UNDERSTANDING THE 'ANIMAL': A STUDY OF JIM CORBETT'S NARRATIVES

अंडरस्टैंडिंग द 'एनीमल' : ए स्टडी ऑफ जिम कार्बेटस नैरेटिव्स

Ph.D. THESIS

by

PARUL RANI

DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ROORKEE
ROORKEE, INDIA (247667)

MAY, 2019

UNDERSTANDING THE 'ANIMAL': A STUDY OF JIM CORBETT'S NARRATIVES

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSPHY

in

HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

by

PARUL RANI

DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ROORKEE
ROORKEE, INDIA (247667)

MAY, 2019

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ROORKEE
ROORKEE

CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION

I hereby certify that the work which is being presented in the thesis entitled **"UNDERSTANDING THE 'ANIMAL': A STUDY OF JIM CORBETT'S NARRATIVES"** in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy and submitted in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences of the Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, Roorkee is an authentic record of my own work carried out during a period from July, 2015 to May, 2019 under the supervision of Dr. Nagendra Kumar, Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, Roorkee.

The matter presented in this thesis has not been submitted by me for the award of any other degree of this or any other Institution.

(PARUL RANI)

This is to certify that the above statement made by the candidate is correct to the best of my knowledge.

(Nagendra Kumar)
Supervisor

Dated:

ABSTRACT

The present thesis attempts to unravel the multilayered human-animal relationships in the colonial setting of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century India with the help of the literary oeuvre of James Edward Corbett, popularly known as Jim Corbett (25 July 1875-19 April 1955). Being an influential hunter of his time; sharing close relationships with the Kumaoni locales, Corbett's texts: *Man-Eaters of Kumaon* (1944), *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag* (1947), *My India* (1952), *Jungle Lore* (1953), *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon* (1954), and *Tree Tops* (1955) reflect a great picture of human and non-human properties. Corbett's narratives offer an opportunity for this study to discuss the hunting-cum-sport practices and discourses as integral parts of constructing the paternalistic image of the British Raj in India. By and Large, this study presents a critique of the hunting tradition, and consequently is concerned with the question of the "animal." Recognising the underlying (in)significance of the non-human animal to brighten the (meaningful) existence of the human, there is an analysis of various forms of affinities among; humans, animals, the British Empire, and Jim Corbett. Although Corbett's popular identity of being a conservationist seems to overshadow his imperial self on a general note, here the attempt is made to unveil the contested-self of Corbett where he seems to consolidate his British identity as far as his hunting career as a sportsman is concerned. Corbett appears to represent the British ideological normative of benevolent fatherly *Sahibs*, simultaneously sustaining the ideological "othering" in the delineation of the colonised people.

The broad categorisation of the "humans" and "animals" suffers from the species layout where the superiority and priority of the human species can be well defined and well judged through the hunting activities. However, the sub-categorisation of the animals between the "domestic" and "wild" by the colonial governance in British India reconfigure the multidimensional othering of the non-humans animals to which the animals have been subjected. The imperial cultural prerogative to push the animals/big cats; particularly "tiger," into a category of killable animal is also married to the political needs of the British Raj for strengthening the social alliances with the colonised population. There is a trajectory of the idea of the animal, the cult of being a gentle British man (a *sahib*), and the concept of humanity/animality that altogether are interrelated to make the Raj a success particularly among

the “poor of India.” It captures the notion of *how* the Empire responds to its fading days in India by employing its various social, cultural, political, and psychological mechanisms related to the concept of the “animal.”

Further, the thesis is comprehensively concerned with a thorough understanding of the implantation of the man-eater animals as the offspring of the cultural construction of the imperial hunt. Concisely, there is a probe into *why* the notorious man-eaters emerge at a particular time. Developing the argument to the “man-eating” phase as unusual for the animals, the study questions the human discourses of a man-eater and their rule over the animals. The study situates the man-eaters; a subject of explication, as the essential characters of the narratives; liable to their “natural” proviso. Concurrently, the significance of Corbett’s first-hand experiences with the animals lies in providing an insight into the ways of the wildlife and how these ways unravel the multilayered relationships of animals with their environment; including humans. The focus on animal behaviour makes this study to exemplify how the interspecies and intraspecies interactions validate the non-human animal agency. The role of the animal agency into forming the non-human entities as subjective unveils the animals/big cats in particular paradigms of power that resist and challenge the colonial desire to orientalise the colonial non-human animal subjects. Also, the animals’ retrieval glorifies the prowess; they are full of, as a bit of Nature.

In order to answer the compelling questions: the animals’ presence in colonial narrative and its significance; to conceptualise the man-eating category of animals; the underlying resistance of the big cats through agency and power; and the othering of the colonised subjects in several ways; this study implies the critical discourse analysis with methodological paradigms of the postcolonial critics in conjunction with the human-animal studies. The “critical” or “critique” remains an approach in this thesis as the study opts not to divulge into the pure aesthetic rhetoric of the human and animal interaction in the jungles instead assesses the interconnection of dominance, power, discrimination, and control as exercised and maintained through the discourse. The textual analysis: spoken or written is extended to analyse that social, political and cultural structure which glorifies the hunting of the animals, along with the pictorial assessment of the hunter and hunted subjects. It also considers the hunting sport; a tool to exercise power on the human and non-human entities.

The contested nature of Corbett's narratives attributes relevance to his writings in the contemporary world. "Killing" of the animals is a thematic concern of the narratives. The site of hunting/killing an animal arises many unanswered questions; why is it taking place and where does the animal stand in the complete picture of the White hunters' hero ship established through eradicating the malevolent animals/man-eaters? However, this study considers the animal existence at the centre of colonial discourses, using Corbett's narratives as a potent example. Since the hunting sport decorates the background of the war between the animals and hunters, so the significance of hunting is inevitable to notice. Therefore, the present thesis recognises the animal significance in two ways: as an object and as a subject of discussion. The presence of the animal as an object weaves the strands of race, class, gender, and role of technology in solidifying human supremacy (the British hunter; a case in point). On the other hand, Corbett's acknowledgement of the "Laws of Nature" at the killing of the man-eaters allows this thesis to foreground the animal stance. Conversely, the analysis of animals-as-such is on the threshold of a different perspective of the hunter and the hunted. A close engagement with the animals attempts to see the man-eaters as sufferers amidst an environment of the hunting sport in India. Altogether, an analysis of the animal behaviours in the wildlife seeks to challenge the traditional philosophy of animal automaton and intends to add to the contemporary debates on the non-human animal agency.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The journey of a Ph.D. project from beginning to end is a collective effort of many people whose enormous contributions remain cloistered. Probably, I am one of those very few fortunate research scholars whose tedious trekking of doctoral expedition has been very smooth and congenial. Here, I need to unveil a gratifying bestowal of all the noteworthy individuals who made my thesis a success. Although I am short of words, my overwhelming attribution of sincere thanks starts from my supervisor Prof. Nagendra Kumar (Head of the Humanities and Social Sciences Department); whose formal and informal contributions to this study are countless. Apart from being a supervisor of academic writing, he is the one who always creates a compatible ambience around him. His level of understanding a scholar; along with his/her strengths and weaknesses is remarkable. He is amongst the rarity of academic persona whose intellectual and humane values have provided a boost to my scholastic growth. Also, I extend my sincere thanks to Mrs. Kalindi Chaturvedi who has always been so welcoming and embracing to encourage me.

I cannot resist stretching warm thanks to the members of my Student Research Committee for their enlightening suggestions: Prof. S. P. Singh (SRC & DRC chairman), Prof. Pashupati Jha (Internal Expert), and Dr. R. L. Dhar (External Expert), and the list remains incomplete without referring a special thanks to Prof. D. K. Nauriyal (the then DRC chairman) for encouraging my research proposal. Indeed, the contributions of my Pre-Ph.D. coursework professors of the department: Prof. Pashupati Jha, Prof. Nagendra Kumar, Dr. Binod Mishra, and Dr. Smita Jha are mentionable for making me develop critical thinking for the texts' readings. Additionally, I acknowledge the inspiring presence of Prof. Renu Rastogi, Dr. Anindya J. Mishra, Dr. Sanjit Mishra, and Dr. Sourit Bhattacharya for creating a healthy environment for discussions with the students. Simultaneously, I also thank all the non-teaching staff members of the HSS department, notably; Mr. Mukesh Kaushik, Mr. Praveen Agarwal, and Mr. Shrawan Rawat for their cooperation at all levels of the official work.

As far as the subject matter of this thesis is concerned, I am incredibly thankful to the collaborative efforts of Prof. Nagendra Kumar and Dr. Sovan Chakraborty (one of my seniors) who trained my mind to have multiple readings of Corbett's writings and prepare a critical framework for the same. One of the uniqueness of my supervisor settles in creating a research

group of the scholars working or worked under his supervision; preparing a platform for unceasing interaction and exchanging intangible feedback with each other. In this regard, I have special thanks for a younger brotherly figure: Prashant Maurya, who has been a fellow companion of the progressive stages of this dissertation, for patiently listening to my research ideas as well as my unmelodic singing, and for always accompanying me for a cup of tea. In the same troop, I thank Dr. Devendra Kumar Sharma, Dr. Yogisha, Meenakshi, Radhika Sharma, and Ankit Raj for always being ready to assist in whatever way it is required.

I would also like to thank Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee for creating a safe and free environment for the students, and for offering academic and co-curricular activities. Throughout my life, I will hold the good memories of my Badminton group with whom I played from time to time. Badminton has always been a great companion of me who kept me positively engaged; devoid of any stress during my stay at IIT Roorkee as a student. Also, my sincere thanks go to the Ministry of Human Resources Development (MHRD), India for assisting me financially in terms of fellowship for pursuing Ph.D.

Similarly, my special thanks must go to my batchmates-cum-friends: Ashish Sharma, and Asif Khan who have always been very enthusiastic and confident of my research progress. Their friendly readiness to make everything ease for me is the rarity of qualities to be easily found in the modern world. Their friendship makes IIT Roorkee a cherished memory for me. At the same time, I continue thanking my fellow scholars whose presence in my Ph.D. tenure remains significant in one or other way: Dr. Rachna Arora, Lal Veer Aditya, Bhawna, Anju Goswami, Swati Sharma, Vikrant Panwar, Mayuresh Kumar Mishra, Elisa Mohanty, Ankit Nagar, Akshi Bajaj, and Shruti Shuvam. However, I am also thankful to all the research scholars of the department whom I could not mention namely in the list.

I could never be able to put the disciplined and sincere efforts into my studies without the energy that my family channelised in me. It is tough for me writing in words a thanking note to my family members. The love, care, and support of my family are boundless. First, I feel favoured enough that I am able to live the dream of being an iitian that my father Mr. Charan Singh saw of. He broke the middle-class boundaries of situating the daughters within certain boundaries and embarked my potentialities. His contributions to making me come up writing a doctoral thesis in particular and my life, in general, are infinite. Secondly, my heartfelt thanks

must mention the names of two kind ladies whose blessings made my life so happy and comfortable: my mother, Smt. Sudha, and my mother-in-law Smt. Vijaya Laxmi. Their support in my life and for my Ph.D. tenure is extremely healthy. They both never learnt to say no to anything; their eagerness and faith in me made my studies easier and enjoyable. Further, I express my deepest gratitude to my brother Mr. Chand Veer and sister-in-law Dr. Parul Balyan who have always boosted up my ideas. Simultaneously, I am grateful to my sister Veeka and my brother-in-law Mr. Praveen Kumar who showed intermittent interest in my research project, and for creating a space in which there is no place for any kind of pretence and I am always acceptable for what I am. Now, it is time to award big thanks to the little ones of our family: Vipra Arya and Rudransh whose sight has always made me cheerful and smiley. Their collaborative efforts to make my thesis delay are certainly an unwanted but pleasant happening to me. In fact, both of them supported me to grow morally, spiritually, and intellectually through their games and quizzes.

