation, advocated that; psychoanalysts recommended getting the men to understand their symptoms through the talking cure. Each of these approaches claimed some successes. Meanwhile, the military were disturbed that many men were being lost to the army. There was a suspicion that some were courting the diagnosis as an easy and

not dishonourable way of evading their military duty. As the preface to the 1922 Southborough committee's enquiry into shell-shock remarked:

. . . This class of complaint excited more general interest, attention and sympathy than any other, so much so that it became a most desirable complaint from which to suffer. (p.6)

Many soldiers came to look at the problem in a different way – as a question of morale. As the Regimental Medical Officer for the 4th Black Watch told the Southborough enquiry: :

If morale is good in a battalion, you will have less so-called 'shell-shock' or war neurosis. . . I regard 'shell-shock' or war neurosis as very contagious when it gets into a battalion. (Report p.66)

A new pattern of treatment was developed – men were kept in France, not sent home. The label "shell-shock" was avoided, and men suffering from symptoms were classified as "Not Yet Diagnosed (Nervous)". They were given a period of rest, but were not allowed to lose their military identities. Gradually they were reintroduced positively to military duties. This seems to have worked for the less serious cases. So what did Kipling think? Well, he rejected the idea that it was a disciplinary or medical matter:

And it was not disease or crime
Which got him landed there,
But because They laid on My Mother's Son
More than a man could bear.

But in the third line, who are "They"? The Germans who sent so ferocious an artillery barrage that the man lost his wits? Or the British Army that demanded too much of his fortitude? In that case, are They us and should we (to quote another Kipling poem) :

. . . end by (think of it!) looking on We
As only a sort of They!

That is a possible reading – or we can look at it quite differently and think of the man's problem as precisely that he is making a distinction between himself and a hostile "They" to whom he does not belong. When Kipling considers the problem of shell-shock, it is linked closely with questions of isolation and belonging. In a series of stories written over a long period, from 1918 to the mid-thirties, Kipling explored the question of those on whom the war had imposed an intolerable burden. And it's worth noting that his treatment of the theme is significantly different from that of most other writers of the period. For a start, most others write stories centred on officers or ex-officers. Fictional accounts

of psychologically suffering private soldiers are in short literary supply. The early detective novels of Dorothy L. Sayers reflect the usual stereotype. Lord Peter Wimsey (Major, Rifle Brigade) returns from the war restless, neurotic, tormented by terrible dreams, and with an overwhelming need to be diverted by detection, whilst his servant and ex-batman – "the indefatigable Bunter", as he is called in *Whose Body?* (1923) – who had presumably been through many of the same experiences, remains forever stolid, dependable and balanced. Neurosis becomes a mark of sensitivity, and for many writers of the day sensitivity was something reserved for the officer classes, though the statistics of actual war-induced neurosis tell a very different story, as is made clear by Peter Barham's book *Forgotten Lunatics of the Great War* (2004.) Kipling knew that war affected all classes, and so set many of his stories of shell-shock in a community that proudly proclaimed its openness to all classes and sorts of men, a Masonic lodge that first appeared in 1918, in the story, " 'In the Interests of the Brethren' ". (Kipling made much of the inclusive nature of Freemasonry. Remembering his own first Lodge in Lahore, he claimed in a 1931 letter: 'I was entered by a Hindu, raised by a Mohammedan, and passed by an English Master').

" 'In the Interests of the Brethren' " (later included in *Debits and Credits*) was written shortly after Kipling joined the War Graves Commission, and six months after he had agreed to write a campaign history of his son's regiment. In the *Story-Teller* magazine for December 1918 where it was first published, its propagandist purpose was made explicit by the editorial comment: 'The motif which lies behind it is such that we urge all those who have relatives in the War who are Freemasons to send them a copy.' In the story, the narrator has an inconsequential meeting with a stranger in a birdshop. Some time later:

... I turned into a tobacconist's to have a badly stopped pipe cleaned out.

'Well! Well! and how did the canary do?' said the man behind the counter. We shook hands, and 'What's your name?' we both asked together.

The Masonic handshake has bonded the two men, and soon Brother Burges, proprietor of Burges and Son ("but Son had been killed in Egypt") introduces the narrator to his Lodge in a converted garage just around the corner from his shop. "Visiting brothers" – soldiers in London who want to re-establish contact with Freemasonry, are being tested to make sure that they are genuine. They include a one-armed New Zealander, a man "all head-bandages" with only six teeth and half

a lower lip, a silent "shell-shocker" and a man who seems to have forgotten everything:

'I don't blame yer,' he gulped at last. 'I wouldn't pass my own self on my answers, but I give yer my word that so far as I've had any religion, it's been all the religion I've had. For God's sake, let me sit in on Lodge again, Brother!'

The visitors are set to work, one as an organist, though he has to be carried to the organ-loft, others to the recitation of ritual; the familiar words of the ceremony stir the memory of the Visiting Brother who had forgotten everything. It is important to both Brother Burges and to Kipling that they should be conducting the ritual for themselves, not having it done for them. This is a place of self-help and mutual help, not of top-down charity. The community is supportive, but gives men a chance to be useful through working – 'You'll often find half-a-dozen brethren with eight legs between 'em, polishing and ronuking and sweeping everything they can get at.'

Crucial to the enterprise is the framework of ritual. "All ritual is fortifying," as Brother Burges says. In his early Indian stories Kipling had valued the army for the order that its routines gave to otherwise disorderly lives. In his imagined Lodge, Freemasonry offers something of the same.

Kipling had always been aware of the fragility of men, and their need for groups, both formal and informal, to which they belong. Mulvaney, Learoyd and Ortheris, his Soldiers Three, are formidable together, but each has his vulnerability, as is shown especially in the story "The Madness of Private Ortheris" where heat and melancholy drive Ortheris to the brink of suicide, but he is helped through the night by Mulvaney. One might also remember '*Captains Courageous*'. The crew of the *We're Here* individually have weaknesses and limitations.. Together, though, they are strong. It is an insight that underlies many of Kipling's stories from first to last – every human needs a group with which he can identify; isolation and exclusion lead to despair.

So what Kipling is imagining in " 'In the Interests of the Brethren' " is a community where damaged men can feel at home, and can feel useful. The Masonic Lodge is not the only such possibility. In "The Woman in his Life" (*Limits and Renewals*), Kipling describes a man helped by the most minimal community. John Marden is an engineer who had spent much of the war underground, with the tunnelers under Messines Ridge. Long after the war he falls into what might now be diagnosed as a clinical depression:

. . . the horror, the blackness, the loss of the meaning of things. . . a certain secret dread which he had held off him since demobilisation.

A doctor only suggests a sedative and a rest. Marden goes to the country, but is brought to the brink of suicide by hallucinations, including a Black Dog, "an inky, fat horror with a pink tongue".

It is Marden's disreputable servant, Shingle, his ex-batman, "systematically a peculator, intermittently a drunkard and emphatically a liar," who saves the day by fighting the Black Dog of the mind with one that is flesh and blood — Dinah, an Aberdeen terrier. The dog's needs and demands bring out forgotten qualities in John, and finally, when the dog is trapped in an underground cave, he is forced to confront the wartime terrors that he has repressed. So here we see Kipling's idea of the healing community at its simplest: the crafty servant who looks after Marden, and the dog whom he in turn must care for. Between them they save him.

The story that most clearly shows the great variety of possible supportive communities is "The Janeites" (*Debits and Credits*). This story centres round a member of the Lodge called Humberstall, "an enormous flat-faced man, carrying the shoulders, ribs and loins of the old Mark '14 Royal Garrison Artillery, and the eyes of a bewildered retriever," presently a hairdresser. He had been badly affected when "the dump blew up at Eatables" but the Colonel allowed him to stay in France with the battery as a mess waiter — obviously because he knew that the military identity was essential to the man. A friend and fellow-soldier, Macklin, a "toff and ex-schoolmaster looks after him, and realises that Humberstall needs something to fill his mind. Macklin, as an educated man, can discuss literature on equal terms with the officers.

A debate about Jane Austen mystifies Humberstall — (Here's a private contradicting an officer, and who's Jane?) so Macklin invents a fantasy about a fictional community of Janeites, into which Humberstall can be initiated, if he makes a huge effort. This works not unlike Brother Burges's Masonic Lodge; Humberstall's mind is kept busy with detail, as Macklin makes him not only read the books, but learn pages by heart. " 'E said 'e'd been some sort o' schoolmaster once, and he'd make mind resume work or break 'imself." And there actually is, Kipling suggests, both in the story and outside it, a community of Janeites, though it is informal one, and not the organised esoteric society of Humberstall's imagination. A new officer feels at home in the Mess when he discovers others who share his literary enthusiasm; the officers accept being put right by a drunken Macklin on this literary matter, when almost any other kind of interruption would have led to a charge and punishment. Finally, and most important for Humberstall, his mention of Miss Bates to an otherwise imposing matron 'a woman with a nose and teeth on 'er') means that she takes a special interest in him, and ensures that he is included in the hospital train back to England — which possibly saves

his life. People recognising a commonality of interest form bonds that help them in unexpected ways. In the Lodge it's mentioned that a taxi-driver argues with his fare, but when both realise that they have served together in the Palestine campaign, they are firmly bonded against the rest of the world:

'Just like 'avin' the Password, eh?' was Humberstall's comment.

'That's right! Ours was *Imshee kelb*. Not so 'ard to remember as your Jane stuff.'

In the Lodge, Humberstall has been supervised by Brother Anthony, who makes him work hard and talk about his experiences – two essential elements of the restorative process. Right at the end of the story, Anthony's blush reveals that he is engaged to Humberstall's sister. A final type of supportive community is revealed – a loving and caring family.

