THE INTERIORS, Vol. 14, 2025, 275-280: ISSN 2319-4804

Colonial Encounter and the Limits of Liberal Humanism in E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India*

MD. RIYAZUDDIN

Abstract : E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* stands as a complex engagement with British colonialism in India, interrogating the moral and cultural contradictions of the imperial project through the lens of liberal humanism. Forster's advocacy of empathy, connection, and individual moral responsibility is evident throughout the narrative, especially in the idealistic but fraught friendship between Dr. Aziz and Mr. Fielding. Yet, the novel ultimately reveals the inadequacy of liberal humanist ideals in the face of the structural injustices and cultural alienation inherent in the colonial system. By examining the symbolism of the Marabar Caves, the disintegration of personal relationships, and the portrayal of institutional and epistemological divides, this paper explores how *A Passage to India* simultaneously embodies and critiques the limits of humanist reconciliation in a colonized world. Forster's novel acknowledges the philosophical appeal of "only connect," but undercuts its feasibility under imperial domination, marking an important transition in modern British literature from liberal idealism to postcolonial skepticism.

Keywords : Postmodernism; multiculturalism; interconnectedness; multilingualism; gaps and silences; deconstruction.

E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* (1924) is often considered the most significant literary engagement with the colonial relationship between Britain and India before independence. Written in the interwar period, the novel reflects Forster's personal ambivalence toward the British Empire, shaped by his own visit to India in 1912 and again in 1921. Rooted in Forster's belief in liberal humanism-an ethical system centered on empathy, rationalism, and individual moral integrity-the novel explores the possibility of cross-cultural understanding amidst racial, political, and religious tensions. Forster, like his character Fielding, appears committed to the idea that if people could "only connect," human relationships might transcend social and imperial divisions (*Howards End* 192). Yet, *A Passage to India* dramatizes the failure of this ideal. This paper argues that Forster's liberal humanism, though sincere, is ultimately

Received : 6th June, 2025; Accepted : 15th June, 2025

limited by its inability to dismantle or fully comprehend the structural violence of colonial rule. The novel thus becomes a site where the contradictions of liberal humanism are laid bare in the context of empire.

Liberal Humanism and the Forsterian Ethic

Forster's liberal humanism derives from Enlightenment values and Victorian moral philosophy, filtered through his Bloomsbury sensibilities and personal ethics. In his essay *What I Believe*, Forster declares, "I do not believe in Belief. But this is an age of Faith, and there are so many militant creeds that… I have to formulate one of my own" (*Two Cheers for Democracy,* 74). He upholds the values of friendship, tolerance, and private decency over institutional allegiance. This ethical stance permeates *A Passage to India*, particularly in the character of Cyril Fielding, the liberal British educator who seeks to understand and befriend Indians on equal terms.

Forster's characters often operate as moral emblems within a humanist framework: Mrs. Moore represents intuitive understanding, Fielding stands for secular liberalism, and Aziz embodies a flawed but emotionally vibrant humanity. The novel initially suggests that if individuals like Aziz and Fielding can form friendships across cultural divides, then colonialism's injustices might be morally, if not politically, overcome. However, this possibility is complicated by the systemic barriers imposed by empire-barriers that Forster's liberal ethos cannot fully resolve.

Colonial Framework and the Failure of Connection

The novel's central narrative arc-the friendship and estrangement between Aziz and Fielding-reveals how imperial structures distort even the most well-intentioned relationships. Despite Fielding's genuine sympathy for Aziz and his rational dismissal of Adela's accusation, his actions remain confined by his position as a colonial officer. His defense of Aziz at the trial alienates him from his British peers, yet he remains fundamentally unable to transcend the privileges and assumptions of his race and status.

The "Bridge Party," organized ostensibly to foster Anglo-Indian unity, serves as an early demonstration of liberal failure. Although it is meant to symbolize goodwill, the event collapses into superficiality and awkward formality. As the narrator observes, "They [the British] meant

to be kind, but they had not managed to be kind" (*A Passage to India* 42). This ironic comment encapsulates the entire trajectory of the novel's critique; good intentions are not enough when the structures of domination remain intact.