I have chosen to thank my husband-cum-best friend Mr. Vijaya Karthik in the last since his presence is beyond any beginning and an end. Although I cannot compose a thanking text for him since his support in my life is all pervasive, and surpasses any existence, in the context of this Ph.D. project, I can only mention he is the source of every possibility. He provided me with the actual freedom (the most endearing element in one's life) that helped me grooming myself in specific ways. The calm and composite attitude I learnt from him assisted me in developing and writing my ideas into the final shape of academic writing.

PARUL RANI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTE:

The thesis is typed on both sides with 1.5 spacing (as per the Institute guidelines). The font size of the text is 12 and United Kingdom English spelling is used throughout. The thesis follows the *MLA Handbook: Eighth Edition* guidelines for complete citations. Notes, Works Cited list, Bibliography, and Publication details are given at the end.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction: Reconceptualising the Human/Animal Dichotomies

The English words "Human" or "Humane" are often interchangeably used to define and characterise a species *Homo Sapiens* whose meaning develops in two ways: "Humans are clearly recognized to be in a continuum with other life" (Waldau 71), and the other side: "Many other ways of marking the special moral significance of human beings have been suggested: the ability to reason, self-awareness, possessing a sense of justice, language, autonomy, and so on" (Singer, *Defense of Animals* 4). The present use of the word derives its source from the Latin word *humanus* or Old French word *humain* which means anything belonging to the man. The intellectual revolutions in the human history: the sixteenth century Renaissance and the eighteenth century Enlightenment and scientific/technological advancements makes this term to play a central role in the philosophical history of the whole Western thought. Gaining the wisdom through the human knowledge resultant in the social progress is inseparable from the *–ism* (humanism) which is the root of many inventions and development, but at the same time entangles in a kind of domination which the present century makes a powerful critique and digs at it with the suspicion.

Humanism celebrates the human capacity to envisage and conceptualise through knowledge the ultimate truth by liberating itself from any kind of bondages. Utility of the human mind to reach the proper ends of the science epochs the mastery of this creature on the earth. Although this term has become an umbrella term, having the various shades of thought associated with it, liberal humanism; scientific humanism; ethical humanism; religious humanism and in the last century existential humanism knocks at the doors of philosophical strands, the cult of humanism lies in placing the man at the centre; emphasising on empiricism and reasoning than the super-naturalistic approach. The faith in the human logic and intelligence attributes a peculiar privilege to the man over the others existing in the chain of being. To bring the humanity out of the clings of supernaturalism or the abstract fear, the weighted importance to the human being proves itself in the eighteenth century Enlightenment period. The teachings of Hume, Rousseau and Voltaire of the freedom of thought, Bacon's maxim between power and knowledge, the scientific

revolution of Copernicus, Galileo and Newton and the undue emphasis on "I" (representing man) introduced by Descartes and Kant bring the European philosophy to philosophise the human existence as something unique and superior to all. It is an epoch of technological civilization; something as a result of the human mind's discerning activity.

The Eighteenth century uses the most recurrent use of the terms: "human", "humane" or overall "humanism." Etymologically the characteristics associated with these terms: compassion, kind, gentle, refined, civilised are getting replaced by more politicised and modern concepts that start legitimising the superiority of one species over the others from the humans' unique access to language, reasoning, consciousness and the so-called human-made civilised world. Cary Wolfe gives the gist of humanism in the introduction of the book *What is Posthumanism?* In the following words:

> *Humanism* is a broad category of ethical philosophies that affirm the dignity and worth of all people, based on the ability to determine right and wrong by appeal to universal human qualities—particularly rationality. It is a component of a variety of more specific philosophical systems and is incorporated into several religious schools of thought. Humanism entails a commitment to the search for truth and morality through human means in support of human interests. In focusing on the capacity for self-determination, humanism rejects the validity of transcendental justifications, such as a dependence on belief without reason, the supernatural, or texts of allegedly divine origin. Humanists endorse universal morality based on the commonality of the human condition, suggesting that solutions to human social and cultural problems cannot be parochial. (xi)

As humanism endorses the human rationality it begets the human essence in the agency that naturalises the man's place at the centre of all discourses. The assigned dignity of the humans attributes agency that gives concrete shape to the incredible things, ideas, imagination and inventions. David Cooper terms it "creative agency," and it is the paradigm of this agency "that distinguishes humanity from other creatures" (38). Further, he associates creative agency with the dignity of man, quoting Mirandola, representative of God speaking to Adam who represents the mortal man asserts the freedom and special place of man on this planet, "The nature of other creatures is defined and restricted . . . ; you, by contrast, . . . may, by your own free will, . . . trace for yourself the lineaments of your own nature . . . fashion yourself in the form you may prefer"

(42). The underlying faith in the human potentiality to meet up the end of all the problems and their solution renders an abstract power to the humans that consequently find its manifestation in the ordering of things according to the man's needs. Broadly the idea of the humanism is to recognise and use the human temperament and value it.

Although the fundamental ideals of "being human" and humanism lay in embracing the humane characteristics that see all the subjects in the world with objectivity and liberty, the proportionate weight age to the human intellect in search of the ultimate truth and the nature of things gradually turn to the anthropocentric ideals with the arrival of enlightenment period. The man in search of the knowledge of the world reaches to be the master of the entire ecosystem instead of a part of it. Bringing to the light, the power/knowledge concept of Bacon, Horkheimer and Adorno quote: "The 'true end, scope or office of knowledge' does not consist in 'any plausible, delectable, reverend or admired discourse, or any satisfactory arguments, but in effecting and working, and in discovery of particulars not revealed before, for the better endowment and help of man's life'" (2). Approaching the real end of the knowledge, considered to be resultant in the betterment of human life in itself is an ambiguous concept because these are the purely humanistic concepts for the man's life, ignoring the other degradations in the form of the non-human world commanded by the man's actions. In spite of knocking at the doors of humanity the man starts to cross the limits of (in)humanity. For performing as the masters, indeed, there is need of the slaves. And in the way of the enslavement, one of the principal subjects to suffer is the non-human Nature. Enlightenment controls the Nature in two ways: first, it decomposes the notion of inherent supernatural power in nature and intellectualises its existence; secondly, this thought encloses Nature within the framework of "a matter" only which could be controlled and used for the societal progress. As Horkheimer and Adorno say:

> In the authority of universal concepts the Enlightenment detected a fear of the demons through whose effigies human beings had tried to influence nature in magic rituals. From now on matter was finally to be controlled without the illusion of immanent powers or hidden properties. For enlightenment, anything which does not conform to the standard of calculability and utility must be viewed with suspicion. (3)

The advancement of thought, enquiring into the nature of things has, in fact, learnt to dominate every other thing which is substandard and unlike the human intellectualization. It

approaches to quantify the things in numbers and anything beyond this quantification is considered meaningless. Weitzenfeld and Joy opine that in the age of enlightenment, the humanism reduces the Renaissance religiosity and, "broadened its project to the utopian ambition of universal human progress through rational enquiry (i.e., the natural and human sciences), the demystification of the natural world, and the self-authorization of the nation state (i.e., democracy)" (5). In entering the objective science of the things through rational enquiry, Galileo introduces the concept of mathematical knowledge of Nature. Edmund Husserl says, "[T]hrough Galileo's *mathematization of nature, nature itself* is idealized under the guidance of the new mathematics; nature itself becomes—to express it in a modern way—a mathematical manifold" (23). The representation of Nature in a way which can be mastered reveals the triumph of reason. The embracement of reason in philosophy and science insists on a civilization which is human in its manners and thinking. Now the definition of human is coming very close to create the dichotomies of "being human" itself. It marks a sharp division between the human and the non-human world on the basis of its civilisation, rationality, language, consciousness, thinking etc. Again it is appropriate to quote Husserl:

> To be human at all is essentially to be a human being in a socially and generatively united civilization; and if a man is rational being (*animal rationale*), it is only insofar as his whole civilization is a rational civilization, that is, one with a latent orientation toward reason or one openly oriented toward the entelechy which has come to itself, become manifest to itself, and which now of necessity consciously directs human becoming. (15)

"To be human" is alike to encapsulate the means of enculturation which creates/leads to the rational civilisation of rational beings. The mathematization of the natural sciences leave the overall impact on the whole humankind as it evolves to be understood and find meaning in itself in opposition to the non-humans. Looking at the man as a rational being or *animal rationale* is an act of the covert discrimination underlying the requisites of being a human animal. If the human is a rational animal, capable of living and making a rational civilisation, then it indicates the existence of the irrational animal that stays in an uncontrolled way and, i.e., a non-human animal. One the one side, the scientific temperament is employing the whole non-human others to serve the humankind in one or other way: on the other side, there is a historical construction of one of the most popular categories and, i.e., the "animals."

Before conceptualising the idea of the animal in Indian colonial era and what purpose does it serve for the British imperialism as well as in literature, it is worthy to look back at the etymology of this term and following ideas related to this word and its meaning formation. Etymologically the English word "animal" is derived from the Latin word "animale" that means any living being which breaths. It negates all the differences between man and animal. In fact, the term animal surfaces in the sixteenth-century only when it gets replaced with the words *beast* and *brute* and carries the connotations of alienation and disgust in the works of Shakespeare and Milton.[i] The replacement of the terms *beast* and *brute* with the "animal" generates the duality of this usage: it functions to denote a species, and at the same time it excludes the humans from that species and narrowingly gets pregnant with the nonhuman and anti-human essence. Midgley throws light on the journey of the word "animal" and points out that it carries two contradictory connotations: first benign, which includes the humanity and the second use "which excludes humanity—the notion of the animal stands for the nonhuman, the anti-human. It is a symbol of the forces which we fear in our own nature . . . By speaking of those forces as 'animal,' we imply that they are in some way alien to us" (35). Tapper claims that "'the animal' is a culturally constructed category" (51), and Derrida considers the "animal" a word which is related to the men's right to this word, "Animal is a word that men have given themselves the right to give" (*The Animal That* 32). Tim Ingold takes the different approaches to deal with animality as a domain or "kingdom" that includes humans as a biological taxonomy, one amongst the many animal species inhabiting this earth and connect to each-other in a complex web of ecological interdependencies and the second approach is a state or a condition which is opposite to humanity, i.e., it characterises the "natural" behaviour when the actions are devoid of reason or values.[ii] Thus, for being called a human being, a process of enculturation takes place (as Husserl also talked about with more emphasis on rationality) which the children of this species have to undergo to be civilised. The advent of the evolutionary theory by Darwin establishes the significant continuum between the human and non-human animals' nature, but that could not change the outlook on the animals which had already made its strong basis. Although man can consider himself as a social animal that is scientifically a part of animal species, the comparison with an animal remains only to a derogatory state which was/is unacceptable in civilised human society. The term "animal" seems to render and address more profound questions than

superficially it appears to be about the animals and what purpose do they carry in the human domain?