There is more to these Masonic stories than is suggested by the comment of critic Douglas Hewitt that:

The stories of shell-shock end with the clipped tones of men of power and action who know how to put things right. (347)

Paternalism was something that Kipling quite frequently approved of, but I don't think it's what is happening in these stories. In "Fairy-kist" (*Limits and Renewals*), for example Lodge-members prove that a war-damaged ex-soldier is innocent of murder, and even show how the man's odd delusions and eccentricities come from memories of a children's story read to him by a well-meaning nurse. However, Kipling makes it clear that their solution to the problem has no effect on his mental condition, and he happily continues with his eccentric practice of planting flower seeds on the verges of roads, lunatic by everyday standards, but to him a sensible, satisfying and absorbing practice.

Shell-shock may not be cured, but men, Kipling is saying, can be helped to find an alternative to the existential emptiness that war has inflicted on them. Kathryn Sutherland, in her commentary on "The Janeites" in *Jane Austen's Textual Lives*, has described clearly why the Masonic Lodge is, for Kipling, particularly useful. It offers:

... a set of social ideals based on male self-sufficiency, shared knowledge and comradeship, where special jargon and rituals not only confer power – the power of a secret mastered and shared — but imply unity and sense, a world that makes sense, obeys rules, and protects those inside it. (p.20)

And Kipling's remedy is a long way from the rest and milky diet formula that wants to cure men by giving them a life that is the opposite of

war. The Lodge's familiar ritual, hard work and all-male community is very like the Army in whose service these men have been damaged. So we can see Kipling as being on the side of those who saw shell-shock as a problem of morale, as a loss of control that needs to be combated by the reinforcement of a sense of the man's identity as member of a supportive group.

To go back to "In the Interests of the Brethren" – it is capable of being looked at in a different way. While *The Story-Teller's* editorial comment focused on the possibility of a Lodge's helping others, Kipling's narrative suggests something else as well. Brother Burges, as I reminded you, was proprietor of Burges and Son ("but Son had been killed in Egypt"). In *The Story-Teller*, the tale begins like this:

I WAS buying a canary in a birdshop when he first spoke to me and suggested that I should take a less highly coloured bird. 'The colour is in the feeding,' said he. 'Unless you know how to feed 'em, it goes. Canaries are one of my hobbies.'

By the time it was reprinted in *Debts and Credits* in 1926, however, Kipling had made a significant correction:

I WAS buying a canary in a birdshop when he first spoke to me and suggested that I should take a less highly coloured bird. 'The colour is in the feeding,' said he. 'Unless you know how to feed 'em, it goes. Canaries are one of our hobbies.'

"My" has become "our". Later in the story Kipling drops the hint that Burges has now given up canaries. With the correction, Kipling wants to make very sure that we recognise that bird-breeding was something that Burges and his son had done as a pair. Their joint hobbies have lost all their appeal. No longer part of that significant pair, Burges has devoted immense effort to transforming the Lodge as much for his own sake as for the soldiers. Organising meetings several evenings a week and two afternoons as well is his way of filling his life with useful activity, just as the polishing and ronuking was for the soldiers, and maybe as the War Graves Commission and *The History of the Irish Guards* were for Kipling. When Burges says that 'All ritual is fortifying' he is not just speaking of the soldiers but for himself as well, and indeed for Kipling. We can see Burges as a partial self-portrait of the author not only in his desire to help the war-damaged, but also in the intensity of his need. The same things are needed to help the bereaved as to help the war-damaged, Kipling is saying; they are in the same boat. What threatens them both most frighteningly is loss of meaning, existential emptiness. That is why Kipling felt able to write "The Mother's Son" in the first person.

It is also, perhaps why these stories so often foreground the act of story-telling. The middle-aged Lodge members of the frame stories sometimes sort out problems, but more characteristically they are engaged in story-telling, often as a group, each of them making his own contribution to the narrative. Kipling doesn't explain why they do this – he doesn't feel that he needs to – the sharing of stories is a way of reinforcing the group's bonds, as well as refining its shared view of the world.

In "Fairy-Kist" the Lodge-members communally tell a story which is about the unexpected effect of a story on a troubled man — quite unexpectedly it gives him purpose and activity. The story that obsesses him is *Mary's Meadow* by Juliana Horatia Ewing, a children's book from the 1880s that in itself is a story about the power of stories – inspired by old books, a family of children improvise together a tale about gardeners and honest-root-gatherers, and then put the story into practice by planting flowers by the roadside, for the pleasure of travellers. By writing his story about men telling a story about a man obsessed by a story about children acting out a story based on stories that they have read, Kipling has affirmed his own place in the great community of storytellers. Possibly, too, he has given us a rather strange self-portrait.

By 1927 Kipling felt increasingly isolated and out of touch with an age that had by and large rejected many of his political ideals. Yet he kept on writing stories, and publishing them, often in magazines where they sit rather oddly with the rest of the contents, despite complaints that they were becoming too obscure, in the hope that they would give pleasure and consolation to others. One of these tales is "Fairy-Kist", with Wollin, who is impelled to motor-cycle obsessively around the countryside, for reasons he only partly understands, planting flowers in the hedgerows with the hope of making the world a better place for others; who has been damaged and disturbed by the war, but who when he busily 'cuts about the Home Counties planting his stuff and is utterly absorbed in this work, becomes 'as happy as—Oh my soul! *What* wouldn't I give to be even one fraction as happy as he is!' If we take flowers as an equivalent of stories, isn't this perhaps a portrait of the artist?

REFERENCES

- Report of the War Office Committee of Enquiry into Shell-Shock*, 1922, reprinted by the Imperial War Museum, London, 2004 (The Southborough Report).
- Juliana Horatia Ewing, *Mary's Meadow*, 1886, available online.
- Douglas Hewitt Review of Kemp, *Kipling's Hidden Narratives*, in *Essays in Criticism*, Vol.39, Jan 1989.
- Kathryn Sutherland *Jane Austen's Textual Lives: From Aeschylus to Bollywood*, Oxford 2005.

" "TIN FISH" "
TWO TEXTS, TWO READINGS

By DANIEL KARLIN
(The University of Sheffield)

My subject is one of Kipling's shortest complete poems. I want to look at this poem in two different, perhaps opposed ways. I begin with the poem as I first encountered it, in the so-called *Definitive Edition* of Kipling's verse.

"TIN FISH"
1914-18
(*Sea Warfare*)

The ships destroy us above
And ensnare us beneath.
We arise, we lie down, and we move
In the belly of Death.

The ships have a thousand eyes
To mark where we come . . .
But the mirth of a seaport dies
When our blow gets home.

As it stands in the *Definitive Edition* the poem is signposted in certain ways. The quotation marks around the title indicate that it is a bit of slang or jargon. The context makes it clear that it means 'a submarine'; Kipling's command of naval slang is questionable, by the way, but I don't have time to go into that here. Then the date: '1914—18', obviously referring to the Great War. Below the date comes a reference to the volume in which the poem was first printed, *Sea Warfare*. The impression I got from this information was that the poem offers a general, not a specific statement about submarine warfare, a kind of epitome of what the deployment of this new and terrifying weapon meant. After all the epitaph-like dates of the War, '1914-18', tell us that the poem speaks from beyond its original moment. The voice it evokes speaks in the present tense, yet its 'presentness' is marked as contained in the past. That gives it a certain distance, and this impression of something considered and summative is powerfully confirmed by the poem itself, in its brevity, in its diction, and in its prosody.

The brevity of "Tin Fish" recalls that of Kipling's "Epitaphs of the War", and like many of the "Epitaphs" it is presented as a dramatic utterance. But "Tin Fish" is more epigram than epitaph. It is not retrospective; the voice which utters it survives the perils of the first stanza in order to inflict death in the second, but this survival is provisional and the present tense of the utterance enfolds both the submarine and its target in perpetual dread. 'Death', in this version of the poem capitalized and personified, is the pivotal word and figure, the hinge on which the poem turns, but it turns both ways. The voice, moreover, is collective, 'we', not 'I', and it fuses the submarine and her crew in a Kiplingesque compound of organic and inorganic elements, a compound already suggested in the title-phrase. Yet the title is also markedly different from the poem it heads, because it is the only visible trace of colloquial idiom in the poem, unless we except the very last words. For the most part the poem is steeped in the diction of the King James *Bible*. I take it that most readers of the poem would recognize, in 'the belly of Death', an allusion to Jonah's ordeal in 'the belly of the fish', but this specific reference is enhanced by the biblical resonance of words such as 'destroy', 'ensnare', 'arise', 'lie down', and 'mirth', and by the rhythmic patterns in which they are set. The doublet of 'arise' and 'lie down', for example, serves a double purpose, as literally apt to what a submarine does, yet also recalling numerous biblical passages which ring the changes on rising up and lying down: I've put some of these on the handout, along with some other passages I don't have time to comment on.

The use of biblical language supports the poem's claim to a certain kind of authority. The King James *Bible* had always mattered to Kipling, but when he settled permanently in England in 1902, and began reflecting on the history and destiny of the country in which he was both a native and an immigrant, it took on a special importance as one of the sinews of national identity. The voice of "Tin Fish" utters the highest kind of collective speech, the one endowed with the most impersonal authority, greater even than would be conferred by Shakespearean or Miltonic diction.

The poem's prosody, though it works by alternating stress patterns, has neither the rocking motion of the traditional ballad nor the colloquial swing of iambic metre. Kipling achieves the most extraordinary feats of variation considering the constraints he was working with: think of the difference the single extra syllable makes between the last line of the first quatrain, 'In the belly of Death', and the last line of the second, 'When our blow gets home', a tightening which allows the strong stress on 'gets' and makes the final phrase fall like a hammer. And although the poem rhymes, it does so in the most guarded way, offering only one

full rhyme ('eyes' and 'dies') and in every other case opting for eye-rhymes, a tacit refusal of euphony, but one which brings to prominence the tremendous assonance in the last line between *blow* and *home*.

