

**T.C. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI PROGRAMI**

**POWER CONQUERS HUMANITY: REREADING THE COLONIAL
DISCOURSE BY EXPLORING THE DISCRIMINATION
PERFORMED BY THE NON-WESTERNERS IN E.M. FORSTER'S A
PASSAGE TO INDIA AND EDWARD P. JONES'S *THE KNOWN
WORLD***

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Elçin AYAKAN

KOCAELİ 2021

**T.C. KOCAELİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
BATI DİLLERİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI PROGRAMI**

**POWER CONQUERS HUMANITY: REREADING THE COLONIAL
DISCOURSE BY EXPLORING THE DISCRIMINATION
PERFORMED BY THE NON-WESTERNERS IN E.M. FORSTER'S A
PASSAGE TO INDIA AND EDWARD P. JONES'S *THE KNOWN
WORLD***

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

Elçin AYAKAN

Doç. Dr. Berna KÖSEOĞLU

Tezin Kabul Edildiği Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Karar ve No: 09/06/2021-13

KOCAELİ 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZET.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER I	
1. COLONIALISM.....	6
1.1. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF COLONIALISM.....	6
1.2. THE IMPACT OF COLONIALISM ON ENGLAND.....	12
1.3. THE IMPACT OF COLONIALISM ON AMERICA	17
1.4. THE ABUSE OF POWER BY THE WESTERNERS IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD	22
1.5. THE ABUSE OF POWER BY THE EASTERNERS IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD	29
CHAPTER II	
2. AN ANALYSIS OF E.M. FORSTER'S <i>A PASSAGE TO INDIA</i>	37
CHAPTER III	
3. AN ANALYSIS OF EDWARD P. JONES'S <i>THE KNOWN WORLD</i>	57
CONCLUSION.....	86
WORKS CITED.....	96

ÖZET

Tarih boyunca insanlar tarafından uygulanan ayrımcılık birçok farklı şekilde ön plana çıkmaktadır. Ayrımcılığın ve o dönemlerin önemli bir yansıması olarak sömürgecilik, ayrımcılık eyleminin insanlık üzerinde yadsınamaz ve yıkıcı bir etkiye sahip olduğu öne çıkan bir dönemdir. Sömürgeciliğin barbarca yapısı, çoğunlukla Batılıların başı çeken rolüyle ilişkilendirilir. Batılılar, Batılı olmayan yerli halklardan yararlanarak sürdürdükleri üstün statüyü korumak için bu zalim sistemi ayakta tuttular. Öte yandan, sömürgecilik dönemlerinde Batılıların ayrımcılık yapmakla suçlanması gereken tek insan topluluğu olmadığı da bir gerçektir. Batılı olmayanlar da beklenmedik şekilde ayrımcı uygulamalar gerçekleştirmişlerdir. Onlar da sömürgecilik sürecine dahil oldular ve aynı zamanda insanları aşağılayarak ikincil konuma getirdiler. Hindistan'da 20.yüzyılda dahi meydana gelen Hindu-Müslüman çatışmaları ve Amerikan sömürgeciliği döneminde siyah köle sahiplerinin siyah kölelere sahip olduğu gerçeği, Batılı olmayanlar tarafından amansızca uygulanan bir eylem olarak ayrımcılığın nasıl açıkça gözlemlenebileceğiyle ilintilidir. Dahası, bu tezin ilgi alanları olan bu unsurlar üstünlük duygusunun insanlığın konumunu tehlikeye attığını ortaya koymakta ve bu unsura bağlı olarak da ırk ve din gibi konular insanların üstünlüklerini ispatlamak için suistimal ettikleri kavramlar haline gelmektedir.

Bu tezin amacı, Batılı olmayanların ayrımcılığa dahil olmalarını göstermek için E.M. Forster'ın *A Passage to India* ve Edward P. Jones'un *The Known World* adlı eserlerini incelemektir. Bu iki romanın ana karakterleri, uyguladıkları ayrımcılık ışığında incelenecektir. Diğer karakterlerle birlikte, başkahramanlar olan Dr.Aziz ve Henry Townsend vasıtasıyla üstünlük hissini nasıl içselleştirildiği ve sabit bir fikir haline dönüştüğü bu tezde detaylı olarak sergilenecektir. Aziz, kendi dini İslam'ın üstünlüğüne ve kıymetine inanarak Hindu Hintlileri aşağılarken, Henry ise eski bir köle olarak siyah kölelerin siyah köle efendisine dönüşüyor. Bu anlamda, Batılı olmayan karakterlerin ayrımcılığa varan insanlık dışı uygulamaları, bu tezde detaylı bir analizle Forster ve Jones'un eserlerinde tartışılacaktır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Ayrımcılık, güç, üstünlük, siyah köle sahipleri, E.M. Forster, Edward P. Jones

ABSTRACT

Discrimination, which has been practised by human beings throughout the history, comes to the fore in many different ways. As a significant reflection of discrimination and those periods, colonialism is an outstanding era in which the practice of discrimination has an undeniable and destructive impact on humanity. The barbaric structure of colonialism is mostly related to the leading role of the Westerners. They kept this tyrannical system alive to preserve the superior position they sustained via taking advantage of the non-Westerners, indigenous people. Nevertheless, it is evident in colonial times that the Westerners were not the only group of people that should be blamed for performing discrimination. Also, the non-Westerners unexpectedly carried out discriminative practices. They involved in the colonisation process and put people in secondary position by degrading them, as well. The Hindu-Muslim conflicts taking place in India even in the 20st century and the reality of black slave holders owning black slaves in the time of the American colonialism are in correlation with how discrimination can clearly be observed as a practice employed relentlessly by the non-Westerners. Furthermore, these facts which are the concerns of this thesis reveal that the feeling of supremacy jeopardises the place of humanity and in relation to this fact, matters such as race and religion become the notions people abuse to prove their superiority.

The aim of this dissertation is to analyse E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* and Edward P. Jones's *The Known World* in order to show the participation of the non-Westerners in performing discrimination. The main characters of these two novels will be analysed in the light of the discrimination they employ. Through the protagonists, Dr. Aziz and Henry Townsend along with other characters, how the feeling of superiority is being internalised and turns out to be an obsession will be reflected in this thesis in detail. While Aziz insults the Hindu Indians by believing in the superiority and worth of his own religion Islam, Henry transforms into a black slave master of black slaves as a former slave. In this sense, the inhumane practices of the non-Western characters leading to discrimination will be discussed in the works of Forster and Jones with a detailed analysis in this thesis.

Key words: Discrimination, power, superiority, black slave-owners, E.M. Forster, Edward P. Jones


ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is my willful duty to show my love and thanks to the people who have touched my life positively in different ways. First and foremost, I want to express my deep and endless gratitude and love to my dearest supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Berna KÖSEOĞLU from the bottom of my heart. Her sincerity, kindness, elegance and motivation have helped and inspired me so much in all the time of my academic study and daily life. She is definitely a role model for me. It was an amazing privilege and honour to be a part of her lectures during both my undergraduate and master studies. Also, it was a great chance for me to write this thesis under her guidance. She encouraged me a lot in this academic journey. I could not have imagined having a better supervisor than her for my master study. I feel so happy to be able to know such a lovely and precious soul.

I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee, Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat KADİROĞLU and Assist. Prof. Dr. Seda ÇOŞAR ÇELİK, for their contribution. My sincere thanks also goes to my lecturers at Kocaeli University, English Language and Literature Department and especially to my dear lecturer, Gülrah MORAMOLLU who has introduced me to Forster's *A Passage to India* in her lectures and has inspired me to come up with the idea of my thesis.

Last but not least, I would like to extend that I am deeply grateful to my family, especially my beloved mother, Ferahnaz AYAKAN whose unconditional love and support made me the person I am right now. I know how much you sacrificed for our family and that your love to me knows no boundaries even at times that I can be stubborn enough to drive you crazy. I am so proud and lucky to have such a strong and confident woman like you as my mother. I thank you for being my guiding light, first teacher and Wonder Woman and dedicate this thesis to you as a token of my endless love to you.

I would like to finish my words by thanking Mustafa Kemal ATATÜRK whose principles and revolutions made me an independent and educated woman and gave me the opportunity to write this thesis.



History is a futile cycle of violence and savagery, progress is a chimera, civilization is a higher form of barbarism, and egoism is the underlying truth of human conduct.

Terry Eagleton, *The English Novel: An Introduction*

INTRODUCTION

It won't be wrong to say that colonialism can be easily described as the strong ones' imposing their economic, political and cultural power over the weak ones in order to prove their being able to control racially or religiously different people. It takes an important place in the course of history especially for its referring to the power struggle and a kind of an internalized tendency of discriminating one another, without considering notions like friendship or being united no matter what happens. Being superior, having control and authority over someone seems much more vital for human beings, as this can be found evident in the course of colonialism. Throughout the history, it is seen that usually the Western powers turned the Easterners into their slaves and servants, even after the colonial period, for the sake of preserving their superiority in the world scene, with a kind of an idea that the weaker one needs to be protected and controlled, as the examples of British Empire and the United States demonstrate. Due to the reason that, matters such as race, culture and power mean a lot to world powers like these two actors, it can be said that they did not have a second thought in terms of defining the non-Westerners as lesser beings than themselves, which is, of course unacceptable considering the fact that a human's being from a different race, culture or religion does not indicate that that person has to be labelled as a second-class human or slave. In relation to that, nearly in all of the literary productions of colonial or post-colonial works, one can, easily find the powerful image of the West, that can be seen as the underlined message, or mostly, the struggling position of the non-Westerners under the pressure and humiliation of the Western people. It would be proper to assert that such a discriminative environment makes it nearly impossible for the human beings to be totally united as a whole, because of all the racial, cultural or religious varieties they have. But, what is going to be put forward in this dissertation is the fact that the non-Westerners, also play an important role in this discrimination and colonialism, just like the way the Westerners do, because of the reason that notions like race, religion and power mean a lot than friendship, which will be examined and proved through the detailed analysis of two different novels, E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* and Edward P. Jones' *The Known World*. Instead of the superior and discriminative attitude of West, which is the generally accustomed one in terms of colonialism, in the analysis of these two novels, the attention will be on something totally different

than the discriminative perspective of the West, which is the attitude of the non-Westerners. Although the colonial criticism is being made upon the Westerners, because they were discriminating and isolating the non-Westerners by means of factors like race, culture, religion, but mostly being financially and politically superior, the novels which are mentioned in the previous lines highlight an unusual perspective for the nature of colonial criticism. This criticism can be made against all people who seek for power. Both of these novels show that human beings' feeling superior is not just valid for the Westerners, but it can be also found as highly working within the non-Westerners. This means that regardless of race or culture, all the people of the world discriminate and differentiate one another unfortunately because of reasons such as race, culture or religion and for the sake of being much more powerful. To put it another way, it can be said that human beings show more respect to the reasons stated in the previous line, than showing respect to each other and being united as a whole regardless of differences, which will be analysed and proved in this thesis.

In relation to the points stated earlier, the first novel, which will be analysed in this paper as one of the two main works, Forster's *A Passage to India* will be touched upon from a perspective criticizing the non-Westerners. They, too, have the tendency of putting a distance in their social relationships because of factors like race and religion. The main character of Forster's well-known novel, Dr. Aziz will be examined as a person who is being hypocrite in his relationships with people. Aziz, who, himself, criticizes the English for invading India's freedom and ironically, contributes to the fragmented social structure of India by being disrespectful to Hindu traditions which can be observed in this study. In this case, religion seems like a really significant factor about human affairs, considering Aziz's being a Muslim believer. As one can observe openly, the existence of factors such as race and religion, in other words social varieties, which are highly significant and valued in the eyes of human beings, can be regarded as matters that create discrimination between human beings. Even friendship, which can be seen as the basic level of social connection of two or more people, usually depends on these factors. That is why, not only the Westerners, but also, the non-Westerners show discrimination towards one another, as they believe that their social and cultural values are the most

precious ones. In such an atmosphere, the possibility of people's being united as a whole sadly turns out to be impossible which will be defended and proved in this thesis. A person, whose land is being invaded and controlled by the colonial forces, the British Empire, who approaches the non-Westerners as inferior creatures that need to be controlled by the West, can be expected to be much more understanding, sensible and thoughtful for matters like, being discriminated or being respected. However, the instance of Dr. Aziz stands as the very opposite of that expectation, regarding his hypocrite behaviours towards Hindu Indians, or in other words, the non-Muslim citizens of India. As it is clear, it would be proper to state that E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* pictures a social and cultural muddle in the setting of India. This reflects that cultural and racial issues effect people's coming together as a whole and not criticizing each other just because their religion or race is different. This situation arouses a kind of a feeling of superiority within people, which can be seen clearly in the act of colonialism, as the colonisers believe that they are much more superior in terms of their race and religion than the non-Westerners. But, what this dissertation aims to put forward is the fact that every person, if given the chance, is ready for controlling other people under the name of colonialism or something else. Because, this is a kind of a natural result of cultural varieties' leading people to assume that people whose race or religion are different, always need to be isolated, controlled or discriminated. This can be seen as the reason which can be found behind Aziz's being disrespectful to the Brahmany bull sacred for the Hindus. Similarly, for the same reason, Aziz believes that India needs to be ruled by someone from his race and thinks that the only problem is the English people. However, unfortunately, even if the English mandatory leaves India, the power struggle of the people of India would remain, as they are not united within themselves. This is something related to cultural and social matters' blocking the possibility of living in peace and colonialism's not just something being linked to Western people, but also, being an act that can be performed by the Easterners. Because everybody, not just the Westerners, can evoke the feeling of superiority within themselves.

In relation to that, the second novel of this paper which will be touched upon, *The Known World* of Edward P. Jones, stands as a novel that proves the aim of this thesis along with Forster's *A Passage to India* because the non-Westerners can also

be in the coloniser party of colonialism and they can cause social discrimination, as they give much more importance to cultural and social values than being united and this leads to the feeling of superiority within human beings, as mentioned before. What is outstanding about Jones's novel is something partially unknown for the colonial period, which is the black non-Westerners' turning out to be slave owners in the 19th century America. When the matter comes to colonialism, most people, usually think that only the white Western people were the colonial rulers and the ones, who made the non-Westerners their slaves and servants. However, Edward P. Jones's work disproves that general opinion by creating a novel, that highlights a hidden part of colonialism depending on true verification. That is why, *The Known World*, shows a colonial world that not so many people know, actually. The main character of Jones's novel, Henry Townsend portrays a black man, who is a slave once, and has turned into a slave owner, himself, by hard work and earns the money to buy black slaves for himself. Despite the fact that it sounds pretty interesting for the first time, such a reality used in a fictional work reveals a highly significant thing about the human nature. Just like the way, Dr. Aziz can be expected to be much more caring for the Indian people, regardless of being Hindu or Muslim, Henry Townsend can be expected not to become a slave owner, too, especially after encountering the negative nature of being a slave, himself, which is, naturally a very insulting way of living. However, it is evident in the novel that Townsend wants to be in the powerful side of this huge war of colonialism. This proves that showing control and superiority over other people who are less strong, is something not special to the Westerners, the non-Westerners can also be in that seat willingly, as a result it shows that the only matter is having power and being a coloniser is beyond being a Westerner. On the other hand, Henry Townsend, in a way, in order to justify his becoming a slave owner in the 19th century Manchester county, thinks that he is going to be a better owner than the white slave owners, which, of course, cannot be acceptable considering the fact that being a better master does not change the degraded social position of the black slaves. It won't be wrong to say that his believing that he is a good master means nothing, regarding that he has bought his slaves with money, just like a property. In other words, he chooses to be a master, so called a better one, rather than not serving to the humiliating, inhuman system of colonialism and slavery. Consequently, it proves that being powerful and having

control over other creatures have a higher significance for humans instead of living in an equal and friendly environment. Henry Townsend's example, inspired by historical truths about the facts of black people's owning black slaves in America, gives clue about an important reality, which is, if the non-Westerners had the economic and political power, in the period of colonialism, instead of the Westerners, they would have turned the Westerners into their slaves. This demonstrates that there is a feeling of being superior in human beings, which leads to creating inhuman living conditions and labels for other human beings. Although Henry Townsend believes that he is a good master, his slaves' running away from being Townsends' servant, right after his death, indicates that he is not as good enough as he assumes. Besides that, another note-worthy related issue, also, needs to be mentioned in that very point. It can be said that as well as the feeling of superiority within people, what gives courage to a former slave to have slaves for his service, can be seen as slavery's being performed by legislations, along with the fact that it was believed to be approved by God, as a consequence religion is an important matter in human relationships.

As it has been reflected so far, these two attention-grabbing novels will be analysed in this dissertation in order to prove that not only the Westerners, but also, the Easterners discriminate one another, as human beings give more attention and value to notions like race, religion and being powerful. Due to the reason that these two fictional novels stand as a kind of a reflection of real life and incidents, they contribute to this dissertation, in terms of proving the idea of this paper, in a detailed way. On the other hand, the aim of this paper is not supporting the Western colonialism, that is surely intolerable, but rather, it is stating that regardless of being Westerner or non-westerner, each person is capable of discriminating one another, as it can be seen in the example of *A Passage to India's* Dr. Aziz, or turning people into their slaves, as it is obvious in the case of *The Known World's* Henry Townsend. In brief, these points will be studied in this dissertation with great extent of scope.

CHAPTER I

1. COLONIALISM

1.1. A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF COLONIALISM

It would be quite proper to say that people's owning something can be seen as quite natural. Human beings, for centuries have been buying and selling things according to their wish. As it is generally known, it can basically be called as the activity of shopping. Till that point, it all sounds totally normal for people. But, when they begin to do that activity in terms of owning someone, rather than something, it would be proper to say that things started to go wild and wicked considering the notion of humanity. It is the unfortunate activity which has been carried out for many centuries in which people regard other people as properties that need to be owned or sold. This highly cruel and inappropriate activity goes by a famous name which is colonialism and can be based on the explanation stated at the beginning, besides lots of different definition can be found in academic publications. In one of these works, Ania Loomba clears up the minds of people who want to learn about the cruel activity of colonialism by defining the term itself that "comes from the Roman 'colonia' which meant 'farm' or 'settlement", "as the conquest and control of other people's land and goods" (1998: 7-8). As the definition puts forward, it is not so hard to see that the main aim of colonialism is centred on the idea of gaining power, but only the power attained through the invasion of less-strong people along with what they have valuable, such as soil. It seems like the word, control, can be regarded as significant because controlling something or someone leads the powerful person to be the one who is in charge of everything, including the identity of human beings. In relation to that it would be proper to mention imperialism in order to understand the activity of colonialism as these two terms can be used or seen interchangeably in terms of the meaning they refer to. The very well-known scholar M.A.R. Habib points out that imperialism comes to the fore as a strategy used by the powerful states when they want to dominate more and more lands and peoples forcibly by means of military, cultural and economic control (2005: 737). As it is obviously seen, the plan

of imperialism is what exactly lies behind the activity of colonialism. In other words, colonialism is the practical part of imperialism; the way how the powerful countries and individuals try to employ their power in an unfortunately negative and reckless way in terms of disregarding human values and rights, which is what this study aims to examine. In order to gain a better understanding of colonialism and imperialism, it is proper to say that in colonialism there are noticeable numbers of settled colonies of Western people, whereas in imperialism the number of migrated colonizers are few, for example during colonialism “most of Africa and Asia [...] was imperialized-dominated but not settled-[...]” (Horvath, 1972: 47). So, it is clear that colonialism cannot be considered without imperialism. The reason behind a nation that practises colonialism and imperialism over the others is nothing but power. All the economic and military purposes of the strong ones are based on this single motif. It will not be wrong to state that having authority and power means much more than observing peaceful relationships between human beings and states. It can be said that this mentality constructs what is known as the history of colonialism. In that very moment, it would be proper to go back a little earlier in history in order to see what happened in terms of the history of colonialism. It will not be wrong to state that older civilizations in history had imperialistic concerns so as to show themselves in the world arena as superior powers:

Both the Western world and the Eastern world have seen a series of vast empires which have extended over vast territories, often in the name of bringing the blessings of their civilization to the subject peoples who were regarded as barbarians. These include the Chinese empires extending from the eleventh century BC to the tenth century after Christ; the Sumerian, Babylonian, Egyptian, Assyrian, and Persian empires; the empires of the Greeks, which reached a climax with the conquests of Alexander the Great; the Roman Empire, the Byzantine Empire, and the various empires of Islam which lasted until the early twentieth century (Habib, 2005: 737).

The priority of empires is gaining power, as it can be seen above and this depends on the amount of land that they have. Although it seems like empires, regardless of their being Western or Eastern, carried out this practice this for the sake of bestowing what makes them civilized, the reality is just their building superiority. The unfortunate point about the relationship between the empires and the ruled ones is the insulting attitude of the rulers over their subjects. It can be said that they did not hesitate to abuse their power. In a way, empires imposed their power because of the reason that they only considered the continuity of their empires. In this sense, one

can assert that European colonialism of the following centuries dates back to hundreds of years ago. As a result of the “voyages of exploration and ‘discovery’ ” of “a few European powers (England, Belgium, France, Spain Portugal, and the Netherlands)” European colonialism began in the fifteenth century, almost “80 percent of the world” was dominated by these European countries (Amoko, 2006: 132). It can clearly be observed that from the fifteenth century on, there was a shift in power relations between the Eastern and the Western countries. As it is obvious, Europeans’ having an active role in sea voyages has led them to rule more lands than the non-Westerners and to get goods of the far-fetched lands automatically. European powers played a highly significant role in terms of exploring overseas territories. Africa, India, the Americas and East India coasts were explored by Portuguese and Spanish explorers in the fifteenth century and in relation to that maritime commerce developed through the establishment of overseas colonies, in addition to that in the seventeenth century, the activity of colonialism has reached to a next level in terms of expansion of colonies and European powers including England, France and Netherlands competing with one another in order to colonize new and more territories (Kozlowski, 2010: 2). It is not a surprise that European countries turned out to be colonizers in regard to the fact that the sailors who discovered the unknown parts of the world were European. The role of geographic expeditions cannot be denied in terms of colonial powers’ being from Europe. To state an example from the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, the raw materials which were found in non-Western territories, turned into capital and used by the Westerners in different fields of production such as agricultural products from Brazil, cloth and spices from Asia, dyestuffs and leather from America in addition to silver and gold mining (Blaut, 1989: 281). Although it would not be wise to compare the amount of trade and production of these centuries to the amount of production of the following centuries, production of such materials through colonial activity in these early centuries cannot be denied as they are outstanding. It can be said that on the surface, productivity seems something positive, but the way how this productivity occurs is problematic and it is linked to economically powerful countries’ dominating the weaker ones. Additionally, what was produced was not just raw materials but also human beings who were classified as slaves. This shows that the colonizers controlled the lives of the non-Western people for the sake of the prosperity and

power of their countries. It is like a black destiny written for the economically unprivileged parts of the world which were discovered by the West as valuable treasures. However, that value does not come from caring for human identity. Rather than that, it is related to labour value produced by slaves. It is an undeniable fact that the number of slaves were unfortunately in a considerable amount:

In the 17th century the plantation system rapidly expanded, and its significance for the rise of capitalism increased ably. During this century a total of 2,000,000 slaves was the Americas. Barbados (the first British sugar colony) producing around 1640 and within the next 50 years 50,000 slaves were imported into this tiny island alone (Blaut, 1989: 285).

Analysing the historical background of colonialism, referring to such statistical data means a lot in terms of acknowledging the importance of slave trade for the European powers and the development of colonialism. The fact that the extent of it was too much demonstrates that the only thing that matters for the colonizers was their profit. Their being imported like some kind of a property clearly proves that fact. Besides the importance of discoveries of new lands by means of rapid expansion of colonialism in history, the existence of capitalism, also deserves to be mentioned in this part. It is proper to state that the birth and development of industry in Europe created a need for goods to be used in factories. In this sense, competitive European countries as colonial actors aimed to control non-Western regions of the world and used colonies in order “to obtain raw material” as a consequence of the fact that “industrial revolution resulted in increasing production” which enhanced the significance of colonies (Ateş, 2008: 42). This situation shows that there is an explicit connection between colonialism and industrial production. The birth of modern industry and its rapid development in the nineteenth century contributed to the powerful place of the Western actors in terms of the expansion of colonialism. However, this powerful place of the West was sustained as a result of a system in which “societies drained of their essence, cultures trampled underfoot, institutions undermined, lands confiscated, religions smashed, [...] malnutrition permanently introduced, agricultural development oriented solely toward the benefit of the metropolitan countries” (Césaire, 1972: 6-7). In other words, industrialization has brought economic power and economic power has brought colonial expansion and finally, such an expansion created morally unacceptable consequences. In relation to that, the British Empire can be given as a prominent and powerful example of that

expansion in the Victorian Age regarding the interference of technological innovations in industry:

England's technological progress, together with its prosperity, led to an enormous expansion of its influence around the globe. Its annual export of goods nearly trebled in value between 1850 and 1870. Not only the export of goods but that of people and capital increased. Between 1853 and 1880 2,466,000 emigrants left Britain, many bound for British colonies. By 1870 British capitalists had invested £800 million abroad; in 1850 the total had been only £300 million. This investment, of people, money, and technology, created the British Empire. Important building blocks of the empire were put in place in the mid-Victorian period. [...] Although the competitive scramble for African colonies did not take place until the final decades of the century, the model of empire was created earlier, made possible by technological revolution in communication and transportation (Greenblatt, 2006: 985).

According to the facts indicated above, the reason why British Empire can be regarded as the restorer of civilization is so clear. The economic prosperity of the empire contributed to its growth as a power which expands its lands progressively by way of colonizing more and more parts of the world. Although England's development is such a success for the empire, its exploiting non-Western countries on its way of being superior is not an acceptable thing. The positive words of Benjamin Disraeli, who can be considered as an outstanding name of the time, seem ironic regarding colonial activities of the British Empire: "It is a privilege to live in this age of rapid and brilliant events" (Greenblatt, 2006: 985). Despite his being an English citizen, his view of progress may look normal and even patriotic, obviously he did disregard the background of this progress which was sustained by way of colonial activities. This is the point which makes the whole process of development tainted considering the slave trade. Needless to say, the Western people saw their tainted development as bringing civilization to the countries in which they colonized. Enslavement was the price of meeting civilization. What makes the technological development of the empire a situation in which one should be proud of is its relation to the expansion of colonialism. In other words, the growth of one nation results in enslavement of some other non-Western nations. That is why this kind of an advancement caused these less-privileged countries to live under the rule of powerful nations like England. In this sense, colonialism is like a system in which only the powerful ones have the right to do whatever they desire including domination.