Before the animal turn during the closing decades of the twentieth century, it is the seventeenth and eighteenth century when the philosophical discussions are bending towards the animals. In this era of science, the discourses implant on marking the differences between humans and animals than the similarities. The surge to justify the vivisection in the experimental science heats the debate on the animals. After Galileo's introduction to the novel natural science, it is Descartes who sets the idea of rational universal philosophy that impacts the whole of Western thinking and remains popular for centuries as Cartesian philosophy. Descartes' *Discourse on Method*, which originally published in 1637, brings two well-discussed concepts: the English proposition "I think, therefore I am" appeared in French as *je pense, donc je suis* which precedes the existence of mind over the body as he proposes the mind and the body as two different entities. The second concept, this book brings about, is the morality and rationality of the human beings in contradiction to the animals that fuelled the debate over the animals as irrational entities. Descartes assigns the animals merely the bodies who are machine-like, devoid of the mind which is solely the property of the humans. He introduces the animals nothing more than the machines, but he does accept the sensation in the animals but calls it only a bodily function of a physical action. He compares the actions of the animals with that of a clock which works mechanically:

> [A]lthough there are many animals that show more skill than we in some of their actions, we nevertheless see that they show none at all in many other actions. Consequently, the fact that they do something better than we do does not prove that they have any intelligence, for, was that the case, they would have more of it than any of us and would excel us in everything. But rather it proves that they have no intelligence at all, and that it is nature that acts in them, according to the disposition of their organs—just as we see that a clock composed exclusively of wheels and springs can count the hours and measure time more accurately than we can with all our carefulness. (*Discourse on Method* 33)

The accuracy of the actions in the animals is the outcome of working like a machine that rotates correctly but not reasonably. That is why Descartes not only devoid the animals of mind but also somewhat of the consciousness which disable them to think and transmit the languages. As the

basis of all knowledge lies in the thinking and semantic properties of the humans, so the tendency to work naturally only on the basis of the dispositions of the animal' organs reduces their intellectual properties. Drawing a line between human-animal species on the grounds of consciousness and language, the animal loses its subjectivity and restraints merely to a representation by a rational being: whose description varies in philosophy, science, literature, social and political lives conferring their need to fulfil well-destined purposes. The act of thinking and its conveyance through specific language as the superior sign of the human beings led Descartes to call the humans surpassing in every sense:

> Now it seems to me very striking that the use of words, so defined, is something peculiar to human beings . . . there has never been known an animal so perfect as to use a sign to make other animals understand something which expressed no passion; and there is no human being so imperfect as not to do so, since even deaf-mutes invent special signs to express their thoughts. This seems to me a very strong argument to prove that the reason why animals do not speak as we do is not that they lack the organs but that they have no thoughts. (*Descartes* 245)

The lack of the manifestation of the thoughts through language justified the subjugation of animals in vivisectionist activities and for the commodifications since Descartes devoid the animals of pain also. As pain is directly related to the feeling and understanding of sadness that is purely absent in the animals, subsequently make them perfect experimental objects. Quoting Descartes, Guerrini writes, "By this argument vivisection was not cruel, because animals were outside the realm of human ethical conduct" (392). In mechanicalisation of the animals, Descartes carries the notion of Aristotle a bit forward as he also aligns the body and unreasoning to the non-humans and he suggests the animals to be under the command of their masters, though he does not compare them with the machines, "Where then there is such a difference as that between soul and body, or between men and animals, . . . the lower sort are by nature slaves and it is better for them as for all inferiors that they should be under the rule of a master" (qtd. in Weil 29). Aristotle had already categorised the animals by assigning them an inferior place, though this inferiority can be applied to any like children and females who need to be mastered and ultimately play an important role in the upcoming European era as there is a sound trajectory developed among the children, females and the animals. The notion of mastering the animals

relates itself to mastering the nature when the human beings intentionally represent the natural objects in such a way which facilitates ordering and commanding of the things. Also, if the distance occurs in the thoughts, the actions implement it efficiently. It reminds of Horkheimer and Adorno's words, "In thought, human beings distance themselves from nature in order to arrange it in such a way that it can be mastered" (31). Much like Aristotle, Karl Marx also distinguishes the man from animal. His distinction is on the basis of the man's creative mode of production and his conscious life activities. As the animal's productivity lies for himself or his young while the man has a social essence and his way of production is universal. He argues, "An animal's product belongs immediately to its physical body . . . whilst man knows how to produce in accordance with the standard of every species, and knows how to apply everywhere the inherent standard to the object" (qtd. in Wilde 42).

Taking the notion of the human and animal difference further, Martin Heidegger makes a distinction between the two in inquiring about the question of the "world" and the position of stone, animal and man in this world in his book *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*. According to this enquiry, the animal's world is poor against the man's world-forming. The animals' world poverty seems to be a presupposition of zoology, and he makes a metaphysical query into it:

> Poor in world implies poverty as opposed to richness; poverty implies less as opposed to more. The animal is poor in world, it somehow possesses less. But less of what? Less in respect of what is accessible to it, of whatever as an animal it can deal with, of whatever it can be affected by as an animal, of whatever it can relate it as a living being, less as against more, namely as against the richness of all those relationships that human Dasein has at its disposal. (Heidegger 193)

World signifies a total of beings that is available to the man and the animal equally, but it varies in the way of its penetrability by the two different species. In fact, poverty of the animal world lies in the animals' lack of penetrability in whatever is accessible to it/him. The human being is word forming in the sense not only of its wide range of penetrability into the things rather the manner in which this penetrability takes place. The animals stand at the inferior rank because the value is attributed to the world forming. However, he alarms against the hierarchical evaluation taken between poverty in world and world formation because "What is poor here by no means

represents merely what is 'less' or 'lesser' with respect to what is 'more' or 'greater'. Being poor does not simply mean possessing nothing, or little, or less than another rather *being deprived*" (Heidegger 195). The theoretical concept of "animal world as poor" becomes problematic since it is entangling with the autonomy of the human life and humans as well here. The question of the deprivation is haunting because deprivation always enters into any domain with the mastering or instructing capacities of the other entities. It indicates the interference of something which is making the animal world poor. The animals and their world appear to stand at an unfavourable platform because the fundamental tendency to look at the humans and their world is how they belong to other non-humans. Again it is appropriate to throw light on what Heidegger says about the human *Dasein* (Heidegger's term for human existence): "Today—and we can only ever speak of *our* Dasein as we are doing now—we find ourselves in a favorable situation. It is favorable not merely on account of the great variety and vitality of research but also because of a fundamental tendency to restore autonomy to 'life', as the *specific manner of being pertaining to animal and plant*, and to secure this autonomy for it" (188). The stress on "*our*" signifies humans as an exclusive category which finds its existence a favourable stance only by the manner it evolves to relate itself to the animals and the plants. At the same time, human existence is world forming in the sense that it can derive the meanings out of the things, and its application creates an intellectual environment in which the humans live while the animals are unable to recycle their perception of the things that deprive them of any creativity, so their world is poor. The question of understanding the "animal world poverty" again entangles with obscurity when he says, "It cannot be decided by reflections on language but only by taking a look at animality itself" (Heidegger 195). Further, this statement opens a new debate on the idea of "animality" which he addressed at the beginning of this essay itself.

In *The Metaphysics of Morals*, discussing the duties of man, Immanuel Kant plainly states that the human being is one of the animal species. But the sense of responsibility which is commonly attributed to a human being rests upon two attributes: first, man as a *sensible being* and secondly, man as an *intelligible being*.[iii] The sensibility and the intelligibility of which Kant is talking about both relate and stand in contradiction to the animal characteristics. The sensibility of a man is related to the emotional aspect that he feels for his community (humans) and finds its manifestation through the moral relations. The humanity is made up of the humans, and then the duties to the humankind are the duties to the man itself in a circular form. The

intelligible being has its relation to the reasoning which makes a man act sensibly. To bring the man to the centre and to perform all the duties only for man excludes the non-human animals from the paradigm of intelligible and moral assessment. However, he opines that the non-human animals should abstain from the cruel treatment, i.e., to perform the duties to animals lay in the periphery of the duties to the man itself since it is bound to the moral issues of the humans. Also, if the ethical concerns are put out of the scenario, then man holds no duties to the animals of any kind. When Kant throws light on the animality of human nature, he throws light on the irrationality of such action in the human nature. Thus, according to Kant the animals and animality are devoid of the reason:

> As far as reason alone can judge, man has duties only to men (himself and other men), since his duty to any subject is moral constraint by that subject's will. Hence the constraining (binding) subject must, *first*, be a person; and this person must, *second*, to be given as an object of experience, since man is to strive for the end of this person's will and this can happen only in a relation to each other of two things that exist (for a mere thought-entity cannot be the *cause* of any result in terms of ends). But from all our experience we know of no being other than man that would be capable of obligation (active or passive). Man can therefore have no duty to any beings other than men; and if he thinks he has such duties, it is because of an *amphiboly* in his *concepts of reflection*, and his supposed duty to other beings is only a duty to himself. (*The Metaphysics* 237)

The sense of performing the duty to oneself marks a stark line between human species and animal species which Kant puts forward through his views, and there are undue respect and responsibility for man and humanity. The human-centeredness of his views excludes the animals from owning any direct duties towards themselves from the humans. He explicitly states, "our duties to animals are duties only with reference to ourselves" (*Lectures* 171), and "Our duties towards them are indirect duties to humanity . . . If a dog, for example, has served his master long and faithfully, that is an analogue of merit; hence I must reward it" (*Lectures* 212). So in Kantian philosophy, the animals related to the humans in any sense and the service done to them is of the moral sensibility which lies in the humans' psychological states. But he makes himself distanced from those (particularly Descartes) who claim that animals do not suffer or they don't have the sense of pain and conflate on the point of animals' irrationality.

Across this philosophical tenor, the human supremacy is repeatedly asserted in opposition to the sub-humans and animal-like. Thus, the evolution of the term "animal" rests upon an entirely different category than humankind. Armstrong and Simmons say, "[T]he very idea of the human—the way we understand and experience ourselves as humans—is closely tied up with ideas about animals" (1). Therefore, the idea of the animal and the human emerges in carrying the opposition between two species in the Western/European thought creating the antagonism by rationality, linguistic transmission, agency, consciousness, intellectuality, and spirituality and so on. In fact, the construction of the meaning of "animals" as it prevails from seventeenth century to the twentieth century is central to determine the existence of humans as superior.

This study conceptualises the idea of the animal and its associated dichotomies as it intertwines together with the humanistic, anthropocentric and speciesist approach that extends the imperial enterprise of the British to its one of the most significant colonies *viz* India during the colonial period. In going through the literature of British India, one finds the innumerable stories about the animals. But at the same time, the presence of the non-humans in the British tales, as the British by its disposition is very elite and refined in its nature and culture, and that is what the British Empire tries to present itself, raises many questions on the nature of British Empire and its tales of the "wild." The emphasis on wild is evident in the sense that if the colonised humans do not fit into the upper and polished paradigms of the colonisers, then the animals' presence in the White masters' narratives is questionable. In fact, what purpose do the animals serve for the British and their empire? Why do so many thrilling tales of the powerful animals (big cats and mammals) become immediately accessible in the country as well as abroad? The presence of the animals in the British literature is inevitable and needs to be revised to present the new perspective that perhaps remains blurred as the preferred significance has been attributed to the human sphere: race, class and gender in the colonial era. Relatively there is much literature available describing the exploitation and oppression of the colonised human beings than the colonised animals.

There is an attempt to address all the questions mentioned above and beyond that by analysing the non-fictional oeuvre of the celebrated Anglo-Indian writer, Edward James Corbett, popularly known as Jim Corbett whose lifespan ranges from 25 July 1875 to 19 April 1955. Deriving his ancestry from Ireland, his forefathers settle in India. He spends most part of his life

in the hilly area of the lower ranges of Northern Himalayas known as Kumaon region of the United Provinces of British India. Jim Corbett is one of the several names of British colonials who shine during and after his stay in India. He earns his reputation among the two contested poles simultaneously: the colonials and the colonised. The much he is revered by the colonial administration, not less than the love showered on him by the rural folk of the native country. This popularity depends upon the two acts: his service to the British administration and his duty towards his rural folk by making them free from the danger of the man-eaters by hunting them. He is a renowned hunter cum conservationist in India. He comes up writing six collections of narratives in his lifetime. All his writings are more or less the personal narratives, the recreated version of the time that he spends in the jungles of Kumaon and with the Indian rural folk. The non-fictional nature of his works attributes a more candid view of the encounter between the British and the Indian wildlife. The following works are taken for the present study:

1. *Man-Eaters of Kumaon* (1944)
2. *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag* (1947)
3. *My India* (1952)
4. *Jungle Lore* (1953)
5. *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon* (1954)
6. *Tree Tops* (1955)

He writes the first five books about his experiences with the Indians: humans and non-humans, and the sixth book explains the Princess Elizabeth's peregrination to Tree Tops (a famous and sophisticated hut) in Kenya in 1952 as he retired to Kenya after the Indian Independence in 1947. The titles of these books suggest the three books exclusively describe the animals, i.e., the man-eaters, *My India* details about the Kumaoni and Mokameh Ghat people where Corbett works as a fuel inspector in the Railways and *Jungle Lore* is based on the jungle knowledge that Corbett receives or develops in having the first-hand experience with the Indian jungles. He describes the various language patterns of the animals in the forest and about a consciousness which he advances in, if there is any danger around him and, also about the wind blowing patterns that helps him finding out the prey for hunting.