I would draw attention to two other rhetorical effects. One is typographical, and relates to the three point ellipsis in line 6. I take this to be the graphic representation of the track of a torpedo. The other is the pun at the end of the poem, in which the phrase 'gets home' refers to the torpedo successfully striking its target, whose consequence is that the stricken vessel, and the men on board her, will not 'get home'. This is only to emphasise that the gravity of the poem does not mean that Kipling's verbal imagination is not at work. The craftsman in him – curious, playful, sometimes cruel – never slept.

My first reading of " "Tin Fish" " lacked any knowledge of its original context. By 'context' I mean both the history of composition and publication, which is misleadingly represented by the title and date, and the historical events with which it deals. What caught me was the tone of dread, and the ferocity of the reversal by which the hunted in the first quatrain become the hunters in the second. It is a hard-featured poem, not asking for our sympathy, not caring for our disapproval, seeming only to advise us not to flinch.

I turn now to my second kind of reading, for which the context is not a *Definitive Edition* but that least definitive form of print, the newspaper. When the poem was originally published, it looked like this:

THE FRINGES OF THE FLEET

By Rudyard Kipling

FOURTH ARTICLE

SUBMARINES

The ships destroy us above
 And ensnare us beneath.
 We arise, we lie down, and we move
 In the belly of death.

The ships have a thousand eyes
 To mark where we come . . .
 And the mirth of a seaport dies
 When our blow gets home.

'Submarines' is not the title of the poem, but of the article which it prefaces. It was actually the second of two articles on submarines

which Kipling wrote as part of a series of six, "The Fringes of the Fleet", published in the *Daily Telegraph* in November and December 1915. The series had been commissioned by the Admiralty as part of a propaganda offensive, to show the public that the Navy was not inactive in home waters. So Kipling wrote about the undemonstrative heroics of mine-sweeping, and about the coastal patrols carried out both by civilian vessels (trawlers and private yachts) belonging to the Navy's Auxiliary Reserve, and by the Navy's own submarines. He based his reports on visits he made in late September to the headquarters of the east coast naval patrols at Dover and the submarine base at Harwich. He returned to Bateman's on 25 September, a week before receiving the news that his only son, John, had been wounded at the battle of Loos and was missing. Although Kipling went through the motions of enquiring about John's possible fate as a prisoner-of-war, he had few illusions that his son might be alive. To Colonel Lionel Dunsterville, the original of 'Stalky', he wrote on 12 November: 'The wife is standing it wonderfully tho' she of course clings to the bare hope of his being a prisoner. I've seen what shells can do and I don't.'¹ A little further on in the same letter he mentioned the articles he had written over the previous weeks: 'I've been, as I think I told you, among the ships and my lucubrations are coming out in the D. T. It was a gay time. I went down in a submarine.'

"The Fringes of the Fleet" was therefore the first writing of any kind — journalism, fiction, poetry — that Kipling did in the immediate aftermath of his bereavement. He went on to write two further series of articles on the Royal Navy — "Tales of "The Trade" " and "Destroyers at Jutland" — and in 1916 all these articles were gathered into the volume called *Sea Warfare*. Each article in "The Fringes of the Fleet" was accompanied by a poem, and all these poems were untitled, both in the newspaper and the volume. " "Tin Fish" " — I shall continue to use the title, for want of a better — differs radically from the other poem about submarines in "The Fringes of the Fleet". This poem, which appeared at the head of the third article, is a jaunty parody of the old ballad "Farewell and adieu to you Spanish ladies".

As for the articles that make up "The Fringes of the Fleet", their tone is carefully judged. The main point Kipling wanted to make about the Navy's campaign in home waters was that it was a mundane business, consisting in the wearisome maintenance of a blockade, the repetitive sweeping for mines, the shepherding of merchant vessels; its heroism was of the most unglamorous sort, the routine acceptance of discomfort and danger and the willingness to make sacrifices without fuss. There were relatively few exploits to celebrate, and indeed celebration would have struck the wrong, the demonstrative note. The

Navy was simply picking up where it had left off a century ago in the blockade of Napoleonic France, and Kipling wants us to marvel not at something exceptional, but at something only to be expected. That something, Kipling tells us in the first article, 'works in the unconscious blood of those who serve [the Navy]', which has 'simply returned to the practice and resurrected the spirit of old days'.²

The appeal to history, to 'a thousand years of experience', or what Kipling goes on to call 'this Elizabethan world of eighteenth-century seamen',³ is doubly significant when it comes to writing about submarines, since the submarine was not only a new kind of vessel – the first was commissioned in 1901 – but had had to make its way against the hostility of the naval establishment itself. This hostility was based in part on a misunderstanding of what submarines could accomplish – as late as June 1914 Admiral Sir Percy Scott was ridiculed in the press for arguing that 'submarines and aircraft had entirely revolutionised naval warfare' – but it was also the result of a form of moral prejudice, embodied in the famous snort by Admiral Sir Arthur Wilson in 1901 that the submarine was a 'damned un-English' weapon and that crews of submarines captured in wartime should be 'treated as pirates and hanged'.⁴ A submarine, after all, embodies the principle of unfair play.

There are traces of this primitive attitude in a remark that Kipling cites by the skipper of one of the auxiliary craft who were responsible for minesweeping and coastal patrols:

The Trawlers seem to look on mines as more or less fairplay. But with the torpedo it is otherwise. A Yarmouth man lay on his hatch, his gear neatly stowed away below, and told me that another Yarmouth boat had "gone up," with all hands except one. " 'Twas a submarine. Not a mine," said he. "They never gave our boys no chance. Na! She was a Yarmouth boat—we knew 'em all. They never gave the boys no chance."⁵

Yet the third article, the first of the two devoted to submarines, begins by re-emphasising that the submarine *belongs* in the Navy, and by looking at the question of 'chance' from the opposite perspective:

Like the destroyer, the submarine has created its own type of officer and man—with language and traditions apart from the rest of the Service, and yet at heart unchangingly of the Service. Their business is to run monstrous risks from earth, air, and water, in what, to be of any use, must be the coldest of cold blood.⁶

The primary meaning of the phrase 'in cold blood' in this context is coolness, holding one's nerve; it translates the French *sangfroid*. This is the quality required to survive the pressure of the 'monstrous risks' associated with serving in a submarine. But shadowing this sense is the other meaning of callousness, the ability to inflict suffering with deliberate intent. This quality, too, is necessitated by the particular way in which a submarine operates. Kipling uses the phrase again, in the fourth article, the one headed by " "Tin Fish" "; and here the meaning seems to have shifted a little, a shift marked by the appearance of a phrase from the poem:

"But submarine work is cold-blooded business."

(This was at a little session in a green-curtained "wardroom" cum owner's cabin.)

"Then there's no truth in the yarn that you can feel when the torpedo's going to get home?" I asked.

"Not a word. You sometimes see it get home, or miss, as the case may be.["]"⁷

As readers, we tune in here to a conversation which has already started; the first word we hear, 'But', implies an objection to something which has just been said. What was it? My guess is that the narrator has remarked that 'submarine work' has something thrilling about it, and the 'owner', or commander of the submarine, responds by saying that, on the contrary, it is a 'cold-blooded business'. The narrator presses the point: can't you 'feel when the torpedo's going to get home', and isn't that a thrill? Behind the commander's matter-of-fact rebuttal lies the fact that firing a torpedo is a matter of calculation of relative speed and distance, and in submarines of this period was an extremely inexact science. It may well involve the human eye, brain and hand, but the commander who gives the order does so coolly, detached from the consequence of his action. Note that the phrase 'cold-blooded business' refers here to what the submarine does, the destruction it inflicts, rather than the coolness required to endure the 'monstrous risks' it runs of being, itself, destroyed. This change from passive to active turns the phrase a little towards the meaning of callousness, of lack of emotional engagement. And this turn is reinforced, I think, by the twice-repeated phrase used to describe the torpedo's successful blow, the phrase *get home*.

'And the mirth of a seaport dies / When our blow gets home.' In the *Daily Telegraph* text, and in *Sea Warfare*, it is 'And'; only in the *Definitive Edition* does it become 'But', a poor revision, which substitutes grammatical logic for the powerful suggestive connection

between the three dots and their fatal consequence. But the poem's climax is unchanged: it is delivered by that tremendous pun on what it means to get home. Kipling uses the phrase in its other, benign sense several times in *Sea Warfare*. 'And in due time that boat got home': that is said, for example, of a British submarine, which was hunted in shallow water and yet escaped.⁸ Destroyers are stoutly built: 'they can crumple themselves up from stem to bridge,' the narrator informs us, 'and still get home.'⁹ German cruisers in the battle of Jutland shirked the fight: 'They wanted to get home.'¹⁰

The image of submarine warfare that Kipling presents in his articles follows the pattern of "Tin Fish": it is divided between the cold-blooded endurance of being hunted, and the equally cold-blooded business of destruction. But the connection between verse and prose is more complex than that suggests. Reading the poem in its original setting brings out its strangeness, its intense abstractedness, since the articles insist on something to which the poem is indifferent, the 'Englishness' of submarine warfare and its right to be valued alongside the other branches of the Navy. In the articles, Kipling makes a clear and determined attempt to differentiate between submarine warfare as practised by the British and by the Germans, alluding to the German policy of unrestricted submarine warfare, the targeting of unarmed merchant ships, the sinking of the *Lusitania*, and other German atrocities – some real, some the product of the heated propaganda of the time.