Aziz's arrest and trial further expose the limitations of liberal responses to colonial injustice. Fielding defends Aziz not because of institutional obligation, but out of personal conviction. Yet even this moral stand fails to repair their relationship, which ultimately fractures under political pressures and cultural misunderstandings. Forster makes it clear that individual decency cannot dismantle colonialism's institutional and psychological barriers.

The Marabar Caves: The Collapse of Meaning

At the symbolic heart of *A Passage to India* lies the Marabar Caves-a space of existential and metaphysical ambiguity. The caves disrupt the narratives of both colonizer and colonized, confronting characters with an alien nothingness that resists interpretation. For Mrs. Moore, the echo in the caves induces a spiritual crisis, "Everything exists, nothing has value" (147). This existential despair challenges her earlier religious faith and moral clarity, rendering her incapable of action thereafter.

Adela's experience in the caves, culminating in her false accusation against Aziz, similarly reflects the disintegration of liberal epistemologies. Her encounter with the caves cannot be reconciled with the rational, empirical worldview she has inherited. In this moment, Forster demonstrates that colonial knowledge-based on classification, control, and reason—breaks down in the face of India's enigmatic spiritual and natural forces. The Marabar Caves symbolize the unknowability of the colonized Other and the failure of Western humanist frameworks to comprehend or contain that Other.

Postcolonial Readings and Liberal Complicity

Critics such as Edward Said have pointed to the ambivalence of Forster's position. While *A Passage to India* critiques the arrogance of empire, it also reinforces certain orientalist assumptions. Said notes that Forster, despite his sympathetic portrayal of Indian characters, cannot entirely escape the binaries of East and West, "He represents the colonizer as

weary and beleaguered, and the colonized as enigmatic, spiritual, and emotionally rich but politically naïve" (Said, 245).

Homi Bhabha's concept of the "colonial ambivalence" is useful in analyzing the Aziz–Fielding relationship, where attraction and repulsion, identification and othering, operate simultaneously. Fielding's liberalism is itself a colonial formation, reliant on a fantasy of equality that ignores systemic inequality. His inability to remain close to Aziz after independence signals the failure of this fantasy.

Benita Parry, offering a more generous reading, argues that Forster's novel "stages a moment of ideological rupture within imperial discourse" (Parry, 117). While Parry acknowledges the novel's limitations, she emphasizes its capacity to expose the violence and hypocrisy of empire from within.

The Ending: Final Separation and the Limits of Reconciliation

The novel's conclusion-Aziz and Fielding riding together through the Mau jungle, only to part ways-is both emotionally poignant and ideologically sobering. The landscape itself resists their union, "But the horses didn't want it-they swerved apart; the earth didn't want it... 'Not yet,' and the sky said, 'No, not there'" (*A Passage to India* 322). Nature itself appears to reject the possibility of cross-cultural reconciliation under colonial rule.

This ending signals Forster's acknowledgment that human connection-though desirable-is insufficient in the face of historical, political, and cultural divisions. His liberal humanism may aspire to universality, but *A Passage to India* ultimately confronts the reader with its historical limitations. The novel does not reject liberal values, but it interrogates their reach, asking whether personal virtue can ever substitute for systemic change.

Conclusion

E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* is both an affirmation and a critique of liberal humanism. Through characters like Fielding and Aziz, Forster dramatizes the ethical and emotional appeal of cross-cultural friendship. Yet, the narrative arc, the symbolism of the Marabar Caves, and the novel's inconclusive ending all serve to highlight the impotence of individual morality in the face of imperial power. Forster's liberalism is deeply felt

but ultimately constrained-capable of diagnosing the illness of empire, but not of curing it. His vision, therefore, is one of mournful insight: that the dream of "only connect" may remain unattainable so long as colonial structures persist. As such, *A Passage to India* remains an indispensable text for understanding the intersection of literature, liberal ethics, and colonial power.

Md. Riyazuddin
Research Scholar, Department of English
Magadh University, Bodh-Gaya

Works Cited

Forster, E. M. *A Passage to India*. Edward Arnold, 1924.
_____. *Howards End*. Edward Arnold, 1931.
_____. *Two Cheers for Democracy*. Edward Arnold, 1951.
Parry, Benita. "The Politics of Representation." *Cultural Critique*, no. 7, 1987, pp. 117-152.
Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. Vintage, 1993.