There is no question regarding the hunting capabilities of Corbett and his underlying love for the rural folk of Kumaon (Indian rural folk in general) which makes him stand distinct from the

other colonials, and reasonably he seems like a swinging bridge between the coloniser and colonised. He earns many prestigious awards from the British government of India as well as the Government of Independent India. He has been awarded "Kaiser-I-Hind Medal," "Companionship of the Indian Empire," and a rare distinction "Freedom of the Forest" (liberty to enter the reserved forests) has also been given to him. For serving the government through training the troops in jungle fighting, during the World War II, he receives the honorary rank of Lieutenant Colonel. In 1957 the Indian Government renames "Hailey National Park" as "Jim Corbett National Park" that lies in the present day state of Uttarakhand, to commemorate a wildlife conservationist of the country and thus making him a common household name in India. He is one of the few who acknowledges the importance of the carnivores to make an ecological balance in the environment and advocates the conservation of the tigers towards the later phase of his life.

The critical studies on Jim Corbett's texts are not very enriched, particularly when it comes to an exclusive survey of his writings. The outcome of my best efforts to read the other scholars' work on his narratives remains an incipient arena as I come across only few studies in the form of research articles and reviews. There are only three full-fledged studies on Corbett, out of which only two studies can be accessed and the remaining one could be accessed only through the interview of its author, published in a newspaper. At the same time, there are many passing references to Corbett's works whenever there is any literary discussion on wildlife conservation and the concept of good or bad colonials etc. Most of the research articles are from the historical perspectives when the historicists attempt to relate the degradation of Indian wildlife to the colonial period.

Rajendra Satyashil Ponde in his thesis *Man, Nature and Wild Life as Depicted in the Jungle Literature of Jim Corbett and Kenneth Anderson: A comparative Study* (2012), as the title indicates, focuses on bringing together and makes a comparison between the two twentieth-century nature writers who were arguably among the last race of the white hunters in India. Although the popularity of both the hunters hails from different regions: Corbett from North India and Anderson from South India, they both share the common cult, i.e., the hunting of the wild animals (particularly man-eaters). This study aims at bringing together the perspectives of both the writers on wildlife and man-nature relationship with the emphasis on analysing this

relationship with its impact on the environment. It focuses on the topography of Indian jungle, Indian wildlife behaviour, Indian tribal and rural life with their myths, traditions, customs, folklore, dialects, etc. with throwing light on the issues of conservation, retention of the environment, deforestation and ultimately the growing ecological sensibility of the writers. The study suggests that the writings of both the writers belong to the "*shikar* literature in India." Ponde seems to admire Corbett for having the visionary power of the future wildlife predicament and for being the pioneer conservationist while Anderson was harsher towards the human beings for bringing the wildlife and jungles at the fringes of scarcity and destroying them. The hunting techniques of Corbett and Anderson vary in the ways of the availability of the weapons to them; however, Ponde calls Corbett the lesser advanced if compared to Anderson because the latter had more accessibility to the advanced weapons and means to reach the jungles while Corbett explored the jungles on foot. Anderson seems to be a polished hunter in his approach and the way of hunting in the Indian jungles. There is a great sense in Corbett regarding the language and signs of the jungles which made him capable of dividing the jungle folk into different groups based on their nature and role in the ecosystem. Corbett talks about the well-known animal species in his narratives while Anderson's tales throw light on the lesser known wild folk which made a difference between the writing styles of these writers.

Mirdhe Rabiya Nikhat in her thesis *Jim Corbett as Prose Writer: A Study* (2017) discusses the tradition of the Anglo-Indian writing in India among whom Jim Corbett secures a safe place as a writer and explores his non-fictional writings as prose which correspond to the day to day speech. She has mentioned about the hunting tales written by Corbett in a very simple and plain language. The study aims to study the life of Corbett along with his works and his hunting capabilities. The various shades of Corbett are analysed: a hunter, a prose writer, a memoirist and finally as a naturalist by using the analytical, descriptive and analytical methods.

Through an interview excerpt of Archana Deshmukh to the *Times of India*, published on 27 April 2014, I found the gist of another Ph.D. thesis conducted in India on Jim Corbett. Although the accessibility to this thesis as a whole could not be possible due to its unavailability on the web sources, the central idea of this study is very clear from the interview which provides a clear insight into the content and structure of this work. The title of the thesis *Jim Corbett: An Evaluation of His Personality in the Light of His Works* explicitly discusses what this study aims at. Being a non-fictional and self-experience description writer, Corbett leaves a wide area for

the researchers to explore his personality through his works, and this is what Deshmukh has attempted to. The study situates Corbett as an eco-centric person and studies his works from the eco-critical perspective. She talks about the making of an author out of Corbett along with an exposure to Indian people's life and culture, nature and environment, characterisation, style and technique etc. She mentions, "His writing conveys an explicit message of nature conservation and shows he had foreseen the future predicament of Indian flora and fauna. His man-eater stories are well-known but the human side was that he followed the ethics of modest hunting." Thus, the study frames Corbett purely within the ecocritical perspective and extols him a pioneer conservationist at a time when the technology had its limitation in a country like India and the people were relatively more unaware about the importance of wildlife.

The article, "Environmentalism and Imperial Manhood in Jim Corbett's *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*" (2007) by Jesse Oak Taylor, heralds the prospect of the British masculinity which embeds with the burgeoning environmentalism of Corbett. The study explores the connection between "masculinity" as the hallmark and a requisite for being a colonial hunter and masculine consciousness which emerges with developing a concern for the natural world. Reading of Corbett's this text leads the study to probe into the complex web of masculinity, nature and empire. It brings forth Scott Slovic's term "ecomasculinism" to reconsider the understanding of the image of man which is employed in the sensitiveness of the man for nature in opposition to the "ecofeminism" who consider the man as responsible for the destruction of Nature. Taylor makes the reader understand the whole dynamics of the colonial engagement with the animals and how Corbett is caught in his colonial and local identities. It discusses the leopard turning into a reality and as a "natural" entity in lying dead in front of Corbett while descending from a supernatural and a fiend entity for the Garhwalis. Throughout the discussion, Corbett maintains his sportsman codes when it comes to using the rifle which is a "weapon of manhood" (160), in place of all the technological means which the government had provided to him for capturing the leopard. Whether it is about the killing of a man-eater or the increasing of a conservationist consciousness, taking place in his mind, he is adhered to being a pure masculine and paternalistic figure for the Garhwali people. In the continuous persuasion of the leopard, he (the man-eater) becomes a liminal being which ultimately places the leopard and Corbett both in a paradoxical position:

> [I]magining the leopard as a liminal, invisible threat in the night, Corbett places it (and himself) in a paradoxical position. He both stands in opposition to an 'un-natural' construction of the leopard offered by the Garhwalis in order to affirm his masculine, imperialist position, and yet simultaneously indulges in similar descriptive tendencies himself in order to explain the man-eater's elusion of the machinery of death that he employs against it. (160)

Further, Taylor puts the question on the modern Western domain of rationality and language, associated with those mechanisms which are employed to restrict the natural being and reversely relies on his weapon of sportsmanship: "the rifle". Again the article argues that Corbett is caught in the irresolvable tension "in which the double lineage of colonial subjectivity are reproduced" (163). The fear of leaving India as its Independence lingers on, marks a question of his position as it will no longer be legitimate as he took a self-expatriation from the country in 1947. Thus, the conservation which provided him with a safe identity position in India was not out of the clings of the colonial legacy.

Prasanta Das through his article, "Jim Corbett's 'Green' Imperialism" (2009) makes a sarcastic appraisal of Corbett's ability to seduce his readers through the elaboration of his experiences, who ultimately turn to sing the songs in his praise. The article provides critical insight into Corbett's works when he is no longer an idealised figure rather a fully paid imperialist who throughout his life supported British administration through his service provided to them. Das goes into the background of the stories in the nineteenth century India which Corbett is reluctant to portray in the stories. The study makes a satire on the forest policies of the colonials and the conduction of hunting the animals by the natives and by the Europeans which purely differs in its nature, manner and the motto of hunting. It raises the question on Corbett for being silent on the matters of arranging hunting expeditions in Kumaon on the visit of any higher officials. It brings forth some of the discrepancies which were raised by his biographer Martin Booth also at times related to the hunting of Champawat Man-eater, Panar man-eating leopard and the Muktesar tigress and their time of hunting. Further, there is an inquiry into Corbett's role of a low paid fuel inspector at the Mokameh Ghat: "There is the Corbett who was an overworked and underpaid railway employee at Mokameh Ghat in Bihar from about 1894 to 1917. And there is the shrewd and successful businessman who in December 1906 took over F E G Matthews and Co. Where he got the money to acquire this Nainital hard-ware and house agent business is not

known" (22). Das addresses the scarcity of critical thinking of Corbett's texts as a "myth" which continues and most of the scholars stick on praising his deeds instead of critically evaluating them. He mentions Guha and Rangarajan's appreciative references to Corbett in their respective works. And finally, this study looks for the disillusionment of the Corbett myth in the subsequent research works. A similar kind of critique Arjan Singh presents of Corbett's man-eating tales for "emphasizing the innate savagery of a hard pressed animal [tiger]" (82). Conversely, Singh offers a consideration of tiger (solitary predator) having "a nobility of character" (xiii).

An article published in the *Hindustan Times* (August 7, 2012) written by Jairaj Singh is focused on Corbett's encounter with the supernatural spirits in the hilly region of Uttarakhand. Although the reference to the "churail" or banshee or the evil supernatural spirits finds mention only as a strange experience in the form of the interregnum in his stories, Singh found it interesting to highlight that which is almost blurred from the analysis scenario of the tales. Corbett mentions that the belief in the churail is a vital part of the hill folk and perhaps unintentionally becomes the part of Corbett's life also when he undergoes the eerie experiences in the shooting days of Champawat man-eater and Talla Des man-eater.[iv] Singh considers Corbett's avoidance of the supernatural tales, perhaps credits to his following of the strange faith as among the local people; of not speaking about the banshee otherwise it appears as the tiger appears on calling him by name.

Through the research article, "'Go After a Man-eater that has Killed a Hundred People? Not on Your Life!'" (2014), Vijaya Ramadas Mandala traces the paradoxical career of Jim Corbett: hunting and conservationist practices. The paper closely examines, "[H]is (Corbett's) changing relationship with Indian wildlife, arguing that the shifts in attitude mirrored changes in his own hunting and professional career" (573), and "situates him along a spectrum—of hunter and conservationist, killer and protector, ruler and saviour—that offers a far more nuanced analysis of his colonial career in India" (577). The argument develops from Corbett's working as a fuel inspector and covers the changing phases of his life with a critical scrutiny and presents the ongoing dilemmas in him as he never questioned the colonial practices and participated in the hunting and on the other hand, his initiation for the preservation of the tigers and wildlife was also very passionate and paternalistic. What made Corbett different from his contemporaries was, "[H]is hunting lore and conservation thinking were less influenced by the dominant and extant ideologies of the nineteenth century imperial hunters in India and Africa or the ideologies of

those who came thereafter" (576). There is an innate sense of preservation in Corbett for the local people as well as for the local environment. And, at the same time, the study corrects the erroneous conception of the "only" shooting of man-eaters by Corbett and mentions the instances when he actively participated in the hunting expeditions in his young age. The paternalistic nature which he shows towards the local people and his surroundings though derives its essence from the well established imperial prerogatives, but the unofficial cooperation to the people made his stand interesting. Since Corbett gives his services to the British administration and the natives simultaneously, he was able to develop a different persona as far as the British hunters' image is concerned in India. Summing up, the study finds the vital role of an individual (Corbett) in giving shape to conservation agendas in colonial India and also makes a significant contribution to clean the image of the Raj, "Corbett represented significant interventions in the colonial programme of 'vermin eradication' and conservation" (608).