But for all his efforts, the spirit of "Tin Fish" broods over his descriptions, so that the cold-bloodedness which he asks us to admire in our submarines comes close to the callousness he asks us to condemn in theirs. Towards the end of the fourth article in "The Fringes of the Fleet", he reports a conversation between a group of officers on a recent encounter between a British submarine and a German Zeppelin. The fight between these two newfangled weapons is comically inconclusive, and one of the officers remarks: 'Oh, if Fritz only fought clean, this wouldn't be half a bad show. But Fritz can't fight clean.' The dialogue continues in this vein – a bit unconvincingly, I must say – and the narrator finally asks, 'And do you suppose that Fritz understands any of it?' To which the officer replies: 'No. Or he wouldn't have lusitaniaed. This war was his first chance of making his name, and he chucked it all away for the sake of showin' off as a foul Gottstrafer.'¹¹ The stereotypes that Kipling deploys here, with complete deliberateness I would emphasize, are intended both to entertain and reassure his readers that the men who wage war in 'our' submarines have not become alien to their race. The kind of behaviour countenanced by the Germans can only be represented in a foreign idiom: 'lusitaniaed', Kipling's coinage, and the ugly-sounding compound 'Gottstrafer'. But

so straightforward a piece of propaganda is immediately followed by this, the concluding paragraph of the article, in which the submariners' conversation takes a different turn:

And then they talked of that hour of the night when submarines come to the top like mermaids to get and give information; of boats whose business it is to fire as much and to splash about as aggressively as possible; and of other boats who avoid any sort of display—dumb boats watching and relieving watch, with their periscope just showing like a crocodile's eye, at the back of islands and the mouths of channels where something may some day move out in procession to its doom.

Notice the shift here from direct quotation to reported speech, which allows Kipling's own voice gradually to take over, to impose its diction and rhythm. Readers who know their *Second Jungle Book* will recall, in the image of the periscope as a crocodile's eye, the great cunning crocodile, the Mugger of Mugger-Ghaut, in "The Undertakers", that tremendous sardonic tale of revenge finally taken on a cold-blooded assassin. It is extraordinary to find the Mugger resurrected here as an assassin in British colours, waiting for his prey in the form of the German High Seas Fleet. But if a Royal Navy submarine can lurk like a crocodile, what price war as a good show and a clean fight? The truth is that Kipling's imagination has left propaganda behind, and is attentive, as it is in "Tin Fish", to an impartial vision of human death and fate.

NOTES

1. Thomas Pinney (ed.), *The Letters of Rudyard Kipling, Volume 4: 1911-19*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999, p.345.
2. Rudyard Kipling, "The Auxiliaries I", *Sea Warfare* (London: Macmillan, 1916), p.5 [reprinting the *Daily Telegraph* article of 20 November 1915].
3. "The Auxiliaries II", *Sea Warfare*, p.19 [*Daily Telegraph*, 23 November].
4. Richard Compton-Hall, *Submarines at War 1914-1918*, Penzance: Periscope Publishing, 2004, pp.9, 18 (first published by Macmillan in 1991 as *Submarines and the War at Sea 1914-18*).
5. "The Auxiliaries II", *Sea Warfare*, p.17.
6. "Submarines I", *Sea Warfare*, p.31 [*Daily Telegraph*, 25 November].
7. "Submarines II", *Sea Warfare*, p.57 [*Daily Telegraph*, 27 November].
8. "Submarines I", *Sea Warfare*, p.41.
9. "Patrols II", *Sea Warfare*, p.84 [*Daily Telegraph*, 2 December].
10. "The Night Hunt", second article of "Destroyers at Jutland", *Sea Warfare*, p.170 [*Daily Telegraph*, 26 October 1916].
11. "Submarines II", *Sea Warfare*, p.59.

FINDING ONE'S WAY THROUGH *ACTIONS AND REACTIONS*

By ELODIE RAIMBAULT
(Université de Paris 3)

The bulk of Kipling's writing consists of his short stories and critics often focus on the most striking ones, on the masterpieces. They thus create or perpetuate a group of "hits" which are collected in anthologies. In *Actions and Reactions*, the most famous stories may be "With the Night Mail" or "The House Surgeon", but certainly not "The Puzzler": what brings them fame is their intrinsic originality and their forceful character but also an interesting critical history. The more a story is analysed, the more interesting it gets – such is the power of criticism. The point here is not to add another layer of criticism on the most successful stories but rather to deal with the collection as a whole, and to analyse the effects of this type of book organisation on the reader.

Except for "Garm—a Hostage", the stories were all written between 1905 and 1909. They all appeared first separately in newspapers, showing that they can be read independently. When the collection was published in 1909 it was entitled differently from any of the stories included. An apparently thematic title now tops up these eight very dissimilar stories and appears as a link between them, which means that the stories' status changed in the process of collection. Despite a first impression of disjunction, the reader feels that the collection is more than a mere juxtaposition. The poems did not accompany the stories when they were published in the newspapers, whereas Kipling wrote them for the collection, showing that they have a role to play in its building up.

In his stories, Kipling created many characters whose main function is to listen to a narrator telling his yarn: this certainly proves the importance of the question of the horizon of expectation, using Jaus's term, and more generally that of the reader's role. Kipling invented his own type of organization for his collections, and book after book his readers became used to this form. *Actions and Reactions* can be taken as one example of the Kiplingian short story collection and of the strategies at work in it.

THE HOUSE IMAGERY

The obvious fact that the stories are at the time of their creation totally independent has to be challenged: Kipling chose to place them in a particular order and to associate them with one another within a collection. There is a structural similarity between the spatial composition of the

collection and the places of a mixed but united nature described in the stories. The architectural metaphor of the house is very relevant in this respect. Interestingly, the first and last of the stories in the collection are about houses. "An Habitation Enforced" is about a young American couple buying a house and being gradually accepted as part of a community; "The House Surgeon" tells how a haunted house is made habitable by the narrator. Both houses are rather large and described as labyrinths. In the first story, a particular sentence appears as the guideline of this study:

He led them on and on, through a maze of back-kitchens, dairies, larders, and sculleries, that melted along covered ways into a farmhouse, . . . (A&R 13)

In the last story, the narrator alludes once more to the image of the maze:

We played a sort of Blind Man's Buff along the darkest passages, in the unlighted drawing-room, and little dining-room, calling cheerily to each other after each exploration that here, and here, and here, the trouble had removed itself. (A&R 296-7)

These labyrinths are neither gothic nor threatening: on the contrary they are invitations to lose oneself and start a game of exploration. These two passages may be seen as an indirect formulation of the directions for use of the collection, as if the author was explaining to his readers how he intends them to read his stories. In "An Habitation Enforced", the discovery of the house occurs quite unexpectedly and on a playful mode:

The footpath turned the shoulder of a slope, through a thicket of rank rhododendrons, and crossed what had once been a carriage drive, which ended in the shadow of two gigantic holm-oaks.

'A house!' said Sophie, in a whisper. 'A colonial house!'

(A&R 8-9)

The first impressions Sophie and her husband George get of the house are quite false and cliché: "colonial", " 'Look at that view. It's a framed Constable' ". They compare their adventure to a touristy visit: " 'Don't you like us exploring things together—better than Pompeii?' ". In *Out of Place*, Ian Baucom mentions the ruined country house as one of the places which have been used by writers to portray Englishness:

[These] places have served as apt metaphors for writers struggling to define what it means to be English, and (. . .) such metaphoric understandings have been literalized, sometimes subtly, sometimes crudely, so that these material places have been understood to

literally shape the identities of the subjects inhabiting or passing through them. (Baucom 4)

Sophie and George Chapin are influenced by what they expect from a ruined country house and fail to see its originality at first: not only is it English, but it is the emanation of the particular county and land it stands on.

When they finally understand the house better, they see it as part of the country, as an expression of the historical links between the people and the land. It then becomes more than a house, a whole "hidden kingdom" with a soul of its own which indeed shapes the identity of the Chapins. As soon as the sentence, "He led them on and on, through a maze of back-kitchens, dairies, larders, and sculleries, that melted along covered ways into a farm-house", the notion of a unity revealing itself out of an accumulation of small entities is present in the phrase "melted into a farmhouse". In "The House Surgeon", the house is shown as a living organism, a body suffering some unexplained pain and transmitting it to the inhabitants:

We were silent again, and, in a few seconds it must have been, a live grief beyond words—not ghostly dread or horror, but aching, helpless grief—overwhelmed us, each, I felt, according to his or her nature, and held steady like the beam of a burning-glass. (*A&R* 271-2)

The pain tends to affect one room at a time, so the family gathers in one room only, fearing the depression might be in the next one. The house is haunted, invaded by two spirits who are striving to communicate and making the inhabitants depressed. When the house is finally healed thanks to the narrator who managed to connect the two spirits and put them to peace, the house ceases to be only seen as separate rooms:

They drew short, but afterwards deeper, breaths, like bathers entering chill water, separated one from the other, moved about the hall, tiptoed upstairs, raced down, . . . (*A&R* 296)

The first reaction of the owners is to walk around the house and to make it whole again through their movements.

Following the idea that there is a metaphorical relationship between the houses in the stories and the construction of the collection, it appears that the book needs to be made whole by our reading, that is to say that the stories are independent only as long as they are not read in a sequence. The main question being that of the relation between the stories. What paths are we to follow and what bridges can we throw between the tales?