However, analysing the history of colonialism, it is proper to indicate that this

power and slavery-based system had come to an end gradually after 1945 due to the negative costs of two great world wars although it was not a total end for all the colonized parts of the world (Habib, 2005: 738). This means that the process of decolonization did not destroy the secondary position of the formerly colonized countries. Being superior stands for the most important matter in the world scene. It has changed its form from colonizing weaker and less-privileged countries to sustaining the secondary and dependable position of these countries. The effect of world wars should be taken into consideration in that compulsory change. As being the main colonial powers in the twentieth century, British Empire and France had to make some sacrifices in terms of introducing reforms for gradual decolonization, for example England was aware of the fact that restoring a “responsible government” in Southern Rhodesia was the best option in the time being instead of bearing “[...]the cost of reimbursing the South Africa Company and the colonial administration, thus clearing the way for responsible government plebiscite” (Von Albertine, 1969: 25). Regarding the presence of colonialists in overseas territories throughout the centuries, these kinds of reforms can be defined as the footsteps of change in the system of colonization even though it was carried out involuntarily. But, there is no doubt that Europe’s being affected by two great world wars did not bring about a drastic difference in the position of the non-Western countries apart from gaining their independence. It may sound like independence means a lot for these nations, however the non-Westerners’ problem of isolation in colonialism led them to be labelled as formerly colonized people in the post-colonial period. This shows that the economic and political superiority of the colonizers never disappeared and affected many countries, including colonizer and colonized ones. Considering the importance of that superiority, analysing and acknowledging the impact and significance of one of the note-worthy colonizer countries, The British Empire will be appropriate in the following chapter. This part will be helpful in terms of comprehending the boundaries of the ones who have access to power through the example of the colonizer, English nation.

1.2. THE IMPACT OF COLONIALISM ON ENGLAND

England’s place in colonialism is highly notorious. It can generally be said that the country is mostly known for its connection to colonialism as a significant

colonizer. In regard to British Empire's huge control on the overseas lands in colonial period for a very long time, being famous for that is very normal. Because of that reason, the name of this country is not a strange one for the non-Western nations. *The Week* states that Britain's journey of expansion around the world lasted more than four centuries as a colonial empire and even today, England has still domination over some islands such as Falkland Islands (2019). This ongoing control of England proves the power of the country as a significant actor in the world scene even after the colonial period. It is a predictable thing that the empire was receiving benefit from discovering new lands and turning them into colonies. England is regarded as "the largest, most powerful, best organized of the modern European countries" which reached to the largest number of territories in the world (Greenblatt, 2006: 1832). Although this was a great improvement for the empire, it was a failure of humanity in terms of colonial activities which have contributed to that success. The British Empire's solid and primary place indicate that human values were ignored throughout the period of colonialism. This ignorance can be linked to the empire's being the biggest power of the world until the twentieth century. A person who cares for notions such as humanity, identity or pity naturally may have some difficulty to understand the lack of them. But, there have been people who did not bother themselves with such difficulty. As a result of this ignorance, it is so obvious that in colonial period and the time following, non-Westerners bore the burden of being considered to be worthless. In that point, one can ask a question related to the issue: what kind of a human being turns a blind eye to what makes humans more than just flesh and bone? The answer of this question can be traced in this great power's ties with colonialism. For England just like the other European powers, the whole history of colonialism started with gathering strength in overseas. Although Portugal and Spain had the biggest role in geographic discoveries in the very beginning of the expeditions, the impact of England cannot be denied as the empire to get the bigger slice of the cake (Zarei and Delshad, 2015: 23). In North America, Britain created 13 colonies which, later on, built United States towards the end of the eighteenth century, along with that in 1600 the British East India Company established some business centres in some Indian cities such as Mumbai and Calcutta by the permission of Queen Elizabeth I (2015: 23). It is surely beyond doubt that such enterprises caused the loss of identity of countries like India. Apart from seizing

what is tradable in colonized countries as raw materials, the empire also captured persons with the aim of exploiting them. It can be indicated that economic concerns of an empire affect its taking harsh decisions in terms of exploitation of less-privileged countries. In this sense, slavery meant a lot to the growth of British economy as the following lines support:

[...] slavery-based demand for British goods was not so much (or not only) large but rather, presumably unlike domestic demand, focused on a particular of product-such as iron-that was central to the British growth process. Likewise, profits earned from slavery were not only large, they particularly likely to be invested into banks, textile factories, or canals, all of which were of huge importance to the industrialization process. Plantation crops such as cotton, so the argument goes, were critical to growing industries [...] (Eltis and Engerman, 2000: 125).

It is clear that the slave trade in overseas helped the empire flourish. The more British colonies produced raw materials through slave labour, the more Britain prospered by means of industrialization. As being responsible for the production of the materials found in the lands of the non-Westerners, British Empire progressed day by day in the homeland. That is why James Penny who was “a principal owner of dozens of Liverpool slaving ventures” demonstrates the importance of slave trade by stating that abolishment of slave trade would definitely have a negative impact on commercial interests in addition to a possible fall of “the Landed Property of the County Lancaster” and “the Town of Liverpool” (2000: 123). In such a case, slavery and its trade’s being supported by British merchants like James Penny can be seen as highly natural regarding these people’s deriving financial profit through colonialism. According to the statement of Penny, it can be deduced that neither the freedom of slaves nor the economy of Liverpool was his concern. The only crucial matter can be seen as the permanency of his own economy and Liverpool’s economy was only substantial for the reason that it affects his business. This example of the ambitious merchant shows the strong impact of colonialism over Britain. In relation to such oppositions to the abolishment of slavery, in 1791 the bill of slavery abolishment was rejected by the parliament (Greenblatt, 2006: 3). Rejection of the bill seems very natural from the British point of view considering the fact that economy was flourishing for the benefit of traders. This benefit is surely on behalf of the British economy. Then, under these circumstances, why would a parliament of an independent nation takes a decision against itself by accepting an abolishment bill? Surely, they did not kill their golden goose which sustained wealth. In this regard, it

will not be wrong to say that The Great Britain became great thanks to its rapid expansion in the non-Western countries throughout colonial period and especially in The Victorian Age.

Defining the nineteenth century as a time of success and dramatic change for Britain would not be exaggeration. During the long reign of Queen Victoria “the pivotal city of Western civilization” became London by toppling Paris from its throne, undeniably England’s turning out to be the very first industrialized power in Europe can be seen as an influential factor in that matter (Greenblatt, 2006: 979). Not surprisingly, the effect of colonialism comes to the fore in that point. England’s increase in prosperity can be explicitly associated with the colonial activities:

An early start enabled England to capture markets all over the globe. Cotton and other manufactured products were exported in English ships, a merchant fleet whose size was without parallel in other countries. The profits gained from trade led also to extensive capital investments in all continents. After England had become the world’s workshop, London became, from 1870 on, the world’s banker. England gained particular profit from the development of its own colonies, which, by 1890, comprised more than a quarter of all the territory on the surface of the earth; one in four people was a subject of Queen Victoria. By the end of the century England was the world’s foremost imperial power (2006: 980).

In this respect, England owes much of its wealth to the non-Western countries because what made Britain a world power was related to the imperial and colonial mind of it. Even though, as stated previously, Portugal was the first who contributed a lot to overseas expeditions, England proved itself as the big boss of colonialism particularly in the nineteenth century. As a related issue, the perspective of the British towards colonialism also deserves to be pointed out in this part regarding the moral side of this activity. According to the idea of the most of the British, colonial expansion was a mission of the white man. It can be interpreted that the selfishness of such an idea comes from Queen Victoria who was thinking that The British Empire’s duty “was ‘to protect the poor natives and advance civilization’ ” (Greenblatt, 2006: 985). Speaking of that one-sided view of the British, the famous English writer Rudyard Kipling needs to be mentioned by means of his colonialist mind. Kipling was supporting the idea that bringing civilization was the responsibility of the European nations through colonialism, he even served as an advocator of that expansionist perspective in his well-known poem called “The

White Man's Burden" (Veloso de Abreu, 2013: 687-8). His regarding the non-Westerners as the burden of Europeans is so ironic because no one has ever asked Europeans or in particular British to be dominated by them. Britain acted as a superior power against the non-Western nations. Rather than being a burden, the non-Western territories were a kind of a vehicle for the white man to become an imperial world power. They justified their imperial cause under the disguise of bringing order and civilization. In a way, colonialism aroused an internalized superiority and proud within the British people. Queen Victoria can be the biggest example of that superiority. It will not be wrong to assert that Britain's feeling of superiority over less-privileged countries is a result of colonialism. In this perspective, as asserted in *Literary Theory: the Basics*, the Western discourse of the colonizers views the Eastern people as beings who are "irrational, passive, undisciplined, and sensual" and this approach constructs the central position of the Western countries such as England in opposition to the marginality of the Eastern countries (Bertens, 2001: 205). The negative construction of the East functions as an obvious justification of colonialism. That is why, the impact of the empire's gaining power through colonialism shows itself in British people's accepting colonial activity as a favour done for the sake of the colonized ones. They viewed it natural in order to support their own aim of expansion. The British did not just hold the so-called burden of restoring order in overseas territories, but they also claimed the right of exploiting these territories in exchange of that burden of civilization. By means of that superiority of colonialism, British people thought that everything belonging to Britain had a great value. According to them, Britain was the most privileged one of all categories like language, culture, religion or skin colour. In other words, as it is proved in the previous lines, The British Empire was highly good at reminding its people that they were a part of a master race.

On the other hand, as one of the issues taking place in the nineteenth century England in terms of colonialism, the impact of that activity in daily life of England needs to be mentioned. There is no doubt that English society was noticeably influenced by the entrance of the colonial materials to the country:

England's merchants profited, too, thanks to the marketing successes that, over time, converted once-exotic imports from these colonies into everyday fare for the English. In the eighteenth-century tea and sugar had

been transformed in this way, and in the nineteenth century other commodities followed suit: the Indian muslin, for instance, that was the fabric of choice for gentlemen's cravats and fashionable ladies' gowns, and the laudanum (Indian opium dissolved in alcohol) that so many ailing writers of the period appear to have found irresistible. The West End of London and new seaside resorts like Brighton became in the early nineteenth century consumers' paradises, sites where West Indian planters and nabobs (a Hindi word that entered English as a name for those who owed their fortunes to Indian gain) could be glimpsed displaying their purchasing power in a manner that made them moralists' favorite examples of nouveau riche vulgarity (Greenblatt, 2006: 4-5).

These significant details clarify the connection between colonialism and British social life. Thanks to colonialism, English society met with products which were highly new and interesting to them. Apparently, they were really happy with the treasures of that fertile country. The imports coming from the fruitful soils of India prospered British people. They did consume the overseas lands and as a result of it, England created its brand-new fashionable socialites although some people regarded them as uncouth. English entrepreneurs who exploited the non-Western colonies like India were even given the name, nabob for making profit from Indian products. It interpreted that this is an unjust profit. In a way, the British people provided themselves with the products of the people that they turned into their slaves and servants. Therefore, it can be indicated that the way the British became great was so fancy and admirable but on the other side it was also quite selfish and inhumane. It means that the it was only the British who benefited by far the most from this interaction. Civilizing “the jewel of the crown” by building railroads, telephone and telegraph systems, bridges and canals, in addition to improvements in health and education fields can be considered as the so-called duty of colonization (Beck, et al., 2009: 791-2). They brought civilization but after all everything has a price. It is not so hard to think that these changes in the lives of the Indians were not basically done for the sake of the colonised people, but for the British who built a life in India in order to rule their businesses. In this respect, England did not bring all these developments to the non-Westerners’ doorstep in order to fulfil their moral duty of bringing civilization. They had to serve these in India to become successful in British manufacturing which makes sense considering the nineteenth century’s being the age of industrialization and modernity. These important details highlight that gaining power overcomes humanity and human identity. In other words, countries like Britain considered only the impact of colonialism on their own nation, not the

negative impact of it on the colonized ones. As it is demonstrated in this part, as well, the British Empire greatly expanded and prospered for many years of colonial time thanks to its imperial possessions such as “ ‘the “sugar islands’ of the Caribbean and the trading forts of India” which also “enabled the Industrial Revolution” (Hodge, 2008: 114). Besides that, it is for sure that such a successful expansion contributed to England’s leading role in Industrialization. In short, the impact of colonialism on England was undoubtedly positive. On the other side, The Great Britain was not the only country in which one can observe the effects of colonialism. America as being another significant power in matters of colonialism and slavery deserves to be analysed in the following part of this thesis, especially regarding this nation’s direct relationship with colonialism.

1.3. THE IMPACT OF COLONIALISM ON AMERICA

It is widely known that the American continent was found by Europeans centuries ago by way of geographic explorations. However, the exploration of the continent was carried out by a miscalculation. Christopher Columbus, the Genoese sea captain who serves for Spain has discovered a whole new piece of land as a result of sailing West around the Atlantic ocean rather than reaching to The east around the South Africa and stepped onto different Caribbean islands more than once (Beck et al., 2009: 553). Who would have known that such an error would affect the years following in terms of the social interaction of peoples of America and Europe and be the cause of European colonization of America and its people? There is no doubt that discovering this new land which was mistakenly assumed as Asia, was followed by the main purpose of Columbus’s voyage which was possessing new lands as a part of Spain. On the other hand, although Christopher Columbus can be regarded as the first person that comes to mind in the discovery of America, “the Florentine navigator Amerigo Vespucci” who serves for Portuguese is the one who has actually explored the American continent by noting that it is a new land, not belonging to Asia and explained it all in his “*Mundus Novus (The New World)*” and accordingly, as its very name signifies, the name of the continent was given in honour of its discoverer (McQuade, 1999: 6).

It will not be wrong to state that colonialism created America, and afterwards the

United States. After finding out the fact that there is a new land in the world, not claiming expansion would be so unnatural for Europeans whose aim was gaining more power, especially in overseas territories. As it can be recognized generally, discovering a new land means establishing colonies with the aim of expansion. Among various European nations demanding right on America and establishing colonies, there was the British Empire which arrived in these lands for expansion and raw materials. The first colony of the British Empire that settled in the coast of Virginia was Jamestown by settlers who were interested in searching for gold, and following that as being the second one after the Jamestown, Pilgrims created their own colony called Plymouth in Massachusetts in the seventeenth century and then after this colony, a group of people called Puritans established a larger one in the region as well, by escaping from the Anglican Church of England in order to live their religious beliefs freely (Beck et al., 2009: 562). While settling colonies in this new-born continent, Europeans used what was valuable and producible in America. They have built large sugar and cotton plantations which required the labour of enslaved labor force (2009: 563). It is clearly seen in these endeavours that the Westerners have found new beneficial materials of trade and manufacturing in addition to the non-Western labour force to be exploited. Along with that, it can be noted that the reason why one can observe that today's United States has a multicultural pattern is many European powers' placing their colonies in America centuries ago. In short, this discovery meant a lot both for Europe and America by means of cultural interaction. That interaction shows itself in the forms of colonialism and enslavement. On the other hand, there is such an important matter in terms of the impact of colonialism on America along with its racial and cultural development. By planting the seeds of colonialism, European colonizers shaped the racial background of the continent as they settled in America. However, these settlers coming from mother countries were not all alone in the continent. They needed workers to use in their plantations. One might assume that the natives of American continent could have been exploited as slaves who could work in mines or plantations, but it was not exactly the case having existed in the new world due to a certain reason. The deaths of millions of Native Americans as a consequence of European diseases, cruel attitude of the colonizers and wars took place between the Natives and the Westerners, caused the lack of low-cost labour, hence, the European

colonizers soon fulfilled this lack by turning their eyes to Africa which was not a continent unfamiliar to colonialism and slavery (Beck et al., 2009: 566). It is obvious that African people turned out to be the absolute residents of America through the non-Westerners' slave trade partaking in the Africa-America route. That is why, there is a considerable number of African Americans in the United States today. The European colonizers' transporting slave workers from Africa does not seem like a surprise because, as indicated in the previous lines, Africa was already enslaved before the discovery of America. This makes the African people immune to the superior and brutal attitude of Europe. The familiar relationship between African slaves and European settlers can be likened to a business climate in which employees are used to work under a strict management of their boss. In this sense, it can be interpreted that European colonizers were both clever and brutal enough to enslave another race different than their own when they were in need of workers to be successful in the new continent. Slavery's having existed for a long time helped colonialism in terms of the importance of using African people as slaves. However, there is a significant point in the matter of slavery that needs to be touched on. The institution of slavery took a very firm place in the world depending on societies' enslaving the people of their own race, for example, in the ancient Greece people were forced to work in constructions and in the Roman Empire and Mesopotamia, they had to work in mines, or agricultural areas (Welton, 2008: 58). This fact can be understood as a detail which shows that race was not always an outstanding factor of enslaving a human being. At least, it did not start like this way many centuries ago. But, it can be interpreted that geographic discoveries aroused a kind of a feeling of superiority within Western nations over the cultures of newly founded lands. This situation indicates that powerful societies could exploit not only the less-privileged people of their own race, but also the ones of different races, such as Africans as stated above. The impact of colonialism cannot be denied in terms of the interference of racial factor.

Slavery can be viewed as a notion explicitly associated to American history. Considering the excessive amount of the non-Western people brought to the new world, relating slavery to America turns out to be an easy thing. The numbers of the non-Western slave population in America highlights that by 1803, approximately 2

million African slaves became a part of this new continent, particularly as a consequence of England's dominant role in the Atlantic slave trade (Beck et al., 2009: 567). In other words, it is highly clear that black population constituted an important part of America's ethnic diversity. As well as that, it will not be wrong to note that European settlers owed much of the growth of America to the African slaves that they brought from the other side of the world. Owning human beings who were regarded as inferior because of their race and skin colour basically shaped the destiny of both the owners and the owned ones. In this respect, it can be noted that the race factor must be viewed as distinctive for American society in this case. Because of the reason that the American colonizers bought the non-Western people as properties and brought them their new homeland, European colonies in America gained prosperity. This situation is not unpredictable considering huge amount of labour force's impact on the well-being of a country. In a way, America's new residents were dependent on slave labour power by means of their country's development. Regardless of the inhumane side of colonialism and its allied slavery, it can be referred that bringing workforce was a clever and strategic move for the economic prosperity of the country. On the other hand, it was not a simple and normal labour transportation. The colonists, mainly the British, were forcibly bringing the non-Western people whom they define with the following terms: "laziness, aggression, violence, greed, sexual promiscuity, bestiality, primitivism, innocence and irrationality" (Loomba, 1998: 93). These labels prove that slavery has a close relationship with race. It is so apparent that nearly all the negative terms are given to non-Western nations in order to highlight the necessity of dominating these people. For that very reason of despising the non-Western races, European colonists of America treated the non- Westerners so badly as the following lines demonstrate:

As to such of the extraordinary punishments before mentioned as did not terminate in death, such as picketing, dropping hot sealing-wax on the flesh, cutting off ears, and the like, it appears that slaves had no redress whatever, for that these actions also on the part of the masters were not deemed within the reach of the law (Blake, 1860: 156).

As it is expressed above, daily life was extremely harsh for the slaves. Far from living their life as they pleased, they were living a life that one can see only in nightmares. But, they obviously lived a nightmare, the life of a hell. Such unacceptable behaviours of the colonizers confirm that colonialism's effect on the

slaves lived in America was so merciless and challenging. It is worth noting that the activity of colonialism in America aroused a lack of mercy and morality within human beings. This lack should be counted, as well, among the impacts of colonialism on this young nation. To speak realistically, these bad treatments performed on innocent human beings are unfortunately the natural consequences of colonialism and slavery. Even though America progressed well economically as a new nation, it can be interpreted that it has regressed morally and humanistically. In addition to that, it is revealed among the drastic facts about slavery that there was no legal sanction for violating human values. Tolerance for harsh behaviours which was carried out by the colonizers expresses that slavery was perceived totally normal and natural, as if being colonized is an inevitable way of life for the non-Westerners. In order to comprehend the abusive nature of colonialism, the negative effects of it along with slavery will be touched upon in the following parts of this thesis as exemplified with many intense facts.

Lastly, as one of the impacts of colonialism on America, transportations of various goods as a result of colonialism need to be pointed out in detail. Both Europe and America have met many new materials that they never saw before. In other words, colonial interaction created a global exchange. The transportation occurred by way of exchanging the following items opened way to new branches of trade:

Discoveries of new supplies of metals are perhaps the best known. But the Old World also gained new staple crops, such as potatoes, sweet potatoes, maize, and cassava. Less calorie-intensive foods, such as tomatoes, chili peppers, cacao, peanuts, and pineapples were also introduced, and are now culinary centerpieces in many Old World countries, namely Italy, Greece, and other Mediterranean countries (tomatoes), India and Korea (chili peppers), Hungary (paprika, made from chili peppers), and Malaysia and Thailand (chili peppers, peanuts, and pineapples). Tobacco, another New World crop, was so universally adopted that it came to be used as a substitute for currency in many parts of the world. The exchange also drastically increased the availability of many Old World crops, such as sugar and coffee, which were particularly well-suited for the soils of the New World (Nunn and Qian, 2010: 163).

According to the highlighted points about trade materials, there was a two-sided transportation which was held between Europe and America. This suggests that colonialism effected the eating habit of the whole world. The new settlers of America including the African slaves have met with not only a totally new piece of land, but also new flavours. The exportation of these new flavours had a great impact on the

Old and the New World economies. Due to that reason, colonialism in America can be defined as a sort of clash of these two worlds. Although it seems like European countries gained more financial profit by transporting these new food products as they were the discoverers of them, the impact of it for America cannot be ignored because the New World colonists were lucky to have them for the economic well-being of America. Besides the discovery and exchange of the nutritional foods which determined the cuisine cultures in the world, as a consequence of this mutual trade, the new world welcomed the tastes of the old one, as well. It would be worth saying that settling colonies on America was a profitable business for both sides considering the fact that it was the white man who came out ahead of it. The Western nations provided themselves new soils and supplies with the purpose of gaining more economic and political strength. While doing so, they walked over the innocent people whom they regarded inferior. For that reason, it is nearly impossible not to relate each and every issue about colonialism with the dark face of it. In this sense, the following parts will shed light on that dark face of this activity by examining one familiar and one unfamiliar performance of it. To put it another way, the exploitative nature of human beings who assume themselves worthy will be explored.

1.4. THE ABUSE OF POWER BY THE WESTERNERS IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD

It is what an unfortunate understanding that some people have a strong faith in considering a specific race or identity as the most precious one. Such an understanding is nothing but a reason which causes discrimination and abuse among human beings especially in terms of colonialism. The presence of human beings with this kind of immoral ideals makes way for polarization between people. The case of Cecil Rhodes stated below, who was an entrepreneur in the business of diamond mining in Africa in the nineteenth century, sadly stands for the reflection of that understanding (Mdudumane, 2005: 51). This mentality of Rhodes is just one example of the fossilized superiority feeling within the Western people:

I contend that we [Britons] are the first race in the world, and the more of the world we inhabit, the better it is for the human race...It is our duty to seize every opportunity of acquiring more territory and we should keep this one idea steadily before our eyes that more territory simply means more of the Anglo-Saxon race, more of the best, the most human, most

honourable race the world possesses (Beck et al., 2009: 775).

According to the extract, it will not be wrong to say that as if there is a voice within themselves whispering a song of superiority. Human beings who think like that put the notion of race above everything in order to justify their own cause which is gaining more power, in this case. Even though, the way they choose was not humane, imperialist people went after the idea of expansion by ignoring the existence of other races whom they regarded as uncivilized and low. But, there was a point in which the colonizers have forgotten in the colonial period: freedom. As a result of some people's feeling eager to seize more lands, a lot of people suffered from abusive activities in the colonial period. The suffering of the colonized was nothing but a situation of abuse of power. The colonized ones lived a challenging period of time in which even imagining the hardships of it is truly overwhelming. They had to struggle with the agonizing conditions of being under the domination of someone who selfishly believes in his supremacy. The lines below taken from the autobiography of the abolitionist African writer Olaudah Equiano (Gustavas Vassa) demonstrate the fact that actually the challenging life of the non-Westerners started in the very beginning of their horrific journey, in slave ships:

I was not long suffered to indulge my grief; I was soon put down under the decks, and there I received such a salutation in my nostrils as I had never experienced in my life: so that, with the loathsomeness of the stench, and crying together, I became so sick and low that I was not able to eat, nor had I the least desire to taste any thing. I now wished for the last friend, death, to relieve me; but soon, to my grief, two of the white men offered me eatables; and, on my refusing to eat, one of them held me fast by the hands, and laid me across, I think the windlass, and tied my feet, while the other flogged me severely [...] In a little time after, amongst the poor chained men, I found some of my own nation, which in a small degree gave ease to my mind. I inquired of these what was to be done with us? They gave me to understand we were to be carried to these white people's country to work for them [...] I feared I should be put to death, the white people looked and acted, as I thought, in so savage a manner; for I had never seen among any people such instances of brutal cruelty; [...] (Levine, 2017: 741).

The very own experience of Equiano sheds light on the unacceptable manner of the slave traders whose actions tell much of their personality. Equiano as being one of the lucky ones to be able to speak about his abduction and enslavement reveals the ruthless nature of slavery through his autobiography. To put it another way, he turned out to be the voice of the voiceless African slaves. The way how he expresses his experience of transportation brings the horrors of sailing to the new land without

knowing what kind of a life was waiting for him. Nevertheless, he probably imagined that it would not be a life full of comfort and enjoyment regarding the relentless manners of the Western kidnapers. Equiano was right about being afraid of the white people who put them into such a wretched position. To see the significance of Equiano's narrative, it can be interpreted that observing someone's own personal account of slavery is much more effective than reading a text about slavery because no one can describe an incident better than the one who experience it at first hand. Obviously, the treatment received by the non-Westerners shows that the Europeans exploited their powerful place in the world scene, not just by dominating the overseas lands but also dominating human beings. Enslavement through slave trade is the performance of that domination. As it is seen in the narrative of Olaudah Equiano above, the whole story of slavery includes misery in every part of it. Unfortunately, the ill-treatment in the slave ship can be observed as only the beginning of enslavement. Equiano keeps telling his story in the following lines of his autobiography which highlight the situation of the slaves after the ship landed in American shores:

We were not many days in the merchant's custody, before we were sold after their usual manner, which is this:— On a signal given (as the beat of a drum), the buyers rush at once into the yard where the slaves are confined, and make choice of that parcel they like best. The noise and clamor with which this is attended, and the eagerness visable in the countenances of the buyers, serve not a little to increase the apprehension of terrified Africans, who may well be supposed to consider them as the ministers of that destruction to which they think themselves devoted (Levine, 2017: 744).

