

Unraveling the System of Representation of the Colonizer in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924) and Louis Bertrand's *La Cina* (1901)

Fatima BENSIDHOUM

English Department

Faculty of Letters and Languages, University of Mouloud Mammeri

Tizi Ouzou, Algeria

Abstract

The main focus of this research paper is to study one of the key concepts of postcolonial critical theory which is "Identity and Representation". It is based upon a textual reading and analysis of two texts as representatives of colonial literature written about British-India and French-Algeria, namely *A Passage to India* by E.M. Forster and *La Cina* by Louis Bertrand. Relying on Albert Memmi's foundational postcolonial theory developed in his *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, we assume that both texts obey and reflect a similar ideological discourse. The narratives are revealed to operate through a complex system which tends to (re)fashion and to (re)mold the identity of both the colonizer and the colonized. We demonstrate that Forster and Bertrand shape the main characters into two types which Memmi labels as: 'the Colonizer who Accepts' and 'the Colonizer who Refuses'. We have also showed that the writers though belonging to different imperial powers and writing in two different languages, they could not but adhere and support the colonial practices of their countries. What comes also of this study is that Forster, though most often known for his Liberalism, vehicles a racial discourse which accounts for the superiority of the British colonizer. Bertrand is much more racist and jingoist, his attitudes are reminders of what Achebe said about Conrad; 'a bloody racist'.

Key Words: A Passage to India, colonial discourse, E.M. Forster, identity, La Cina, Louis Bertrand, representation, 'the colonizer who accepts', 'the colonizer who refuses.'

Cites as: BENSIDHOUM, F. (2019). Unraveling the System of Representation of the Colonizer in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924) and Louis Bertrand's *La Cina* (1901). *Arab World English Journal for Translation & Literary Studies*, 3 (2) 56-65.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol3no2.6>

Introduction

“The colonial situation manufactures both the colonialists, just as it manufactures the colonized” (Memmi, 1974, p. 56). The thrust of the present study is to read two representative texts of colonial literature through the Memmian concepts exposed in his foundational critical book *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. The literary works that we intend to shed light on are E. M. Forster’s *A Passage to India* (1924) and Louis Bertrand’s *La Cina* (1901). What we intend to demonstrate is that literature, be it English or French, is an ‘Invisible Bullet’—using Greenblatt words— that acts as an ideological weapon to support and accompany colonialism. Literature, as Edward Said (1993) rightly contends cannot be politically innocent. The issues of identity and representation of the colonizer in the respective novels are to be analyzed with special focus on the ideological outlooks of both writers. In the discussion below, we explore the discourse of identity in the colonial context and its intricate relationship with what Memmi recognizes as ‘the Colonizer who Accepts’ and ‘the Colonizer who Refuses. Hopefully, we are to prove that the writings devoted to British-India and French-Algeria, as the sample texts disclose, vehicle and operate through a similar ideological stance which shapes and forges the image of the colonizer to obey the exigencies of imperialism.

To our best knowledge, little attention to date has been accorded to the study of both writers and their works together. No study has been developed or joined the two works despite the fact that they are loaded with significant insights which make them paramount in studying issues related to colonial literature written about British-India and French-Algeria. Indeed, the present study focuses and is particularly interested in exploring the way Forster and Bertrand work through their novels to depict the colonial system as engaged in (re)furbishing, (re)molding and (re)shaping the identity of the colonizer. The analysis is, as said, conducted following the theoretical auspices of Memmi’s critical canon.

Discussion

1)-Memmi’s Notion of ‘The Colonizer who Accepts’ in the Novels

Memmi defines ‘the colonizer who accepts’ as the colonizer who accepts his role as usurper because of his illegitimate privilege. The theorist assigns the term “colonialist” to the colonizer who agrees to be a colonizer. He maintains that this type “will defend his role and must absolve himself by demonstrating the merits of his culture and the faults of the native’s” (1974, p.52). Memmi (1974) also states that the way in which the colonialist wants to see himself plays a considerable role in the emergence of his final portrait.