A MECHANICALLY ORGANISED COLLECTION

Both houses are complex places in which each room has a name and a function. In "The Mother Hive", a similar pattern can be found: the hive is an organised and complex space where each bee has a precise role to play. For instance, the wax-making process is explained in very short and assertive sentences resembling orders:

Before a bee can make wax she must fill herself with honey. Then she climbs to safe foothold and hangs, while other gorged bees hang on her in a cluster. There they wait in silence till the wax comes. The scales are either taken out of the maker's pockets by the workers, or tinkle down on the workers while they wait. The workers chew them (they are useless unchewed) into the all-supporting, all-embracing Wax of the Hive. (*A&R* 88)

"The Mother Hive" is followed by a science fiction story with which it apparently bears no connection, "With the Night Mail". Yet, between the anthropomorphic bees and the futuristic balloon trip over the Atlantic Ocean, the bridge is built thanks to a common theme and a structural similarity of the hive and the mail tower: both stories begin with the alighting of a flying object on a busy platform. The bees are bound to their hive as the dirigible balloons are to their mail tower. The hive is accessed through an alighting-board, and the bees come and go just as the dirigibles do. Among the fictional advertisements added at the end of "With the Night Mail", a column is even entitled "The Bee-Line Bookshop". Another link between the stories is that both present a vision of a strictly organised and hierarchic society, verging on the military. Each individual has a role to play in this machine-like society, and revolutionary attempts are annihilated.

In a machine age, the terms "action and reaction" are applied to a wide range of objects, including animals and humans, as is explained by Herbert L. Sussman in his book *Victorians and the Machine*:

By the middle decades of the century, with the success of the Darwinian theory and with advances in scientific physiology, it seemed to biologists that the modern machine, self-powered, often self-regulating, moving predictably by the complex interaction of springs and levers, provided an ideal theoretical model for organic life itself. In 1874 Thomas Henry Huxley, the acknowledged spokesman for science in England, in an essay entitled "On the Hypothesis that Animals are Automata, and Its History," could declare the principle of mechanism as the central hypothesis of modern biology. (Sussman 135)

It is therefore not new to compare animals and even men to machines. The question is whether the collection can be seen as mechanically

organised as well. The alternation of prose and poetry is strictly applied: each story is concluded by a poem developing one of its themes or characters. The poems can be seen as so many closures and boundaries between the stories, as limits intended for the reader to stop there or at least pause in his reading.

However, it would be presumptuous to think that the form of a collection could be that prescriptive. The poems must be seen more as dual agents of closure and opening, as thresholds: they remain within the scope of the story they are closing and at the same time they take a sufficiently different stance to open up onto the next story. They could then be parts of a mechanism activating the process of reading: at the end of a story, the reader is prompted to go on and read the next one, the poems acting like a pump. The words "*Actions and Reactions*" also lead to the notions of fate and destiny: they picture a mechanical, inevitable and binary movement between cause and consequence. If we apply this to the field of fiction, then we must see the plots as run by necessity. In Conan Doyle's 1892 short story "The Blue Carbuncle" the phrase "action and reaction" is used to describe the ways in which individuals run into one another in London, and also the notion that in a crowded city every action induces a reaction, every move provokes another one. In Sherlock Holmes' own words:

No, no. No crime. Only one of those whimsical little incidents which will happen when you have four million human beings all jostling each other within the space of a few square miles. Amid the action and reaction of so dense a swarm of humanity, every possible combination of events may be expected to take place, and many a little problem will be presented which may be striking and bizarre without being criminal. (Conan Doyle 151)

In a situation of shock, the reaction to a movement is another movement in the opposite direction: such is the nature of the link between some stories in the collection. For instance, after the world of science fiction depicted in "With the Night Mail", the incipit of the story "A Deal in Cotton" strongly indicates a remote time and place ("Long and long ago, when Devadatta was King of Benares . . ."), before finally reaching present day England in which the narration takes place ("lives now at a place in England called Weston-super-Mare"). The detour via oriental antiquity must be interpreted as an enhancement of the discrepancy between the two stories. Highlighting the gap is a paradoxical but efficient means of bridging it.

Another type of relation can be found between "A Deal in Cotton" and "The Puzzler": there is no great thematic difference between the two stories. Both deal with a colonial official trying to develop the

province he is in charge of. But while "A Deal in Cotton" tells in a dark atmosphere of a melancholic gathering of old friends, "The Puzzler" turns into a comic of situation type of story. The change of tone is very striking, all the more so as the world depicted in both stories is the same. When read in the order chosen by Kipling, each story definitely reacts with the preceding ones, either thematically or formally, and they lead the reader along an interpretable path. Just as the rooms in the country house, they can be said to "melt along covered way into a collection". The links are not always very visible but they exist.

A MUSICAL COMPOSITION

The notion of a "model reader" as defined by Umberto Eco is certainly useful here: an author always writes with a model reader in mind, a reader who is going to actualize the text by his reading, that is to say by his role as a conscience able to fill in the blanks of the text. This model reader is not an existing person of course, but an operative notion useful as the text is written. Kipling left it to the reader to determine what the links between the stories are, although their nature is partially implied by the title of the collection. What is the role of the poems within this collection, are they too agents of interpretation helping the reader? They can simply complement the story they follow by, for instance, expressing in more general terms a particular situation. At the end of "Little Foxes", in which Kipling mocks a London liberal Member of Parliament, the poem entitled "Gallio's Song" transposes the situation into the Roman Empire. The poem acts as a kind of commentary upon the story. Other stories are completed by a poem which voices the words of a character who was not allowed to speak in the story. After "An Habitation Enforced", the land itself is given a voice and the poem "The Recall" is its chant:

I am the land of their fathers,
 In me the virtue stays;
 I will bring back my children
 After certain days. (A&R 51)

The land then is more explicitly shown as the agent of the enforcement mentioned in the title of the story. Being shorter and rhymed, the poems are also more likely to be remembered by the reader.

However, the poems occasionally seem more distant from the story, or even in contradiction with it. Some poems appear to draw a stern lesson from a lighter narrative, just as in apologues. "The Power of the Dog", which comes at the end of "Garm—a Hostage", is a warning concerning the possible dangers linked to the attachment existing between a dog and its master:

*Brothers and sisters, I bid you beware
Of giving your heart to a dog to tear. (A&R 79)*

In the story, the friendship between man and dog is much valued, whereas what is highlighted in the poem is the fact that this attachment can lead to difficult emotional situations. Through this type of poem another voice speaks and gives a musical counterpoint to the story.

The poems are the voice of hesitation, of modulation, of alternation. The stories could very well be read without their poems, they are already whole, and in that sense the poems do not always complete the stories. What the poems achieve is a modulation on the theme; they give another shade to the story. The story remains identical but after reading the poem the reader will not see it with the same unanimity. The reader is led to imagine a dialogic relationship between the story and the poems because of this modulation. The most striking modulation may be the one between "The Mother Hive" and its poem "The Bees and the Flies". The story is told in earnest and has strong moral overtones, with a glorification of the faithful bees who embody the virtues of courage and perseverance at the end of the story. In the poem, the tone is clearly mock-heroic. First referring to Virgil, it is about the naivety of a farmer who tries out the old belief that bees will swarm in the body of a dead bull – only to find worms and flies in it:

A busy scene, indeed, he sees,
But not a sign or sound of bees.
Worms of the riper grave unhid
By any kindly coffin lid,
Obscene and shameless to the light,
Seethe in insatiate appetite, . . . (A&R 107).

The collection then ceases to be read linearly. The reader, surprised by the poem, will go back to the story which has indeed changed from his first interpretation. The poem initiates a to-and-fro movement within the unit made up of a story and a poem. The musical structure of variations on a theme is to be found in the collection at different levels: within the smaller units, but also more generally from story to story. The echoes are numerous and lead the reader to perceive the collection as a whole.

The book is made of powerful and subdued moments, of strong and weak beats: it is composed like a musical piece in this respect. It appears that the word "composition" fits this type of book organization better than the usual "collection" which suggests a juxtaposition of separate elements. Here, the book is truly a unity and all its parts relate to one another to produce meaning. Its interpretation evolves as the reader goes through it; the more futile stories both enhance the

effect of the others and gain weight thanks to the interactions between the stories.

Three main ways of reading *Actions and Reactions* can therefore be identified: first as a set of connected units, thematically organised; then as a musical composition, at once linear and full of echoes; and finally, but this is too vast a subject to be dealt with here, a third reading would link other stories, coming from other collections, to some of the *Actions and Reactions* stories. Kipling indeed creates some bridges himself by using recurrent characters: at the beginning of "A Deal in Cotton" he explicitly refers to the story "A Conference of Powers".

This multiplicity of possible readings and the modulations afforded by the poems both show that the collection is meant to be freely read. Kipling teaches his reader how to read his work and the reader can free himself from the structure of the collection precisely thanks to its fluidity. Some stories are strongly assertive, as for instance "The Mother Hive", and Kipling has been blamed for this, especially when he sides with the reaction. However, his use of the poem as a modulation of the point of view, or more generally the fact that he decided to make this story part of a collection, shows that he may have seen the necessity of indirectly qualifying its reactionary aspect thanks to the complexity of the collection's organization. A very subtle strategy indeed.

LIST OF WORKS CITED

- Baucom, Ian, *Out of Place. Englishness, Empire, and the Locations of Identity*. Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1999.
- Conan Doyle, Arthur, "The Blue Carbuncle". 1892. *Sherlock Holmes. His Adventures, Memoirs, Return; His Last Bow & the Case-Book. The Complete Short Stories*. London: Murray, 1929.
- Eco, Umberto, *Lector in Fabula ou la Coopération interprétative dans les textes narratifs*. Traduit de l'italien par Myriem Bouzaher. Paris: Grasset, 1985.
- Jauss, Hans Robert, *Pour une esthétique de la réception*. Traduit de l'allemand par Claude Maillard, préface Jean Starobinski. Paris: Gallimard, collection «Bibliothèque des idées», 1978.
- Kipling, Rudyard, *Actions and Reactions*. London: Macmillan, 1909. [A&R].
- "A Conference of Powers". *Many Inventions*. 1893. London: Macmillan & Co, 1928.
- Sussman, Herbert L., *Victorians and the Machine. The Literary Response to Technology*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard U.P., 1968.