It is such a shame that kidnapped Africans were sold to buyers to live with their new masters. Every line of this personal narrative proves that human life and identity meant nothing to the Europeans and as stated previously, the non-Westerners had no value in the eyes of the Westerners. Otherwise, the colonizers would not have enslaved those people. Once more, it is clear that humanity comes to the fore as beaten-up by power. Slavery turns into a sort of shopping as if it is the most natural and normal activity in the world because the Westerners perform colonialism and slavery triggered by a very solid motif. The term Eurocentricity which esteems only the ethnicity of Europeans and considers what belonged to them as superior, gave way to the validity of colonialism in history (Malpas and Wake, 2006: 183). This point of view supports Europe's being placed in the centre of the world. By counting

on that perspective, Westerners thought themselves superior in the colonial period compared to the non-Western identities. Accordingly, Westerners did not see any harm in invading other races. In this sense, to gain a better understanding of how the feeling of superiority takes shape within human beings, it is important to examine the ideas of the well-known critic Edward Said in his work *Orientalism*, as follows:

A group of people living on a few acres of land will set up boundaries between their land and its immediate surroundings and the territory beyond, which they call "the land of the barbarians." In other words, this universal practice of designating in one's mind a familiar space which is "ours" and an unfamiliar space beyond "ours" which is "theirs" is a way of making geographical distinctions that can be entirely arbitrary. I use the word "arbitrary" here because imaginative geography of the "our land-barbarian land" variety does not require that the barbarians acknowledge the distinction. It is enough for "us" to set up these boundaries in our own minds; "they" become "they" accordingly, and both their territory and their mentality are designated as different from "ours" (1979: 54).

Said highlights the manner how human beings so easily discriminate the ones who do not look like them. It is only the strong ones who give that decision of building limits through the dichotomy of "us" and "they". Said's words prove that the first matter that human beings take a look at is the differences, not the similarities. To put it another way, it can be interpreted that human beings, generally the ones who hold the power are the cause of distinctions. As it is highly obvious in the words of Edward Said, they deliberately draw invisible but effective lines between one another. The patronizing attitude of the Westerners can be considered as the biggest proof of Said's view above. In the moment of turning out to be 'us' and 'they', the 'us' begins to abuse the 'they' for not being from their own and for being inferior according to their subjective view. However, what is ironic about that is the powerful groups' treating the ones they call barbarians barbarously. It can be interpreted that the fallacy of Westerners or Eurocentrics is assuming civilization and power as just composed of economic and military progress, technological developments, forms of politeness and so on; but concerning the significance of humanity, personal identity and equality is a great part of civilization and power. These notions can be considered as inseparable agents of civilized and powerful societies. The deficiency of them resulted in negativities like power abuse, enslavement and humiliation. Terry Eagleton, as being one of the note-worthy critics of English literature has indicated that "imperialism breeds a disabling cultural relativism" which means that within the

scope of imperial and colonial perspectives, there is no room for having respect to the other since “beneath imperialism lies the eternal barbarousness of the human condition” (2005: 236-43). It is pretty clear that one cannot define himself/herself as civilized while oppressing the other in every sense, but colonizers did that in the colonial period by creating slaves for colonial purpose. The following examples of exploitation display the outcomes of discriminating human beings as superior and inferior.

Among many non-Western lands in which tyrannic abuses took place in the colonial time, Africa can be investigated as one of the outstanding territories. Although the number of scholars who criticised the Westerners in the post-colonial era were very high, there were names who did not hesitate revealing a critical stand in the colonial period, as well. Besides Britain’s active role in colonialism, the nation produced anti-colonialists who were brave about expressing the abuse of power under the name of civilization. British colonial critics, “the Irish-born diplomat Roger Casement” and “British journalist Edmund D. Morel” voiced “the most condemnation against the inhumane exploitation of Africans in the Congo” in order to raise awareness to savagery employed in The Congo Free State which was ruled by King Leopold II of Belgium (Zins, 1998: 58). The relentless treatments carried out in The Congo Free State has shown by the journalist Morel in his book called *King Leopold’s Rule In Africa*, as follows:

I ascertained, by receiving photographs and letters from the Upper Congo, that mutilations were frequently practised by the Congo soldiery upon the living, upon men, upon women, upon poor little innocent children of tender years. The information I then received has been, alas ! but too amply corroborated since from various sources, and notably by Mr. Roger Casement. Consul Casement's evidence is abundant and precise. [...] a boy of sixteen whose right hand was missing [...] had been first shot in the shoulder, and then mutilated by a soldier. Here, two boys not older than seven were also brought to him in a similar condition both mutilations perpetrated by sentries, as part of the "punishment" to which the village they belonged to was subjected for not bringing in enough rubber (1904: 113).

In the light of these ruthless actions of the Westerners, one can clearly observe the death of humanity in the hands of ill-natured human beings who had no idea of mercy. As being the so-called owners of the Africans, whose lives meant nothing to them, the Belgian colonizers abused their power by means of disabling and even

murdering the colonized Africans. In relation to that, it can be interpreted that the Westerners' feeling of superiority comes from a sort of an internalized feeling of inhumanity reflected as barbarism. Karl Marx points out in his book called *On Colonialism* created with F.Engels that "inherent barbarism of bourgeois civilization" can openly be seen in colonialism (1968: 88). So, it is worth saying that Western civilizations failed in being morally civilized and consciously or unconsciously acted with their most primitive selves.

Examining the Western side of colonialism in terms of abuse of power, British Empire should not be skipped regarding its notable role in colonialism which is referred in the very beginning of part 1.2. When this undeniable role is taken into consideration, one can deduce that the damage it caused became so much visible. For example, the British domination in India was considerably abusive. It is a shocking event that British administrators of India have built asylums for Indians who were not actually lunatics. The lines below can be viewed as the obvious proof of that:

Allee Jaim. Mussl. Beggar. 40. 19 Feby 1862.

Feb 1812. This man was sent in by City Magistrate of Luckdown – he had been taken up by Police as a beggar – whether from want or dissipation he appears to be weak in intellect and is so reduced in flesh + natural vigour that it is evident he has not long live. Suffered from diarrhoea ever since admission – gradually got weaker + died 25th March 1862 (Mills, 2000: 70).

The example above shows that there are many ways of exploitation or in other words, British colonizers tried it in various unbelievable manners. In a way, they were making sure of the inferior position of Indians by showing their strength. In spite of the fact that these natives were nothing more of vagrants, the officials kept them within their reach by labelling them as mad people. This indicates a very important clue about the imperial mind of the British: they were probably afraid of the unknown, the possibility of these homeless people's being not happy about their marginalized and dominated lives. The only important matter was sustaining their rule in India. What else could be the reason for such an unreasonable and abusive treatment other than concern of power?! Rather than 'civilizing' the conditions of the Indian vagrants, the British abused them as they did to the rest of the country by colonizing them. It can be suggested that it was all carried out as a consequence of the corrupted hearts and minds of the British rulers in India. What arises from this

corruption is violence as located in native experiences. The one asserted above and many other types of violence have “ruled over the ordering of the colonial world” and “ceaselessly drummed the rhythm for the destruction of native social forms” in addition to the destruction of humanity itself (Fanon, 1963: 40). Apparently, human beings can easily be obsessed with power once they used to the feeling it brings along and in such a case, discrimination through abuse of power becomes just a mission to be fulfilled to reach victory. In accordance with that, there were some causes which triggered this mission. They can be called as natural obstacles like religion and race which have been mentioned before in this thesis. It is indicated by Sidiki and Aboubacrine that according to the Westerners, they were “divinely ordained by God to civilize” the non-Westerners (2018: 967). That is to say that Christianity was used as a means of justification of colonial aim. To illustrate, Christian missionaries who worked for the spread of religion in colonies can be examined as one of best examples of Westerners’ viewing themselves superior than the natives. In this regard, the Anglican clergymen Samuel Hinds who was an active figure about for the conversion of the native population of New Zealand in the nineteenth century, supported the idea that “a modern state could impose its rule on [...] ‘barbarous countries’ ” and saw the role of missionaries vital in terms of the establishment of Christianity in British overseas colonies (Carey, 2011: 312-15). People like Hinds prove that human beings have no respect for different belief systems. The need for conversion tells that the powerful one feels free to impose what he/she has. Differences are not welcomed, on the contrary they are ignored. This situation is what humanity suffers from. It is evident in the colonial time that multiplicity of races, religions or cultures generally do not bring people together besides the exceptions. If that had been the case, this thesis would not have been written. However, this is not the case and it is the purpose of this study to shed light on the weakness of human beings for gaining power and their pushing the boundaries of humanity for matters like race and religion. As it is seen in the previous lines that colonizers defend their cause by saying that what they do is for the sake of God and Christianity which does not make sense due to the reason that they destroy freedom in every field of life, even in religion. By doing so, the Westerners caused the discrimination among human beings. The one who assumes himself/herself powerful does not care about whether colonizing a territory or enslaving a person leads to

discrimination. It can easily be deduced from the colonial facts stated until now that unification or friendship signified no meaning to the Western colonizers. How could have such a unification occurred under circumstances in which colonizers were pulling out the teeth of slaves or cut them “on the back, breast and thighs” for running away or stealing meal “from hunger” as they were “nothing but skin and bone” ? (Blake, 1860: 150-1) Being physically unwell can be observed as the natural result of ill treatment and being considered as a property. In that very moment, the factor of race comes to the fore as an undeniable obstacle on the way of a humanitarian life style. The famous dichotomy of being superior and inferior is linked to the notion of race and considered as highly significant by Westerners. It is indicated in *Notes on the State of Virginia* by the former president of America, Thomas Jefferson that the difference of race is such a vital matter in reference to the whites and the blacks:

Is it not the foundations of a greater or less greater share of beauty in the two races? [...] The circumstance of superior beauty, is thought worthy attention in the propagation of our horses, dogs, and other domestic animals; why not in that of man? [...] it appears to me [...] they are [...] in reason much inferior [...] and [...] in imagination they are dull, tasteless, and anomalous (McQuade, 1999: 332-3-4).

In this regard, an absolute prejudice towards other races can be found as deeply rooted in the minds of the strong which leads to discrimination and isolation. Besides that, Jefferson is the one who wrote the Declaration of Independence to free 13 colonies of the North America from being the subject of Britain and supported “that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” however, ironically he owned slaves at the same time (Beck et al., 2009: 641-2). These words of Jefferson written in the Declaration of Independence asserted that he was just defending the rights and freedom of the white colonists. There is a contradiction between what he supported and what he did in terms of individual rights and liberty. It is so hypocritical that American colonies fought for their independence from the British but kept slavery institution alive. This situation proves that Americans were not honest about supporting the necessity of equality and freedom in the Declaration of Independence. It was a partial equality that they demanded which highlighted the selfish nature of human beings. All of these examinations about the Western abuse of power shed light on the negative side of the

European colonizers, but it will be shown in the following part that the Westerners were not alone in the corruption of humanity through colonialism.

1.5. THE ABUSE OF POWER BY THE EASTERNERS IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD

One may really be surprised after reading the title of that part considering how unfamiliar and strange it sounds like. But, the historical facts which will be stated and examined throughout this part have the capability of shocking the readers who are mostly acquainted with the realities of the previous part by means of colonialism. It is a generally acknowledged issue that the Westerners or in other words the Europeans are notorious for being the colonizer, the dominant one and the enslaver. In short, the role of both sides was determined by the powerful position of the Westerners. What this part aims to demonstrate is the replacement of these roles. Even though the West primarily exploited much of the world and created discrimination by power in colonial period, the Easterners did that, too in some ways similar to the that of the Westerners. This indicates that regardless of being from the West or the East, human beings are generally ready to discriminate and abuse one another. It is evident in American history that freed black people owned African American slaves which can be viewed as “one of the most peculiar features of the peculiar institution” (Lightner and Ragan, 2005: 535). One of the earliest data of black slave ownership dates back to the 17th century, in particular, “in 1654 Anthony Johnson and his wife Mary [...] gained the services of their black servant, John Casor, for life” by the judgment of court (Halliburton, Jr., 1975: 130). It appears, indeed, very peculiar and strange considering that once possessed people became the possessor of their own race. People may think that free blacks desired to be in the same level with the white slave holders to feel themselves equal and to forget what slavery makes one feel. The data of 1830 analysed by “the pioneering African American historian” Carter G. Woodson who studied broadly about the black slaveowners as being “the first scholar”, makes the black slave holding issue visible (Lightner and Ragan, 2005: 535). It can be found in the records of the year 1830 that in the same year, there were nearly 319,599 freed black people in the United States of America and 3,775 freed blacks held the property of 12,760 enslaved blacks

(Halliburton, Jr., 1975: 131). These numbers are in a considerable amount which shows that black ownership was highly common in America. It can be interpreted that gaining power through possession was not just valid within the Western countries, but also valid for the non-Westerners. In this sense, it is obvious that the black ownership stands for the experienced proof of human beings' tendency towards discrimination. Being from the same or different race actually does not signify anything. The problem is that humanitarian living is not that valuable in the eyes of the human beings, in general. The following extract from one of the black slave holders in America highlights the way how discrimination and abuse were being continued by the hands of the non-Westerners:

William Ellison was born in upcountry South Carolina in 1790. His parentage is obscure, but it is likely that his father was a planter named Robert Ellison and that his mother was one of Robert's slaves [...] After earning the money needed to buy his freedom at age twenty-six, he soon purchased and freed his wife and daughter [...] By 1830 he had acquired four male slaves to assist him in his busy workshop [...] He himself became a cotton planter as well as a gin manufacturer, eventually owning nearly nine hundred acres of land and sixty-three slaves. Ellison was rumored to have treated his plantation workers harshly, and one can infer from the large difference in the number of male and female children owned by Ellison that he had no compunction about severing family ties by selling off girls simply because he had more use for boys. He did spend lavishly on medical care for his slaves, but that may have reflected a desire to protect the value of his property rather than humanitarian concern. Except for the members of his own family, he never freed a single slave [...] the Ellisons kept their workshop busy with blacksmithing and the making of wagon parts, and on their plantations they raised lucrative crops of vegetables, corn, and sorghum instead of cotton. But most of their burgeoning wealth was invested in slaves [...] (Lightner and Ragan, 2005: 540-1).

In the light of this example above, it is clear that black slave holders were not in a welcoming mood towards their black slaves. As it appears, they have acted in the same way that their former white masters did. It can even be seen that they abused their power over the blacks. Human beings can be really shocking considering how ironic and unbelievable they can be. Why would a former slave who earned his/her freedom from the brutal hands of the Western superiors turn into the kind of person whom he wanted to get rid of ? Power is the short but effective answer of that question.

On the other hand, according to the study of Philip J. Schwarz, it can be said that the historian Carter G. Woodson along with his colleagues had a positive approach

towards the issue of black slave ownership by defining it as a sort of a victory in addition to believing that “most free black slaveholding was fraternal and protective and that ownership for profit of Afro-Americans by other Afro-Americans was not widespread” (1987: 319-320). Even though free blacks generally kept their loved ones as slaves in order to protect them, it still does not change the fact that slave ownership was a part of their lives. It is reflected by the historian Ira Berlin in his book called *Many Thousands Gone The First Two Centuries Of Slavery In North America* that “like ambitious whites, free blacks bought and sold slaves, used slaves as bequests, donations, and gifts in marriage contracts, and employed slaves as collateral in mortgages and other transactions” (1998: 338). The harsh language that Berlin uses to define black slave ownership is very rightful considering how weird blacks’ owning blacks seems. The non-Western populations in colonized and enslaved regions were wounded pretty much in the colonial period but, apparently seeking power and status overcame humanitarian behaviour which they only needed once upon a time. In this sense, corruption and discrimination were employed not only by the Westerners, but also by the non-Westerners, who were ambitious enough to go by the rules of colonialism. Non-Westerners’ will of superiority can be seen effectively in the quote below:

At New Bern, North Carolina, a free black wife and son purchased their slave husband-father. When the newly bought father criticized his son - the son sold him to a slave trader. The son boasted afterward that “the old man had gone to the corn fields about New Orleans where they might learn him some manners” (Halliburton, Jr., 1975: 138).

As it is clearly expressed in the extract, freedom has given former slaves the idea of dependency, ironically. Instead of supporting independence and equal life for everyone, free blacks took advantage of their freedom. In a way, they exploited something good in order to do something bad that hurt them considerably before. It can be seen in R. Halliburton Jr.’s study that nearly all free blacks were holding black slaves and by doing so, they aimed to gain some respect as being privileged (1975: 137). Expecting respect by performing a very unrespectful act is nothing but pure abuse. Furthermore, it shows that free black slaveholders had no respect to themselves. Following the pattern of an already corrupted understanding reflects that situation. However, they have seen no harm at all by committing a bad deed like that:

Andrew Durnford [...] was born in 1800 in New Orleans, where his mother, a free woman of color, was a *placée* - an arranged consort - to his

white, planter-class father [...] Durnford acquired fourteen slaves and St. Rosalie, a sugar plantation located on the Mississippi River thirty-three miles south of New Orleans [...] He fed his slaves as economically as possible on corn, fish, and low-quality pork [...] When a slave named Jackson misbehaved, Durnford “ordered five round to be given him.” After the flogging, Jackson ran away, whereupon Durnford declared, “I wish to lay eyes on him once more. I will fix him so the dogs will not bark at him.” [...] Although John McDonogh, Durnford's white patron and mentor, was an ardent colonizationist who permitted some of his slaves to earn their freedom and then sent them to Liberia, Durnford thought such philanthropy impractical [...] Durnford believed that slavery was a moral evil that the government of the United States would abolish “in future ages to come” but not any time soon. “Self interest is too strongly rooted in the bosom of all that breathes the American atmosphere,” he said (Lightner and Ragan, 2005: 543-4).

The statements of Durnford about slavery can be viewed as highly hypocritical because of the reason that he both supported it and criticized it. He believed in the evil nature of slavery but, indicated that time has not come yet for abolition which makes no sense. One can predict the reason why he did not support it. He probably was not eager to witness the end of slavery in his own time while his business was going on very well. This inconsistency can also be found in the instance of Thomas Jefferson which has been pointed out previously. He supported values like independence, freedom and equality and owned slaves, however. Such loopholes leap out when slaveowners, the black ones in this case, behave like this way. On the other side, there is a notable similarity between the life of Andrew Durnford and the one of Henry Townsend who is the black slaveowner protagonist of Edward P. Jones's *The Known World* which is one of the two novels of this thesis' consideration to be analysed. Similar to Dunford's example, Townsend takes advice and help from his former slaveholder which proves the realistic side of Jones's novel. The novel will be analysed in detail followingly as referred before, in order to take attention to each and every human kind's proneness to discriminating one another. Additionally, there is one more point about the issue of Andrew Durnford, actually a point in which one can find a true confession: self-interest's being on the top of the manner how people treat each other. It also demonstrates that they do it all consciously; by being aware of the possible consequences which is horrible.

However, performance of discrimination can be examined through more than one Eastern group of people besides the African American non-Westerners. The India example deserves to be explored in this study regarding E.M. Forster's A

Passage to India which is the other novel that will be analysed in the following chapters. It is a mostly known fact that India is composed of many different ethnic groups. Among these groups, Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, Buddhists and Jains can be observed in addition to some smaller ones such as Bahá'is, Jews, Zoroastrians and animist faiths followed by various ethnic communities (2017: 5). As it can be seen, India is a religiously divided society. This division shows itself in a negative way. It will not be wrong to state that the multiplicity of beliefs in India, caused people of these beliefs to discriminate the opposite groups. Especially, the conflict of the Hindus and the Muslims can be observed as an outstanding problem of India. Even though, the impact of British rule in India cannot be denied in terms of arousing tension in a society already divided ethnically, the truth is that the traces of encounter of these two groups can be found in the times before colonialism. It is stated by Ajay Verghese that the conflicts date back to seventeenth century which occurred between Hindu and Muslim kings as concentrated on “land, gold or politics” and besides that, it is also indicated by Verghese that there were “clear differences between Hindus and Muslims in the past, especially the difference between monotheistic Islam and polytheistic Hinduism. Hindu kings abhorred cow slaughter. Muslim kings decried idolatry. The British did not construct Hindu and Muslim identities – these communities were consolidated before colonial rule” (2018). These facts highlight that Hindu and Muslim communities’ breathing the same air in India without discriminating one another was not easy as they cared about religion more than humanity. Similar to African Americans’ being prone to discrimination, Indians from different belief systems acted in the same manner. What is notable is that the historical conflicts never ceased away, even in the more recent years, they continued to happen, as can be seen in the lines below:

Hindu-Muslim tensions ebbed and flowed, but were never completely resolved. Major clashes in 1967 and 1969 led to hundreds of casualties. Riots and bombings in Mumbai in 1992 and 1993 claimed more than a thousand lives. More recently, the 2002 and 2006 riots in Gujarat and clashes in Uttar Pradesh in 2013 contributed to the overall death toll of the conflict. In 2017, fears of renewed escalations have overshadowed a major election in India's most populous state, Uttar Pradesh. Beyond that, the everyday lives of citizens all across the country are affected by the threat of violent escalations (Schutte, 2019: 4).

By looking at these incidents, one can clearly see a deeply rooted hatred. This can be regarded as an inevitable consequence of abuse born out of discrimination and

disrespect. A person does not have to love or support a religion, culture or race but he/she has to show respect to the people who embrace different values in order to create a liveable, humanitarian society and world. Rather than doing that, people create huge gaps between one another. For example, during the 2002 riot in Gurajat as can be seen in the extract above, the Hindu Bharatiya Janata Party regarded all the minor religious groups as other, especially the Muslims whom they assumed to be “foreigners needing to be completely ‘Hinduised’ in order to become ‘true Indians’ ” (Chatterjee, 2012: 136). Religion becomes a very strict measure in embracing or ignoring someone’s existence and because of such strong matters like religion or race, one can discriminate even the people of his/her own society. On the other hand, the Muslims, too, fail in terms of showing respect to the values of Hindus which demonstrates that there is a mutually employed abuse and discrimination. In spite of the existence of many peaceful unifications of Hindus and Muslims, it will not be wrong to indicate that Muslims do not have much tolerance to Hindus considering the example in which they have destroyed some of Hindu temples due to the ongoing religious tension in the Kashmir region (Dimock, Doniger and et.al, 2019). It is so wretched that people hold on to a prejudiced view so strictly that they do not even acknowledge how inhumane the actions they take. In this sense, the main character of E.M. Forster’s *A Passage to India*, Dr. Aziz will be analysed in this thesis by means of his discriminative and prejudiced perspective.

All these facts assert a very significant point about the wicked nature of discrimination and abuse. The point is that people want to change the one they regard as the other or inferior and moreover they do it by way of assimilation and abuse of power. From a humanitarian point of view, accepting such a selfish thought is impossible because no one has to share same values with one another. In an environment in which there are multiple races, religions and cultures in addition to power struggles, diversity becomes an inevitable result. Although varieties can be considered as colours of the world, it should not be missed that this colourful palette is not welcomed by people in most of the times. Rather that, an unwelcoming attitude can be seen as adopted by people from the people of West or East. Just like the Westerners, it is examined previously that the non-Westerners had a discriminative approach in the colonial period in terms of free black slaveowners. This shows that

employing discrimination and abuse is not just valid for the Westerners, everyone who is given or has found the chance of having power can easily be brutal. It has been seen in the analysis of free blacks that they were as savage and abusive as their former white masters were. They could have chosen not to exploit their power over other blacks, but instead of that they followed the familiar pattern of exploitation. In this regard, it can easily be interpreted that free non-Westerners forgot their painful days of enslavement. In terms of that, both the Westerners and the non-Westerners had the capacity of colonizing territories or enslaving people regardless of race. The effecting factor here is lack of humanity. On the other hand, the Indian society stands as far away from non-discriminative actions. In their case, the triggering motive of exploitation and lack of respect is related to notion of religion. The discrimination they perform seems like an ongoing process. Considering the humiliation employed by the Hindus or Muslims to each other by means of religion, it can be highlighted that they cannot stand any difference in a society. They even attack places considered sacred as fuelled with intolerance and hatred. This should not be the way of supporting something valued. This intolerance can be likened to Western missionaries' idea which is based on the superiority of Christianity. Just like the Western colonists or missionaries who believed in the supremacy of their own religion, the followers of various faiths in India believed in the superiority of their own one. The Hindu-Muslim conflicts assert that understanding. Even though the motive of exploitation can change, the result is unfortunately the same. In this respect, the way how discrimination carried out by the non-Westerner point of view will be explored in E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* and Edward P. Jones's *The Known World*, in the following chapters.