A Passage to India and *La Cina* displays two devotees of the colonialist ideology who put no avail to embrace the new identity it imposes. Both Ronny and Claude are young men who easily adopt the colonial situation and act according to its principles. The change which is entailed by the move and the establishment in the colony is part and parcel of colonialism. Memmi contends that the identity of the colonizer undergoes a radical change by the new role and status colonialism confers to the colonizer: “being a mediocre man in his country, the colonizer suddenly turns to a master, giving orders, earning money which he cannot dream about, having facilities at his disposal” (p.53). The colonizer in the colony enjoys privileges that he never dreamt of in his

homeland. Ronny, the protagonist of *A Passage*, becomes the City Magistrate in India. He is portrayed as a 'farouche' and diehard colonialist whose engagement and commitment to the ethos of British imperialism are unshaken. Mrs Moore is even shocked at the metamorphosis of her son: "The traces of young's man humanitarianism had sloughed off" and deemed that "one touch of regret...would have made him a different man, and the British Empire a different institution" (Forster, 1979, p. 42). After the Bridge Party, the old woman reproaches the way Ronny treats the Indians. She remarks addressing him: "you never used to judge people like this at home". Ronny asserts that "India isn't home" and vehemently uses phrases and arguments that the narrator qualifies as "picked up from older officials" (p. 26) and as belonging to the British order. When turning to Bertrand's novel, the change is rather announced and applauded right at the beginning of the narrative. Claude and Michèle headed to Algeria hoping for a new practical life far from the 'isms' of a sterile existence of the French society in the closing years of the 1890's. Both young men are inclined to action and convinced of 'la nécessité d'agir' and sought an active, fruitful life: "nous somme enervés d'émotions factices, accablés de science sterile [...] Il faut tout jeter à bas, il faut tout jeter à bas, il faut nous refaire de font en comble [...] Il faut nous refaire: Nous referons là-bas!" (Bertrand, 1901, p.5) [" We are fed up of false emotions, overwhelmed with sterile science [...] We have to throw everything down, We have to throw everything down, we have to rebuild ourselves from top to bottom [...] We have to do it again: we'll do it again!"]. Claude asserted.

In fact, the move to Algeria is heralded to bring a remarkable change in the destiny of Claude and Michèle who are initially described as educated and learned. The narrator stresses the fact that the protagonists lead a passive and monotonous life in France devoid of practicality and serious engagement. Their lives are, as held by them, 'spoilt' with idealism and abstractism of science, religion and art. The new colony provided for both a new existence and a promising future. Michele inherited a large estate from his father General Botterie, almost two thousand hectares, and a villa in Tipaza built in a Roman style. He is also encouraged to apply for candidacy as a deputy of Algiers and is thus offered many opportunities to emerge as a well-established politician who enjoyed both the power of money and influence. Claude, on his behalf, having sold his land in Lorraine, wanted to invest his money in a thriving business. In this context, Memmi (1974) asserts that the change involved in moving to a colony must first of all bring a substantial profit and the best possible definition of a colony is:

A place where one earns more and spends less. You go to a colony because jobs are guaranteed, wages high, careers more rapid and business more profitable. The young graduate is offered a position, the public servant a higher rank, the businessman substantially lower taxes, the industrialist raw materials and labor at attractive prices (p. 48)

In their work, both Forster and Randau maintained that India and Algeria, respectively, are to trace and to forge a new identity but also a distinctive personality to their characters. Ronny and Claude underwent a metamorphosis that made even their close relatives hardly recognize them. Besides his mother who recognizes in her son a different man, Adela also notices the big change in Ronny and declares that "India had developed sides of his character that she had never admired. His self-complacency, his censoriousness, his lack of subtlety" (Forster, 1979, p. 68). In addition,

Claude is to be reproached by his close friend Michèle who accuses him of opportunism and corruption; he even breaks relation with him: “Il me fait horreur ton opportunisme morale [...] Va_t’en, faux ami! Va-t’en! Je te chasse!” (Bertrand, 1901, p. 314). [How awful is your moral opportunism [...] Go, fake friend! Go! I'm chasing you!]