"ain't goin' to have any beastly Erickin' ":
THE PROBLEM OF MALE FRIENDSHIP IN *STALKY & CO.*

By CAROLYN OULTON
(Canterbury Christ Church University)

The first question I should address is why friendship should be a problem in a series of stories famous specifically for celebrating it? And following on from this, why it was not evidently a problem for mid-century writers such as Disraeli in *Coningsby*, or Hughes, in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. The answer lies at least partly in Kipling's determined ridiculing of two famous school stories, Farrar's *Eric*, published in 1858, and his *St Winifred's*, published in 1862, which warn against the perils of drunkenness but also what would later be termed homosexual behaviour. We heard from Dr. Nagai about the importance of quotation in the "Stalky" stories, and I think *Eric* in particular stands in a special relation to them. But in order to understand the issues at stake, it is necessary to contextualise the stories in terms of earlier ideals of romantic friendship.

Intense expression of friendship was common among the young for much of the nineteenth century. It was possible for friends to write letters of longing and devotion in terms that would now appear inescapably erotic, without being subject to any such interpretation. For instance, the young William Thackeray could receive letters from a Cambridge friend expressing eternal love for his 'dear Willy' with no suggestion of irony or double meaning. Such passionate friendships were actively encouraged, leading later generations to assume either that the Victorians were hopelessly naive or that they were employing acceptable discourse as a cover for illicit desire. But neither explanation really holds water. Before assuming that the Victorians knew nothing about sex, we should remember that they often had families of ten or fourteen children. Nor is it plausible to suggest that homoeroticism was being smuggled into respectable life under cover of simple friendship, when the idea of romantic friendship was applauded by such writers as Sarah Ellis, who published the famous series of conduct manuals for girls. On the contrary, the purveyors of this ideal were deeply conscious of its erotic potential, and for this very reason they were careful to formulate it in such a way that it avoided suspicion.

While Thomas Hughes is often seen as having invented the school story, there are in fact earlier examples of relevance here. Disraeli's *Coningsby*, published in 1844, is predicated on the central idea that romantic friendship is ennobling. The schoolboy hero initially resists a friendship with a manufacturer's son on class grounds, and while he

later responds to Millbank's adoration because he has saved his life and can therefore offer a kind of patronage, the most important lessons he learns are from the mysterious Sidonia, who is perceived as being more and not less aristocratic than he is himself. More critically, Dickens's *David Copperfield* is likewise concerned with the class implications of romantic friendship. In this novel David initially chooses the wrong friend – the sophisticated upper class Steerforth as opposed to the solidly middle class, less threatening Traddles. It is apparent from the relationship between David and Steerforth that even by mid-century romantic friendship can be dangerous, and critics have not been slow to point out the erotic tension in their friendship. Steerforth renames David 'Daisy' and is often seen talking to him while in bed, while David in turn dreams of his 'enchanted' friend. But in a strategy that appears with increasing persistence in later texts, David's own purity is registered as a failure to comprehend the signs of Steerforth's predatory interest. The deployment of this theme through a guileless narrator who must nonetheless identify his friend and not himself to the reader, as the source of erotic threat, is masterfully handled, and anticipates the similar strategy employed by Kipling in *Stalky & Co.* some fifty years later.

In his 1857 novel of school life, the strategy of Hughes, a far less sophisticated writer than Dickens, is to make one token reference to the misery of effeminate boys who are corrupted by their seniors, before moving on to the glories of sport and friendship in the making of manly Christians. In the Rugby of his imagination, the playing of games equips Tom Brown with the necessary credentials, justifying him as inherently 'manly' and so allowing him to form a romantic friendship with the highly spiritualised Arthur – even here, the necessary emotional exchanges cannot take place until Arthur has almost died. But the following year Dean Farrar, himself a schoolmaster, addressed the issue of proscribed sexuality in schools in his evangelical story *Eric or Little by Little*, of which and its successor *St Winifreds or The World of School*, it has been said by Richard Jenkyns that:

Only a writer of genuine talent could have produced works as deeply bad as these. Their fetid atmosphere of moral panic and clammy religiosity may seem hardly credible to those who have not read them. The boys are stalked by fearful spiritual perils, signalled in language so impenetrable that the best-brought-up child must have had trouble understanding it.¹

Clearly finding the issue difficult to approach, Farrar's most direct comment on the issue of lascivious talk and its result lies in the assurance that, 'I hurry over a part of my subject inconceivably painful; I

hurry over it, but if I am to perform my self-imposed duty of giving a true picture of what school life sometimes is, I must not pass it by altogether.² He then passes it by altogether. Nonetheless the original edition of the story contained unabashed references to one friend sitting on another's knee, as well as notably emotional expression between the saintly Russell and the eponymous Eric. According to the editor of the latest, 21st C edition, Farrar felt obliged to make about 200 changes in subsequent editions, many of them toning down the arguably erotic content.³

By the 1890s, in the wake of sexology, it was considerably more difficult to ignore the possible relation of romantic friendship to erotic feeling or homosexual practice. Indeed Eve Sedgwick has famously characterised this decade as a time of 'homosexual panic'.⁴ Edward Carpenter complained that male friendship in particular was over determined, at a time when female romantic friends were still managing to hold their ground. And of course the Oscar Wilde scandal put a real spanner in the works, in the appeal of the accused to the traditions of Ancient Greece and David and Jonathan, as a justification of Uranian love. In appropriating these well known and much invoked traditions to his own ends, Wilde undermined the very basis of male romantic friendship, which rested its claim to purity on the absence not the status of sexualised feeling between celebrated pairs of friends. The problem for writers in the 1890s was to find an acceptable model of male friendship that would both continue the traditions of male bonding and be able to withstand the increasingly insistent over-interpretations of the sexologists. Specifically this becomes a problem for Kipling in *Stalky & Co.*, most of the stories from which were published in the 1890s.

In *Something of Myself* Kipling insists that the United Services College, on which the Coll. of *Stalky & Co.* is based, was remarkable for its lack of sexual activity among the boys, and remarks acidly that 'if masters did not suspect [cases of perversion], and show that they suspected, there would not be quite so many elsewhere.'⁵ But this was written in 1936, many years after the scandals and retrenchments of the 1890s. The only one of the *Stalky* stories to make this point in similar language is "The United Idolaters", where the Head points the finger firmly at the public schools by commenting that there has to be 'a tradition in these things'⁶. But again, this story was not published until 1924. What is notable throughout the stories originally published in the late 1890s, after the Wilde trials, is an increased need to confront the issue of illicit sexual practice, in ways that *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and *David Copperfield* found largely unnecessary and *Eric* could not cope with at all.

It is not entirely coincidental that there should be three friends in these stories rather than two. Of course the presentation of a trio at one level simply meets the facts, given that Stalky, M'Turk and Beetle are modelled on Kipling himself and his two friends at school. But it is also suggestive of a pattern in male friendship stories of the 1890s, in which intense bonding between a pair has come to be seen as problematic and all but impossible to represent – Du Maurier could hardly present the level of intense feeling between friends that is so characteristic a feature of *Trilby*, were it not for the repeated emphasis on there being three young men involved, and even here the passion of Little Billee for his admired friends is stated by the narrator rather than by the character. The famous duo Sherlock Holmes and Dr Watson, where the implied surveillance of a third party is not available as a guarantee, are held together by the famously clinical detachment of Holmes.

And if Disraeli offered unquestioning allegiance to the aristocracy, Kipling followed Dickens's lead in distancing his characters from the more dubious traditions associated with the upper class – his characters stress more than once that they are not actually at a traditional public school at all. Again like Dickens's *David Copperfield*, the retrospective narrator of *Stalky & Co*, who finally emerges as the character 'Beetle' himself, conveys the threat of homosexual practice in the school largely in order to highlight his own lack of awareness at the time. He repeatedly shows his own innocence by a failure to interpret, not coded signs, but transparent enough conversation on the subject. He is bewildered by any reference to 'prurient conversation', and both Stalky and M'Turk protect his innocence in a way that essentially feminises him. But while a greater explicitness is found necessary in the 1890s than had been thought of in the 1840s or '50s, the point of the stories is not to exculpate one character at the expense of the others, a point which presents Kipling with a further problem of representation. Stalky himself is embarrassed by any direct discussion of sexuality, using the term 'beastliness' to denote a particular form of sexual practice among the boys or equally as a vague term of abuse. He turns for help to the famous school stories of Farrar, ridiculing with his friends the aberrations of Eric – 'Let's get to where he goes in for drink' demands M'Turk gleefully in "An Unsavoury Interlude"⁷ – in order to suggest that such warnings are understood but not needed in their case. And there are moments where he is unable to articulate the threat at all, breaking down altogether in what is supposed to be a humorously ironic denunciation of the pious St Winifred's,

'But this lot'—Stalky rapped the gilded book—'can't prevent fellows drinkin' and stealin', an' lettin' fags out of window at night,

an'—an' doin' what they please. Golly, what we've missed—not goin' to St Winifred's! . . .'⁸

He recovers himself quickly, but the momentary hesitation serves to emphasise his own purity, even as his acknowledgement of the issue helps by the 1890s to guard him against the arguments of Havelock Ellis that friends can be unconsciously attracted to each other through the enactment of accepted friendship rituals. As if to save him from the need of further comment, Prout makes a significantly silent entry at this point.