CHAPTER II

2. AN ANALYSIS OF E.M. FORSTER'S *A PASSAGE TO INDIA*

Among many similar types of novels in the field of colonial studies, a different one which has not commonly been preferred could have been chosen for this study. But, would another novel be the most suitable choice is a debatable question. Because, E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* is a novel which does not hesitate to show the defects of its characters in a genuine manner. It can be said that Forster knows representing the characters and their relationships with each other in terms of the colonial atmosphere in which they live in. In this regard, the well-known novel of Forster equally and truthfully approaches to both of the parties: The Westerners and the non-Westerners. The reader can witness the way how people discriminate one another in *A Passage to India* regardless of racial discrimination. It means that performing discrimination does not belong to just a specific group of people in the novel. However, the novel has generally been analysed in terms of Western discrimination towards Easterners, but in this thesis the prejudice of Easterners against the Westerners will be explored. In a way, Forster not only criticizes the Westerners, but also the non-Westerners and due to that reason Forster's novel is a good choice for this thesis. What takes place in *A Passage to India* is considerably an unusual kind of discrimination carried out by the non-Westerners. As it is stated in the previous chapter as well, people are familiar to see the Westerners discriminating the Easterners especially by means of colonialism. *A Passage to India*, which was published in 1924 and received the James Tait Black Memorial Prize and the Prix Femina Vie Heureuse, demonstrates whether unity and friendship between human beings can be possible or not (Naghshbandi and Zarrinjooee, 2015: 23). It is a fitting example of the struggle of human relations caused by the social and cultural differences and prejudices of human beings from same or different races and religions. The story of the novel which portrays the colonial India tells the lives of "some Indians of different religions (Hindus and Muslims), some British administrators and some visitors from England who tried to experience the 'real' India" (Kanak, 2014: 16). Clearly, the setting of the novel

demonstrates a socially crowded and chaotic picture because it includes more than one race and religion. It is very unfortunate that the multiplicity of these factors turns out to be a social problem for humanity. The existence of such diversities makes it difficult to be united. It is for sure that the presence of English people is an undeniable agent in that chaotic atmosphere. However, the British Empire cannot be blamed for being the one and only colonial power in India. Apart from the unacceptable destruction Britain caused in Eastern nations like India by colonising them, the religious struggle in India had begun hundreds of years ago. As the examples in the first chapter make it clear, Hindu and Muslim interaction became a struggle in the late seventeenth century and has laid the foundations of discrimination in the Indian region (Verghese, 2018). Even today, the traces of discrimination can be observed between Hindus and Muslims. It appears that this very deeply rooted problem of unification in India is an on-going process that harms the nature of humanity. According to *BBC News*, in 1992 as a result of a political effort, the Babri mosque built in the 16th century was destroyed by the Hindu supporters claiming that it is the birthplace of the God Rama and Muslim rulers destroyed it back then (2017). Obviously, religious intolerance is an undeniable problem in the case of India. It is apparent that human beings are not good at welcoming plurality in matters such as religion and race. In this sense, E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* reflects that long lasting anger and social gap. Even though the side effects of the British rule in India step forward much more clearly, one can still read between the lines and see the unavoidable reality by means of the non-Western discrimination. The protagonist, Dr. Aziz as a Muslim Indian who is under the colonial suppression of the British governance, does not respect to the religion of the Hindus and performs discrimination to non-Muslim Indians around him. Discriminating Indians as being an Indian seems highly awkward considering the domination of the British Empire in India. The following lines of the novel assert that Dr. Aziz internalizes discrimination:

A mosque by winning his approval let loose his imagination. The temple of another creed, Hindu, Christian or Greek, would have bored him and failed to awaken his sense of beauty. Here was Islam, his own country, more than a Faith, more than a battle-cry, more, much more... Islam, an attitude towards life both exquisite and durable, where his body and his thoughts found their home. [...] On the right, over in the Club, the English community contributed an amateur orchestra. Elsewhere some Hindus were drumming – he knew they were Hindus, because the rhythm was uncongenial to him – and others were bewailing a corpse – he knew

whose, having certified it afternoon. There were owls, the Punjab mail... and flowers smelt deliciously in the station-master's garden. But the mosque – that alone signified, and he returned to it from the complex appeal of the night, and decked it with meanings the builder had never intended (Forster, 1979: 41).

There is no doubt that a supporter of a religion naturally devotes himself/herself to a belief but, doing that by disgracing other religions and humans who devote themselves to these beliefs, is an unacceptable attitude. On the surface, the feelings stated above may look like as the positive expressions of a religious person. However, Aziz shows disrespect to Hindus and their rituals. people do not need to love or promote another human, religion or religious rule, but must show respect in order to live in a comfortable environment. Besides its soft and religious atmosphere, his perspective of religion reflects a prejudiced mind. In that sense, it can be deduced that all the other belief systems are boring and ugly in the eyes of him. His expressions highlight that only in Islam, there is beauty and comfort, that is why he paves the way for discrimination. It is not so hard to indicate that the discrimination performed by Aziz in many parts of the novel, comes from a feeling of superiority. One's favouring his/her religion, culture or race with the concern of superiority, blocks an absolute possibility of being united as one regardless of the racial or cultural differences of human beings. In order to defend something valuable blindly, people forget to live respectfully as a whole with all the human beings of this world. Sharing only "the overarching sky" in this world, of course, cannot be enough for a good and normal relationship for human beings (Forster 1979, 32). Aziz should have been gentler and more respectful in referring to various beliefs and practices. Besides that, he is disrespectful in a sacred place. It is a temple where every other religion should be welcomed and respected for a peaceful and humanitarian lifestyle. The extract suggests a very significant detail about the structure of India. It is the fact that India is a long-fragmented country as referred before in this study. In this regard, it can be asserted that discrimination is commonly inflicted on the citizens in that country. India is a microcosm of discrimination of the non-Westerners along with the Westerners in the world. It can be defined as one of the most common characteristics of human beings, as a result of which unpromising situations have occurred for centuries.

Aziz, after finding peace in his mosque while humiliating other practices, believes that he is being disturbed by a Christian: Mrs. Moore. The unexpected entrance of her to the mosque seems very abrupt to him. The following lines clearly show that:

Another pillar moved, a third, and then an Englishwoman stepped out into the moonlight. Suddenly he was furiously angry and shouted: 'Madam! Madam! Madam!'

'Oh!' the woman gasped.

'Madam, this is a mosque, you have no right here at all; you should have taken off your shoes; this is a holy place for Moslems.'

'I have taken them off.'

'You have?'

'I left them at the entrance.'

'Then I ask your pardon.' (42).

It is pretty obvious in these lines that Aziz has strict prejudice. Regarding the prejudice of Aziz, it is indicated by Kanak that "these presumed ideas about each other created barriers for the development of relationships between these two races - colonizers and colonized" (2014: 18). It is clear that discrimination is born out of prejudice. He is rude to Mrs. Moore and does not welcome non-Muslims. Regarding the fact that Mrs. Moore is a British citizen whose country rules in India, Aziz's reaction can be understood to some extent. Naturally, he cannot bear the presence of the English. Being regarded as inferior in one's own country causes overreaction. The English community of India believes that they are superior to Indians and sees them as their subjects. To exemplify, Mrs. Turton who is highly aware of her nation's power, arrogantly warns Adela Quested that she is "superior to everyone in India [...]" (1979: 61). It is the feeling of superiority and prejudice of the coloniser. Lamia Tayeb points out that it is a "presumptive superiority" which "invalidates the establishment of a hybrid friendship" (2004: 46). However, it is important to note that Aziz, also, feels himself superior towards the non-Muslims which is too similar to the English colonisers in India. The place's being a mosque does not give him the right to say that she cannot be there, just like having economic and military power or Englishness do not mean that they can colonise less-privileged nations. These indicate that the Westerners are not the only race employing discrimination. It is within human beings including both the West and the East. Therefore, it is seen that such unapproved attitudes are not limited to the English. In that very moment, another part of the novel about Dr. Aziz deserves to be pointed out in this chapter:

Now it was sunset. A few of his co-religionists had come to the Maidan,

and were praying with their faces towards Mecca. A Brahmany bull walked towards them, and Aziz, though disinclined to pray himself, did not see why they should be bothered with the clumsy and idolatrous animal. He gave it a tap with his polo mallet. As he did so, a voice from the road hailed him: it was Dr Panna Lal, returning in high distress from the Collector's party. [...] he was further annoyed because Aziz buffeted the Brahmany bull (76-77).

As the passage above indicates, Aziz commits violence against the Brahmany bull. His rude and unacceptable behaviour annoys Dr. Lal. It can be interpreted that he does that on purpose. He cannot put up with the animal which makes no sense. As an Indian who lives with the Hindus, he must be aware of Hindu traditions and related to that, showing respect must be his priority. Doing what is morally right should not be so difficult for a man who criticizes the rule of English in India. In other words, he treats the Hindus just like the British rulers. The reason behind his intolerance can be regarded as the cultural factors like race and religion. They turn out to be obstacles on the way of being united as one despite all the social and cultural differences. It seems that these varieties make a total friendship problematic. Furthermore, possibility of unification becomes impossible. It would be proper to say that Forster, as the author of this novel, effectively explored the human relationships and reflected them in a detailed manner. He seems willing for a social unification. It can be asserted that in many parts of *A Passage to India*, Forster tries to find an answer to the question of whether human beings can tolerate their differences or not. He attempts to create a friendly atmosphere through the help of characters like Cyril Fielding and Mrs. Moore in addition to some public events such as the Bridge Party and the Marabar Caves outing, but these events are far away from being promising and they turn out to be negative consequences considering Adela Quested's hallucination of being raped by Aziz (1979, 58-172). The possibilities of unification and "good intentions, based on the desire to fully accept the cultural other as an equal" are "entirely inadequate in British India whenever such an attempt fails to take account of the dimension of misrecognition" (Christensen, 2006: 163). It is very unfortunate to see that people can be so willing to misrecognise each other instead of trying to tolerate or understand. The intolerance of the characters in the novel "creates the problem of reaction, harshness, retaliation, revenge, misunderstanding and hatred" (Yousafzai and Khan, 2011: 89). Aziz reflects his negative feelings in multiple ways. Misdirection is one of the reasons:

Slack Hindus – they have no idea of society; I know them very well because of a doctor at the hospital. Such a slack unpunctual fellow! It is as well you did not go their house, for it would give you a wrong idea of India. Nothing sanitary. I think for my own part they grew ashamed of their house and that is why they did not send (86).

It is quite natural that he may not like Dr. Lal or criticise him for being late, but Aziz does something very dangerous in terms of human relationships. He generalizes all the Hindus from the example of only one person. It seems that he does that on purpose to reflect himself and Muslims as superior to Hindus. Discrediting people just because they belong to another religion is such an inappropriate manner. It does nothing but affecting the Hindu image of other people. Aziz can be seen as an epitome for human beings who believe in the superiority of what they themselves respect. Craig Bradshaw Woelfel states that “the desire to think in binary terms” is “a part of human nature” as human beings “see things - or want to see things - in black and white, yes or no, either/or terms” and they wish to see “people to believe or not, to be religious or secular, to appeal to revelation or reason” (2012: 26). Related to that, to tell the truth, the unification desired by people like Forster turns out to be unrealistic as long as more than one religion or race exist. Because, people do not give up on discriminating one another by thinking that some religions, races or a group of people are lower. It may seem hard to accept but human history proves that there some people must always be on a higher level. To put it another way, life does not teach people another alternative. For centuries, humans go after what they see from their ancestors: war, domination, ruling, violence. By way of these, human beings learn how to survive in this world. It is like a pattern they are being thought each and every day. Although notions of love, mercy and morality exist, humans choose to follow the path of the negative actions stated previously. In this regard, it can be seen that Aziz chooses to humiliate The Hindus. According to the lines of Aziz above, it is proper to indicate that he is ironic within himself, considering his previous comments on his dislike for the British rulers, by saying:

He lay in a trance, sensuous but healthy, through which the talk of the two others did not seem particularly sad – they were discussing as to whether or not it is possible to be friends with an Englishman. [...] Aziz joined in. “Why talk about the English? Brrrr...! Why be friends with the fellows or not friends? Let us shut them out and be jolly” (35).

The total difference between these two expressions of Aziz demonstrates the two-

faced approach of him. Although, he seems to be desiring to be one with the Indians while talking to his Indian friends, he despises them in a highly cruel and gossipy manner in order to be accepted by the English. Because he discriminates Indians as well and does not accept them as one including all the religions of India. In other words, it can be deduced that the only obstacle on the way of social unification and living in 'jolly', is not the presence of the British. Also, India and Indians as a whole are not totally satisfied with one another, regarding the presence of the Hindu and Muslim Indians' conflict. This shows that the cultural and religious differences can be regarded as problems on the way of being absolute friends and unifying as one. In addition to that, these examples can be given as signs of disrespect and intolerance of human beings and such disrespectful actions' taking place between the members of the same or different race and religion does not make any difference. The crucial point seems like the diversities caused by cultural, social, racial, religious or imperial motives. In a way, it can be said that Aziz as being in the position of a colonised in India, shows hypocrisy and supports social divisions through showing discourtesy.

E.M. Forster is a novelist who was able to reflect his ideas in an objective style on *A Passage to India*. For "an Englishman writing about India", this style of him may not be regarded as the expectation, but it should not be forgotten that "he was more concerned with social intercourse than institutions while he was contemplating on the British existence in India" (Aydemir, 2015: 16). Having such a view is quite the opposite for a British who writes about the colonial context. In one of the parts dealing with that objectivity mentioned, Forster points out the conversation between Mrs. Moore and his son, the city magistrate Ronny Heaslop whose negative approach for the Indians can be sensed densely:

[...] I am out here to work, mind, to hold this wretched country by force.
[...] We're not pleasant in India, and we don't intend to be pleasant.
We've something more important to do.' [...] ' I'm going to argue, and indeed dictate,' she said, clinking her rings. 'The English *are* out here to pleasant.' [...] India is part of the earth. And God has put us on the earth in order to be pleasant to each other. God ... is ... love.' She hesitated, seeing how much disliked the argument, but something made her go on. 'God has put us on earth to love our neighbours and to show it, and He is omnipresent, even in India, to see how we are succeeding.' (69-70).

It is not a surprise that seeing an English ruler in a colonised land who acts emotionless and cold about the mission of setting the so-called peace and order in

less-privileged places of the world. Heaslop is a predictable character like the rest of the Anglo-Indians ruling and living in India because of the typical superiority complex of the people who like to be superior, but apparently her mother does not share the same feelings with him. Depending on her love of God and religion, she portrays a completely lovely personality towards people in general and Indians in particular. It is also obvious in her first meeting with Dr. Aziz in the mosque as she acts with an unexpected courtesy. However, in spite of her welcoming 'God is love' attitude, Mrs. Moore fails to cherish hope for possibility of friendship and unification because her statements on the role of the British in India can be interpreted as far from contributing to being united as one and equal. Even though on the surface her speech looks like it is uniting and doing nothing but favour the people in India, it sounds that those people are vulnerable, weak and in need of real help. Colonising someone's land by force and ruling there has nothing to do with acting pleasant. This is some sort of a lie in which she makes herself believe. What is it she thinks about the British existence in a completely different soil than England? Is it the Indians who pleasantly give the control of their country to a power coming from the other side of the ocean? It should be said that the expressions of Mrs. Moore are not different than his son Ronny Heaslop or the discrimination of Aziz reflected in the previous lines. She has some sort of an internalized feeling of superiority and what is worse is that she does that by saying that God wants us to do it. Does God want that so called help from the British but not from the Indians or another Eastern race? Because the God of Mrs. Moore poses like a power who increases the importance of the coloniser similar to the one of Aziz. His understanding of God and religion, too, makes him a kind of man who cannot bear the existence of Hindus. In a way, people depend on a point, which is religion in this case, in order to be able to use it for their own sake. In this regard, the situations of Aziz and Mrs. Moore are not different from each other concerning what they suggest. Once more, it is seen that the Westerners and the non-Westerners are on the same boat in order to perform discrimination to one another by taking help from various tools. It can be interpreted that both of them are capable enough in terms of acting unmannerly and disrespectfully. They just choose the person that they want to spend time with. Generally, this is a pretty normal and expected behaviour; surely, people are free to be selective by means of making friends. However, what is abnormal and discriminative becomes obvious

when people do that by compromising. Besides while deciding to make friends according to the religion or race of the person, compromise can be observed as one of the effects that is influential in friendship. It is quite sad that people make sacrifices in order to be accepted or something else. The film director Spike Jonze has thoughts about compromise which can be regarded suitable for the following extract from *A Passage to India*: “If you compromise what you’re trying to do just a little bit, you’ll end up compromising a little more the next day or the next week, [...]” (Knafo, 2009). Clearly, the famous director has a point about the negative side of this approach. As for Aziz, compromise comes to the fore when he wants to be accepted by the English. The lines below seem quite certain to demonstrate that:

“Blast !
‘Anything wrong?’
‘I’ve stamped on my last collar-stud.’
‘Take mine, take mine?’
‘Have you a spare one?’
‘Yes, yes, one minute.’
‘Not if you’re wearing it yourself.’
‘No, no, one in my pocket.’ Stepping aside, so that his outline might vanish, he wrenched off his collar, and pulled out of his shirt the back stud, a gold stud, which was part of a set that his brother-in-law had brought him from Europe.
‘Here it is,’ he cried” (82).

In his dialogue with Cyril Fielding, Aziz makes a compromise because of the reason that Fielding is good to him. Fielding’s decency towards Aziz as an English person affects Aziz’s approach to Fielding positively but, still, it does not change the fact that he makes sacrifice in order to be welcomed in a group he has newly participated. It is a big sacrifice for Aziz considering that it is materially and spiritually precious. His sacrifice shows the respect he feels for Fielding however, he does not show this respect to Hindus as seen before. His respect can, also, be called as a kind of a chance for friendship. The Brahmany Bull incident that is stated earlier is the proof of Aziz’s denial of that respect or friendship chance. On the one hand, he desecrates a specific religious group, on the other hand he can quickly open his arms to the English who are being good to him. Does he make that discrimination because of the reason that the English people’s friendship is much more valuable or the Hindus’s religion is less valuable? Aziz comes across a coloniser who is totally unfamiliar with him. He is the party that makes the sacrifice in this relationship. The reason that lies behind it is the fact that he feels inferiority complex against the British, that is why he compromises and sees it as a chance for living in equal terms. Inferiority

complex can be observed as one of the damages of colonisation due to the pejorative approach of the British. Apart from that undeniable truth related to colonisation, not giving the same chance to the people of his own country does not make sense in this regard. Furthermore, Forster voices another true feeling of Aziz in which he makes a comparison for his love between friends from two different races:

He loved them even better than the Hamidullahs, because he had surmounted obstacles to meet them, and this stimulates a generous mind. Their images remained somewhere in his soul up to his dying day, permanent additions. He looked at her now as she sat on a deckchair, sipping his tea, and had for a moment a joy that held the seeds of its own decay, for it would lead him to think, 'Oh, what more can I do for her?' and so back to the dull round of hospitality (154-5).

It can be observed in these lines that Aziz turns the issue of discrimination into a whole new level. He is prepared to sacrifice the friendship of the people of his own religion that he cares about so much. Humans can make new friends and it is possible for them to love the new ones more than the old. The problematic matter in this case is his being so much ready to make big sacrifices. Because the attitude of Aziz towards Mrs. Moore sounds like he cannot get rid of the inferior position attained by the coloniser. Despite his rigid perspective for the existence of the British rulers in India, Aziz does more than only being hospitable to his new English friends. It is very clear that Aziz's mind is so confused with friendship. He just cannot create a loving environment in order to have friends without making a fuss about their religion or race. The inaccessibility of having an English friend for Aziz increases the significance of these friends in the eyes of him. That is why he feels himself as a blessed human being who is lucky to get the chance of befriending with an English. He challenges the ordinary atmosphere of the colonial time by experiencing an extraordinary type of friendship. The crucial point here is that challenging is not good enough to destroy the secondary position of him because even if he does not want the coloniser, he still cares for their friendship. In a way he tries to prove that a non-Westerner can be a friend of a Westerner as well and that non-Westerners are capable of communicating with the Westerners. On the other hand, while he gives such an effort to gain the important friendship of the English, he does not do the same for his deceased wife, as the following conversation between him and Fielding highlights:

He muttered, 'Really, I don't know why you pay me this great

compliment, Aziz, but I do appreciate it.'

'Oh, it's nothing, she was not a highly educated woman or even beautiful, put it away. You would have seen her, so why should you not see her photograph?'

'You would have allowed me to see her?'

'Why not? I believe in the purdah, but I should have told her you were my brother, and she would have seen you. Hamidullah saw her, and several others.' [...]

'Put her away, she is of no importance, she is dead,' said Aziz gently (128-9).

It is very ironic that Aziz gives much more care to the English than his own wife. It is proper to point out that his newly met friends are on an elevated scale for him compared to the mother of his children, his life partner. Despite Fielding's careful and respectful approach to his spouse, Aziz's behaviour is surely unbelievable. His words are full of disrespect. He barely humiliates her and this can be interpreted as another way of discrimination performed by Aziz. It is really hard to understand his approach, especially if it is observed from a humanitarian point of view. It might be said that he reduces human value only to physical appearance by remarking that his wife is illiterate and not good looking. It is not so possible to come up with a different result than thinking him as a narrowed minded human being. Aziz's understanding means that everyone is allowed to determine someone's importance according to that person's beauty, level of education, or even being alive or dead. One can find various words and expressions to define this situation: rudeness, humiliation, discrimination. Also, there is another point which deserves to be mentioned at this moment. The perspective of Aziz about women may lead someone to think of him as a misogynist because his words demonstrate a sort of disgust and insult toward women and as a consequence, he discriminates a non-Westerner who is his own wife. He does not even find her enough to talk about a bit more considering his apparent intention of being close friends with Fielding. Related to that, speaking about family can be seen as a topic of conversation that brings people together through growing relationships. It is asserted in *The Cambridge Companion to E.M. Forster* that "sexual symbolism and patriarchal discourse" exist in the novel (Childs, 2007: 196). It is very true in the light of the patriarchal voice of Aziz. Additionally, Adela Quested has her share of humiliation besides the wife because she is "not beautiful" and "has practically no breasts" in the eyes of Aziz (131). Towards the end of the novel, it comes to light that Aziz turns out to be innocent on the charge of

Adela's false accusation of being raped by him however, there is definitely a verbal assault performed by Aziz as his discriminative expressions show. If looking good means a lot to him in marriage, then it can be interpreted that he should be highly upset about his deceased spouse who has been regarded insignificant as a woman and wife. It is proper to assert that Aziz is very successful in discriminating all types of people in terms of various features such as religion, beauty, physical appearance and even living status.

Setting humiliation towards women aside, Aziz is not the only non-Westerner who performs discrimination in *A Passage to India*. The extract below indicates that some of the Muslim characters in the novel have a tendency to humiliate people. They do that by depending on the religious background and activities of non-Muslims, specifically the Hindus:

Before long they began to condemn him as a source of infection. 'All illness proceeds from Hindus,' Mr Haq said. Mr Syed Mohammed had visited religious fairs, at Allahabad and at Ujjain, and described them with biting scorn. At Allahabad there was flowing water, which carried impurities away, but at Ujjain the little river Sipra was banked up, and thousands of bathers deposited their germs in the pool. He spoke with disgust of the hot sun, the cow-dung and marigold flowers, and the encampment of saddhus, some of whom strode stark naked through the streets. [...] Aziz liked to hear his religion praised (118).

Once more, it is observed that discrimination plays an important role in this multireligious country. This time, Aziz has the company of the people who are ready to attack the religious activities of the Hindus very severely. In other words, they judge the book by its cover. They cannot help desecrating Hindu religion. It appears like a habit for them to gossip about the Hindus with a degrading tone. Especially, the rigid words of Mr. Haq remind the discriminative theory emphasized by Mr. McBryde concerning the rape accusation of Aziz: "All unfortunate natives are criminals at heart, [...]" (176). In relation to that, it is important to note that according to the prejudiced views of the Anglo-Indians, Adela Quested's position which turns her into a victim of rape, can be seen as related to the "infamous lust of Indian men" and to "the Indian landscape" which "figures as a violent male principle" (Parry, 1998: 179). It is obviously an unfair generalisation reflected by people who assume Indians as lower than themselves. Even though they stand at opposite poles, Mr. Haq and Mr. McBryde share the same feelings towards the

people they discriminate. The former one performs that with a religious feeling whereas the latter does that with racial feelings. Their aims become parallel when the matter is discrimination. What this comparison expresses is that both of the Westerners and the non-Westerners play a mutual role in discrimination. It should be noted that undeniably, discrimination widens the gap between the colonised and the coloniser but, it is the same factor again which is highly favoured by these two groups. Regarding that, it is very ironic and highlights the reason why something they both value causes them to separate from each other very deeply. It is the feeling of superiority which makes it impossible for these two sides to welcome varieties. They support discrimination but, then they cannot come to terms with the issue of whose religion, race or another value is the best and superior. That is why, all people regardless of their being a Westerner or a non-Westerner discriminate to prove the superiority of what they believe and are ready to be violent. The very detail in the novel which draws attention to the belief of India's being once "one; Moslem" and "always" as a Muslim country clearly demonstrates a one-sided perspective (119). They ignore the existing religious diversity of India in a selfish and discriminative manner. Similar to the situations analysed in this chapter previously, some points about the Marabar Caves outing need to be highlighted in terms of the discrimination performed by the non-Westerners. It is noted before that new English friends of Aziz have primary importance for him, even more than his Muslim friends or his wife. Aziz feels "terribly worried" about the expedition and does not want to make any mistake in order to serve well to his guests (140). Food problem becomes one of Aziz's concern on his way to the expedition. It is multi-racial and religious travel for all of its members. As a result of it, Aziz feels that he has to please them with delicious foods. The upcoming extract reveals his confusion:

There was the problem of Professor Godbole and his food, and of Professor Godbole and other people's food – two problems, not one problem. The Professor was not a very strict Hindu – he would take tea, fruit, soda-water and sweets[...] ; but not meat, [...] : a slice of beef upon a distant plate would wreck his happiness. Other people might eat mutton, they might ham. But over ham Aziz's own religion raised its voice: he did not fancy other people eating ham. Trouble after trouble encountered him, because he had challenged the spirit of the Indian earth, which tries to keep men in compartments (140-1).

Compared to the previous expressions of Aziz on Hindus and their beliefs, it sounds very interesting to see the fact that he cares for what disturbs Professor Godbole in

terms of religious concerns. The reason lying behind this difference can be interpreted as his respect for Godbole. However, although Aziz is aware that cows are sacred in Hinduism, he does not show respect to the Brahmany bull as observed before. It is, also, obvious that he humiliates Hindus by pointing out their religious belief. This instant shift in his actions shows that he is hypocrite. He looks like he shows respect to Godbole and what he prefers to eat but, on the other side, he disrespects and insults his belief. Besides that, the extract demonstrates a struggle which cannot be overcome by Aziz, Godbole or someone else. It is the fact that doctrines of a religion clash with other religions. A forbidden action of a religion may be allowed in another belief system. In that case, respect does not become the priority of people, for example respecting people whose religion forbids eating of a specific food makes a social unification impossible. As it is referred by Forster in the quotation, such gatherings challenge religious or racial varieties of human beings. It is a trouble born out of multiplicity and is very unfortunate for the possibility of a total unification. Ahmad M.S. Abu Baker denotes that “no matter how blurred the borderlines separating [...]” people, “they end up being more emphasised because no native can escape his nativity and no white man can escape his white blood” (2006: 80). This interpretation highlights that differences, whether they are racial, religious or cultural, cannot bring human beings together. It will not be wrong to express that discrimination is an irremediable disease and no one wants to be cured. Also, when attempts for filling the gap fail, it becomes obvious that it is really incurable. Why would a human ever want that, considering discrimination as an easy path leading them to assume themselves superior? This is probably the question circulating in minds when the matter comes to supporting a religion or race. In this sense, Aziz can be considered as really good at defending his own religion since he humiliates Hinduism. His love for the Muslim rulers of India in history can be regarded as one of the things which makes him incredibly delighted. To be known just like these rulers is a source of pride in his consideration. That’s why, he is so proud of hosting his English friends in Marabar Caves and emphasizes that he feels “like the Emperor Babur” because Babur helped his Afghan ancestors and they “came down with him from Afghanistan” (155). The Moguls pose a reflection of happiness and superiority for him. He enjoys speaking about the Mogul Emperors from his point of view as the lines below put forward:

‘I always enjoy conversing about the Moguls. It is the chief pleasure I know. [...]