In contrast to Ronny's strong and faithful support of colonialism, the individualism and humanism of Mrs Moore and Adela are rejected because they endanger the ethos and principles of the British colonial system. Their insistence on having relation with the Indians and their sympathy with them is seen as a threat to the social order based on racism. When Mrs Moore tells her son about her discussion with Aziz, Ronny inquires about the feelings of the doctor in an attempt to assess the potential threat he would represent:

Did you gather he was well-disposed?” Ignorant of the force of this question, she replied. Yes, quite, after the first moment.” “I mean, generally. Did he seem to tolerate us—*the brutal conqueror, the sun-dried bureaucrat*, that sort of thing? (Italics added) (Forster, 1979, p.25)

The italicized words denote that the colonizer is aware of the ‘other’s’ gaze to him as a usurper. The same attitude is also found in *La Cina* when Sidi Brahim, an assimilated native, is thought to hide hostile feelings towards the colonizer: “Qui sait les pensées qui couvent au fond de son coeur? Vous prétendez qu’il est comme tous les Arabes, que son silence ne cache que le vide ou la vanité puérole. Qu’en savez vous?... Mais il peut se lever un jour contre vous, ce petit fils de l’Emir” (Bertrand, 1901, p. 370). [“Who knows the thoughts that smoulder at the bottom of his heart? You claim that he is like all Arabs, that his silence hides only the emptiness or the childish vanity. What do you know?... But he may rise one day against you, this little son of the Emir”]. The colonizer assumes a negative approach and endorses a series of negations towards the colonized that, according to him, can never be fully scrutable. He is constantly suspected, challenged and opposed in the least insignificant action.

To justify colonization, false images need to be created so that the subjugation makes sense. These images become the identity of the colonized. Memmi (1974) notes that “one after another, all the qualities which make a man of the colonized crumble away” (p. 129). One universal image that has been associated with the native people is the fatalistic laziness. The Indians in *A Passage* are said to be with parasitic tendencies owing to their ‘indolence’. Aziz is thought pretending illness by Ronny and Major Callendar who sent Panna Lal to inquire after him. The narrator’s and Major Callendar’s views amount to the same as regards Oriental behavior: “Major Callendar always believed the worst of natives” (Forster, 1979, p. 93). The elaborated image of the lazy is also found in Bertrand. The Alsatian landowner Emile Schirrer expresses his belief in the ingratitude of the Arabs who, according to him, are irremediably indolent. When his foreman Jule Berton informs him about the absence of two workers, he immediately orders for their dismissal: “réglez leur compte ce soir et vous me les flanquerez à la porte! [...] D’ailleurs ils sont continuelement en ripailles. Quant se n’est pas la fête du Mouton, c’est la fete de la Grenade...Ça

n'en finit plus" [give them their due tonight and kick them out! [...] Besides, they're always on holiday. When it is not the Festival of the Sheep, it is the Feast of Grenada... It never ends] (Bertrand, 1901, p. 400). Laziness is obviously seen as constitutional in the very nature of the colonized for whatever they may undertake, whatever zeal they may apply could never be anything but lazy.

Three factors typify the colonizer according to Memmi. These are profit, privilege and usurpation (p.48). Forster and Bertrand invest them in their characters that embody the shallowness of the white men's burden. The colonizers claim that they have the mission of "bringing light to the colonised's ignominious darkness" (pp. 74-76). Hence, Ronny announces that "we're out here to do justice and keep the peace. That's my sentiments". A pretension to which Mrs Moore protest saying:

"Your sentiments are those of a god," [...] Trying to recover his temper, he said, 'India likes gods.' 'And Englishmen, like posing as gods' [...] and the country's got to put up with us, gods or no gods [...]' [...] We're not pleasant in India and don't intend to be pleasant. We've something more important to do' (Forster, 1924, p. 41)