Throughout the stories responsibility for controlling the boys, who of course live in close quarters and with little privacy, falls to the masters. This relocation of moral control from the individual self to the masters ultimately brings into question how incorruptible their purity really is. While Beetle in "The Moral Reformers" has no idea why the masters patrol the dormitories at night, Stalky and M'Turk expound at length on the evils of married housemasters who fail to keep an eye on their charges after lights out. Their language is only just opaque enough to permit Beetle's continuing failures of comprehension, as he 'wag-gishly' tells the chaplain that he can tell who has walked through the dormitory by the smell of their tobacco:

'Good heavens!' said the Reverend John absently. It was some *years* [emphasis added] before Beetle perceived that this was rather a tribute to innocence than observation. The long, light, blindless dormitories, devoid of inner doors, were crossed at all hours of the night by masters visiting one another; for bachelors sit up later than married folk. Beetle had never dreamed that there might be a purpose in this steady policing.⁹

It is in this story that the three friends agree to save a younger boy from being bullied, but in answer to the suggestion of making him a study fag, M'Turk answers decisively, "we ain't goin' to have any beastly Erickin' "¹⁰ with the physical contact and sentimental expression of feeling this implies.

If the *Stalky* stories offer a determined attempt to reformulate male friendship for an anxious age, they are obliged to do so intertextually, in contradistinction both to the manly Christian of Hughes' admiration (Stalky, M'Turk and Beetle are repeatedly characterised as loathing house games), and the morbidity of Farrar's dying saints. It is only in the much later story, "The United Idolaters", that the narrator feels confident enough to dismiss the suspicions of a relentless temporary master without this framework. Only here can the narrator begin to

dismantle the assertions of the sexologists themselves, in the opening line, 'His name was Brownell and his reign was brief.'¹¹, before ridiculing Brownell's obsession with the nature of what he terms the 'Animal Boy'. In earlier stories Prout has been quick to accuse an uncomprehending Beetle of causing 'soul-corrupting consequences' with his unseemly talk, and King has issued similar lectures on the evils of 'prurient conversation' – in these earlier stories of the 1890s the purpose of their misunderstanding is not to satirise them, but to give Beetle an opportunity of revealing his own naivety.

In the story that completes the series in the arrangement of *The Complete Stalky & Co.*, published as a collection in 1929, it is still important for the trio of friends to be, if not dissolved, reformulated. The duration of intense friendship, even as figured in these stories, cannot extend beyond late adolescence or early adulthood. It is therefore no coincidence that in "Slaves of the Lamp II" Stalky himself does not appear, and his exploits are discussed by a number of ex-pupils of the Coll. who have seen him since.

Only now does Beetle reveal himself as the narrator of the previous stories, and it is he who completes the reworking of Stalky from a dangerously enchanting, Steerforth-like friend, to a more widely accessible public myth, all but denying their personal relationship in the process – India, he tells the company, is full of Stalkies.

NOTES

1. Jenkyns, Richard. "Potter in the Past", *Prospect Magazine*, p.56, October 2000.
2. Eric, p.35 (full reference below).
3. See Anstruther, Ian. Dean Farrar and Eric. *A Study of Eric, or Little by Little and Its Author, Dean Farrar, Together With the Complete Text of The Book*, London, Haggerston Press, 2002.
4. This term was coined by Sedgwick in *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1985.
5. Kipling, Rudyard, *Something of Myself and Other Autobiographical Writings*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.
6. Kipling, Rudyard, "The United Idolaters", *The Complete Stalky & Co.*, Oxford, OUP, 1999, p.145. All further references are to this edition.
7. "An Unsavoury Interlude", p.72.
8. "An Unsavoury Interlude", p.72.
9. "The Moral Reformers", p.122.
10. "The Moral Reformers", p.124.
11. "The United Idolaters", p.140.

IF ANY QUESTION WHY HE DIED: JOHN KIPLING AND THE MYTHS OF THE GREAT WAR

By DOROTHEA FLOTHOW
(University of Salzburg)

On 27 September 1915, John Kipling, the author's eighteen-year-old son, who had volunteered for the army almost immediately after the outbreak of the First World War, fought his first battle. He was severely wounded; it seems certain that he died the same day. Tragic as this is, John's fate is in itself unremarkable, for a similar story could be told of many of the Kiplings' friends and relatives – Oscar Hornung, Julian Grenfell or George Cecil.

Nevertheless, especially since John's body had been identified by the Commonwealth War Graves Commission in 1992 (cf. Holt/Holt 1998: Epilogue), his fate has attracted much attention. His relationship with his famous father, his short span in the army and in particular his terrible death have been retold in an historical account by Major and Mrs Holt (1998), in the young adult novel *Kipling's Choice* (2005) by the Flemish journalist Geert Spillebeen, and in a successful theatre play by the actor David Haig, *My Boy Jack* (1997). This play has also been made into a film, starring Daniel Radcliffe as John and Kim Cattrall as Carrie Kipling and has been released on Armistice Day, 11 November 2007.

As I will argue in this paper, this interest in John Kipling and his relationship with his father cannot be explained with the continued fascination for the private life of a famous author alone. Rather, John's life and death as described in the fictional accounts seem to epitomize many of the 'myths' still surrounding the Great War in British popular memory. The story of this unremarkable young man and his famous father serves as a symbol of what this conflict stands for to this day.

THE GREAT WAR IN BRITISH POPULAR MEMORY

The First World War still takes a prominent place in British popular memory, as is shown by rituals such as Remembrance Sunday, by the general knowledge of World-War-One poetry and by the continued attraction of battlefield tourism to Flanders Fields. Particularly in recent years the Great War has experienced a renewed surge of interest which has led to the great popularity of novels such as Pat Barker's *Regeneration-Trilogy* (1991-5) or of TV-shows such as *The Trench*

(1999). There is a widespread feeling that this conflict which clearly revealed the nature of industrialized warfare still affects us.

The popular memory of the First World War is dominated by a number of stereotypical images or 'myths', which Samuel Hynes defines not as a "falsification of reality, but [... as] the story of the war that has evolved, and has come to be accepted as true." (1990: ix) For instance, while the Second World War is remembered as a crusade against Nazi barbarism, the First World War is seen as a futile conflict fought for no genuine reasons (cf. Bond 1997); in retrospect, it seems to have resolved little and soon led to another world war.

Moreover, its high number of casualties seems out of proportion with what the War achieved. While historians such as Jay Winter (1995) have pointed out that the percentage of casualties was no higher than in previous wars, the absolute number of nearly a million British dead certainly was. Officers were particularly conspicuous targets; therefore, casualties were proportionately higher in the upper classes of society. As many officers were extremely young men, it is unsurprising that in popular memory the 'myth of the lost generation', that of a promising youth cut down before its prime, is still prominent (cf. Wohl 1979).

According to popular 'myth', many soldiers were sent to this conflict with highly idealistic ideas of war – ideals they had been taught by their parents and teachers. Scholars like Paul Fussell also blame the literature of that time for instilling the young with an image of war as a heroic and chivalric adventure (1975: 21). Under the realities of battle in this modern, industrialized conflict, the soldiers' attitudes towards war changed. This process is known as the 'Myth of Disenchantment' and has been summarized by Hynes:

[A] generation of innocent young men, their heads full of high abstractions like Honour, Glory, and England, went off to war to make the world safe for democracy. They were slaughtered in stupid battles planned by stupid generals. Those who survived were shocked, disillusioned and embittered by their war experiences [...]. (1990: x)

The process of disenchantment is mainly attributed to the Western Front, which was characterized by "exhaustive attacks, artillery bombardments and season-length battles" (Onions 1990: 2). Here, the British suffered the greatest number of casualties. With its maze of trenches, the rain, rats and mud, the dangers of gas and enemy artillery, the Western Front dominates the memory of the Great War and, as Hynes states, seems to symbolize the evils of all modern warfare: "If

you want the purest embodiment in history of that vision of war in all its cruelty and stupidity and power, the Western Front is the place to go. It is a tragic vision, on a vast scale; compared to the Western Front, other wars are only wars." (1997: 75) Though many of these myths have been questioned by recent scholarship (cf. Bond 1997; Winter 1995), these images of the War also prevail in the fictional accounts of John Kipling's life.

KIPLING'S CHOICE

Geert Spillebeen's young adult novel *Kipling's Choice* is overtly didactic, particularly in its rejection of war. The story starts during the British attack on September 27th, just before John received a serious face wound. John's slow, painful death is then described in detail; in between, flashbacks convey the story of how John became an officer and show the contrast to the luxurious life he led before. The novel stays close to the historical facts of John's life; yet like any fictional account, it shapes its story by emphasizing selected themes and events.

Two of the dominating themes are present from the start: John's physical deficiencies and the overpowering influence of his famous father. Like Rudyard, John was extremely short-sighted and as Rudyard himself could not join the Navy because of his eyes, he was determined that John should become an officer in his stead. " I know what you are feeling, boy. I have the same eyes, you know. I had the same dreams of the navy." (12) Throughout the novel, John fails various eye-tests and thus does not qualify for the armed forces (e.g. 9, 13, 20 and 27). After the outbreak of the Great War, when the army was desperate for volunteers, he is rejected again:

'Left 6/36 without glasses, 6/6 with glasses.' [. . .]

The war is six weeks old. John [...] wants to serve in Lord Kitchener's new army. [...] 'Right 6/36 without glasses, 6/9 with.'

The verdict is given: 'Unsatisfactory.' (27)

While John is clearly disappointed, his father is even more so: "Rudyard Kipling feels wounded. After all, everyone wants to do his part in the war. Why should his only son be barred from serving king and country. How can they pass over the son of Rudyard Kipling, the most celebrated writer of his time [. . .]?" (29) There are other reasons why John is not qualified for the demands of an officer's life: though a likeable boy, he fails to pass the exam for Sandhurst (22f.) and is repeatedly described as small and weak (1, 23, etc.). Unsurprisingly "[t]he harsh outdoor life during the raw winter months undermines his health" (44) – the military training proves too much for him and he fre-

quently has to go home to recuperate. In a war which is often perceived as unnecessary, John's terrible death looks even more futile, as, clearly, he would have had any excuse not to fight. This physically unfit young man, who had no real chance of surviving the war, serves as a proxy for thousands of young, eager, yet ill-prepared volunteers sacrificed in the First World War.