‘Tell us something about Akbar.’

‘Ah, you have heard the name of Akbar. Good. Hamidullah – whom you shall meet – will tell you that Akbar is the greatest of all. I say, “Yes, Akbar is very wonderful, but half a Hindu; he was not a true Moslem,” which makes Hamidullah cry, “No more was Babur, he drank wine.” But Babur always repented afterwards, which makes the entire difference, and Akbar never repented of the new religion he invented instead of the Holy Koran.’

‘But wasn’t Akbar’s new religion very fine? It was to embrace the whole of India.’

‘Miss Quedsted, fine but foolish. You keep your religion, I mine. That is the best. Nothing embraces the whole of India, nothing, nothing, and that was Akbar’s mistake.’ (156).

The Emperor Akbar who turns out to be the topic of the extract above is one of the well-known rulers of the Mogul Kingdom and as it is obvious, is not the favourite of Aziz. The dream Emperor of Aziz, Babur is the one who established the Empire in 1526 and the Moguls followed Islam as their religion (Nishat, 2005: 5). Concerning the admiring approach of Aziz, Babur’s once rule in India leaves a legacy to him to be filled with joy. The primary and fundamental reason which makes him so much precious than Akbar or another ruler is his religion, Islam. Aziz makes it pretty clear in his sharp expression. Apparently, Akbar’s being ‘wonderful’ is not enough for Aziz as he ‘was not a true Moslem’. The history of India tells that the Mogul Emperor Akbar believed that the Muslim rulers preceded him ignored the non-Muslims and this was bad for the prosperity and unification of the empire, that’s why he created a religious policy which has welcomed different beliefs under the roof of “universal toleration” (Nishat, 2005: 7-15). As an interpretation, it can be asserted that he wanted Indian people to see the points they can share as a whole, not to see the ones they collide with. However, Akbar’s ‘new religion’ does not satisfy Aziz because Akbar did not favour Islam as the only religion considered in India. It can be said that Akbar was clever and used his policy of religion as a political strategy to be the recognised ruler of the whole India. Because, turning a blind eye to a society full of diversity may lead to aggression and conflict. The way how conflicts demonstrate themselves has shown in the preceding chapter. Aziz seems not ready for a total unification. He is highly focused on what and whom he defends that he is even ready to forgive Babur for drinking wine although it is forbidden in Islam. Aziz can easily tolerate Babur for the reason that he “always repented” which does not make sense (156). His reference to the word ‘always’ takes attention. According to Aziz’s idea of

Islam, is it allowed for Muslims to commit a sin every time and repent repeatedly? He contradicts with himself. It is obvious that Aziz plays with the doctrine of the religion he believes in and respects Babur so deeply for his own purpose. It can be said that Aziz discriminates and does not show respect to someone who does not favour his religion. He finds Akbar mistaken for not embracing Islam as the one and only religion. In relation to that, the rest of the conversation above reflects that an attempt of unification fails:

‘Oh, do you feel that, Dr. Aziz? she said thoughtfully. ‘I hope you’re not right. There will have to be something universal in this country – I don’t say religion, for I’m not religious, but something, or how else are barriers to be broken?’

She was only recommending the universal brotherhood he sometimes dreamed of, but as soon as it was put into prose it became untrue (156).

Through the character of Adele Quested, Forster questions the possibility of unification. He gives the clue which reveals hardness or even the impossibility of it. It is pretty sure that Aziz opposes the hope that Adele states. The idea of ‘universal brotherhood’ seems nothing but a futile attempt for Aziz. He does not believe that it may come true. It can be understood from the extract that Forster is aware of the fact that there has to be a solution for the gulf existing between human beings but also, he knows that humans are not willing for such a possibility. Aziz precisely states that perspective. Because the matters which cause people to stay away from one another, are much stronger than a uniting matter. Aziz’s example shows that humans do not want an equal treatment to all sorts of religions, races or else. He is selfish as he only considers his value. In this regard, finding a matter or value is not possible in order to be united. Therefore, E.M. Forster points out through Aziz that ‘nothing embraces’ all humanity. Even if it does, there is always a point ready for dividing people.

Last but not least, the end of the novel makes its final statement for the discrimination of the non-Westerners and the impossibility of a total friendship. Forster makes a final move to bring Aziz and Fielding together after everything they experience, especially Aziz’s trial of rape accusation. Kieran Dolin states that “Forster acknowledges the wish for union and, having done so, returns to the indicative mood of realism, to the inevitable rocks that sunder Fielding and Aziz on their last ride” (1994: 348). In their last conversation, Aziz reflects his anger for the English through Fielding. Although his anger is related to his being accused by

Adela Quested, it is stated previously in this chapter that his hatred is not new. He is only amazed by the warm atmosphere among himself, Mrs. Moore, Fielding and Adela Quested. However, apart from his objection of the English, Aziz does what he prefers throughout the novel; discriminating the rest of India. He harshly reveals what is present in his mind as the following lines show:

‘Who do you want instead of the English? The Japanese?’ jeered Fielding, drawing rein.
‘No, the Afghans. My own ancestors.’
‘Oh, your Hindu friends will like that, won’t they?’
‘It will be arranged – a conference of oriental statesmen.’
‘It will indeed be arranged.’ [...]
‘India shall be a nation ! No foreigners of any sort ! Hindu and Moslem and Sikh and all shall be one ! Hurrah! Hurrah for India ! Hurrah ! Hurrah !’ (315).

It is very distressing that Aziz does not acknowledge that the non-Muslim population in India might be considering themselves to be the rulers of the future Indian nation. He is so reckless in his defence. Through his hatred and anger for the domination of the English, Aziz reflects his long-awaited dream of Muslim rule in India without really caring about the idea of the non-Muslims. It is so similar to the coloniser mind of the British. They do not attach importance to people of the land they dominate and apparently, it is the understanding of Aziz, too. He slides over Fielding’s question about whether the Hindus will accept his ancestors as the new rulers of India or not. Fielding’s internalised feeling of superiority should also be noted. He sounds like he does not believe that the English may leave the Indian territory as he is so sure of his own race’s powerful coloniser position. Besides that, Aziz contradicts himself considering that his own ancestors will take the lead in India and at the same time, everyone will be one in this new nation. It means that being one can only be acceptable by Aziz as long as Muslims rule in India. He speaks as if India does not have any internal problems except the presence of the English. It refers to the feeling of superiority once more. Previously in the novel, he warns Adela that there is not an embracing vehicle in India but, now he supports the idea of a nation in which all the sects will be united. It can be interpreted that he does not believe in what he says by heart and reveals in the following part of the dialogue that the idea of being one is binding until the end of the British rule in India and afterwards, Indians will not have a motif which can bring them together as united:

‘Down with the English anyhow. That’s certain. Clear out, you fellows, double quick, I say. We may hate one another, but we hate you most. [...]

we shall drive every blasted Englishman into the sea, and then' – he rode against him furiously – 'and then,' he concluded, half kissing him, 'you and I shall be friends.' (315-6).

Aziz confesses his true feelings for the non-Muslim Indians and the British. His hatred of the British is justifiable as he is in the position of the colonised because of England. No one can be happy about to be in such a degrading and insulting position. On the other hand, his confession of hatred towards the Indians proves the discrimination performed by himself throughout the novel. This kind of a discrimination is the unfamiliar one compared to the one performed by the Westerners. The very end of the novel demonstrates that friendship is highly far-fetched and the last lines of it conclude the novel without a resolution:

'Why can't we be friends now?' said the other, holding him affectionately. 'It's what I want. It's what you want.'

But the horses didn't want it – they served apart; the earth didn't want it, sending up rocks through which riders must pass single-file; the temples, the tank, the jail, the palace, the birds, the carrion, the Guest House, that came into view as they issued from the gap and saw Mau beneath: they didn't want it, they said in their hundred voices, 'No, not yet,' and the sky said, 'No, not there' (316).

The way how Forster ends the novel has a pessimistic mood even though it states a definite reality: a never-ending discrimination struggle of humanity. Unfortunately, that is the truth, and the truth is bitter. As reflected before, the gap between two people, two country or within a country is like an incurable disease and the validity of the gulf will probably exist in the future, too. Peter Burra, in his *Introduction to the Everyman Edition* written for *A Passage to India*, touches upon a vital point regarding the issue of difference: "the clash of human beings, the struggle which one individual must endure if he is to achieve intimacy with any one other" (1979: 327-8). It can be said that Burra refers to the aim of the novel. It is the aim which is questioned by Forster throughout the novel. The critic continues his interpretation with another significant statement: "The fundamental personal difference is again deliberately heightened by an external circumstance – the difference of race" (328). It is the external circumstances such as race and religion which become the priority of human beings or in other words, the differences belonging to people.

Throughout *A Passage to India*, E.M. Forster explains human condition in many various ways in terms of the possibility of unification. While doing that, he also, does not miss the interference of discrimination as analysed in this chapter. It is

important to note that he approaches equally towards the Westerners and the non-Westerners. In this matter, Todd Kuchta notes that “what Forster requires is an event that will allow him to retain both his anti-imperialism and his criticism of India all at once” (2003: 322). It means that he does not turn a blind eye to the unfair rule of the English over India, or to the disrespectful perspective of the non-Westerners as exemplified by Dr. Aziz. However, some critics do not share the same idea. Mohammad Ayub Jajja, supports that Forster’s novel justifies the “colonialist ideology of superiority and presents India, Indians and their culture as lesser and inferior”, for example, he criticizes the humiliating behaviour of Mrs. Turton towards the Indian women as it “is only a stereotype portrayal,” and “meant to reinforce the imperial ideology of superiority and to contain India and Indians” (2013: 38-41). However, the presence of such a character is to show the discriminative approach of the English who believes in their superiority. It is very apparent in the novel as mentioned before in this chapter. Besides that, if stereotyping the Indians were the aim of Forster, then why would he portray Adela Quested as mistaken for falsely accusing an Indian and portray Aziz as the innocent party in that case? It can be said that Forster wanted to criticise the prejudice of the British especially considering the discriminative perspective of Mr. McBryde mentioned previously. It is interpreted by Lin Ling-yu that Forster shows a “humanistic concern and anti-colonial consciousness” and “deconstructed the binary oppositional pattern of Orientalism” in multiple ways in the novel such as “the failure of the charge case” (2019: 380-1). Additionally, Kieran Dolin asserts that the novel “offers a corrective to the imperial desire to categorize and control Indians en masse” (1994: 337). For sure, Forster criticises the Indians, too, as seen in this chapter but, he does that equally. The following words of Forster shed light on an objective review of his own novel:

‘[W]hen I began the book, I thought of it as a little bridge of sympathy between East and West: but this conception has had to go, my sense of truth forbids anything so comfortable’. [...] ‘I think that most Indians, like most English people, are shits and I’m not interested whether they sympathize with one another or not’ (Bristow, 1996: 147).

This extract taken from an essay of him written to Syed Ross Masood indicates that Forster loses his hope for any chance of unification or friendship among human beings. He sounds highly weary because of the struggle humans put themselves consciously. It is clear that he has an impartial approach to the discriminative and divisive attitude of both the British and the Indian. He is exhausted while trying to

find a chance to bring them together. As long as human beings do not wish for it, nobody can change anything. It will be proper to assert that Forster does not elevate or degrade just a specific group of people, on the contrary he dwells on humanity as a whole about whether they can be a whole or not and decides at the end that it is not possible. Joseph Bristow indicates that “Forster had lost faith in his liberal idealism” (1996: 147). It is not difficult to come up with the same loss of faith like him after learning and seeing that nothing changes for centuries by means of the internalised feeling of superiority of humanity. They fought, colonised, humiliated etc. and the worse situation is that all these negativities are still going on around the world in different patterns. Therefore, it is definite that if someone is going to be blamed for performing discrimination, it is the citizens of the world, not only the Westerners or the non-Westerners. In the novel, even formerly colonised black people who witness the cruelty of being discriminated can perform it upon their own race without hesitation or feeling any remorse. In this sense, the next chapter will analyse another unusual example of discrimination portrayed through the protagonist Henry Townsend, the free black slave owner living in the Antebellum Period in Southern America. It is convenient to note that his story reflects behaviours which are unexpected from a black person regarding the degrading and inhumane position attained to the black people.

CHAPTER III

3. AN ANALYSIS OF EDWARD P. JONES'S *THE KNOWN WORLD*

Who is to blame in a world surrendered by slavery and discrimination? Is it the whites, or the blacks to put the blame on? Or else, is it a totally different group of people categorized by skin colour, religion or culture? What this chapter aims to demonstrate is that there is no just one single group of people which can be accused of discriminating one another. It means that there is not only one answer to these questions. Relatedly, Edward P. Jones's *The Known World* is the proof of that. Discrimination can be interpreted as a performance that is beyond notions like race and human beings as a whole can be regarded as capable of discriminating each other. Jones's novel can be seen as one of the rare examples of the history of black slave ownership. Even though slavery is mostly attributed to the Western countries, as the novel puts forward it was performed by the non-Westerners, too. As the lines continue, this novel will show that slavery is the noticeable reflection of discrimination in terms of power restoration that can be performed by all human beings. The unfamiliar story of the protagonist Henry Townsend who starts running a farm and works as a former black slave-owner can be found in the 2003 Pulitzer Prize winning work of Jones (Rooney, 2008: ii). The life circle of Henry along with the other characters who are important as well in terms of the problems they reflect, draw the attention of the reader to a very specific information. It is the fact that not only the Westerners but also the non-Westerners are influential in the performance of slavery. What makes Jones's novel notable and interesting is this point. His main character can be described as a happy and contented slave-owner. If Henry Townsend was a Western and a white person, his being happy about slave owning would have been totally common considering the colonial period. But, it sounds different and awkward in the case of Henry. It would be proper to define the situation as unexpected regarding the non-Westerners' suffering caused by the Westerners in the colonial history. The novel begins with the death of Henry Townsend at an early age and moves forward with the help of some flashbacks consisting of times referring to his childhood, adolescence and especially adulthood when he is leading

his life as the master of his black slaves in *The Townsend farm* (Borgen, 2014: 3). Edward P. Jones directly points out the status of Henry as a black slave-owner in the very beginning of the novel:

Henry Townsend—a black man of thirty-one years with thirty three slaves and more than fifty acres of land that sat him high above many others, white and black and Indian, in Manchester County, Virginia—sat up in bed for most of his dying days, eating a watery porridge and looking out his window at land his wife, Caldonia, kept telling him he would walk and ride over again (Jones, 2004: 5)

It will not be wrong to say that Henry has a really considerable number of slaves and amount of land compared to his young age. To tell the truth, such a privileged life seems highly unusual and interesting for a former black slave. What makes Henry a black slave owner for a time period which devalues the black population is absolutely a matter of question. The life of Henry Townsend changes when he is an enslaved child and the property of the white master, William Robbins. It will not be wrong to say that Henry owns much of his superior position in life to this man owing to whom he learned how to be a slave-owner. Even though Henry is born into a life of a slave, being manipulated by a white dominant figure effects Henry's perspective of life. It is possible to deduce from the novel that Robbins has an undeniable role in the character development of him and as Henry is pleased with having the chance of gaining superiority, it can be reflected that it is easy for Robbins to make a supremacist out of Henry. He consciously chooses to follow the footsteps of white colonisers. Edward P. Jones reflects in an interview that in terms of creating his novel, he was inspired by a book concerning a Jewish who allied to the Nazis in the Second World War (Bassard, 2008: 407). In this regard, Henry Townsend is the Jew of the novel whereas the white American colonisers are the Nazis whose ill-treatment spreads like a disease within the Afro-American society. Learning this fact revealed in the interview about the idea behind the structure of *The Known World* suggests that unexpected relations may grow up between human beings although they can be difficult to understand. The one occurs between Henry and Robbins is one of these relationships which is highly welcomed by the former slave. Silje Hegna Borgen points out that William Robbins is a chance for Henry which leads him to think of "his gain from that relationship as more valuable" (2014: 19). The compulsory distance between Henry and his biological parents, Augustus and Mildred Townsend has a great impact on the strong bond of Henry and Robbins, as well. The former

slave of William Robbins, “Augustus Townsend, Henry's father, finally bought himself out of slavery when he was twenty-two” and afterwards he “made the last payment for his wife, Mildred, when she was twenty-six and he was twenty- five, some three years after he bought his own freedom” (14-15). Henry’s parents work hard to save money for their freedom which is absurd but sadly reflects reality. What is more distressing in this case is the fact that Henry’s father, Augustus makes promise to make him free and come back to take him from Robbins however, Robbins knows that Henry is an intelligent boy and raises the cost of him every time when his parents attempt to buy their own son’s freedom (17). The miserable struggle of the Townsend family for freedom highlights the bitter side of the colonial period and the way leading to Henry’s being manipulated in the hands of the white master Robbins. Even when his parents finally finish their payments and buy Henry’s freedom from Robbins, Henry can not fully acknowledge how a great and important day the day of freedom is as the conversation below demonstrates:

About halfway the trip home, the man realized that these had been his son's first days of freedom. He and Mildred had planned a week of celebration, culminating with neighbors coming by the next Sunday. Augustus said, “You feelin any different?”
“Bout what?” Henry said. He was holding the reins to the mules.
“Bout bein free? Bout not bein nobody's slave?”
“No, sir, I don't reckon I do.” He wanted to know if he was supposed to, but he did not know how to ask that. He wondered who was waiting now for Bobbins to come riding up on Sir Guilderham (49).

It is very clear in this flashback part that Henry does not complain about serving his master, Robbins and is unable to see the fact that he stays in his mansion as a slave. William Robbins’s being like a mentor to him does not change such an upsetting fact. Due to that, he probably can not find something worth for celebration. Henry Townsend gets to learn everything he knows from Robbins since he is young. It is reflected by Jones in the novel that besides “being William Robbins's groom, the boy Henry Townsend had been an apprentice to the boot- and shoemaker at the Robbins plantation” and even after gaining his freedom he still keeps moving on seeing his former master “again and again to make boots and shoes for him and his male guests” (111-12). It is surely beyond doubt that these non-stop meetings tighten their connection and paves the way to Henry’s becoming a slave-owner and it makes his parents angry and disappointed which will be analysed in the following parts of this chapter. Augustus Townsend reveals his concern about his ‘free’ son’s paying visits

to Robbins's mansion and wishes that Henry would cut his ties with "the white man who had once owned him" (113). However, apart from cutting off his communication with the former master, on the contrary, Henry Townsend is pretty happy about ignoring the fact that William Robbins is a coloniser, a discriminator and a man who does not consider the free will of black population. The blindfolded stand of Henry proves the very discussion of this thesis: humanity's degraded position against power and discrimination. It is unbelievable that he admires such a being known as 'human' and he turns out to be like Robbins. The lines below show that Henry sows the seeds of his own slave owning process step by step:

Henry began to accumulate money, which, along with some real estate he would eventually get from Robbins, would be the foundation of what he was and what he had the evening he died. It was Robbins who taught him the value of money, the value of his labors, and never to blink when he gave a price for his product (113).

As clearly explained by the narrator, William Robbins is exactly the person who is successful at teaching Henry in terms of his becoming a reflection of himself. It is given in the extract above that the money he saves is for getting his own plantation, mansion, slaves and power. These all suggest what he dreams of since the times he is the slave of Robbins. It can be interpreted that Henry Townsend has two types of role models in which he can choose one of them's path to follow: whether the path of his own father who gives him his freedom or the path of his 'beloved' former white master who enslaves him as a property. But, Henry ironically goes on the way of Robbins even after his freedom is given to him. It is proper to assert that he clearly betrays his father. Augustus Townsend is a man who struggles to earn his family's independence which should not be bought or sold. Related to that, Jeremy Gibbs points out in his dissertation that "Henry struggles with and finally rejects his father's views on slavery in favor of those of his former master, William Robbins" (2019: 40). Although his connection with Robbins can be seen influential in shaping his adulthood plans, Henry gives his decision in free will about his future. It can be deduced from the passage below that Henry Townsend already makes up his mind as an enslaved property:

He had gotten used to seeing Henry standing in the lane, waiting as Robbins came back from some business or from visiting Philomena and their children. The boy had a calming way about him and stood with all the patience in the world as Robbins, [...] made his slow way from the road to the lane and up to the house.
"Good mornin, Massa Robbins," the boy would say, for it was invariably

morning when Robbins returned home.
“Mornin, Henry. How long have you been here?”
“Not so long,” the boy would say, though he usually had been
waiting for hours, starting in the dark, no matter what the weather (112).

It can be said that Henry’s admiration of his master Robbins is highly obvious and not effected by the coloniser-colonised dichotomy. He can not notice that Robbins actually owns him despite the fact that Henry is not a real estate but a real human being. This is the point Henry misses. One may say that Henry serves to his master because he has to do it as he is a slave however, he behaves very eagerly and voluntarily in “a calming way” and with a “patience” (112). His attitude is hard to understand. Besides the black slave ownership issue covering the whole plot of the novel, the behaviours of the black people owning slaves are very crucial and show that being black or white is not a criterion to discriminate someone else. It is asserted by Antje Kley that Jones’s *The Known World*’s “critique extends beyond the system of slavery, however, to a language of ownership implicit in the liberal language of self” (2012: 647). This is a very significant point about the novel. Slavery is just an inhumane vehicle preferred by human beings who have a tendency to discriminate one another and to be a supremacist just like Robbins and Henry Townsend. It is occurred in Forster’s *A Passage to India* through religion within the Indians and through race between the Indians and the English as analysed in the previous chapter. The tools can vary in different cases. In one case, it can be religion and in another one, it can be slavery. But, the real reason behind such excuses does not change which is discrimination and it is important to note that what comes via discrimination is nothing but superiority. Similar to his master mentor, Henry Townsend does what he does for domination and power even if it includes ignoring the corruption of humanity. In this sense, his own father’s thoughts about slavery mean nothing to him. It can be emphasised that Henry and Augustus Townsend are two divergent characters. Whereas the former is very satisfied with walking over people whom he turns into his properties, the latter can not even bear the idea of such a humiliating performance. That is why, Augustus can not control himself when Henry proudly comes to him and shares the news which make him the king of owning people:

“I got my own man. I bought my own man. Bought him
cheap from Master Robbins. Moses.” [...]
“You mean tell me you bought a man and he yours now? You done
bought him and you didn’t free that man? You *own* a man, Henry?”
“Yes. Well, yes, Papa,” Henry looked from his father to his mother.
Mildred stood up, too. “Henry, why?” she said. “Why would you do

that? [...]
"Do what. Mama? What is it?" [...]
"Don't you know the wrong of that, Henry?" Augustus said.
"Nobody never told me the wrong of that."
"Why should anybody haveta teach you the wrong, son?"
Augustus said. "Ain't you got eyes to see it without me tellin you?"
"Henry," Mildred said, "why do things the same old bad way?"
"I ain't, Mama. I ain't" (136-7).

Henry's perspective of slavery, in other words, discrimination does not change. This conversation can be seen as a reminder of the start of his new free life. As observed in his first free day, Henry can not grasp the value of freedom at this time, too. He is such a hard character to make sense especially considering his being a black who should be aware of the misery felt by his own family and all the other slaves around him. Henry is, indeed, like the Jew supporting the goal of the Nazis who inspired the author of this novel. Additionally, it is very interesting that he defends himself for the reason that no one warns him about the negativity of slave owning. Such an excuse proves that Henry Townsend's sense of morality is really broken. It seems like he is open to be manipulated by people like Robbins. But, to tell the truth, even manipulation or influence has an effect to some extent. Apart from these, every human being should be able to acknowledge what is right or wrong by his/her own heart and mind. Some behaviour's being cruel or not, should not change according to the calculations of different human beings. For example, it is a generally acknowledged truth that murder or rape is accepted as a criminal action and punished by the law systems. Destroying a human's freedom and labelling that human as a property of another person is the same. If a person regards actions similar to these as normal and acceptable, then it means that this person has some serious moral problems like Robbins and Henry. It is not only the influence of the master, but also, the desires and character of Henry make him a merciless being. Beata Zawadka asserts that Jones identifies the slavery understanding "with people's universally serving the idea of mastery itself" (2009: 90). In relation to that, it can be said that Henry Townsend serves the idea of mastery and supremacy. On the other hand, the situation of his parents reflects a sudden shock accompanied by a feeling of disappointment. The response of Augustus Townsend to his son's being a slave-owner demonstrates emotions which are unfortunately not felt by his own son:

Augustus said quietly, "I promised myself when I got this little bit of land that I would never suffer a slaveowner to set foot on it. Never." He put his hand momentarily to his mouth and then tugged at his beard. "Of

all the human beings on God's earth I never once thought the first slaveowner I would tell to leave my place would be my own child. I never thought it would be you. [...]

"Papa, I ain't done nothin I ain't a right to. I ain't done nothin no white man wouldn't do. Papa, wait." [...]

"I ain't done nothin that any white man wouldn't do. I ain't broke no law. I ain't. You listen here." Beside the door, Augustus had several racks of walking sticks, one under the other, about ten in all. "Papa, just cause you didn't, that don't mean ..." Augustus took down a stick, one with an array of squirrels chasing one another, head to tail, tail to head, a line of sleek creatures going around and around the stick all the way to the top where a perfect acorn was waiting, stem and all. Augustus slammed the stick down across Henry's shoulder and Henry crumpled to the floor. "Augustus, stop now!" Mildred shouted and knelt to her son. "Thas how a slave feel!" Augustus called down to him. "Thas just how every slave every day be feelin" (138).