So, under the cloak of bringing civilization and order, Ronny and through him, the British colonizer justifies his acts and policies. When, for example, the Mohurram troubles take place, Ronny feels elated because the riots "proved that the British were necessary to India; there would certainly have been bloodshed without them" (p. 82). Undoubtedly, what is at stake in his assertion is the fact that the Indians are in a dire need of the British to install justice and peace, for 'without them the country is in a state of total chaos and disorder'. Perhaps the most significant and revealing instance which accounts for the hypocrisy of the civilization mission is the one encompassed in Ronny's words when his mother expresses her compassion and sympathy with the Indians saying that "India is part of the earth. And God has put us on the earth in order to love our neighbours and to show it, and He is omnipresent, even in India, to see how we are succeeding" (p. 42). Ronny answers without hiding his arrogance allowing the narrator's comment that he "approved of religion as long as it endorsed the National Anthem, but he objected when it attempted to influence his life" (p. 43). Thus, as Abu Baker asserts "Ronny's religion only conforms to the needs of the Empire" (2006, p. 78) which fosters the discrepancy between the colonizer and the colonized at a great scale to insure its permanence.

A similar civilization discourse enrobed in politics and religion is also to find its echoes in *La Cina* wherein Bertrand adopts a purely racist stance. The archbishop Monseigneur Puig incarnates to a great extent the Memmian conception of the colonizer which is pushed to its extreme. Throughout the novel, Mgr Puig is cast plotting, conspiring and planning to achieve purposes which are too far from those assigned to the church. The opportunist and profiteering spirit of the archbishop is made apparent when concerting with the Abbey Lalouette about the elections and the inherent profit they would gain in terms of allies and material gain. Having already the first candidate Carmelo in their hands "celui-là est à nous: avec de l'argent on en fera tout ce que l'on voudra!" [This one is ours: with money we will do whatever we want!] (Bertrand, 1901, p. 249), they planned to have the second candidate Michele and the third one Delieu and the

means to that end were immoral. In fact, Mgr Puig hankered after Michel's land and was too ambitious to enlarge the church properties; he even wanted to turn against him Father Lechapeller and the Jesuits of Lyon that supported his candidacy in case of refusal to sell him his estate. The abbey Lalouette states: "On pourrait lui démontrer que cette candidature serait préjudiciable au parti, qu'il se trompe sur le compte de M. Botteri, que ce jeune homme n'est pas un catholique sérieux ..." ["It could be shown that this nomination would be detrimental to the party, that it is mistaken on Mr. Botteri's account, that this young man is not a serious Catholic..."] but if he accepted "sans le mettre en avant, nous lui ferons donner de l'eau bénite de cour par *l'Espérance*, notre journal" ["without putting him forward, we will give him holy water from the Courtyard by *l'Espérance*, our newspaper"] (Bertrand, 1901, p.249). Mgr Puig harshly criticises the Cardinal Mgr Lespèze because of his commitment to convert the non-Christian with peaceful ways. For him the primary mission of the church is not to spread Christianity but to serve France and its "oeuvre civilisatrice". He declares:

Le devoir de l'église est tout tracé, c'est ce peuple neuf qu'il s'agit de conquérir et non les sauvages [...] Commençons par être riche et par posséder. Thésaurisons au lieu de jeter notre argent par les fenêtres pour l'émerveillement des badauds ! Ce pays qui nait a besoin de crédit pour s'outiller—supplantons les Juifs, ouvrons notre bourse aux colons, dont nous sommes surs en n'exigeant d'eux qu'un intérêt modéré [...] *Quand on a besoin d'argent, on ne regarde pas d'où il vient.* (p. 262)

[The duty of the Church is all traced, it is this new people that it is to conquer and not the Savages [...] Let's start by being rich and owning. Hoarding instead of throwing our money out of the Windows for the amazement of the onlookers! This country that is born needs credit to equip itself — supplant the Jews, open our purse to the settlers, of which we are sure, requiring only a moderate interest [...] *When you need money, you don't look where it comes from*] (Italics added)

The last chapter entitled 'Le Concile de Carthage' [The Council of Carthage] emphasizes and shows Mrg Puig as the embodiment of a mature colonizer who succeeds in achieving his goals. He was promoted to cardinalship and thanks to his tricky schemes, he gained government's privilege and was granted three thousand hectares.