As the novel repeatedly points out, John died on the Western Front because his father wanted him to do his 'bit'. Indeed, John only got into the Irish Guards because Lord Roberts owed Rudyard a favour. Though John wanted to volunteer, Rudyard is shown to be the decisive force: "[Rudyard] believes that the war is a heroic fight against the barbarians, and that the noblest fate a young man can encounter would be to give his life for his country." (53) With these thoughts, Rudyard personifies an image frequent in the memory of the Great War: the old generation who, unaware of the true horrors of modern warfare, sacrificed the young for their ideals (cf. Winter 1995: 2). As the author of well-known war propaganda, for instance the poem "For All We Have and Are", which is partly quoted in the novel (29), Rudyard is presented as a great war-enthusiast who, however, fails to understand that this war does not resemble the heroic wars of his imagination. The novel emphasizes this point by establishing a parallel between John and Mowgli. In an imaginary conversation with his fictional creation Rudyard finally realizes the difference between fiction and reality: "I sent you to the Jungle, Mowgli. [. . .] But you survived, Mowgli. John didn't." (149)

The feeling that John's death could have been avoided is strengthened by the frequent foreshadowing of his fate through the deaths of his friends — George Cecil (34), George Manners (35), Oscar Hornung and Julian Grenfell (49f). "[T]he list of dearly beloved sons of friends is growing longer every day" the narrator states prophetically (35). The 'myth of the lost generation' is thus mirrored in the fate of the novel's characters: these hopeful young men from a promising background, who have all the splendid things money can buy – skiing holidays in Switzerland, dinners in expensive restaurants, John's splendid car 'Car-Uso' –, die at a time when they are just beginning to enjoy life to the full. In his dying thoughts, John himself makes this point: "*One* battle? [. . .] Is that really all, Daddo?" (128)

The novel blames Rudyard for John's death, yet his love for his son, "the apple of his eye" (15), and his great distress after John's death are also emphasized: "Rudyard Kipling is slumped in an easy chair, grasping the armrests and weeping hysterically." (129) Though Rudyard continues to write war propaganda, his disillusionment with the war dominates:

And every day the questions running through his head become clearer: *Why? Did he have to defend that war so strongly? Who dies if England live? What kind of father sends his only son to his death? How many boys have I written into the grave,* he wonders? (146)

His reaction illustrates the disenchantment with the First World War and with the glory it seemed to promise; the novel retells the story of the famous author who started out as a war enthusiast and reversed his attitudes completely to demonstrate to a modern readership how widespread this disillusionment was.

A further myth central to the Great War, which also dominates in the novel, is the Western Front. It is, of course, not the "Great Picnic" (54) and "real adventure" (68) John and his friend expect. Instead, the novel's graphic battle descriptions show the Western Front to be terrible beyond belief. "From the maze of trenches, the British and French had been able to hold the front line that curved around the city of Ypres, but it had cost thousands of lives and many appalling injuries: men whose eyes were burnt out, whose lungs had burst." (79) Though in reality many men survived the War uninjured, these are the images of the Western Front most people share to this day. John is wounded quickly and in his first battle – "At five o'clock Lieutenant John Kipling is observed for the last time. His head is bloodied and he seems half-crazy, bawling from the pain. [. . .] He takes a bandage and tries to stop the blood that is gushing from the shattered remains of his mouth [. . .]." (7) His fate supports the image of the Great War as a lethal conflict which made the individual soldier a mere victim.

MY BOY JACK – THE PLAY

Though also showing a number of interesting differences, David Haig's *My Boy Jack* emphasizes many of the themes central in Spillebeen's novel; most importantly, Rudyard is again blamed for sending his son to a (seemingly) certain death. In an early scene before the Army Medical Board, the play exaggerates John's eye problems in order to highlight the folly of sending him to fight: "John. I can't see anything I'm afraid. Sparks. Top line, don't worry about the smaller letters for now. [. . .] You can't read the top line?" (17)

In contrast to the novel, where Carrie and Elsie Kipling seem to go along with Rudyard, in the play, they point out the dangers of his action from the beginning. Carrie cautions: "He is too young. [. . .] His eyes are not just an excuse." (11) And when Rudyard finally secures John a commission, Elsie exclaims: "Three times the Army has turned Jack down. Why is he suddenly fit to fight? [. . .] He can't see five yards without his specs. Doesn't it worry you that he might be killed?" (27f.)

The two women serve as voices of reason, and through them, the play reproaches Rudyard for the unnecessary sacrifice of his son. Unlike the novel, the play claims that John did not volunteer from a feeling of patriotism. Rather, he looks upon the army as a means of escape from the stifling love of his father: "I don't care whether it's sensible or not, or dangerous or not, I don't give a damn as long as I get away, and get out of this house. [. . .] I can't breathe in. [. . .] It's suffocating." (22f.) Of course, this is merely another means of blaming Rudyard for John's unnecessary death.

Like the novel, the play presents Rudyard as a fanatic believer in the British cause and emphasizes his role as a war propagandist. When John is missing, Rudyard clings to his belief of a just war:

Rudyard. Do you really blame me for this? . . . [People] know what we are fighting for. They know we must go forward, willing to sacrifice everything to deliver mankind from evil. [. . .] Carrie, if by any chance Jack is dead, it will have been the finest moment in his young life. We would not wish him to outlive that. (52f.)

Even an eye-witness' description of John's brutal death cannot shake him: "Bowe. I see Lieutenant Kipling. [. . .] The bottom of his face is . . . shot away. [. . .] There's nothin' below his top lip, nothin' at all. He's cryin', tears, cryin' with the pain, Sir." (74f.) Though this description should have revealed to Rudyard the true nature of John's suffering, he draws the wrong conclusion – a conclusion which illustrates the discrepancy between ideal and reality that seems so typical of the First World War. "Rudyard (quietly). Thank you...so...he was killed by a shell. ..[...] He led his men from the front, and was courageous in the face of considerable enemy fire." (76)

Only at the end of the play does Rudyard finally change his opinion. The play uses his disillusionment with the War to support the wide-spread myth that the First World War achieved nothing. The final scene is set on January 30th, 1933. Adolf Hitler's appointment as Chancellor is announced on the radio. Rudyard's response: "For nothing, for nothing, for nothing." (88) fits today's assumption that the Great War — instead of being 'the war to end all wars' — was only the beginning of further conflicts.

Interestingly, the recent film-version ends on a more consoling note: here, Rudyard recites his poem "My Boy Jack" to George V, whose youngest son has just died. By showing the two men grieving together, the film's final moments are perhaps less of an accusation and instead emphasize the bereavement of all parents who have lost a son. Yet the film, like the play, is clearly meant as a reminder of the pity of

war. It supports the view that Jack's death should have been avoided and emphasizes this through a number of additional scenes – which include Carrie's suggestion that John do his 'bit' on the Home Front, Rudyard's shocked reaction at the casualty figures, and a contrast established between John's often frustrating and gruesome experience in the army and Elsie's useful war work on the Kiplings' farm.

TO CONCLUDE:

As we have seen, both *Kipling's Choice* and *My Boy Jack* use John Kipling as a symbol of the First World War, emphasizing those aspects in his life which illustrate the horrors of this conflict – in particular the futility of the many sacrifices, the disillusionment and the casualties of the Western Front. By retelling John's story, the fictional accounts not only use common myths of the Great War, they also help to perpetuate the dominant memory of this conflict and use it as a warning to future generations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bond, Brian (1997). "A Victory Worse Than a Defeat? British Interpretations of the First World War." *Annual Liddell Hart Centre for Military Archives Lecture*. King's College London, 20 November 1997, pp.1-10.
 <<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/lhcma/info/lec97.htm>> (6.12.2007).
- Dunmore, Helen, "Don't Count John Among the Dreams." *Glad of These Times*. Bloodaxe Books, 2007, p.12.
- Fussell, Paul, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, OUP, 1975.
- Haig, David, *My Boy Jack*, Nick Hern Books, 1997.
- Holt, Tonie and Valmai, *'My Boy Jack': The Search for Kipling's Only Son*, Leo Cooper, 1998.
- Hynes, Samuel, *A War Imagined: The First World War and English Culture*. Bodley Head, 1990.
- The Soldier's Tale: Bearing Witness to Modern War*. Penguin, 1997.
- My Boy Jack*, Director: Brian Kirk. Screenplay: David Haig, 2007.
- Onions, John, *English Fiction and Drama of the Great War, 1918-39*. Macmillan, 1990.
- Spillebeen, Geert, *Kipling's Choice*. Trans. Terese Edelstein. Houghton Mifflin, 2005.
- Winter, Jay, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*. CUP, 1995.
- Wohl, Robert, *The Generation of 1914*. Harvard UP, 1979.

MEMBERSHIP SUBSCRIPTION RATES

UK (payment by Standing Order)	£22	Joint £32
UK (payment by cheque)	£24	Joint £34
(Joint – two members, same address, one <i>Journal</i> .)		
Young Members (under 23 years)	£12	
Surface mail, worldwide	£26	US\$52
Europe (airmail)	£26	€40
Airmail worldwide	£30	US\$60

Universities and libraries are £2 more than the corresponding individual rate.

Cheques are accepted on British banks in pounds, on US banks in dollars and on European banks in Euros. Bank transfers should be made in pounds sterling to the Kipling Society account at Lloyds TSB, Old Bond Street, London. Please ensure that you use our International Bank Account Number **GB18LOYD30962400114978** and the Bank Identity Code **LOYDGB21014**. Details of how to transfer will be on the subscription reminder sheet which accompanies the last *Kipling Journal* before renewal is due.

For those who pay by British bank Standing Order, new Standing Order forms have been sent to all whose payment is due in the first quarter of 2008, those for later payments are following. Prompt completion and return will be appreciated.