It is pretty obvious that Henry does not know how to empathise with his family or any other black. That is why, he clashes with his father. Related to this situation, Katherine Clay Bassard stresses that "Henry's desire for empire, conquest and property contrasts with Augustus' more modest view of freedom which includes distancing himself from the slave past physically in terms of the location of his house, and emotionally in his pledge never to allow a slaveholder to cross his threshold" (2008: 416). Unlike his father, Henry lacks the ability to understand the inhumane life of the black community. Augustus's harsh reaction towards his son can be understandable even though it includes a bit of violence because Augustus reacts out of his anger, heartbreak and disappointment. Naturally, he is so devastated by the news of his own son's turning out to be slave-owner. The reason why he hits Henry is only to show him the bitter reality of the inner conflicts of a slave whose identity signifies nothing to the owners. On the other side, it can be asserted that Henry plans to build a life based on the rules of slavery. In other words, he decides whether a behaviour is right or wrong through the lifestyle of white masters. Tobias Andersson remarks that "Henry sees slavery as a justified economic institution" (2006: 14). Considering Henry's indifference of slavery along with his parents' worried state of minds as the lines before indicate, this can be defined as a right interpretation. Andersson also notes that Henry Townsend has a "rather painless experience of slavery" (2006: 15). In this regard, it can be included that Henry does not experience physical violence which can cause him to think in a different way about the negative nature of slavery. The close bond Henry has with his master can not be denied, as well. However, even if his experience of slavery is not a struggling

one unlike other slaves, it does not change the fact that he is under the domination of another being and is not allowed to live according to his free will. This is what he is unable to comprehend. As a result of this situation, Augustus and Mildred's reproach to their son is unreturned with an insensitive manner. Henry's father points out the physical abuse by demonstrating a show of violence performed on slaves. It can also be interpreted that Augustus wants to underline the mental damage caused by the colonisers. It is not only the body of a slave which gets hurt but also the soul of a slave which shatters. This means that physical damage can heal however, it is not so easy to ease the pain of the mental damage. As Augustus and Mildred Townsend's life story until freedom teaches them the cruelty and mercilessness of the so called masters, they do not want their son's being just like a slave-owner. It can be indicated that even the possibility of such a situation is hard to believe and much more catastrophic than a worst nightmare. Because of Henry's new status which does not make his parents proud, the present distant relationship of them can not be fixed. It is stated by the narrator that the parents choose to stay in the cabins of the slaves instead of Henry's house even when they come for the death of their son as they "had no plans to stay in the house their son and his slave had built" (66-67). The sensitive nature of slavery along with Henry's very own choice of becoming a slave-owner can be regarded as a matter of honour for Augustus and Mildred. It is a kind of "an insurmountable gap mainly between the father and the son" (Anderrson, 2006: 11). The father-son relationship gets effected in a negative way because of the presence of William Robbins as a sort of a father figure for Henry and the fact that Augustus is the first member of the family who gets his freedom and leaves Robbins's mansion where his wife and son serve as slaves. Moreover, there is not much information about the father and son especially after Henry begins his new life which is not so surprising regarding his being a black slave holder. Even the way a black's holding black slaves sounds is weird and ironic. It can be interpreted that Augustus and Mildred Townsend would not wish to see their son performing violence on his slaves. The lines below demonstrate nothing but the barbarous nature of human being and prove that all kinds of people can do this and similar practices:

"We can get in a good bit fore dark," Moses said and lifted the saw high above his head.

"We ain't workin no more today."

"What? But why not?"

"I said no more, Moses."

“But we got good light here. We got good day here, Massa.”
Henry stepped to him, took the saw and slapped him once,
and when the pain begin to set in on Moses's face, he slapped him
again. “Why don't you never do what I tell you to do? Why is that,
Moses?”
“I do. I always do what you tell me to do, Massa.”
“Nigger, you don't. You never do.”
Moses felt himself beginning to sink in the dirt. [...]
“You just do what I tell you from now on,” Henry said (124).

The incident above would be considered familiar and mostly known between a white master and a black slave but, a black person's calling another black 'nigger' sounds pretty unbelievable. How can Henry behave like this way?! Even so the influence of William Robbins on Henry can not be denied, it still does not fit the pattern of familiar master-slave understanding. His behaviours are not strange regarding the inhumane practices of colonialism and slavery. What is strange is the person who practices it. It is asserted by David Ikard that Henry “begins forthwith to physically and verbally attack Moses on trumped-up claims of insubordination” (2011: 79). Henry Townsend imitates the mastery of his 'precious' former master and tries to be a successful slave-owner who knows how to approach his properties. One may assume that William Robbins is not Henry's former master and is still his master owing to the way how Henry listens to him attentively. Robbins's teaching Henry the details of slave holding proves that: “the law expects you to know what is master and what is slave [...] You are rollin round now, today, with property you have a slip of paper on. How will you act when you have ten slips of paper, fifty slips of paper?” (123). As it is explicit enough, Robbins wants Henry to be aware of his limits between him and his slave Moses who is the first slave that he owns. Right after being informed or in other words taught by his former master, Henry slaps Moses as stated above. This situation proves that Henry is a fast learner who clearly believes that abusing someone determines one's superiority. It can be regarded as a sort of a short definition of discrimination. It is unfortunate that Henry does more and worse than only slapping his 'properties' on the face and labelling them as nigger just like a white master. It can be asserted that he proves his superiority through cruelty which can be seen as a reflection of discrimination. In the following years of his masterhood, he turns out to be much more merciless:

A runaway slave was, in fact, a thief since he had stolen his master's property—himself. They arrived about nine-thirty. Moses and one other man took Elias from the field and Oden sliced off about a third of his ear as everyone, including Henry, stood in the lane. Elias had his head down

all the while except when Oden pulled it up to get the razor to do a better job. All of the lobe and then some. Oden always carried a pouch with a pepper poultice, which he blended with vinegar and mustard and a little salt—a proven remedy to halt the bleeding of even those who seemed to have more blood than other men. [...]

Henry told Moses to take everybody back to the field. And there in the lane he paid Oden \$1 for doing the job on Elias's ear. [...]

Oden said of Elias, "If he runs again, the rest of the ear I'll do for nothin, but I will have to charge you for any work done on that other ear." (94-95).

Elias loses a part of his ear because he dares to run away from his black master Henry. This brutal incident takes place accompanied by audience. The most important member of the audience can be considered as Henry Townsend who hires Oden Peoples, the Cherokee for carrying out the service of ear cutting. It is very shocking that such an inhumane practice is welcomed as normal by human beings especially by Henry Townsend. It is so hard to dare to imagine this brutality. He should be sensitive for the misery of his own kin. Approving torture proves that there is not even a single sign of mercy or compassion within Henry. It is also necessary to point out his reaction before the ear cutting part when Robbins finds Elias on the road running away from The Townsend plantation. Before giving the decision of his slave's punishment, he does what probably his former master Robbins expects him to do as reflected in the lines below:

Henry went to Elias and slapped him. "This is a hurtful disappointment to me. What I'm gonna do with you? What in the hell I'm gonna do with you? If you want a hard life, I will oblige." [...] "Is that what you want?" Henry asked. "I will oblige you with a hard life." [...] "No, Marse." Elias was still chained, Robbins having forgotten that the chains belonged to him [...]

"Moses," Henry said, "take him and chain him till I decide if he wants a good life or a bad life." Since the day was a good one and Valtims Moffett the preacher would hold the services in the lane, Moses chained Elias in the large barn. "You want a good life or a bad life?" Moses mocked and then left him.

His first hours in the stall were spent thinking how he could kill everyone around him, first everyone on the plantation, then everyone in the county, in Virginia. Colored and white (84-85).

Afterwards, Henry's precise decision is reflected by the narrator that "he had decided that a whipping would not be enough, that only an ear would do this time" and he is just not sure about the amount of ear that must be cut (89). Henry really spends his 'precious' time for thinking over such a horrible practice without realising that he himself is a former slave. On the other hand, Elias's position is even more degrading than only being an enslaved person. Experiencing it in front of other people is nothing but torture both physical and mental. As reflected by Henry, Elias does not

have a word to say about the current or future position of his life. According to his black master, if he chooses to be obedient and accept his fate as destined by superiority, the life of Elias can be easy. It is for sure that having an easy life does not offer him freedom or doing whatever he wants, on the contrary, it only means being alive and serving his master. In this sense, Elias's unstable mind stated in the extract can be justified as enslavement can be considered as one of the worst situations ever in the world. It is also note-worthy that Elias dreams of killing both coloured and white people since discrimination knows no boundaries. It can be interpreted as an intentional reference made by Jones in order to show the universality of discrimination. Besides that, Henry's first slave and overseer Moses likes to imitate his master. Instead of empathising with Elias whom he lives the life of slavery with, Moses proves that Henry is not the one and only black who believes in superiority through discrimination and torture. They seem like a good match in terms of abusing humans. It is worth mentioning that Henry definitely progresses since the time he treats his first slave Moses badly as stated previously in this chapter. It is important to note that Henry is not unfamiliar with a ear-cut slave. The narrator points out a memory from Henry's days of slavery. He knows a slave whose ear has been cut for running away and then spending the rest of his time scaring children with the "earless side of his head" which shows that he is mentally broken (90). It is also important to indicate some details about this slave: "the wound had blossomed into a terrible mushroom of scar tissue and was as different from the other side of his face as heaven from hell. 'Go find my ear!' the old man would holler as he shook them" (90). The example of this mentally and physically damaged slave emphasises how far inhumanity can go and all kinds of human beings are capable of performing discrimination in highly unbearable ways. Even though it can be difficult for a child to understand the miserable situation of this slave, it should not be so struggling for Henry to empathise with the slave as a grown man. Paying for Oden Peoples to punish Elias for running away proves that he learns nothing from the misery of the enslaved blacks which is so pathetic. It can be asserted that he does exactly the opposite of what humanity expects him to do. In other respects, it is note-worthy to point out Oden Peoples and how he starts his brutal profession:

Oden would not have had his ear business if it had not been for the death of a slave in Amherst County. A white man had cut off the ear of his "habitual runaway," and the slave had bled to death. No one could

understand what had happened—people had been cutting off ears or parts of ears for more than two centuries. In the seventeenth century throughout the Virginia colony even white indentured servants had had their ears cut off. But somehow the luck of the Amherst County man had run out and his \$515 slave had died from the loss of blood. A few white people wanted him indicted for manslaughter, but the grand jury declined, finding that the man had suffered enough with the loss of his property (95).

It will not be an overstatement to say that nearly in all the pages of *The Known World*, one can find barbarity and oppression related to discrimination. What an unbelievable decision the jury gives as it basically ignores the death of human. Separating people as slave and master makes all the difference in the eyes of people. The slave's being killed by a master is not considered enough as a manslaughter because the dead person is a black human, not a white one. Also, Oden Peoples shows that Henry Townsend is not the only non-Westerner in the novel who has a share in discriminating people. He is described in *The Cambridge Companion to Slavery In American Literature* as “one of the patrollers of Manchester County” and “a full-blooded Cherokee who owns and is married to a woman who is half-Cherokee, half-African American” (Rushdy, 2016: 245). Oden Peoples has his wife as his property. His life style proves that discrimination knows no boundary of race, religion or another factor. It is known that “European colonists in North America” turned Native Indians of America into their slaves (Chin, 2014: 1231-32). Regarding this reality, it can be expected from Oden Peoples to be more caring for the African Americans as they both have similar kind of suffering in history. However, just like the attitude of Henry Townsend, he does not have the feeling of empathy, either. When he participates in Augustus Townsend's being kidnapped in the later parts of the novel shows that he takes his job very serious and does more than only patrolling to check for escaped slaves just like another slave patroller Travis. It is so sad that Augustus is kidnapped by the people who feel fine about taking advantage on blacks as they aim to sell them as slaves:

Travis bolstered his pistol and dismounted and then Oden dismounted, still pointing the gun at Augustus. But before either of them was well settled on the ground, Stennis had jumped down from the wagon and over to Augustus in one effortless motion. He pulled Augustus from the wagon and began pummeling him.

“Don't bruise my fruit,” Darcy said. Stennis and Travis dragged Augustus around to the back of Darcy's wagon and soon he was chained to the black man nearest the end of the wagon (216).

Augustus's being a free black expresses nothing to these wretched people. In this

sense, regarding Sally E. Hadden's *The Slave Patrols: Law and Violence in Virginia and the Carolinas*, Tommie L. Jackson indicates in her article that "a legitimate pass, or freedom papers, however, did not prevent some blacks from being imprisoned, brutalized, or, worse, sold into slavery" (2009: 170). They insanely believe that they have the right to be superior over the blacks and do whatever they like to do on behalf of them. It is a wicked understanding which human beings can have regardless of skin colour or any other factor. As a good man who obviously supports abolishment, Augustus Townsend absolutely does not deserve what happens to him by these unbelievably inhumane beings. The names of races can vary but, it does not mean that there can be a considerable difference in discrimination or in the feeling of superiority. Edward P. Jones clearly demonstrates this idea through the unique characters of his novel and Oden Peoples is definitely one of them. It is significant to note that being a slave patrol and an ear cutter demonstrate that he chooses to discriminate humans who are considered low, secondary and weak. To tell the truth, the character of Oden Peoples relies on factual informations. Jeremiah Chin states that "by 1860, the Cherokee Nation consisted of approximately 17,000 Cherokee and 4,000 Slaves, making Black slaves over 20% of the total Cherokee population" and it is also indicated that they believed in the moral and intellectual inferiority of the blacks (2014: 1234-35-37). Apparently the Westerners and the non-Westerners can share the same immoral identity which sounds very irritating. No matter how much annoying the fact that human beings can easily label and discriminate one another, it highlights this harsh, deep and unsettling reality.

Another matter needs to be analysed in this chapter in terms of how superiority and suppression are imposed as if they are notions which are totally normal and ordinary. It is the issue of religion and God. Valtime Moffett appears as nothing less than most of the characters supporting slavery. The black preacher Moffett's preaching as reflected in the lines below highlight that people can easily be manipulated about religion:

Moffett, Sunday after Sunday, had but one theme—that heaven was nearer than anyone realized and that one step away from the righteous path could take heaven away forever. "Hang on," he liked to say, "just hang on, cause heaven is right over there. See it. See it. Close your eyes and see it." His ending words were that they should obey their masters and mistresses, for heaven would not be theirs if they disobeyed. "One day I want to sit with yall and eat peaches and cream in heaven. I don't

wanna have to lean over and look way way down and see yall burnin in them fires of hell” (87).

All these words prove the way how brainwashing works on humans. It is obvious that religious feelings of people are used for the sake of slavery. The so called preacher, Moffett stands as a man who can play with the minds of slaves and make them believe the lie that they burn in hell if they do not obey their masters who pose like fake Gods. What is worse is the fact that a black religious man does such a bad deed. One can find similarities among Henry Townsend, Oden Peoples and William Robbins in addition to Moffett as they all connect in one single point: oppression via discrimination. They are people coming from different roots, but they have the internalised ability to discriminate. It can be implied that religion serves as a vehicle to teach the oppressed ones something so vital for the existence of masters which is obedience. As long as they obey, masters both Westerners and non-Westerners can live a comfortable and egoist life as they please. It can be asserted that the more one reads the novel, the more one becomes accustomed to the bitter truth about the human kind. Moffett promises heaven to the slaves obeying his orders if they do what they have to do. Giving an untrue promise seems like the only way to avoid a possible revolt. It is very sad that this is the kind of life in which slaves are so used to as this is the only life they know, especially considering that it is in a rural area of the fictional Manchester County where social norms are already known by people and accepted as a sort of a standard. In this sense, it is stressed that “rural people may actively resist new experiences” as it would be complicated for them “to exist within a rural society” (Gibbs, 2019: 52). There is like no way to exist in such a society by trying to do the opposite of the expectations of slavery. That is why, raising voice to the cruelty of slavery may not be so easy to accomplish regarding that this is not the life pattern of the slaves. In a way, it can be said that the slavery-based lifestyle is what they know and are imposed by the system of slavery in their ‘known world’. It is important to state that Moffett is not the only character who has some ideas about God. Henry’s ‘beloved’ master William Robbins teaches Henry about how to deceive God:

“Don't settle for just a house and some land, boy. Take hold of it all. There are white men out there, Henry, who ain't got nothin. You might as well step in and take what they ain't takin. Why not? God is in his heaven and he don't care most of the time. The trick of life is to know when God does care and do all you need to do behind his back.”
“Yessir.”

It would be proper to say that William Robbins knows superiority and its link to slavery by heart. He knows about it so well that he even humiliates a divine being whom he believes. This behavior of him sounds like related to excessive pride and right again, his pride is linked to an internalised feeling of superiority. Despite the fact that it is good to see that a white master helps out a black to advance in social hierarchy, it is bad to see that he does not behave in this way in order to serve humanity or equality. Conversely, he tries to fill Henry's mind with immoral ideas about the goodness of turning out to be a slave master and it is so improper that he abuses religion by doing so. In other words, he speculates on behalf of God. It is also important to point out that if someone does something behind someone's back, it is most probably a bad deed unless it is a surprise that can make people happy. In short, the ones who are at the top of hierarchy of domination in the novel abuse religion for their own profit. Robbins clearly reveals his perspective about it in the extract above. Also, it can be noted that Robbins's advice is taken by Henry so that he feels thankful to God for being selfishly superior and suppressive: "[...] the Bible suits me better in the day, when there's sun and I can see what all God gave me" (6). These lines taken from the very beginning of the novel where he spends his last times of his life, demonstrate that the words of his former master definitely leave a strong mark on his mind. It is apparent that he does all he needs to do behind the back of God in his entire life as it is the 'trick of life'. Speaking of the religious perspective reflected in *The Known World*, a different perspective about God deserves to be mentioned, as well. Moses, the first slave bought by Henry has some confused thoughts about slavery, specifically the one performed by his own kind:

Moses was the first slave Henry Townsend had bought: \$325 and a handshake from William Robbins, a white man. It took Moses more than two weeks to come to understand that some one wasn't fiddling with him and that indeed a black man, two shades darker than himself, owned him and any shadow he made. Sleeping in a cabin beside Henry in the first weeks after the sale, Moses had thought that it was already a strange world that made him a slave to a white man, but God had indeed set it twirling and twisting every which way when he put black people to owning their own kind. Was God even up there attending to business anymore? (8-9).

Even though it is reflected before in this thesis that Moses shares similar feelings with his master Henry about being a master, at the beginning of his service to Henry, Moses can not understand how a black human even blacker than himself becomes a

master. He obviously loses his hope in God and the possibility of such a divine power's saving him and the ones like him. It can be interpreted that he may think that God that makes a master out of a slave, can make him a slave, too. This interpretation can explain why he imitates Henry as mentioned before and relatedly afterwards, through the end of the novel, he dreams about taking the place of Henry Townsend:

What all had he ever really asked for in this life, such as it was? He could have done better for the place than Henry Townsend. People would have said, "That Marse Moses, he got somethin magic in him to make that plantation like it is. I did time over to Marse Robbins and Marse So-and-So and Marse Everybody-Else. Did time in all those places and they ain't got half the magic Marse Moses got. It's another Eden, the preacher say, and I can't say no more than that" (333).

His admiration of Henry seems like a big plan of living the exact life of Henry Townsend, including his wife, Caldonia which will be mentioned later on. In this regard, it can be pointed out about Moses that his "complicity in oppression is reprehensible" (Ikard, 2011: 81). He internalises it after seeing an example of a black master or, to put it in another way, the idea of superiority lives with him all the time but, he just waits to see whether it can come true or not for him. Considering that he witnesses the reality of it by the example of Henry, now he wants to make it real. Just like his master, he wants to be a superior in a selfish and cruel way. In this regard, it can be said that religious faith in God is in jeopardy in the eyes of the slaves. The way how Moses wishes to be in the wrong side of slavery proves that. Edward P. Jones refers to the silence of God in a world where even former slaves can turn out to be slave holders and the others lose hope for a change or support oppression. The references made about God can be seen as various reflections of the members of this corrupt system. It is reflected that the God in the eyes of the slaves is totally a different God than that of the owners. Even God is a being who turns a blind eye to the condition of the slaves and people internalise it as it is, even though they are aware of it. About that matter, Elias makes a good point: "Elias had never believed in a sane God and so had never questioned a world where colored people could be the owners of slaves" (9). Here is another observation of God which questions the sanity of God. It reveals that slaves have some trust issues in terms of believing in God and religion. How cannot they have struggles about it under such harsh life conditions which are hard to accept? The kind of a God Elias observes but not believes in can be

seen as an insensitive one. Different than Moses, Elias does not even try to question God. It can be said that he does not believe that something or someone can be saved in such a corrupted world where everyone can be a supremacist. The perspective of God is reflected by the narrator in another line from the novel as follows: “The God of that Bible, being who he was, never gave a slave a good day without wanting something big in return” (337). This figure of God stands similar to that of a slave holder both black and white. Silje Hegna Borgen argues that *The Known World*’s God “is arbitrary and mostly associated with hypocrisy, hardship or even suffering” as it is certain according to the ideas of slaves (2014: 9). Jones’s unfamiliar slave narrative proves that colour or race makes no difference according to the owned one. It is the non-existence of humanity or the willingness of superiority that makes all the difference.

On the other hand, Henry Townsend’s wife Caldonia is also worth mentioning regarding her same kind of ideas on slavery with her husband. But first, due to the importance of referring to religion and God in *The Known World*, beginning this paragraph with her religious perspective will be proper considering the subject analysed right before. As being the black wife of a black slave master, Caldonia’s personality shows that Henry and Caldonia can be described as a best match. According to Robert Lee Edwards as reflected in his thesis, Henry’s “property transfers to his childless wife, Caldonia Townsend, who uses her new authority to maintain Henry’s vision” (2020: 20). In this sense, it can be asserted that Caldonia does not want to let down her deceased husband who is supposed to be, according to Caldonia, a successful slave holder and seemingly to be rewarded in God’s heaven:

Henry had been a good master, his widow decided, as good as they come. Yes, he sometimes had to ration the food he gave them. But that was not his fault—had God sent down more food, Henry would certainly have given it to them. Henry was only the middleman in that particular transaction. Yes, he had to have some slaves beaten, but those were the ones who would not do what was right and proper. Spare the rod ..., the Bible warned. Her husband had done the best he could, and on Judgment Day his slaves would stand before God and testify to that fact (181).

It is so ironic to observe these ideas of Caldonia about the enslaved people by her husband and the way how she justifies Henry for being a ‘good’ owner. There is like no way to come up with a reasonable deduction in terms of calling a slave master as

a good master. Nonetheless, she manages that in an unbelievable way. This extract can be interpreted as Caldonia Townsend's inner struggle about finding out some positive answers in order to view her husband as a decent man. While doing so, she puts the blame on God since it is all because of God if Henry has some difficulty to feed his slaves or has to beat them. The other ironic detail is the fact that Caldonia knows very well that once before, Henry promises that "he would be a master different from any other, the kind of shepherd master God had intended. He had been vague, talking of good food for his slaves, no whippings, short and happy days in the fields" (180). All these plans of her husband seems meaningless and nothing but a waste after seeing that the promise he gives fades away. Furthermore, such a contradiction proves that the desire for power changes the plans or ideas of human beings. Humans yield to superiority so readily. Just like the way Henry gives up on his rather positive future plans about being a good master, his wife Caldonia tries to justify her husband in her mind and believes that Henry's slaves would testify for their 'beloved' master. No matter how good a slave-master can be (as if such a thing can be possible), as long as the slave-master status exists between them, nothing can be good about it. The character of Caldonia highlights that Jones does not only wish to shatter the familiar pattern of slavery, but he also pays attention to the shift in gender status. Katherine Clay Bassard expresses in her article, *Imagining Other Worlds: Race, Gender, and the "Power Line" in Edward P. Jones's The Known World* that "male and female black slaveowners in this text troubles our usual ways of discussing issues of race, gender and slavery as a clearly delineated set of power relations" (2008: 407). These effective issues can actually be transparent and as a result of transparency, humans can cross limits regardless of boundaries of race, religion and also gender, as Caldonia proves. But, this transparency does not mean that it will bring equality. On the contrary, it strengthens these boundaries much more thanks to the internalised feeling of superiority within human beings. As Caldonia has this feeling, she aims to make the power she takes from her husband permanent. The speech she gives to the slaves about the matter of their position after the death of Henry, clearly highlights this aim of her:

"You know now that our Henry has left us," she said to her slaves. "Left us for good, left us for heaven. Pray for him. Give him all your prayers. He cared about you all, and I have no less care than he did. I have no less love." She had not considered beforehand what she would say. Every word was not original, was part of something she had heard somewhere

else, something her father may have told her as a bedtime story, something Fern Elston may have long ago put into Caldonia's head and the heads of dozens of other students. Caldonia said to the slaves, "Please do not worry yourselves. I am here and I will not be going anywhere. And you will be with me. We will be together in all of this. God stands with us. God will give us many days, good and bright days, good and joyful days. Your master had work to do, your master wanted better things for you and your children and this world, and I want them for you as well. Please do not worry. God stands with us." Something she had read in a book, written by a white man in a different time and place. Henry had always said that he wanted to be a better master than any white man he had ever known. He did not understand that the kind of world he wanted to create was doomed before he had even spoken the first syllable of the word *master* (63-64).

The extract above can be regarded as one of the significant parts of *The Known World*. Caldonia speaks to the slaves without considering the fact of their actually being slaves. Clearly, they do not acknowledge Henry as their father or an affectionate person who cares them only for the sake of unity or friendship. Although everyone knows the reality, Caldonia prefers to ignore all the violence, discrimination and the humiliating position of slavery. The narrator likens Caldonia's speech to that of the white men and at the same time, the narrator points out Henry's wish to be better than a white man. These two contradict with one another. Regarding that the wife and husband share the same perspective of slavery, it is impossible to be better by following the footsteps of white masters. In this respect, David Ikard highlights that Henry's dream of becoming a better master is "willfully delusional" since "such mastery is inextricably tied to erasing the humanity of the enslaved" (2011: 79). Besides that, Caldonia keeps using God as a tool to reach the slaves and make them believe that God approves of slavery and its continuation. She claims that Henry desires the best for his slaves but, she does not say what he desires for their well-being. It can be interpreted that the reason why she does not give any detail about it can be seen as the fact that there is nothing to say. The better things Henry wants for his slaves can be defined as a bad lie told by Caldonia. The masters only consider their own profit by taking advantage of slaves. In this regard, Caldonia does not consider freeing her slaves and tries to fulfill her role as the loyal wife of the master Henry. It looks like Caldonia Townsend sees life in rose-tinted glasses and ignores what is really going on around her by means of the brutality of slavery. Although she stands as an affectionate black woman, she is a part of the chain of discrimination by turning a blind eye to its reality and brutality. However, it is also note-worthy to emphasise another black who badly supports the institution of

slavery: Caldonia's mother Maude Newman. It is reflected in the novel that Maude can be regarded as a detestable woman, as her perspective of slavery puts forward:

"My poor widow child," Maude said again.