In another article "The Raj and the Paradoxes of Wildlife Conservation: British Attitudes and Expediencies" (2015), Mandala brings to light the existing contradiction in the British policies of the conservation. The British government was very selective in categorizing the game species v/s conservative species because the practical and economic needs fundamentally guided it. The study selects Jim Corbett, C R Burton and F.W. Champion's lives to argue that the notions of "wildlife" and "conservation" were changing in the twentieth century. Corbett's uniqueness lies in paralleling the conservation ethos and being integral to the colonial establishment. Providing a critical insight into Corbett's conservation career, Mandala's recent release of the book *Shooting a Tiger: Big-game Hunting and Conservation in Colonial India* (2019) dedicates one of the chapters to Corbett and Burton. This chapter primarily answers to the debates of situating Corbett among the likely White conservationists whose concern for wildlife got settled with the imperial ideal of Nature's protection. The argument lies in referring to the personal preferences of Corbett for conservation, he states: "Corbett's later-life conservation thinking in early twentieth-century India heralds his deep-rooted commitment to nature and the tiger conservation cause . . . Corbett's environmentalism was, in that sense, but an extension of his personal engagement with the natural world surrounding him at Kaladhungi" (*Shooting* 330-331).

Tuhin Sengupta in his/her article, "The Aporia in the writings of Jim Corbett: The Paradox of Preservation and Destruction" (2015) discusses about the paradoxes in the works of Corbett as he has undergone many phases in his life. It creates a doubtful position when a conservationist

recounts his experiences of hunting and writes in favour of wildlife on the one hand and seems to destroy the wild animals on the other hand in the narratives. The term in the title as it suggests "aporia" has not been discussed in a literary sense as it is a lofty term which requires its loftiness to be released by its proper elaboration for the reader. It has simply been taken as a situation which describes the inconsistency in the tales. The study focuses on the Corbett's hunted tigers and leopards in quantity and detects the numbers of man-eaters which leaves a surplus amount of these wild animals in the credit of the hunter. This creates the imbalance between preservation preaching and hunting. Sengupta writes, "The paradox that runs through the breath taking tales is that when he recounts his experience as a hunter, he advocates for the wildlife and nature, as he saw and lived in-unmixed, unruffled and in its purity" (157). This study also makes a little comparison between Corbett and Anderson, his contemporary from South India and surprises at the initiation of the wildlife destruction and conservation by the same institution: Europeans or more precisely the British in India.

A research paper titled "Jim Corbett's Conservationist's Approach towards the Wildlife of India" (2013) written by G. S. Mhangore centrally adores Corbett's efforts to conserve the Indian wildlife. Describing the importance of the animals in Indian civilization, the paper differentiates between the Indian and British treatment of the animals. The study presents the close connection between Corbett and Nature and finds him "a devoted conservator who wrote for the cause of wildlife" (88). The article, written by Rameshwer Singh and Rimjhim Singh, "Sport and Anti Sport: Big Game Hunting in Jim Corbett's India" (2016) discusses the nature of the hunting sport in twentieth-century India. The paper paints Corbett in the positive light focusing on his hardships: in lieu of tracking the man-eaters, and for his later attempts of wildlife conservation. It brings the data of the wildlife loss and the impact of hunting on the ecology. The study criticises Prasanta Das' critical commentary on Corbett's "green" imperialism by calling it a "misrepresentation." But the statement in the abstract of the paper: "His career had a remarkable progression as a hunter-conservationist-wildlife photographer and all his writings are deeply coloured by his pioneering conservationist ideas" (1) gives the glimpse of half-learnedness in the Corbett's texts.

Varun Sharma in his article, "Rise and Fall of the 'Man-eater': The Changing Science and Technology of a Species (1860-present)" (2016) broadly focuses on the historical construction of the man-eater which is time specific. Jim Corbett, being the greatest hunter of the man-eaters

comes into the framework of analysis. The study explores the several discernments which contribute to the construction of the man-eaters in a particular time and age and also the role of the technology: gun, camera and printing which made it immediately famous. All the technological apparatuses significantly contributed to the human framed representation of the animal species overlooking the existence of an animal as animal. The article aims at exploring the processes "by which the man-eater was first constructed, and then dismantled by the spokespersons of the wild themselves. The erratic rise and fall of the man-eater are descriptive of changing power relations, the ephemeral yet pervasive axis between the colonial and the post-colonial, and the overall cunning of human society to represent animals for its own purposes" (53). There is the argument that the man-eater is the outcome of the realm of technology. The stories of the man-eaters by any writer give more emphasis on the prowess of the hunters than "anything related to the manner in which the advancement of the gun had made a mockery of tiger hunting" (59). The study focuses on Corbett's narratives in the sense of bringing forth the reasons for a tiger turning to be a man-eater or to explain the "stress of circumstances." Also, on the other hand, the "burst" in the printing activities in the eighteenth century cannot be overlooked for popularising the man-eating category of the animals which also served as the technology of power. The impact of the technology on the construction of the "man-eaters is so powerful that its ripples are felt till day" (72), and this category encloses in an endangered and peripheralised chapter of the history.

Iti Roy Chowdhury in her research article titled, "Man Eaters and the Eaten Men: A Study of the Portrayal of Indian in the Writings of Jim Corbett" (2017) elaborates the representation of Indian people by Corbett who are an integral part of the characterisation in the tales along with the animals. The study examines the colonial perception and their representation in the literary texts and also defies Edward Said's claims of the Orient invented by the West and its disciplining in a right way. Rather it focuses on the harmonious relationship between Corbett and the rural folk of India who is very simple and far from the city. The study finds Corbett helping the Indians instead of being harsh towards them, and his writings do not abide by the "Discourse on Social Darwinism of the East." And, argues that there is not any representation of the East as "Exotic East" in Corbett's works. If Corbett is looked upon through the postcolonial lenses of "Other," then it states, "He was the 'other' though not necessarily a superior other, which give his writings objectivity of view and portrayal of Indians. Corbett's animals are treated with

deference, with a great deal of respect, treated as an enemy who is an equal" (40). It makes a distinction between the people in the British psyche like Aziz, Prof. Godbole and Kim who are inscrutable but not entirely truthful while Corbett's characters are straightforward, honest and loyal hilly people.

Vandana Tripathi and Smita Sharma in their research paper, "An Assessment into the Life of Jim Corbett—the Conservationist" (accessed 2017) focus on Corbett's initiation of the conservation of tigers. They studied Jim Corbett as a conservationist who has worked for India in preserving its tigers. The focus of the research paper is on deforestation, tigers, extinction and survival. They say, "Jim Corbett was an environmentally conscious man who dedicated himself as a saviour of wild and human life. Corbett was the man who pioneered the effort to preserve India's wildlife. He was one of the major preservationists of Indian wildlife" (1). The study pays attention to the life and the transformational moments in Corbett's life. And, it also gives a passing reference to the encroachment of the wildlife due to the increasing population. They state, "Corbett was not a colonialist, he was a global environmentalist who recommended us to think and rethink about our surroundings" (5).

Apart from the above theses and research articles, some significant administrative figures have written about Corbett and his works in a prefatory manner like M.G.Hallett, Lord Linlithgow, and very eminent Anglo-Indian author: Ruskin Bond. Maurice G. Hallett, Governor of the United Provinces, from 1939-1945, has given an "Introduction" to the most famous text of Corbett, *Man-Eaters of Kumaon* (1944) and strongly appreciates Corbett's sportsmanship as he calls him a "genuine sportsman" as he is full of, "[P]hysical strength, infinite patience, great power of observation and power not only to notice small signs but also to draw the right inference from those signs" (v). He brings Rudyard Kipling (his *Jungle Books*) and Jim Corbett on the same platform as far as the popularity of their respective works is concerned but what makes the latter writer's works distinctive is the factuality of its incidences which can entice anyone interested in jungle yarns. Writing a "Foreword" to the same book, Lord Linlithgow, Viceroy of India, 1936-1943, is also mesmerised by the action and adventure of a great hunter. Having spent quite a good time with Corbett on the hunting grounds, Lord Linlithgow is influenced by his capability of understanding "signs of the jungle" (vii). On the one hand, this foreword is brimming to accolade Corbett for his courage, good marksmanship, forethought, preparation and persistence, on the other, the man-eaters are put purely in dark shade like

"cruel" and "malignant" (vii). He says, "Indeed the destruction of these abnormal and dangerous animals is a service of great value both to the afflicted population and to Government" (vii).

The celebrated Anglo-Indian author, Ruskin Bond has written an "Introduction" to newly published *The Jim Corbett Omnibus*, vol. I (2016). Corbett's popularity (India and abroad), broadly came after the publication of his first book *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. The attachment to the authenticity of his tales and the free-flowing style of its narration made Bond very compelling to read his stories irrespective of age: in childhood and after seventy years also. What makes his works so popular even after seventy years of its publication when there are neither the hunting practices nor the habitual man-eaters? He replies, "The conflict between man and beast is captured vividly by Corbett. His knowledge of the habits of wild animals is matched by his sympathy for the simple hill folk who find themselves at the mercy of the larger predators. He lives amongst them, eats with them, assesses the situation, and then goes out into the jungle to track down the killer" (v). Further, it is the loneliness of Corbett which adds more spice to his stories as he follows his hunt on foot in the jungle and follows their tracks. There lies a great tribute to Corbett as a writer as he is "a master of creating suspense" (vi). He takes the reader to the jungles where all the incidents took place, talks about the pursuit and, "Then there is the final shot, as the man-eater falls to the hunter's well-aimed bullet. All this told in a clear, simple, natural style—the style of a born storyteller" (vi).

Hailey in September 1955 in London writes an "Introduction" to Corbett's writings. It is published in *The Second Jim Corbett Omnibus* (2015), aligned to *Tree Tops*. He, too, takes the reader through the lifespan of Corbett as he is centrally the part of his narratives. He reveals about the hardships which Corbett faced but finds a scant description in his stories. He talks about his passion for the sports as it was in his blood and, "Good shooting was to him an obligation rather than an accomplishment" (375). The smooth functioning of the work at the railway junction at the Mokameh Ghat is attributed to his good nature when every worker was ready to work with him. The details also expose the great concern of Corbett for the shooting when Hailey recollects an incident of meeting him in the jungle near Kaladhungi. Corbett was dealing with great hardship for taking the photograph of a tigress and, this passion continues to his retiring place also, Kenya. He, further discusses the honours and medals, he won for his services to the Government of British India.

In reviewing *Man-eaters of Kumaon* (1944), R.W. Burton who, like Corbett, is a well-known hunter and author, was cordial. He endorses Corbett's handling of the gun, his bravery and his knowledge of jungle folk and their voices. But the book *Tigers of the Raj* reveals the pencilled notes of Burton in which he considered Corbett "'either extremely foolish' or inaccurate, or not well informed about wildlife in general" (qtd. in Jaleel 95).