Thus, Forster and Bertrand through Ronny, Claude and Mgr Puig respectively, supply a full portrayal of the colonizers who not merely accept colonialism but further its ends and support its practices. Still, colonialism is a complex situation which also gives birth to another type of 'colonizers who refuse', the instances of which are also to be found in both *A Passage to India* and *La Cina*.

2)- The Concept of 'The Colonizer who Refuses' in the Novels

In contrast with the notion of "colonialist who accepts", the "colonialist who refuses" is the one who "having discovered the economic, political and moral scandal of colonization, he can no longer agree become what his fellow citizens have become; he decides to remain, vowing not to accept colonization" (Memmi, 1974, p.56). This type of colonizers is to find its corresponding

example in Cyril Fielding and Michele Boterie in *A Passage to India* and *La Cina* respectively. The two characters fail to conform to the standards and adopt the ideologies of their countrymen. They prefer, either to side with the colonized, as it is the case of Fielding or, simply to remain indifferent with regards to the positive attitude of Michel.

Cyril Fielding refuses change and colonization and believes in racial friendship which makes him at odds with his British fellowmen. His belief that the world “is a globe of men who are trying to reach one another and can best do so by the help of goodwill plus culture and intelligence” was “a creed ill suited to Chandrapore” (p.52). In the same way, Michel who is initially zealous to change and ‘la nécessité d’agir, the necessity of action, fails to be like Claude and his fellows who embrace the colonial system and lived in accordance to its rules. He, for instance, rejects the opportunistic political schemes which his countrymen wanted him to be thrust so as to take advantage: “Tous les partis se confondent dans une égale malhonnêteté. Tous se traînent dans une même bassesse, tout ont peur des idées!” [All parties merge into equal dishonesty. They are all base and corrupt, all are afraid of ideas!] (Bertrand, 1901, p. 313). So, both of them feel and resist the injustice underlying the colonial situation in the name of a self-centered set of principles which resisted any adjustment.

Both Fielding and Michel do not have the racial feeling or antipathy their countrymen feel and show towards the Indian and the Algerian respectively. This attitude is quintessential in the colonial world to assure its permanence. In *A Passage to India*, Fielding befriends the Indians and takes the side of Dr Aziz when he was accused of attempting to rape Adela Quested. The narrator accounts for this saying that: “Fielding had no racial feeling...because he had matured in a different atmosphere, where the herd-instinct does not flourish” (Forster, 1979, p. 52). The “herd-instinct,” understood as the tendency to group oneself with one’s fellows, is made apparent in Aziz’s charge because Fielding/the colonizer, who is supposed to share the views of his countrymen, prefers to take the defense of Aziz/ the colonized. Mc Bryde is surprised that Fielding “had not rallied to the banner of race” (p.146) as a reaction to the supposed rape of Adella and warns him that “there’s no room for-well-personal views. The man who doesn’t toe the line is lost” (p.152). The Collector even reprimands him saying: “You can’t run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, at least not in this country”(p. 166). Likewise, in *La Cina*, Michele does not show derision or contempt towards the colonized. He even takes side with the persecuted Jews who undergoes harsh treatment and persecution during the anti-jewish crisis of the 1890’s. Perhaps the most important proof which attests for this is his thrust to defend an old Jew who is beaten by a frenzy crowd of anti-Semite students, thus acting against the principles of his own people. Michel even reacts against his own party which advocated and supported the anti-Jewish movement.