"Mama, please. Please don't give me this today. Tomorrow. The day after tomorrow, but not today."

"The legacy is your future, Caldonia, and that can't wait. I wish it could, but no. All else can, but not the legacy." For Maude, the legacy meant slaves and land, the foundation of wealth. Her fear was that Caldonia, in her grief, would consider selling the slaves, along with the land, as if to accomplish some wish Henry, tied to the want and need of a material world, had been too afraid to try to fulfill in life. "I don't want you to be like your father, mired in so much grief he didn't know right from wrong" (180).

It will not be wrong to say that Maude is a manipulative woman who is self-oriented. She tries to make sure that her daughter is not going to sell her slaves left by Henry. In other words, Maude wants Caldonia to share the same ideas with herself. Compared to each other, it is obvious that Maude Newman is much more materialistic than Caldonia, apart from the fact that they are in the same boat in terms of slave owning. What makes Maude anxious is the possibility of Caldonia's selling her slaves just like her father. That's why Maude calls them as legacy as if having slaves can be something to be proud of. About the matter of Caldonia's father, the reader is allowed to have a very vital information in *The Known World*. It is the shocking and secret truth that Caldonia's father and Maude's husband, Tilmon Newman is actually poisoned by his own wife with pie, coffee and meat full of arsenic due to the fact that Tilmon has some plans to sell his slaves to be as innocent as a new-born baby in the presence of God (184). The truth of Maude's being a murderer tells much about her wicked personality and proves that humanity has no chance against superiority and discrimination. She carries an enormous desire to use her power over the less-privileged ones which are slaves in the case of her. Apparently, she does not feel any remorse for killing her husband or owning slaves. Also, the narrator puts forward that Maude "rented out many of her slaves; each leased slave could bring in as much as \$25 a year, and the renter was responsible for meals and upkeep while renting the slave, so just about all of the \$25 was profit" (246). It can be said that slavery is seen as a real business including buying, selling and renting. But, of course, it is not a surprise to see Maude renting slaves considering her cold-blooded nature and how far she can push the boundaries of wickedness. After taking the control of plantation, Caldonia, too, has some issues to

deal with in his plantation as a woman owner. By the way, it is notable to state that according to historical facts, free blacks turned into female blacks through time and as a consequence, the most of the African-American slave owners turned out to be women holders (Bassard, 2008: 413). This information proves the presence and activity of the black women slave-owners in the novel. One of the issues she has to think about is the problem of slaves' escape. In relation to such problems, it is significant to note an incident. Caldonia becomes curious about whether she is going to receive money from the insurance company for her three runaway slaves (322). It sounds so weird that there is a firm which insures slaves so that the casualty of owners can be compensated if a slave escapes or dies. According to the slave holders, a death or a slave's escape is nothing more than a loss of property. On the other hand, Caldonia Townsend has some ideas about these slaves besides the insurancy as reflected by the narrator:

Patrollers may have taken advantage of the women and killed them all to cover the crime. But why kill them if the crime was only rape? Raping a slave would not bring the law down on them. In many minds, raping a slave was not even a crime. Killing property was the greater crime. She wrote Bennett a pass, then she wrote a letter explaining to Sheriff Skiffington what she knew. She told Moses to keep an eye on everyone until the matter could be straightened out (299).

It can be seen in the passage that Caldonia considers that her runaway women slaves, referring to Priscilla and Alice, may be raped and killed. But then, it is stated that raping a slave is not even a crime. It shows how naturally she approaches to the subject as the omniscient narrator lets the reader come into her inner thoughts. All the examples about Caldonia Townsend along with her mother Maude demonstrate that black women slave-owners have an undeniable role in taking over the practice of enslavement from men and manage it as they know very well how to discriminate, abuse and dominate weaker human beings. Considering that, Caldonia and Maude are essential characters in *The Known World* in terms of reflecting the unusual shift in master-slave relationship. It is also significant to note another black woman slave-owner, Fern Elston who will be mentioned and analysed in the following lines of this chapter. In addition to that, there is one more point about the extract given above which deserves mentioning. It is the power of the patrollers stated before that makes sense after learning the brutal fact that abusing slaves is not considered as a crime in the eyes of the system of law. As it is known that individuality of slaves has no importance in the institution of slavery, patrollers do more than only catching up the

slaves who have escaped. The extract highlights that they believe in a kind of an internalised feeling of superiority mentioned in many of parts of this thesis. That's how they abuse slaves or any other people whom they regard as inferior. In this regard, the character, Barnum Kinsey comes to the fore as a white slave patroller who is inferior to other whites. Kinsey is "considered by everyone to be the poorest white man in the county, 'saved,' as one neighbor said, 'from bein a nigger only by the color of his skin' " (42). Once more, it is seen that power line is changeable as the novel puts forward. He is even confronted and accused by other patrollers, Oden Peoples and Travis for warning them to let go Augustus Townsend as he is a free black: " 'You'll take it and you'll like it,' Travis said, taking out his pistol and again aiming it at Barnum. 'You takin the nigger side now? [...] 'Yeah, thas what it is,' Oden said. 'Takin the nigger side against the white man?'" (217). Clearly, the slave patrollers abuse their power over Barnum Kinsey and humiliate him. Paul Ardoin implies that "Barnum retreats into a multi-day bender for want of a special space within space, 'some kinda light' inside of which a person can stand 'and declare what he knows without retribution' or threat of being called 'a nigger kisser or somethin like that' " (2013: 650). In a way, Barnum chooses to be a drunker consciously in order to escape from reality of discrimination and to create a free space for himself. Nevertheless, the system of slavery or society itself does not let its less-privileged members have free ideas. Superiority or in other words, the power of the privileged takes every decision. On the other hand, it is so interesting that Oden Peoples despite being a Cherokee defends whites and abuses Barnum Kinsey for saying a reasonable thing. Considering Barnum, David Ikard underlines that "slave patrollers Harvey and Oden, [...] might view him as a traitor for supporting an African American man over white-identified men" (2011: 72). In *The Known World*, ironically, the non-Westerners whiten and behave like the Westerners. It is another sign which proves the tendency of human kind as a whole towards discrimination and power. Who may support whose right is unknown. A Westerner may support a non-Westerner or a non-Westerner may support a Westerner as it appears. It is all related to the matter of superiority. Hence, one does not need to be white to have the feeling of superiority and to discriminate someone. The non-Western characters who perform discrimination in the novel prove that the idea of being superior is already rooted within themselves since they are so delighted to be superior.

Related to the influence of black slave-owners in *The Known World*, it is significant to analyse another black slave-owner, Fern Elston who stands forward as an effective figure in Henry Townsend's life of mastery. It is known about her that she is "the school teacher for free black children in Manchester County, and she had taught Henry who was then her first and only dark-skinned, former slave, adult student" in addition to the fact that she "owned twelve slaves" along with her husband (Kirlew, 2014: 79-83). The way how Fern Elston internalises being superior and slavery system comes to the fore through her dominant language when she looks down on her slaves:

Ramsey left the barn. Fern left off picking off straw and stepped closer to Jebediah. "You will stay here until you learn some manners, until you learn you cannot get up and walk about like some free man." [...] "This barn has been here many years, and it will stand many more with you in it if you cannot learn manners" [...] Fern never liked to flog slaves; for every whip mark on one slave's back, she estimated that his value came down \$5. But there were some unforgivable matters in the world. (256-57).

It is pretty clear that Fern Elston, same as the other black masters analysed previously, has a good command of slavery. She may even be better than a white master. The narrator expresses that the man who sells Jebediah to Fern Elston "thought he was dealing with a white woman and he was never to know any different" (255). The powerful impression Fern gives to the people around her in terms performing her works as a master, seems undeniable. According to David Ikard, "even as she identifies black despite having light enough skin to pass as white, Fern is an avid, if conflicted, colorist who evaluates intellect, morality, and personhood through a white supremacist ideological lens" (2011: 81). What an irony is that a black human shines out as a colorist. To some extent, it would have been tolerated if the respondent of her performance of discrimination had been upon the whites regarding the white superiority the blacks were exposed to. Yet, the party she discriminates is her own kin which is the reason of such an ironic situation. Her behaviours indicate that she is nothing less than a white slave holder and similar to The Townsend couple, she contributes to the hegemonic power of her country. Therefore, thanks to a character as Fern Elston, it is once more proved that the non-Westerners can practise discrimination besides the Westerners and abuse their power over the less-privileged ones, such as the slaves in the case of *The Known World*.

In addition to all the points stated and analysed till now, the very end of the novel deserves to be mentioned in this chapter in order to make the rest of this analysis much more meaningful. Caldonia Townsend's brother, Calvin Newman appears as an outstanding character at the end of *The Known World*. Unlike the perspectives of his mother and sister, Calvin can be interpreted as a sort of a black character who refuses slavery concerning the immoral side of it. Previously in the novel, the narrator emphasises his distinctive personality in terms of slavery compared to his mother Maude, the unknown murderer of his father:

He and his mother had thirteen slaves to their names, but he was not a happy young man. Whenever he talked to her about freeing them, as he often did, Maude, his mother, would call them his legacy and say that people with all their faculties did not sell off their legacies (66).

Rather than his mother and sister, he seems more like his father whose will of selling his slaves mentioned before. What makes Calvin is an outstanding character as has been noted before is not only the fact that he supports anti-slavery but also, it is the fact that he serves as a tool to convey what he experiences in the city of Washington via the letter he writes to Caldonia. In the city, Calvin comes across three people in which he probably would not think of encountering. These familiar faces are his sister's escaped slaves who are briefly mentioned in this chapter before. It is known that Moses sends his wife Priscilla and son Jamie to freedom along with another slave, Alice who is generally known as mad in the novel (296). Then, it is seen that they end up in the city according to Calvin's letter at the end of the novel which will be analysed in detail afterwards. In this regard, it is significant to indicate the reason why Moses suddenly wants to send his son and wife is related to his desire to be the new owner of the plantation and the free husband of Caldonia concerning his little affair with the deceased master's wife, Caldonia:

That evening was the first time Moses would think that his wife and child could not live in the same world with him and Caldonia. Had they made love in silence, as before, he would not have begun to think beyond himself. But she had spoken of tomorrow, and that meant more tomorrows after that. Where did a slave wife and a slave son fit in with a man who was on his way to being freed and then marrying a free woman? On his way to becoming Mr. Townsend? (292-93).

Moses considers his affair with Caldonia as a way to get rid of his enslaved position. According to Moses, his wife and son are nothing but obstacles on his way to freedom and masterhood. However, it is an illusion due to the fact that Caldonia does

not have a plan in terms of marrying a man who is her slave. On the contrary, it appears that she can not even bear to hear Moses asking her when she will free him to be “a proper husband anyway with authority over everyone and everything”: “Please, Moses, I don't want to talk about this.’ Freeing him had been on her mind but she had never put a day and a time to it” (324-25). Moses’s personality shows that he is ambitious enough to be a supremacist, yet he can not get what he designs in his mind. Moses makes way for the three slaves to build a new life unwittingly by sending Priscilla, Jamie and Alice away and this is how Calvin comes across them as a result. When Calvin unexpectedly meets them in Washington, he seems excited by the works of art he sees in the wall of the dining room of a hotel he goes in and reflects it all through his letter as mentioned before:

It is, my Dear Caldonia, a kind of map of life of the County of Manchester, Virginia. But a "map" is such a poor word for such a wondrous thing. It is a map of life made with every kind of art man has ever thought to represent himself. Yes, clay. Yes, paint. Yes, cloth. There are no people on this "map," just all the houses and barns and roads and cemeteries and wells in our Manchester. It is what God sees when He looks down on Manchester. At the bottom right-hand corner of this Creation there were but two stitched words. Alice Night.

I stood transfixed. At about two-thirty there were few people in the dining room, only those preparing the table for the evening meals. I stepped closer to this Vision, which was held away from all by a blue rope of hemp. I raised my hand to it, not to touch but to try to feel more of what was emanating. Someone behind me said quietly, 'Please, do not touch.' I turned and saw Moses's Priscilla. Her hands were confidently behind her back, her clothing impeccable. I knew in those few seconds that whatever she had been in Virginia, she was that no more.

It was then that I noticed over her shoulder another Creation of the same materials, paint, clay and cloth. I had been so captivated by the living map of the County that I had not turned to see the other Wonder on the opposite wall. [...] It is your plantation, and again, it is what God sees when He looks down. There is nothing missing, not a cabin, not a barn, not a chicken, not a horse. Not a single person is missing. I suspect that if I were to count the blades of grass, the number would be correct as it was once when the creator of this work knew that world And again, in the bottom right-hand corner are the stitched words "Alice Night." (384-85).

This part of the letter in which Calvin demonstrates his observations shows that Priscilla, Jamie and Alice live in a free and totally changed life beyond the boundaries of ‘the known world’ in The Townsend plantation. It can be said that the two works painted by Alice reflect the members and pieces of the County and the plantation in a very detailed way. They are reflected through Alice’s point of view. It is asserted by Theresa Rooney that “she liberates her mind through madness, and in the end this leads to physical freedom” (2008: 3). It is known that “Alice suffers a mental illness that is the result of severe head trauma” (2008: 26). However, as stated

by Rooney, the mental freedom she has in the country due to her illness helps her build a free life in the city. Alice can be regarded as a character who lives out of 'the known world' of slavery. On the other hand, it can be suggested that Alice may not really be mad, but pretending to be so considering her state of mind that is suddenly recovered when she warns Priscilla to stop crying and get ready to escape in an organising manner and besides that Moses reflects that she fools people about being mad (296-97). In addition to that, it can also be asserted that her illness can be related to the severity of slavery besides the head trauma and that's why once she gets her freedom through escaping, she turns into normality. Even though the cause of her mental condition is not really known in terms of whether she is really mad or pretending, one point is obvious that Jones wanted to create a character like Alice in order to highlight the significance of freedom or in other words, the need for a free private environment, and to indicate how unbearable the burden of slavery is on the shoulders of the slaves. The importance of Alice along with the other slaves who have escaped like Priscilla and Jamie is the fact that they represent the possibility of running away from slavery by all means besides its being a difficult attempt for slaves. They prove that the former slaves such as Henry and Caldonia may choose not to be a part of the hegemonic system and instead, may build a life of their own in a place where they can feel themselves independent and happy. It means that abusing someone is a matter of choice. The end of *The Known World* makes it clear that human beings generally want to follow their internalised feeling of superiority over humanity as they enjoy playing with people like puppets. In other respects, in order to analyse the significance of Alice's works of art, it can be reflected that Alice wants to remember where she comes from as her previous life represents hardships, inhumanity and even madness. To be thankful for what she has now, she keeps these works. Additionally, Alice's works may allude to the name of the novel because every detail painted precisely in the works expresses the accustomed life style of the slaves. This shows how the discrimination performed by the black masters in this case, tortures slaves and leaves unforgettable memories in their minds. In this regard, Silje Hegna Borgen points out that "her maps serve as eternal memories of the past and reminders of the legacy of slavery [...] because this world is about to be changed for ever" as the American Civil War began in the very same date of Calvin's letter even though the war did not change the understanding of slavery from upside down

(2014: 56-57). It can not change because humans have been satisfied with some groups' always being weak and inferior so that they can be called as the superior ones. In this sense, Carolyn Vellenga Berman's article can be highlighted since she stresses that *The Known World* portrays "the lives of slaves and slave owners on a fictive plantation in Virginia in 1855, ten years before the Thirteenth Amendment ended US slavery" and she also underlines that "this was an enclosed world on the verge of implosion in which an entrenched dependence on slave labor still felt unalterable" (Berman, 2009: 233). It is unalterable since the oppression and the abuse of human beings can not be overcome by themselves. Moreover, the very end of Calvin's letter has an undeniable significance as well due to the fact that Jones ends the letter by referring to a sort of a redemption of Calvin:

I spoke to Alice thus: "I hope you have been well." What I feared most at that moment is what I still fear: that they would remember my history, that I, no matter what I had always said to the contrary, owned people of our Race. I feared that they would send me away, and even as I write you now, I am still afraid.

Alice responded to me, "I been good as God keeps me."

I am "laboring" here now, at the Hotel, the Restaurant, and the Saloon, trying to make myself as indispensable as possible and yet trying to stay out of the way, lest someone remember my history and they cast me out. I would be sick unto death if I were sent away. After years of being a nurse to Mother, my work here is not taxing. I am happy when I get up in the morning and I am happy when I lay my head down at night.

All that is here is owned by Alice, Priscilla and all the people who work here, many of them, to be sure, runaways. My room is on the top floor of the hotel where everyone lives. It is a nice room and it fits me well. Jamie comes and goes as a student in a school for colored children. He is as fine a young man as any father or mother could want (386).

Staying in the hotel and laboring there now seem good for Calvin's heart and mind as apparently reflected. He sees it as an opportunity to repent on behalf of himself and his family. In spite of the fact that he does not support his mother's owning slaves, it does not change that in a way he owns them, too. However, he finds peace in this new place. Having the perspective of an abolitionist, Calvin can be seen as the only character who passes the boundaries of the institution of slavery within his own class. He is even afraid of being banished by Priscilla and Alice. Through Calvin, Edward P. Jones aims to emphasize that again it is up to the decision of human beings to be on the side of humanity or superiority. It proves that human beings willingly choose the side of superiority and discriminate one another. It appears that Jones creates Calvin to show how the life and decisions of Henry or other black slave-

masters might be. Yet, her not responding to the parts regarding the new life of her slaves having escaped, once more proves that Caldonia's ideas and personality can be defined to be totally different from her brother (387). Unlike his sister, Calvin is a person "who can see just beyond the received understandings of the time, just over the local boundaries as it were" (Feight, 2018: 114). This detail about Caldonia highlights that some facts and situations do not change or no one wants to change them.

To conclude this chapter, it is seen that the way how the unusual narrative of Edward P. Jones sheds light on the discrimination performed by the African-Americans is analysed as seen by striking examples from *The Known World*. Jones's detailed representations clearly show that the attempts to prove one's superiority have not only been practised by the Westerners. Both groups can come together with the aim of discriminating and abusing the less-privileged ones as it is observed in the relationship of Henry Townsend and William Robbins. By way of jumping to the past and present in his narrative, Jones gives his reader a broad timeline in terms of the life of his protagonist in addition to various characters presented in the novel. According to what is analysed in this chapter, it can be indicated that the life of Henry is developed in the reflection of his 'dear' master Robbins whose influence on Henry is undeniable. Henry is a sort of human being who feels himself lucky to come across Robbins since his former master enables him to expose his internalised feeling of superiority. Despite his father's attempts and wishes to make a decent and morally cultivated man out of his son, Henry fulfills his primitive ambitions by turning out to be a slave-owner and treats his slaves in an opposite way of what he promises himself in the beginning of everything. Henry's following the immoral image of Robbins and similarly, Moses's admiration and imitation of Henry evoke the post-colonialist, Homi Bhabha's concept of mimicry which shows a pattern of repeating "the coloniser's ways and discourse" (Bertens, 2001: 208) It is pointed out by Berna Köseoğlu in her article *The Immigrant Experience in V.S. Naipaul's The Enigma of Arrival and Z. Smith's White Teeth: An Exploration of Homi Bhabha's Postcolonial Theory* that the formerly colonised mimicked the behaviors of the Westerners "in order to be accepted by the former coloniser in the post-colonial epoch" (2017: 18). In the same manner, these characters, too, are inspired by someone else's powerful

position even though their aim in doing so is gaining superiority to discriminate people rather than only being accepted. It can be asserted that what they look for is to be just like the supremacists, after gaining power when they have been accepted. On the other hand, it can be observed in this chapter that Jones's novel highlights the perspectives of many characters besides Henry. The people who touch his life or somehow connected to him like Caldonia, Maude or Fern play an important role as well, in addition to the slaves whose presence signifies so much as their aim is to satisfy the master's greediness. The blacks are forced to serve and satisfy their black masters. It is obvious that the problematic and ironic nature of this sentence reflects itself in the fictional universe of *The Known World* and very sadly, in the real world as analysed in the first chapter. Henry, Caldonia, Maude and Fern who appear as the prominent black slave-owners in the novel not only substantiate the performance of discrimination practised by the non-Westerners similar to the way Dr. Aziz does in another century, but also confirm that humanity has nearly no chance against the power of superiority.

CONCLUSION

Struggle for power can be observed as one of the main subjects of human beings' lives throughout the history and the history highlights that power comes to the fore as such a 'precious treasure' of people. It is so valuable that they have even forgotten the meaning of humanity and what it refers to. Among various inhumane actions people performed on other people, it is hard to forget colonialism as it has been emphasised in this thesis as well. This wretched period imprinted on the memories of people so deeply that even today it is studied by a reasonable amount of people. To tell the truth, it is not a shocking surprise to see its influence considering the fact that discriminating someone according to religion, race, culture or some other factor is not limited to the colonial era. Discrimination is a universal and an omnitemporal matter of fact. In this thesis, Chapter I demonstrates that the tendency of discrimination shows itself in different time periods in history. In order to be the best at any matter, human beings are so ready to discriminate one another in highly cruel and unacceptable ways. It is something related to the priorities of people or in other words, about what they really desire in this life. Apparently, superiority comes on the very top of their list of priorities as the history and especially the colonial period prove. In this regard, discrimination appears as a 'perfect' and preferred way of doing it. For the sake of gaining power, people discriminate one another and what is worse is the fact that they do it by way of owning human beings as their own properties or humiliating them.

It can be said that it is a generally acknowledged truth that the Westerners have an undeniable impact on the practical way of performing discrimination which is colonising the less-privileged communities. As it is reflected in Chapter I, the Westerners abused their power in the colonial period in order to make sure that they have an absolute control on the indigenous people of the East. It is their ambition which caused the Easterners to find themselves in degraded positions in comparison to the Westerners. In this sense, it is known and analysed in this thesis that England

functioned as the ultimate power of the colonial system. Establishing colonies in overseas enabled her to be more and more powerful in the world scene and led her to become an undeniably strong empire. Even though it seems like a big success according to the British Empire, it is obvious that colonising communities and enslaving their members can be defined as nothing but inhumanity and brutality. Colonialism and slavery show that discrimination is a path chosen by the power seekers who see domination as the only solution to be powerful. When the matter is gaining power, the way how it is gained becomes meaningless and usually carried out via abuse as the period of colonialism puts forward. The suffering of the colonised meant nothing for the British colonisers since they only considered their own profit and prosperity over the enslaved bodies and the fertile lands of the non-Westerners. It can be interpreted that they spoiled themselves with the good stuff they got from the countries like India as referred in Chapter I and made up a lie that the Westerners help the non-Westerners experience the beauties of civilisation. Surely, controlling the freedom of a human being and playing with her/him like a puppet can not be related to any sort of sense of help. Although it is very clear that it is an excuse to continue to perform the inhumane practice of colonisation, this corrupted system kept going and apparently, no one wanted to demolish it. This is due to the reason that if a person is given power or take it by force, it is not easy to reject such power. That is why, discrimination never goes anywhere and shows itself in different time periods, under different names and has been practised by different people. As it is seen in this thesis, colonialism employed by the English. The other and notorious one is of course the American colonialism.

Obviously, the discovery of the American continent paved the way for a lot of changes in the world. The one and relatively the most drastic change can be named as the effects of colonisation on the residents of the American land. Apart from the natives of America whose secondary position is clear after the arrival of the Western settlers, the forced journey of the Africans to the new world has led them to be enslaved in an entirely new and unfamiliar place. The fact of their being brought to America for labour force has created a hybrid race called the African-Americans whose struggling history influenced many fields such as literature. The reason why they are known well is due to the discrimination performed upon them. It can be said

that it is impossible to view American colonialism regardless of the existence of the non-Western population. What takes attention about this hybrid race is the Western colonisers' ignorance of their existence as human beings. The miserable lifestyle chosen on behalf of the slaves by the Western colonisers as shown through examples in the first chapter proves that humanity can not find a place to flourish within human beings when it comes to power and domination. In spite of the fact that discovering a new land is very important along with the transportation of valuable materials, none of these justify the inhumane fact that slavery played a highly significant role in order to flourish the Western mother lands with newly found treasures and soils. The Western colonists both enriched the continent they found and the continent they came from economically. It is very sad that the price of it caused them to get much more corrupted even though they were not interested in the corruption they gave rise to. It was nothing but a geographical exploration which prospered their economies and gave them military power, as well. Nonetheless, colonising the continent along with numerous human beings proved the victory of discrimination and power against humanity. Considering American history's incontestable relation to slavery and colonialism, it can be claimed that discovering America only gave them an opportunity to accomplish what has already been in their minds in relation to their internalised feeling of superiority. It is like trying to find some ways to fill the hunger of power within themselves. In this regard, colonialism worked very well for both England and America even though it malfunctioned humanity.

Colonialism is mostly known with the brutality of the Westerners. As they were generally in a strong position against the non-Westerners, they abused their power over the weaker non-Western populations. By supporting the truth with many reasons such as race, religion etc., the Westerners discriminated the Easterners which is unacceptable and irrational. Nonetheless, discrimination sounded a totally normal and ordinary performance for them as they colonised the less-privileged people for being inferior by all means in history. That is why, the fact that every human being deserves freedom and equality does not stand as a valid fact for the Westerners. All the merciless practices carried in the colonial era prove this claim. The imperialist world view of people like the imperialist Cecil Rhodes, as mentioned as a suitable example in the first chapter, sheds light on how these people were capable of abusing

their superior position and used the non-Westerners as vehicles to be more powerful. The Westerners devalued the presence of the non-Westerners and defined them only as lower humans whose existence was just significant as long as they lived as slaves. Enslavement, humiliation and inferiority are some of the words to describe the colonised according to a coloniser and it is evident in history that the Westerners can be regarded as the source of such labels. It can be found in this thesis that differences among human beings are not tolerated like race, religion or another notion and in order to be powerful or to preserve the power one already has, dichotomies become inevitable. Colonialism shows that discrimination causes dichotomies which establish irreversible social gaps between human beings. To tell the truth, performers of discrimination do not care about social gaps. It can be interpreted that this is what they are actually looking for because they are the cause of it and they voluntarily create discrimination by saying that Eurocentrism is a privilege. For example, being an English is highly important for the English in addition to being a Westerner as it is reflected in the first chapter. The way how the English can excessively be proud of their race is emphasized in E.M. Forster's *A Passage to India* by the Anglo-Indian coloniser characters. Also, it can be stated that religion is abused by the Westerners in order to prove the superiority of Christianity which does not make sense since religions like races can not be defined as more or less valued. However, unfortunately, human beings are very good at finding excuses to discriminate other humans and prove their so called superiority. The importance and effects of the Western discrimination are analysed in the first chapter of this thesis through the British people's colonisation and the African slaves' misery in America in order to draw attention to the novels analysed in this thesis.