The following segment captures the specific references to Jim Corbett mentioned in the notable books and articles containing vast scholarship on the animals, imperialism in India, big-cats behaviour, and colonial hunting, along with throwing light on Corbett's place in the historians and environmentalists' academe. Anand S. Pandian in his research article, "Predatory Care: The Imperial Hunt in Mughal and British India" (2001) gives a reference to Jim Corbett during a discussion on the role of Corbett as responsible sportsman who is associated with the various agencies of the colonial apparatus. The study sees the imperial hunt as a mechanism of the rule and the political practice. The slaughter of the man-eaters by Corbett is the site of the sovereign power which serves the purpose of control on the countryside. The study mentions: "Corbett gives the villagers an opportunity to see the dead beast 'with their own eyes' to know that the reign of terror is duly over, suggesting indeed that campaigns such as these to gain control of the countryside served the double purpose of winning the hearts of its inhabitants" (87). Further, it asserts, "In these hunting narratives (including Corbett's) colonial pastoral care is exercised . . . The pursuit of predatory tigers opened the countryside to the rule of law and the improvement of welfare only by instantiating the hunter himself as keenly potentate, personification of sovereign force" (88). Another writer, Scott Bennett, writes about Corbett's sportsmanship in his article "Shikar and the Raj" (1984) when he elaborates the ways of hunting by the British. The appraisal of Jim Corbett rests upon the forms of his shooting which were full of endurance and, tracking the man-eaters. Further, he is unique in understanding the ways of rural folk and having a "genuine" sympathy for them.

Whenever there is a discussion on the Indian wildlife, Jim Corbett stands an inseparable name as he is among the ones who understood Nature through his firsthand experiences. Therefore, there are many references to Corbett in the environmental studies, sometimes to rejuvenate the author's argument by using Corbett's knowledge of wildlife and sometimes to raise the question or acknowledge the nature of his conservation. Mahesh Rangarajan and Ramachandra Guha, two of the most popular critiques of the British colonialism and its adverse impact on environment in

India, have also given some passing references to Jim Corbett. But, Corbett appears to secure a safe place in their critical views. As Guha in an "Introduction" to the book *Lives in the Wilderness: Three Classic Indian Autobiographies* (1999) which describes the autobiographies of three writers: Jim Corbett, Verrier Elwin and Salim Ali, appreciates Corbett for highlighting the aspects of Indian life as is done in his *My India*.

The name; Jim Corbett, finds a repeated place in the citations of Mahesh Rangarajan, a widely read Indian historian and environmentalist. An overall understanding of Rangarajan's discussions on Corbett devotes to the duality of his role. He does not give a clean chit to Corbett either a hunter or a conservationist instead studies him/his works in an altering facet. The article "The Raj and the natural world: The war against 'dangerous beasts' in colonial India" (1998) analyses Corbett's role as a defender of the wildlife. In a chapter "Five Nature Writers" (2003), Rangarajan alludes to the studies which mesmerise Corbett only as a conservationist "it is erroneous to suppose, as many people do, that he only shot man-eaters . . . His sporting ethic, all the same, did not measure up to more recent notions of total preservation" ("Five" 351). Further, he identifies Corbett's denial of eradicating the tiger species vermin, "The Killing of man-eaters is always accompanied by a disavowal of any effort to wipe out the tiger as a species" ("Five" 354). However, a short discussion on the hunters' replacement of gun with the camera in his book *India's Wildlife History* (2001) [2017] adds Corbett's contribution to the transformative arena of wildlife preservation. He writes, "Corbett was not a full-throated fighter for the preservation of wildlife, but there were major shifts in his own interests and his public persona" (*India's Wildlife* 70).

In an exciting book *Hunter and Hunted: Relationships between carnivores and people* (2002), Hans Kruuk explores a strange connection between the people and the big cats or the carnivores as a whole. The chapter four of this book, "Man the hunted: Maneaters" delineates the people who have been hunted by the man-eaters. In reporting the attacks in South-East Asia, Kruuk devotes a section to Corbett's texts which chronicle the killings of the people by the man-eaters (particularly tigers and leopards). Kruuk is driven by the true picture of his narratives which create a sense of pain through which Corbett has undergone in redeeming the people from such man-eaters. He says, "Such accounts are presented in such detail that they convey a very factual picture. One feels that Corbett took great pains over the truth" (58). He also refers to Corbett's

knowledge about the leopards and their features by exemplifying the two leopards (the Panar and the Rudraprayag man-eaters) which Corbett explains in detail in his tales.[v]

Swati Shresth in her PhD dissertation (History) *Sahibs and Shikar: Colonial Hunting and Wildlife in British India, 1800-1935* (2009) makes a brief analysis on Jim Corbett in two of the chapters of this dissertation. She examines Corbett's writings while inquiring about the association of hunting as a determinant factor with the notions of class and status. The study argues that the numerous awards to Corbett are the example of negotiating personal prestige (through hunting) with the social hierarchy of the British in India. Corbett, being an Indian by birth and education stands low in the British Social hierarchy system. And, Corbett, being highly conscious of his untrue Briton identity, uses his "hunter-protector" tool to substantiate his identity as a true Briton. The cult of the benevolent hunter in the twentieth century confers the prestige to the lower class Britons.[vi] The focus is laid on Corbett as an important pillar of the empire who serves the Indians with the hope of winning and not losing the well-established faith in the British who built their Raj of a very protective nature. Further, Jim Corbett is evaluated within the structure of, "The role of hunting in the constitution of British power in the rural districts of their Indian empire . . . to highlight the role of hunting in enabling the colonial state's claims to a powerful, pervasive and paternal presence in the Indian countryside" (252). He successfully achieves the tag of a paternal ruler in two ways: eliminating the man-eaters and winning the support and affection of the villagers.

Shefali Rajamannar in her comprehensive book *Reading the Animal in the Literature of the Raj* (2012) deals with the importance of the animals for the Raj for their social, cultural and political enterprises. While discussing the fading decades of the British Raj in the chapter "Our Rightful Claim to Superiority as a Dominant Race: Hunting narratives and the British Raj 1857-1947," she gives a glimpse of the writings of Jim Corbett. The increasing emphasis on the animal rights could not evade the hunting functioning in the later decades of the Raj, and the policies of the British take a soft turn towards the animals in this period. She throws light on the use of the camera by Corbett or in simpler terms his conservation phase is highlighted here. His knowledge of the big cats for turning to be man-eaters, invokes the irresponsible acts of hunting. But at the same time, there is a warning against the late thought of conservation:

> Corbett fought to stop the cycle of hunters wounding big cats who then took to man-eating, which led to more 'protective' hunts that often only served to wound even more

> tigers and other animals. He issued a warning: India was well on its way of losing its big cats, unless drastic measures were taken for their protection. While his warnings came too late for animals like cheetah that never recovered from large-scale depredations in their numbers due to bounty-hunting. (126)

In this period, use of the camera is the epitome of a sophisticated and civilised way of the British behaviour and also the method of gaining jungle knowledge as done by Corbett.

Shashi Tharoor in his book *An Era of Darkness: The British Empire in India* (2016) brings the empire in the darker shade as the title suggests, but he throws light on some of the British who find exclusion from this darkness. He talks about the "heroic efforts" of many who are still remembered in post-colonial India for their contribution to the native country. There is a reference to Corbett's service in a disguised manner: "And yet there is no doubt about the heroic efforts of many individual civilians, who dug canals, founded colleges, administered justice and even in some cases, advocated Indian self-rule. Their names became part of the geography of the subcontinent: towns called Abbottabad, Lyallpur and Cox's Bazar, Corbett Park, Cotton Hill, the Mcnabbwah Canal" (Ch. 2).

The above section of the literature review unfolds many aspects of Corbett's writings, but the weight is on exploring the author of these writings, i.e., Corbett himself. Being a narrator of his own experiences, he dominates the mind and works of the researchers while his texts are examined. Most of the studies find Corbett a great conservationist and end up commending his efforts for the tigers' conservation. If there is a gist to say of all the studies (other than few), as a researcher, it is surprising to find out that the tag of the "good colonial" or "a great conservationist" has overshadowed the hunting phase of his life. The critical insight into his works lacks in depth. Out of the particular Corbett studies, there are few articles including Taylor's, Das', Mandala's and Swati's dissertation that make a textual critique and come up with bringing the other shades, aligning to Corbett and the hunting activities in the British Raj.

Surprisingly none of the exclusive studies on Corbett has touched on the concept of the animal in his narratives. What roles have the man-eaters played in the life of Corbett in particular and for the British Empire in general? Why was Corbett undergoing such hardship (mental and physical) for tracking the big cats? Was it only for "sports" or beyond that? Why was Corbett so close to the native people while holding his "white" identity? Why were the big cats so

significant for the Empire that the bounties were awarded for killing them while the other less powerful animals against the gun remain unfocused? At the same time, there are the serious questions from the animals' point of view which need to be addressed: Were the animals really colonised? Or their retrieval in the form of attacking people can be deconstructed as a resistance to the human rule? Did the animals/particularly big cats offer a threat to the Empire's desire to "orientalise" the colonised non-human subjects? Is the animals' representation possible through literature? And if the animals could be represented, then their underlying capabilities are being diminished by representation because representation is possible only of the objects while the animals are purely the subjective entities. Why did the man-eaters arise only at a particular time? In fact, the emergence of the man-eater makes Corbett a superhero in India. The involvement of the animals in the imperial writings gives a widespread understanding of the idea of "animal" and its deep convictions with the British Raj in India.

This thesis does not jump into the aesthetics and thrill of the adventurous pursuit of one of the most beautiful and powerful/dangerous animals in the dark of Indian jungles of Kumaon instead it situates the texts of Corbett as great pieces of literary work that deal with the broader issues of man and animal and its underlying significance for the British political scenario related to the mechanism of rule. Corbett follows the literary tradition of writing experiences of the hunt on colonial land. However, his specificity posits the rare notes on man-eaters sporting. None of the studies unambiguously addresses the question: why did Corbett remain the most popular and read author of the *shikar* (hunting) literature in India; particularly consigning the pursuit of man-eaters in the jungles? Even though the then contemporary White hunters: Kenneth Anderson and Colonel Burton's careers closely resemble with Corbett's containing the man-eaters' accounts and a final appeal for wildlife conservation but find scant attention by the scholars. Concerning the same question, this study argues that it is the Western cultural and ideological constructions of animal(ity) that glorifies, justifies, and rationalises violence against the animals. Simultaneously, it potentially presents conceptual elaboration *how* the dominant factor of human service (humanity) in Corbett's narratives enforces his identity as a symbol of paternalistic British Raj. The discourse of man-eaters' cruelty and Corbett's humanity leads to the new constructions of humane behaviours of the White hunters differencing from animality.

Corbett's writings present a rare amalgamation of human and non-human properties of a then colonised country remodelling a compact pack of binaries: colonial/colonised, nature/culture and also the distinction between man and animal. However, it is interesting to note (which will be further elaborated in the thesis) that the dissolution of such binaries makes the analysis plunge into the sphere of the colonial discourse when the differentiation is asserted and withdrawn at the same time. Here, the concept of *sahib* requires a good deal of critical analysis as it carries the connotations of racial, social and cultural differences. The pictorial description in the text manifests the gap between two races through specific dress code, the way of sitting and addressing each other. The articulation, "On Sunday evenings Chamari and I would sit, he on a mat and I on a stool, with a great pile of copper pice between us. . . ." (*My India* 170) discloses the existing political, cultural in addition to racial hierarchy, where Corbett is the administrator and Chamari, a worker. The white identity is maintained throughout the discourse in a refined way. His popular name among the natives runs as a "white *sadhu*." The episode of Corbett's conduction of the hunting grounds for Viceroy Linlithgow and his family when they visit Kumaon unveils the underlying devotion and ambition in Corbett for being acknowledged as British identity, serving the British authority. The similar kind of prestige Corbett acquires in serving the British regime can be sensed from the Princess Elizabeth's stay at the Tree Tops (a sophisticated hut) in Kenya in 1952. Describing the overwhelming experience with Princess Elizabeth and Duke Philip, he mentions: "For myself, those hours that I was honoured and privileged to spend in their company will remain with me while memory lasts" (*Tree Tops* 400). Corbett's letter to Brander in 1947 solidifies his imperial-self, soothing only among the unquestioning entities (rural folk) of India. He keeps a word of praise for the submissive population and calls the Indian freedom fighters and nationalists "a parcel of fools" (*My Kumaon* 77). Also, as far as the animal tales are concerned, the sense of anthropocentrism glitters. For example, there is pure negligence towards the pain of Talla Des man-eater: "The people of Talla Des had suffered and suffered grievously from the tigress, and for the suffering she had inflicted she was now paying in full" (*The Temple Tiger* 173). And finally, there was a great sense of satisfaction in killing this man-eater like, "Wounded and starving though she was, she was game to fit it out. Her spring, however, was never launched, for, as she rose, my first bullet raked her from end to end, and the second bullet broke her neck" (*The Temple Tiger* 178).