Memmi maintains that “humanitarian romanticism is looked upon in the colonies as a serious illness, the worst of all dangers” (p. 66). Consequently, the colonizer who has this illness suffers from the scorn and contempt of the other colonizers: “he is considered nothing but a traitor [...] His friends will become surly; his superiors will threaten him; even his wife will join and cry” (Ibid). Fielding is suspected of conspiracy and is blamed of the Mohurram troubles, he is even thought to be “a Japanese spy” (p. 218). Likewise, Michel suffers from the misjudgment and

ridicule. Mgr Puig considers him “un reveur, un dilettante, un catholique amateur, ayant des idées à lui—des idées absurdes” [“a dreamer, a dilettante, an Catholic enthusiast, having ideas to him — absurd ideas”] (p. 249). His close friend, Claude, quarrels and breaks relation with him in a significant verbal *tirailade* saying: “ta lacheté devant la vie m’indigne. Tu es une loque, tu es le déchet d’une génération... [your cowardice towards life disgust me. You are a wreck, you are the outcast of a generation] (p. 314). Even his wife reprimands and denounces him as a fake individual (358). Thus both characters suffer from their own humanitarian attitudes towards the colonized and are looked upon as endangering the colonial system because of their compassion and sympathy.

Both Fielding and Michele are rejected and marginalized against because of their humanistic attitude towards the colonized and the persecuted minority. Their refusal to adopt the same positions like their countrymen cost them a lot. Fielding is thought to “inspire confidence until he spoke”. The reader is warned of “an evil of brains in India, but woe to him through whom they are increased” (p. 52). Fielding, himself, is aware of the doubt and suspicion he inspires owing to his friendship with Aziz and his fair sentiments towards the Indians. “He regretted taking sides. To slink through India unlabelled was his aim. Henceforward he would be called ‘anti-British’ ‘seditious’-terms that bored him, and diminished his utility” (p. 155). The same goes with Michele who is condemned as a weak and effeminate individual, as someone who remains imprisoned in the past. He is deemed too sentimental and romantic to face reality or live in accordance with the prevailing events.

To refuse an ideology while continuing to live with its actual relationship,’ Memmi asserts, makes the colonizer live “his life under the sign of contradiction.” Contradiction deprives the colonizer “of all coherence and all tranquility” because “he participates in and benefits from those privileges which he half-heartedly denounced” (p.52). Thanks to his new status, Michele becomes a rich landowner who owns, by right of inheritance, two thousand hectares of a fertile land and a beautiful villa in Tipaza. But this does not grant him peace of mind and conscience because he, unlike Claude, refuses to deal with politics and to thrust himself in fructifying and enlarging his wealth. His withdrawal from candidacy and most outstandingly his decision to sell his land denote his inability to live in tune with the colonizer’s policy of exploitation. This is in a way or in another a tacit refusal of colonization and its practices. Indeed, unlike Fielding who ends with regaining or joining the camp of his countrymen espousing an Anglo-Indian, Michele breaks with his close friend, abandons politics and sell his large estate.

Though suffering from “humanitarian romanticism”, the colonizer, who refuses colonization, cannot get rid of the superiority complex. In other words, he “cannot help judging the colonized and their civilization”. “How can one deny that they are under-developed, that their customs are oddly changeable and their culture outdated?” The colonizer “admits to a fundamental difference between the colonized and himself” (p.22-25). In Forster’s novel, Fielding, who sympathizes with the Indians and who befriends Dr Aziz, cannot help but feeling a fundamental difference. He does not, or rather, cannot equate himself with the Indians. Several instances in the novel account for this. For instance, Aziz’s remark that Adela practically has no breasts makes

Fielding feel uneasy: “this deprived sensuality...was alien to his own emotions, and he felt a *barrier* between himself and Aziz whenever it arose” (p. 214). The same *barrier* is also felt when Fielding sent his Indian friends postcards from Venice. The narrator asserts that Fielding “feels that all of them would miss the joy he experienced now, the joy of form, and that this constituted a serious *barrier*” (p.250).