It is for sure that the Westerners have a huge role in the emergence of colonialism and discrimination but, it does not indicate that they are totally responsible for discrimination as it can not be attributed only to a specific group of people. Claiming superiority and discriminating other human beings in terms of race, religion etc. to gain power can be performed by human beings in general without only regarding the Westerners or the non-Westerners. Considering the notoriety of the West in colonising the non-Westerners, performing discrimination must be regarded not even the least matter concerned by the non-Westerners. Nevertheless,

the history proves the opposite of it and shows examples of non-Westerners performing discrimination. The Hindu-Muslim conflicts in history come to the fore as note-worthy struggles experienced within the same society and proves that discrimination may occur in this way, too. It does not always have to be between different races. In the Indian example, discrimination shows itself because of religion. As Indians discriminate one another for believing in various religions, they can not bear the existence of someone whose religion is different. This problem appears as an ongoing struggle for a very long time and dates back to centuries ago as it is analysed in this thesis. Even in the 21st century, this religious struggle stands as a gap between the Indians. It can be interpreted that discrimination rather than unification means a lot to human beings. It is like an endless battle for people. The struggling Indians analysed in this thesis as well, are very willing to go after their internalised feeling of superiority. As long as both the Hindu and the Muslim sides defend the superiority of what they value, nothing can be solved. Everyone wants to make sure that their own values must be the ones appreciated as one and only and for the sake of it they discriminate. That is why, neither the Westerners nor the non-Westerners are different from one another in terms discrimination thanks to the human kind's egoist nature. The position of humanity signifies nothing in the eyes of them, only being the superior one by all means matters. Superiority in race, religion or something else can make people do really bad deeds including the non-Westerners. What a shame it is to see the already fallen position of humanity! In this regard, the protagonist of Forster's *A Passage to India* is no less than an Anglo-Indian coloniser by means of discriminating someone who is from a different race or religion. Besides this note-worthy issue, it is analysed in this thesis that historical data of the 19th century proves that some free black slaves owned other black slaves in America. It is unbelievably true and highlights the fact that having power changes everything. Holding black slaves were highly common among the released black slaves. It seems that black's slave owning was surprisingly as normal as white's slave owning. Through the part concerning the abuse practised by non-Westerners analysed in this thesis, Edward P. Jones's *The Known World* becomes evident as analysed in the third chapter along with Forster's *A Passage to India* and these two novels support this thesis since discrimination performed by the non-Westerners is definitely an incontrovertible fact.

Dr. Aziz, the main character of E.M. Forster's famous novel analysed in this thesis as the first work proves the non-Western discrimination as a sort of a reflection of the Hindu-Muslim hatred took place in real life. Aziz can not bear the existence of the British as the very beginning of the novel puts forward and states that he wants them to go away from Indian soils. However, as the novel moves on, it comes to the fore very obviously that the British colonisers are not the only group of people that Aziz does not like. Besides that, he is not contented with the Hindus in India. The reason of his dislike can be related to his being a Muslim. Aziz's outstanding incident with the Brahmany is one of the significant details which gives clue about his hatred of the Hindus. Aziz is an ironic character because he criticises the English but at the same time he behaves in the same way with them by discriminating a value which is not favoured by himself. The way how religion like race turns out to be a significant agent and becomes a priority can be found in Forster's *A Passage to India* as analysed in this thesis. The discriminative behaviours of a non-Westerner who is under the colonial rule and who experiences the hardships of colonialism are highly enough to support this thesis. Obviously, a non-Westerner can easily degrade a group of people who believes in a different religion and ironically discriminates the people of his own country. It shows that discrimination can be seen within the same society, as well. Aziz's dream to build a new Muslim ruled nation out of India stated by himself at the very end of the novel proves that he does not even care to ask the opinions of the other Indians coming from various religious sects. This reminds of the selfish understanding of the Western colonisers who view the non-Westerners as creatures who are nothing more than inferior, irrational and weak beings. Surprisingly, Aziz behaves his new English friends whom he thinks of so precious very friendly. According to Aziz, it seems that a British person's warm attitude is very unexpected and the approach of Fielding, Mrs. Moore and Adela Quested to welcome him as their friends means so much for him in terms of a possibility of social unification. Nonetheless, such a unification is not possible, not only because of the secondary and colonised position of Aziz in front of the English but also because of the reason that Aziz can not even get along with the Hindus who are from India just like him. On the one hand, he is so ready to compromise to make his English guests comfortable wherever he is with them including the Marabar Caves outing in

which his secondary position troubles him till the end of the trial. But, on the other hand, he acts far from showing even the least respect to the Hindus and humiliates them by gossiping about them or showing violence to their values as analysed in Chapter II. His disrespectful attitudes and labelling the Hindus with humiliation makes him an equal to a Westerner in terms of the discrimination he performs. It is also note-worthy to mention that Aziz even favours his new friends more than his Muslim friends by forgetting the fact that these new friends are in India as a part of the system of colonialism even though they appear welcoming. It should not be forgotten that Mrs. Moore and Adela are there to visit the coloniser city magistrate Ronny Heaslop who is the son of Mrs. Moore and love interest of Adela whereas Fielding is a teacher whose presence in India is a contribution the presence of the British rule in the country. All these demonstrate that colonialism is in the middle of their friendship with Aziz and although they seem that they are not like the Turtons, they are aware of the Empire's superior position in "The Jewel of the Crown". It is analysed in this thesis that Mrs. Moore refers to the neediness of the Indians and the British people's mission to help them which shows the internalised feeling of superiority within them. Considering these facts, it is interesting to see Aziz as a hypocrite who shows affection to the colonisers but not to his own people. This is due to the reason that Aziz has the understanding of a coloniser. His discriminative behaviours signify that he internalises the superiority of the Muslims and Afghans who are his ancestors so much that he would colonise the non-Muslim Indians to make sure of Indian's being ruled by only Muslims as it is analysed in Chapter II. Also, it is important to note in this last part that Aziz is not looking for a social unification in which every human being welcomes one another without any discrimination or abuse of power. This is an existing reality Aziz points out thanks to people who go after superiority and discrimination consciously. It can be said that Forster throughout his novel emphasises that notions such as friendship or humanity signify less than gaining superiority by all means and having control over people. Even the author of this well-known and praised novel has no hope for a change and precisely observes the Indians and the British as discriminative poles as referred in this thesis. Besides, Aziz is not the only Indian who discriminates the Hindus. The character, Mr. Haq analysed in this thesis loves to show his disgust of the Hindus and their religious activities. He points out his hatred while talking in a conversation

about the Hindus supported by Aziz as well and believes that the Hindus are disease spreaders. By creating a character like Mr. Haq, Forster concentrates on the importance of the secondary characters and moreover indicates that the religious conflict is not only practised by Aziz. Regarding this novel, lastly, it is important to refer to Aziz's gender based discrimination. He degrades both Adela Quested and his own wife by physical appearance and intellectuality. This shows that discrimination may come to the fore disguised in different matters and it is analysed that gender is one of these matters. He can be considered as such a narrow-minded person who even does not hesitate humiliating his deceased wife. Aziz's character as a whole proves that discrimination is not only valid in the West and performed only by the Westerners. In every time and place and by every people, this wicked activity can be carried out and Aziz is the fictional proof of that as the first novel analysed in this thesis puts forward.

The second and the last novel analysed in this thesis comes with a protagonist named Henry Townsend from a different century than Dr. Aziz in *A Passage to India*. The novelist Edward P. Jones is a black who writes a novel about a less mentioned issue, which is the blacks' owning other blacks in the colonial period of America. The main character Henry Townsend portrays a life emphasised with slave holding. As analysed in detail in Chapter III, Henry is a black person whose mind is set on repeating the lifestyle and moral norms of his former white slave master William Robbins. Along with the negative influence of Robbins, Henry turns out to be a slave master as well regardless of his biological father Augustus Townsend's disapproval. Even though the effect of Robbins can not be denied in Henry's becoming a slave owner, it is Henry himself who is highly contented with his supreme position as a slave master. Jones lets his readers come face to face with the story of Henry in addition to the secondary characters in order to show how shocking some truths can be. It is a novel which sheds light on the reality of blacks' being owned by free blacks. Henry Townsend uses the freedom given to him by his father Augustus to become another member of the chain of slavery. It will not be wrong to state that his morality is controlled by his ambitions that can easily be called primitive. The way how he beats his slaves and forces them to be tortured as a punishment clearly proves that fact. Moreover, it is reflected in the novel and

analysed in this thesis that he is not alone in this wicked and inhumane business. His being not alone in slavery means that he is not the only black who turns slavery into a sort of a business. Particularly his wife Caldonia comes into view especially after her husband dies. She starts to take the control of the plantation. It is seen that she tries to justify her husband by talking about him as a beloved slave master as if such a thing can be possible. By being a part of what Henry owns, Caldonia appears as much as guilty as her husband. She does not even think of leaving her status as the owner. Her not giving up on the slaves and not giving Moses his freedom signify that she likes the privileges she has for being a slave holder. Additionally, Caldonia's mother Maude Newman is no less than her daughter or groom. On the contrary, she is worse. Apart from murdering her own husband Tilmon Newman as he has some plans of not owning slaves anymore, Maude wants to make sure that Caldonia keeps her slaves because this would be a mistake if she let go of her treasures. The only living member of the Newmans who has anti-slavery tendencies is Calvin Newman. The anti-slavery lifestyle he chooses for himself in Washington where her sister's former runaway slaves Priscilla, Jamie and Alice build a free life is the proof of that situation. Nevertheless, the end of the novel proves that a drastic and positive change would be so meaningless to expect as long as people insisted on gaining superiority and abusing their power regardless of being a Westerner or a non-Westerner. That's why the escape of few slaves does not mean that this system having been built on the idea of unfair superiority can ever be renounced by free will. Fern Elston is a similar character whose life is built on slave owning. She is a dominant woman who does not hesitate using her power over her slaves as it is analysed in this thesis. She discriminates other blacks by supporting that she has a lighter skin color which can be enough for her to be seen as a white. She is a woman whose difference can not be identified compared to a white coloniser in terms of her discriminative attitudes rather than her lighter skin. The black slave owners in the novel as a whole prove that the performers of discrimination are not only the Westerners but also the non-Westerners. The ferocity practised by the non-Westerners in *The Known World* shows that humanity is ignored by people for the sake superiority.

In the light of the points reflected in the previous lines and analysed throughout this thesis, it can obviously be seen that E.M. Forster's *A Passage to*

India and Edward P. Jones's *The Known World* both together demonstrate and prove how discrimination is performed by not only the Westerners but also the non-Westerners for the sake of obtaining superiority especially concerning notions of race and religion. Clearly, it is the aim of this thesis to examine the relatively unfamiliar practice of discrimination employed by the non-Westerners. It is discussed that the discriminative attitudes of the non-Western characters analysed in this study show that they internalise being superior by any means just like the way the Westerners do. Both Dr. Aziz and Henry Townsend together with the supporting characters willingly exercise discrimination by only considering their own superiority and values. While Aziz ignores the presence of the Hindus and humiliates them very harshly as he believes that India must be a Muslim land, former black slave Henry begins to own his black slaves and leaves a plantation behind by being proud of what he has through abusing his power. Unlike Henry, Aziz can not go beyond insulting and showing violence to the Hindus. Again unlike Henry who makes his dreams come true by turning out to be a slave-owner, Aziz just wishes to fulfill his way of discrimination via witnessing India's being taken over by Muslim Afghans as reflected at the end of the novel. But yet, this difference does not change the fact that their understandings of discrimination are the same. The characters analysed in this thesis have the potential to let the reader question the potential of human beings to discriminate each other as a whole without exception. They present a drastic perspective of discrimination particularly concerning the colonial era and offer a rereading of colonialism. All in all, it is deduced in this thesis that discrimination is preferred by the non-Westerners in addition to the Westerners in order to gain power and to prove the superiority of their own values in a selfish manner by destroying humanity.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES

Forster, E.M. (1979). *A Passage to India*: Penguin Classics.

Jones, Edward P. (2003). *The Known World*: Amistad.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Abu Baker, Ahmad M.S. (2006). "Rethinking Identity: The Coloniser in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*". *Nebula*, 3(2-3), 68-85. 16 February 2021.

Amoko, Apollo (2006). "Race and Postcoloniality." Eds. Simon Malpas and Paul Wake. *The Routledge Companion To Critical Theory*. Oxfordshire: Routledge, 127-139.

Andersson, Tobias (2006). "The Development of Henry Townsend in *The Known World* by Edward P. Jones." *A60 Literary Seminar*, U of Lund, Lund.

Ardoin, Paul (2013). "Space, Aesthetic Power, And True Falsity In "The Known World". *Studies in the Novel*, 45(4), 638-654. JSTOR/29 March 2021.

Ateş, Davut (2008). "Industrial Revolution: Impetus Behind The Globalization Process". *Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, 15(2), 31-48. dergipark/12 October 2020.

Aydemir, Gül Deniz Demirel (2015). *Why Can't We Still Be Friends?: Othering In Intercultural Relationships In E. M. Forster's A Passage To India And Zadie Smith's White Teeth*. Master's Thesis, The Graduate School Of Social Sciences, METU, Ankara.

Bassard, Katherine Clay (2008). "Imagining Other Worlds: Race, Gender, and the "Power Line" in Edward P. Jones's "The Known World". *African American Review*, 42(3/4), 407-419. JSTOR/30 July 2020.

BBC News (2017). <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-42219773/>
1 February 2021.

Beck, Roger B., et al. (2009). *World History Patterns of Interaction*. USA: Littell McDougal.

Berlin, Ira (1998). *Many Thousands Gone The First Two Centuries Of Slavery In North America*. Massachusetts: The Belknap Press Of Harvard UP.

- Berman, Carolyn Vellenga (2009). "The Known World in World Literature: Bakhtin, Glissant, and Edward P. Jones". *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, 42(2), 231-238. JSTOR/19 April 2021.
- Bertens, Hans (2001). *Literary Theory: the Basics*: Routledge.
- Blake, W.O. (1860). *The History Of Slavery And The Slave Trade, Ancient And Modern. The Forms Of Slavery That Prevalled In Ancient Nations, Particularly In Greece And Rome. The African Slave Trade And The Political History Of Slavery In The United States*. Ohio: H. Miller.
- Blaut, J.M. (1989). "Colonialism and the Rise of Capitalism". *Science & Society*, 53(3), 260-296. JSTOR/10 October 2020.
- Borgen, Silje Hegna (2014). Escaping Expectations A Close Reading of Edward P. Jones' The Known World through Tropes of the Neo-Slave Narrative. Master's Thesis, U of Bergen, Bergen.
- Bristow, Joseph (1996). "Passage to E.M. Forster: Race, Homosexuality, and the 'Unmanageable Streams' of Empire" *Kunapipi*, 18(1), 138-157. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/kunappi/vol18/iss1/14/17> February 2021.
- Burra, Peter (1979). "Peter Burra's Introduction to Everyman Edition." E.M. Forster. *A Passage to India*. Cambridge: Penguin Classics, 327-8.
- Carey, Hilary M. (2011). *God's Empire Religion and Colonialism in the British World, c. 1801–1908*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Césaire, Aimé (1972). *Discourse on Colonialism*: Monthly Review Press.
- Chatterjee, Ipsita (2012). "How are they othered? Globalisation, identity and violence in an Indian city". *The Geographical Journal*, 178(2), 134-146. JSTOR/16 November 2020.
- Childs, Peter (2007). "A Passage to India." Ed. David Bradshaw. *The Cambridge Companion To E.M. Forster*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 188-208.
- Chin, Jeremiah (2014). "Red Law, White Supremacy: Cherokee Freedmen, Tribal Sovereignty, and the Colonial Feedback Loop" *The John Marshall Law Review*, 47(4), 1228-1268. 24 Mart 2021.
- Christensen, Timothy (2006). "Bearing the White Man's Burden: Misrecognition and Cultural Difference in E. M. Forster's 'A Passage to India' ". *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, 39(2), 155-178. JSTOR/ 3 March 2021.
- Dimock, Edward C., et. al. (2019). "Hinduism." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Hinduism> /17 November 2020.

- Dolin, Kieran (1994). "Freedom, Uncertainty, and Diversity: A Passage to India as a Critique of Imperialist Law". *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 36(3), 328-352. JSTOR/ 3 March 2021.
- Eagleton, Terry (2005). *The English Novel An Introduction*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing.
- Edwards, Robert Lee (2020). *Revising A Tradition: Analyses Of The Works Of Edward P. Jones*. PhD Dissertation, U of Clark Atlanta, Georgia.
- Eltis, Davis and Stanley L. Engerman (2000). "The Importance of Slavery and the Slave Trade to Industrializing Britain". *The Journal of Economic History*, 6(1), 123-144. JSTOR/26 October 2020.
- Fanon, Frantz (1963). *The Wretched Of The Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Feight, Janet (2018). "The Poetics of African-American Un/Reality in Edward P. Jones's 'The Known World'". *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, 51(1), 103-119. JSTOR/29 March 2021.
- Gibbs, Jeremy Ryan (2019). *Beyond Postsouthern: The Return Of The Rural In Twenty-First Century Southern Literature*. PhD Dissertation, U of Southern Mississippi, Mississippi.
- Greenblatt, Stephen (2006). *The Norton Anthology of English Literature 8th Ed. Vol.2*. New York: W • W • Norton & Company.
- Habib, M.A.B. (2005). *A History of Literary Criticism From Plato to the Present*. Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Halliburton, Jr., R. (1975). "Free Black Owners of Slaves: A Reappraisal of the Woodson Thesis". *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*, 76(3), 129-142. JSTOR/11 October 2020.
- Hodge, Carl Cavanagh (2008). *Encyclopedia of the Age of Imperialism, 1800–1914, Volumes 1 & 2*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Horvath, Ronald J. (1972). "A Definition of Colonialism". *Current Anthropology*, 13(1), 45-57. JSTOR/19 September 2020.
- Ikard, David (2011). "White Supremacy under Fire: The Unrewarded Perspective in Edward P. Jones's 'The Known World'". *Multi-Ethnic Literature of the United States (MELUS)*, 36(3), 63-85. JSTOR/31 March 2020.
- Jackson, Tommie L. (2009). "Slave Patrols In Edward P. Jones' 'The Known World'". *CLA Journal*, 53(2), 162-177. JSTOR/26 December 2021.

- Jajja, Mohammad Ayub (2013). "A Passage To India: The Colonial Discourse And The Representation Of India And Indians As Stereotypes". *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 29(1), 38-48. <http://www.gomal.pk/GUJR/PDF/June-2013/38-48.A%20passage,%20jajja.pdf> / 7 February 2021.
- Kanak, Azimur Rashid (2014). *India in English Literature: Reading Kim (1901), A Passage to India (1924) and Midnight's Children (1981)*. Master's Thesis, Department of English and Humanities, U of BRAC, Dhaka.
- Kirlew, Shauna Morgan (2014). "A Problematic Agency: The Power of Capital and a Burgeoning Black Middle Class in Edward P. Jones's *The Known World*". *South Atlantic Modern Language Association*, 79(1-2), 68-87. JSTOR/29 November 2021.
- Kley, Antje (2012). "Narratives of Recognition in Contemporary American Fiction: Edward P. Jones's "The Known World" and Richard Powers's "The Echo Maker". *Amerikastudien / American Studies*, 57(4), 643-661. JSTOR/30 July 2020.
- Knafo, Saki (2009). <https://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/06/magazine/06jonze-t.html> / 9 February 2021.
- Köseoğlu, Berna (2017). "The Immigrant Experience in V.S. Naipaul's *The Enigma of Arrival* and Z. Smith's *White Teeth*: An Exploration of Homi Bhabha's Postcolonial Theory." Ed. Ingrid Muenstermann. *People's Movements in the 21st Century Risks Challenges and Benefits*. Zagreb: InTech, 15-34.
- Kozlowski, Darrell J. (2010). *Key Concepts in American History: Colonialism*. New York: DWJ BOOKS LLC.
- Kuchta, Todd (2003). "Suburbia, 'Ressentiment', and the End of Empire in 'A Passage to India' ". *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, 36(3), 307-329. JSTOR/ 3 March 2021.
- Levine, Robert S. (2017). *The Norton Anthology Of American Literature Vol. A Beginnings To 1820*. New York: W • W • Norton & Company.
- Lightner, David L. and Alexander M. Ragan (2005). "Were African American Slaveholders Benevolent or Exploitative? A Quantitative Approach". *The Journal of Southern History*, LXXI(3), 535-558. JSTOR/11 October 2020.
- Ling-yu, Lin (2019). "A Study of A Passage to India Through the Lens of Orientalism". *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, 9(4), 376-381. davidpublishing/16 February 2021.
- Loomba, Ania (2005). *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.

- Malpas, Simon and Paul Wake (2006). *The Routledge Companion To Critical Theory*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels (1968). *On Colonialism*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- McQuade, Donald, Robert Atwan and Martha Banta et al. (1999). *The Harper Single Volume American Literature*. New York: Longman.
- Mdudumane, Khayaletu (2005). The Historical Productions Of Cecil John Rhodes In 20th Century Cape Town. Master's Thesis, The Department of History, U of the Western Cape, Cape Town.
- Mills, James H. (2000). *Madness, Cannabis and Colonialism The 'Native-Only' Lunatic Asylums of British India, 1857–1900*. New York: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Minority Rights Group International Briefing (2017). "A Narrowing Space: Violence and discrimination against India's religious minorities." minorityrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/MRG_Rep_India_Jun17-2.pdf.
- Morel, Edmund D. (1904). *King Leopold's Rule In Africa*. London: William Heinemann.
- Naghshbandi, Frouzan and Bahman Zarrinjooee (2015). "Englishness in E. M. Forster's A Passage to India". *JNAS*, 4(1), 23-29. <http://jnasci.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/JNASCI-2015-23-29.pdf> / 24 April 2020.
- Nishat, Zubi (2005). Akbar's Religious Policy (1542-1605): A Select Annotated Bibliography. Master's Thesis, Department Of Library And Information Science, U of Aligarh Muslim, Aligarh.
- Nunn, Nathan and Nancy Qian (2010). "The Columbian Exchange: A History of Disease, Food, and Ideas". *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24(2): 163-188. JSTOR/6 November 2020.
- Parry, Benita (1998). "Materiality and Mystification in 'A Passage to India' ". *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, 31(2), 174-194. JSTOR/ 3 March 2021.
- Rooney, Theresa (2008). Rewriting Boundaries: Identity, Freedom, And The Reinvention Of The Neo-Slave Narrative In Edward P. Jones's The Known World. Master's Thesis, U of Clemson, South Carolina.
- Rushdy, Ashraf H.A. (2016). "Slavery and Historical Memory in Late-Twentieth-Century Fiction." Ed. Ezra Tawil. *The Cambridge Companion to Slavery in American Literature*. New York: Cambridge UP, 236-249.
- Said, Edward (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Schutte, Sebastian (2019). "Politics or Prejudice? Explaining Individual-Level Hostilities in India's Hindu-Muslim Conflict." *Peace Research Institute*, 1-34.
- Schwarz, Philip J. (1987). "Emancipators, Protectors, and Anomalies: Free Black Slaveowners in Virginia". *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 95(3), 317-338. JSTOR/11 October 2020.
- Sidiki, Coulibaly Aboubacar and Maiga Abida Aboubacrine (2018). "Racial and Gender Implications in African Female Literature: an Afrocentric Feminist Reading of Emecheta's Second Class Citizen". *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences (IJELS)*, 3(6), 966-973. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijels.3.6.7/> 6 May 2020.
- Tayeb, Lamia (2004). "The Inscription of Cultural Bafflement in E. M. Forster's 'A Passage to India' ". *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*, 6(1), 37-59. JSTOR/ 3 March 2021.
- Veloso de Abreu, Alexandre (2013). "Allegory of Dominance: British Power in Rudyard Kipling's Rikki-tikki-tavi". *Journal of Literature and Art Studies*, 3(11), 687-691. davidpublisher/28 October 2020.
- Vergheese, Ajay (2018). "Did Hindu-Muslim conflicts in India really start with British rule?" *Scroll.in*. <https://scroll.in/article/880832/did-hindu-muslim-conflicts-in-india-really-start-with-british-rule/> 16 November 2020.
- Von Albertine, Rudolf (1969). "The Impact of Two World Wars on the Decline of Colonialism". *Journal of Contemporary History*, 4(1), 17-35. JSTOR/21 October 2020.
- Week (2019). <https://www.theweek.co.uk/history/93820/british-empire-how-big-was-it-and-why-did-it-collapse/> 22 October 2020.
- Welton, Mark D. (2008). "International Law and Slavery". *Military Review*, January-February, 57-65 Army University Press/4 November 2020.
- Woelfel, Craig Bradshaw (2012). "Stopping at the Stone: Rethinking Belief (and Non-Belief) in Modernism Via 'A Passage to India' ". *Twentieth Century Literature*, 58(1), 26-59. JSTOR/ 3 March 2021.
- Yousafzai, Gulzar Jalal and Qabil Khan (2011). "Rudeness, Race, Racism and Racialism in E.M. Forster's 'A Passage to India' ". *The Dialogue*, 6(1), 77-92. 14 April 2020.
- Zarei, Bahador and Jalil Delshad zad (2015). "Explaining of the Role of Geographical Explorations in Changing of the International Boundaries and the Political Map of the World". *Indian Journal Of Applied Research*, 5(5): 19-24. [https://www.worldwidejournals.com/indian-journal-of-applied-research-\(IJAR\)/](https://www.worldwidejournals.com/indian-journal-of-applied-research-(IJAR)/) 25 October 2021.

Zawadka, Beata (2009). "Past Into Present And Back: A (Mis)Use Of The Southern History In Edward P. Jones' 'The Known World' ". *Annales Neophilologiarum*,(3), 87-97. <https://bazhum.muzhp.pl/artikul/lista/?generalQuery=Past+into+Present+and+Back+%3A+A+%28Mis%29Use+of+the+Southern+History+in+Edward+P.+Jones%E2%80%99+%22The+Known+World%22/21> September 2020.

Zins, H.S. (1998). "Joseph Conrad and British critics of colonialism". Pula: *Botswana Journal of African Studies*, 12(1&2), 58-68. digital.lib.msu.edu/projects/africanjournals/ 22 October 2020.