Looking into the issues of the binaries which are the hot topics of the contemporary changing world where the animal is purely looked upon from the different perspectives as it was in the colonial period; Corbett's writings appear tainted with many hidden tensions in him. On the one hand, he is hunting the man-eater as this animal is an enemy to the human life while if the same animal is lying dead, he turns to be an innocent animal, abiding by the laws of Nature. The Rudraprayag man-eater's tale is a case in point which is marked with many such expressions. When the man-eater is alive; he is a foe "with the body of a leopard and the head of a fiend" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 19). But looking at the leopard's innocence while lying dead, Corbett says, "But here was no fiend, . . . the best-hated and the most feared animal in all India, whose only crime—not against the laws of nature, but against the laws of man" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 158).

The advent of human-animal studies in the second half of the twentieth century unlocks the possibilities for having new outlooks on the colonial writings where the non-humans play more significant roles than the humans. As the majority of Corbett's narratives revolve around his encounter with the man-eaters and takes the reader to feel and enjoy the thrill of being driven and travel in the remote jungles of the nineteenth-century India, there is need to make a critical inquiry into Corbett's writings. The declaration of the writer in the author's note regarding the nature of the tigers "Human beings are not the natural prey of tigers, and it is only when the tigers have been incapacitated through wounds or old age that, in order to live, they are compelled to take a diet of human flesh" (*Man-Eaters* vii), the words: "wounds" and "compelled" raise the broader question on the nature of human intervention in the animals' sphere and its impact on human life as well as the wildlife. If India seems to be so rich in wildlife then the degradation of it along with decadence in the natural food of the carnivores, in colonial India and the implementation of several wildlife conservation laws in present India raise a question on the disposition of the colonial policies regarding the wildlife in particular and non-human Nature in general. With celebrating its leading position in tiger conservation (TRAFFIC report 2016), India is, in fact, rejoicing its wildlife remnants. The hailing of Corbett as an initiator of the tiger conservation in India again demands an inquiry into Corbett's works. As he is primarily a hunter and stands aligned to the British tradition as far as the hunting of the tigers is concerned. And, his consciousness for the tiger conservation evolves out of his indulgence into the hunting expeditions itself. The hunt of the animals: bear, *ghooral*, deer, *sambhar*, *mahsheer*,

snakes, birds and others are unrestricted. The privilege in slaughtering these animals is more self-satisfactory:

> Lying in an uncomfortable position and shooting up to an angle of sixty degrees at a range of 200 yards at the small white mark on the *ghooral*'s throat, there did not appear to be one chance in a million of the shot coming off, and yet the heavy lead bullet driven by black powder had not been deflected by a hair's breadth and had gone true to its mark, killing the animal instantaneously. (*Man-Eaters* 8)

Although satisfaction lies in hunting the animals, prestige lies in shooting the big cats. The shooting of a leopard at the very early age, Corbett cherishes with his family and friends. He recalls

> Having already hit the leopard in the body, and not killed him, I now decided to try his head . . . but the leopard appeared to sense that I was near, and as was turning his head to look at me I put a bullet into his ear . . . Trembling with joy at the beautiful animal I had shot, and trembling most of all with anticipation of the pleasure I would have in carrying the news of my great success to those at home who I knew would be as pleased and as proud of my achievements as I was. (*Jungle Lore* 292)

The analysis of Corbett's tales freshens up bringing the broad issues of colonialism and its relationship with the animals which in turn shapes the dynamics of their contact with the human beings also. The contiguity between Corbett and the jungles of Kumaon flourishes knowledge in him regarding the jungles/bushes, the animals, winds, the animals' language, habits and their role in the cycle of Nature. And consequently, develop a "Jungle Sensitiveness . . . which can be acquired only by living in the jungles in close association with the wild life, is the development of the subconscious warning of danger" (*Jungle Lore* 363). The warning against the impending danger makes Corbett many times to evade the perilous situation. The Chowgarh man-eater's tale is the prime example of this guarding sense in Corbett. The scenario of the animals' rights and ethics notion emphasises the necessity to revise the concept of the man-eater whose killing is not only justified rather it is a mark of the nobility of a sportsman.

Moreover, the identity of the empire as a whole is embedded with the hunter sportsmen. There is an attempt to conceptualise the concept of the "man-eater animal" that emerges with

entailing several important "ism" with itself like humanism, speciesism, racism, anthropocentrism, and most importantly colonialism which collaboratively idealise the shooting of a man-eater. While on the other side, the concept of the man-eater or the big cats is capable of unfolding the hidden aspects of the animal domain with revealing the colonial desire of controlling these powerful animals who are the strongest makers of their Raj. The study critically analyses the big cats tales which bring forth the aspects of animal agency, resistance and power that intertwine together to challenge the colonial rule and disrupt the colonial desire to present the colonised non-human nature (particularly big cats) as the simple "objects" that could be *Orientalized*.[vii] There is an attempt to uncover the ways of the big cats/man-eaters who reflect the colonial manipulation and emerge as the subjective entities who retaliate against the humans' interference in the wild domain. Since the narratives are the expression of the personal experiences of Jim Corbett, so it is inevitable to keep Corbett apart from the critical analysis. The hunter cum conservationist phase of his life evidently speaks about his emotional and colonial affiliations with the wildlife as well as with the rural folk. His later writings express many concerns linked to the future of tigers in India. Such association with animals is integrated with his life and sportsman vigour. There is an attempt to identify the "contested" realm in Corbett as his liabilities are bound to be a responsible member of the British administration and as a loving *sahib* for the colonised people. It is also curious to see that the two different institutions glorify Corbett but this glorification could not stop him leaving the country in 1947, the year of Indian Independence. The desire of a self-expatriated writer to write about India and its people identifies an unexpressed tension in Corbett regarding his identity which is bound to Indian human and non-human entities or to the country in a singular term.

As discussed earlier, the European modernity emerges with establishing an undiluted difference between the human and the animal. And, imperialism in sheltering the notions of the Western value cosmos bequeaths the man and animal dichotomy. The hunting practices along with a more refined term "sports" are central to the manifestations of that dominance the colonials cherish directly over the animals and indirectly on the humans. Being imperial hunt as the governing theme in Corbett's writings, the humanist approach makes it a cultural construction of the Europeans when the notions of "being English" or "an extraordinary sportsman" is closely tied up with the idea of the animal. The theoretical underpinnings this study employs here expand in questioning the longstanding conviction of the man and animal

distinction. Friedrich Nietzsche is among the ones who critique humanism in the second section of *Untimely Meditations* (1876) and simultaneously it has the implications for the animals too. However, his articulations of the animals remain "it"; dethroning them from the equality of subjectivities. But the inclusion of the animals in his thought is on the threshold of a change. He is a thinker of the animal-human who finds human as an animal, laden with those responsibilities and thinking which make him sad. The concept of the "forgetful" is, in fact, a bliss that makes an animal to live in the present while the same unforgetfulness of the past makes the human envy and pushes him to the dark. He considers that the man is a historical construction and this is the historicity that Nietzsche targets. While an animal is purely an unhistorical being living in the present happily, not having the sense of the past redeems him from all the bondage of unhappiness. There is a sarcastic expression on the human beings when they deny being compared with the animals, "There is a hard sight for man to see; for, though he thinks himself better than the animals because he is human, he cannot help envying them their happiness—what they have, a life neither bored nor painful, is precisely what he wants, yet he cannot have it because he refuses to be like an animal" (60). Although the animals' dissimilarity is used about the humans, there is also a sense of denial of the traits as the sole belongings of the humans. Further, he says, "The animal lives *unhistorically*: for it is contained in the present . . . it does not know how to dissimulate, it conceals nothing and at every instant appears wholly as what it is; it can therefore never be anything but honest" (61).

There is a close engagement of Gilles Deleuze with the non-humans that inspires many of the thinkers working in the post-human or non-human centric area of study. The strand of "antihumanism" is ranging in all his works because he is a critique of the idea of the human as the supreme power and a distinct species, fundamentally separated from the others. Though the nonhuman is such a wide term, "[R]anging from the smallest sub-atomic forces to the operation of solar systems, forces comprising the human and its overcoming, forces that cannot be comprehended by the human (the plane of immanence) but that connect the human to all that is both human and nonhuman" (Grosz, qtd. in Roffe and Stark 19), but remains Deleuze's primary concern in his works. He critiques the category of "the human" which exercises power in various forms, as Elizabeth Grosz says in an interview with Roffe and Stark, "The nonhuman turn . . . is one of the implications of a critique of the restriction of the human to the able-bodied, Western, white, civilized, masculine man, and forms of control exerted by the category 'human'" (qtd. in

Roffe and Stark 18). He considers the human as one of the units in the composition of the universe and man is both: human and non-human as he is the human-animal. It is noteworthy that in analysing the human traits and concepts, the theme of the non-humans is turning to be prominent that validates the interlinking of the different species into one. In reading the complications of the humans, there are the features of the animals coming to the fore and challenge the existing notion of the animality. *Difference and Repetition* (1994) offers the psychic dimensions through Freud and Lacan's conceptions. But at the same time, it brings the concept of intersubjectivity of the human and the animal. This book in discussing the nature of stupidity and error and the factors leading to error, comes to make a proposition imposing an objection on the relative rationality and stupidity as the respective features of the man and the animal. He says,

> Stupidity [*bêtise*] is not animality. The animal is protected by specific forms which prevent it from being 'stupid' [*bête*]. Formal correspondences between the human face and the heads of animals have often been composed; in other words, correspondences between individual differences peculiar to humans and the specific differences of animals. Such correspondences, however take no account of stupidity as a specifically human form of bestiality. (Deleuze 150)

The quote provides an insight into the thoughts that have deliberately been avoided by the humans. The counterpart between "stupidity" and "bestiality" and its erasure from the correspondence between man and animal shows the humans' self-established traits meant to serve the different forms of the humans. While stupidity as such is a "structure of thought" (151) which is possible through the linkage between thought and individuation ("I"), the animals do not aim at.

Peter Singer realises the racist and sexist prejudices; taking place against the non-human species and gives momentum to the term "speciesism," formulated by Richard Ryder, in his book *Animal Liberation* (1975). He invokes the preference given to the human beings as an act of speciesist activity. He makes an analogue between the racist actions of violating the equality among the various members of other race and the sexist acts of favouring the interests of his sex. Also, finds a direct relation of this thought analogous to the speciesist responses of the human species as he says, "most human beings are speciesists," and "Similarly, the speciesist allows the

interests of his own species to override the greater interests of members of other species. The pattern is identical in each case" (9). In bringing the three essential terms together and establishing an identity among the three, Singer reduces the gravity of these terms to the psychological phenomenon of human actions. This term emerges in response to the vivisectionist agility with the exploitation and experimentation of the animals for the sake of the human needs. The crux of the thought lies in to liberate the animals from all sorts of sufferings and pain inflicted on them because of the speciesist derogatory implications. It gives a raise to the concept of the animal as being-in-itself. The work of Singer proves to be a trailblazer for the human-animal studies. It cleans the blurred picture of the "animal" for the academics and a scholarship on the animal representation in literature and the multilayered human-animal relationship emerge. In a similar vein, critique of Western rationalism (rational animal) is found in Coetzee's fictional corpus *The Lives of Animals* (1999). Although fictional, Coetzee's (Costello) poignant defence of animals is noteworthy for the animal ethics. He calls reason "a vast tautology" (25), used for justifying the animals' exploitation.