In *La Cina*, Bertrand, unlike Forster, does not bother to show the feeling of the colonizer towards the colonized because for him the colonized is of little importance. Bertrand not merely relegates the Algerians into an inferior position but, he completely eradicates and debars them from the scope of his novels. In this respect, Maurice Ricord contends that: “Nous savons qu’il ne faut pas chercher dans l’oeuvre de Louis Bertrand, ni l’Islam, ni l’indigène” (1947, p. 204-205) [“We know that we should not look in the works of Bertrand neither for Islam nor for the indigene”] Bertrand, does strongly reject and maintain the racial superiority of the European over the non-European. The author puts no avail in expressing his view against naturalization or assimilation of the ‘natives’. His characters express vehemently the belief in the absurdity of this policy. When an anti-Semite discussion is held in Michel’s villa whereby all the guests consider the illogicality of assimilation and express their racial hatred towards both the Arabs and the Jews, Duranti de la Bégassière maintains that assimilation is a vain sentimentality: “l’Arabe est inassimilable [...] Les Arabes, il n’en faut plus!...” [The Arabs are inassimilable [...] The Arabs are to be irrevocably excluded...] (p. 191). Another guest, Prince de Lamballe, thoroughly condemns assimilation because for him: “L’Arabe est comme le Juif !”, “il faut les traquer comme les Américains ont traqué les Peaux Rouges !” [“The Arab is like the Jew ! “we have to chase them as the Americans chased the Indians! ” (p. 191). Undoubtedly, for both Forster and Bertrand the colonized are definitely kept on a lower pedestal compared to their oppressors.

The twice fold representation of the colonizer underscores and accounts for the ambivalence colonialism creates within the colonial subject who proves to be a manipulable object in the hands of colonial power. What sort out also from the above analysis is that the authors are “constructions by current forms of ideology” and “thus the texts are the discursive formations engendered by conceptual and power configurations in history” (Abrams, 1999: 140).

Conclusion:

The study of representation of the Colonizer in Forster’s *A Passage to India* and *La Cina* using Albert Memmi’s foundational text *The Colonizer and the Colonized* shows us the double conceived identity the colonial system imposes on the colonizer. ‘The colonizers who A agents accept’ exemplified in *A Passage to India* by Ronny and in *La Cina* by Claude and Mgr Puig, thoroughly embrace the colonial system and adopt its practices. These colonialists are aware of their roles as usurpers and illegitimate possessors of privilege, for this they are depicted as strong defenders and farouche supporters of their roles. In contrast, ‘the colonizers who refuses’ as seen through Fielding and Michèle, respectively, recognize the colonial system as unjust; they are politically ineffective because they are plagued and overwhelmed with the worst and most serious illness –using the Memmian terminology- namely ‘humanitarian romanticism’. Yet, Fielding who joins the camp of his countrymen later in the novel proves the impossibility of the colonizer to

align himself with the colonized. Indeed, the “gulf” between the races created by the colonial system remains a serious barrier that casts shadows at the possibilities of friendship and equality between them. More important is the fact that Michèle’s end wallowing in the midst of his weakness and Claude’s active engagement in his new life as a colon do reinforce the creed of Bertrand that the colony’s future would be guaranteed by the likes of Claude. In one way or in another, both writers maintain that colonization is solely and should only be maintained by “the colonizers who accept.”

About the Author

Fatima BENSIDHOUM is a senior lecturer of British Literature at the Department of English, University Mouloud Mammeri of Tizi Ouzou, Algeria. She is currently doing a doctoral research in comparative literature with a particular focus on the literary relationships between French and British authors. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3736-5970>

References

- Abrams, M. H. (1999). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, New York: Heinle and Heinle.
- Abu-Baker, A. (2006). Rethinking Identity: The Colonizer in E. M. Forster’s *A Passage to India*. *Nebula* 3(2). 68-85
- Bertrand, L. (1901). *La Cina*, Paris: Albin-Michel.
- Forster, E. M. (1979). *A Passage to India*, London: Penguin Books
- Memmi, A. (1974). *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, London: Souvenir Press.
- Ricord, M. (1947). *Louis Bertrand L’Africain*, Paris: Fayard.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*, London: Vintage Book.