The ecofeminists acknowledge the need to address the intimacy between human and non-human Othering in academic world. They explore the idea of interlinking the oppression of gender, race and species. Like Carol Adams, Josephine Donovan, and Val Plumwood are among the leading ecofeminists to theorise the dehumanisation of the species. Plumwood furnishes an interlock between racism and speciesism in which the animals (in fact the whole Nature) are put in the "Other" category that fundamentally serves to build the ecological imperialism. She brings racism, sexism and colonialism together to understand the colonial (European) exploitation of the "Other" section in which the colonised, the women, the children and the animals are put alike. She makes an appealing statement of the humans' failure to recognise the plight of the non-humans; including animals when they are othered in such a way that their contribution to the ecological balance is denied. She calls, "Our failure to situate dominant forms of human society ecologically is matched by our failure to situate non-human ethically, as the plight of the non-human species continues to worsen" (2). Further, she asserts, "Primary among the Others whose contribution is assumed but denied is nature, the sphere of the non-human, including animals, plants and the biospheric cycles and processes of which they are part" (28).

Jacques Derrida's late work *The Animal That Therefore I Am* (2008) sounds like a groundbreaking connotation for addressing the question of the animal. He puts at stake the traditional philosophical cult that creates the category "the animal" and maltreats it. The question of the animal runs through many of Derrida's writings showing his sympathy with the animal in the way it has been uttered philosophically and used materially. He addresses many serious unnoticed issues aligned to "the animal": the singularity of this term, the presentation of the animals and the animal life in philosophy and the question of the animals' suffering. Probably he answers to one of the striking queries made by Bentham, "The question is not, Can they reason? nor, Can they talk? but, Can they suffer?"[viii] He repeatedly comes to the suffering of the animals in his lectures because it haunts him. Besides, this book takes account of the animal in Heidegger and other philosophers. He critiques the singularity of the animal in which all the animals are homogeneous in opposition to the humans, and due to this opposition, all the violence and maltreatment to the animals are justified. He coins the plural word for the animals; *animot* which he frequently uses in his lectures and writings to make the readers remember the plurality of the animals, he is, and others are. Derrida's philosophical encounter with his cat makes him think something which has not been thought previously; underneath all the dominant presuppositions there is a desire for establishing dominance and superiority on the animals. He says, "I often ask myself, just to see, *who I am*—and who I am at the moment when, caught naked, in silence, by the gaze of an animal, . . . the eyes of a cat, I have trouble, yes, a bad time overcoming my embarrassment" (*The Animal That* 3-4). Why is the embarrassment taking place in nudity in front of an animal who is purely unembarrassed? Is this the ashamedness of being nude like an animal? In fact, the cat is not naked because she does not have a sense of being naked. Likely he asserts, "[T]he animal is naked without consciousness of being naked, it is thought that modesty remains as foreign to it as does immodesty" (*The Animal That* 5). Thus, the concepts of good and evil, modesty and immodesty, naked and clothed are the human species' constructions that are used interestingly to demarcate with other species. He keeps on calling the animal "a word" that the man creates for its own use, "The animal, what a word! The animal is a word, it is an appellation that men have instituted, a name they have given themselves the right and authority to give to the living other" (*The Animal That* 23) [I mentioned this classification in the animal's definition in the earlier section of this thesis]. The discussion in the book develops to question

the philosophy that deprives the animal of many characteristics and attributes unwarranted license to the humans to use these characteristics as their sole property:

> It is *not just* a matter of asking whether one has the right to refuse the animal such and such a power (speech, reason, experience of death, mourning, culture, institutions, technics, clothing, lying, pretense of pretense, covering of tracks, gift, laughter, crying, respect, etc.—the list is necessarily without limit, and the most powerful philosophical tradition in which we live has refused the 'animal' *all of that*). It *also* means asking whether what calls itself human has the right rigorously to attribute to man, which means therefore to attribute to himself, what he refuses the animal, and whether he can ever possess the *pure, rigorous, indivisible* concept, as such, of that attribution. (*The Animal That* 135)

The question of being *after*, being *alongside*, being *near* or being *with* the animal lies in the association with the animal in several ways. Derrida equates all the possibilities of being there with the animal and surrounded by the animal. He postulates philosophically that in all the suppositions: after, alongside, near or with, the man is nowhere before the animal which is deconstructed as the man is always after the animal. In all the cases, "[I]f I am (following) *after* it, the animal therefore comes before me, earlier than me" (*The Animal That* 10). In another book *The Beast and the Sovereign* (2009), reminding Deleuze, Derrida makes the use of the French words *bêtise* (stupidity) and *bête* (stupid) to designate these characteristics to the humans as he says, "*Bêtise* is a human thing and not that of the beast" (*The Beast* 152), and "[T]hey (the animals) cannot be *bête*" (*The Beast* 154). Like Derrida, Giorgio Agamben in his book *The Open: Man and Animal* (2004) reacts to Heidegger's interpretation of the animal as something which cannot relate itself to its disinhibitor because of its ignorance of "being" there. The man is the only category that has the sense of being. In fact, Agamben opposes the kinds of categorisation that puts the man and the animal against each-other, "In our culture, man has always been the result of a simultaneous division and articulation of the animal" (92). As Derrida refuses the awareness of nudity in cat, Agamben refutes the sense of beings in the animals:

> In so far as the animal knows neither beings nor nonbeings, neither open nor closed, it is outside of being; it is outside in an exteriority more external than any open, and inside in an intimacy more internal than any closedness. To let the animal be would then mean: to

> let it be *outside of being*. The zone of nonknowledge—or of a-knowledge—that is at issue here is beyond both knowing and not knowing, beyond both disconcealing and concealing, beyond both being and the nothing. (91)

Taking the notion of the animal a step forward, Donna Haraway thinks of the "companion species" in *When Species Meet* (2008). She appreciates Derrida as one of the most curious philosophers who brought the unthinkable to the fore, but he fails to the obligation of a companion species. He is curious about the thinking that starts in the confrontation of the cat but is not curious about "what the cat actually be doing, feeling, thinking, or perhaps making available to him in looking back at him that morning" (Haraway 20). This book brings the close entanglements of the man and the animal sphere. Haraway, in situating the feeling and thinking of the cat, perhaps raises more profound issues of the non-human agency. To obtrude the thinking to the cat that Derrida (possibly undeliberately) ignores to address is, in fact, the analytical ability of the mind attributing subjectivity to a non-human animal. The thinking and feeling of the cat, (if) taking place are validating and reminding of Charles Darwin's claim that the difference between human mind and animal mind is of the degree, not of kind: "We have seen that the senses and intuitions, the various emotions and faculties, such as love, memory, attention, curiosity, imitation, reason, &c., of which man boasts, may be found in an incipient, or even sometimes in a well-developed condition, in the lower animals" (Darwin 105). It shows that the actions one finds in the animals are the reactions/responses to specific stimuli.

The poststructuralist notion of language; Derrida introduces in *Of Grammatology* (1997), stirs the humans' authority over the language as the spoken word. The limitisation of language to the humans' words is entirely a collapsing idea of the human intellectualisation. He reposes language for action, movement, thought, experience, consciousness, reflection, unconsciousness, affectivity etc. His emphasis on "writing" tends to observe, "[T]o designate not only the physical gestures of literal pictographic or ideographic inscription, but also the totality what makes it possible . . . we say 'writing' for all that gives rise to an inscription . . . whether it is literal or not . . . cinematography, choreography, of course, but also pictorial, musical, sculptural 'writing'" (*Of Grammatology* 9). Further, he says that the theory of cybernetics must conserve "the notion of writing, trace, gramme [written mark], or grapheme" (*Of Grammatology* 9). Thus, Derrida asserts that the trace, the mark or the inscriptions are constitutional to a language than merely the

spoken words are. If the elements; the trace and the mark are fundamental to a language, then this implication is inseparable from the non-human linguistic abilities and its transmission. Referring to the deconstruction of logocentrism in *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, Derrida says

> The deconstruction of 'logocentrism' had, for necessary reasons, to be developed over the years as deconstruction of 'phallogocentrism,' then of 'carnophallogocentrism,' its very first substitution of the concept of trace or mark for those of speech, sign, or signifier was destined in advance, and quite deliberately, to cross the frontiers of anthropocentrism, the limits of a language confined to human words and discourse. Mark, gramma, trace, and différance refer differentially to all living things, all the relations between living and nonliving. (*The Animal That* 104)

To go beyond the verbal language permits the acknowledgement of various forms of communication that dominates the non-human world. Thus, Derrida's arguments regarding finding the animal in him and human in the animal is opening the doors for revising the outlined understandings of the non-human animals that the humans have constructed. Exposing the animals to the linguistic world, Derrida permeates the issues of the animals' subjectivity and agency. McFarland and Hediger; editors of the book *Animals and Agency* (2009) pay considerable attention to Derrida's repositions of the non-human agency. They derive a quote from Derrida's "Structure, Sign and Play," "How could anything new ever occur in individual behavior without agency" (14). The individual here signifies the non-human animal(s) when her, his/their actions and different behaviours in different conditions indicate towards the non-human agency. They assert that "These animals . . . when forced, react/respond in surprising ways—communicating, joking, helping, deceiving—ways that warrant the title of agency" (15). The expression of the agency might be in a different way from the human way of expressing it; again it is appropriate to quote Paul W. Taylor's view on the different organisms, "[A]ll organisms are teleological centers of life in the sense that each is a unique individual pursuing its own good in its own way" (qtd. in McFarland and Hediger 2). However, many behavioural studies on the animals prove that the animals are competent enough to learn and transmit the languages that lay in the cognitive functionality of them. They can act with awareness in their lives or can follow the social patterns or norms among the similar kind of animal groups. The animals are much aware of protecting their cubs, food, shelter, mate, etc. Frans de Waal, an ethologist and

primatologist, finds a connection between the human morality and animals. He says, "Our 'good nature' is inherited, along with much else, from our nonhuman ancestors through the ordinary Darwinian process of natural selection . . . the simpler nonhuman morality must . . . be regarded, in a substantial sense, as the foundation of more complex human morality" (qtd. in Ober and Macedo xii). The animals' response to each other's activity reflects emotional connections among the animals' group. Rejecting the kinship of morality with rationality (as Kant does), Waal considers emotions as the base for moral behaviours. For instance, Corbett's tales about the man-eaters are full of the alarm calls given by monkeys and *langurs* to the *kakar* and *sambhar* of the presence of the big cats (will be discussed in Chapter 4). It shows the kind of affective responsibility performed by the little animals against the large carnivores.

As discussed above, an overview of the Western thinkers' idea of the animal emerging in the late twentieth century explicitly evolves as a reaction to the eighteenth-century animal notion and to some extent; it is a revised edition to the single sided concept of the animal. It sees the animal not as an object to serve the man in practical life and the literary object of representation that can embellish a piece of literature. Instead, the cult of the human-animal studies that emerges lately studies the animals for animals' sake. By taking into consideration, the presence of the animals in Corbett's texts, the present study endeavours at a multilayered analysis of human-animal relations against the colonial background in India. First, there is an attempt to expose the "man" and "animal" as the constructed categories that assist the colonials in forming contiguity with the natives. Secondly, to encounter the various forms of "othering": the colonised human and non-human subjects are contingent.[ix] Thirdly, to trace the emotional shift in Corbett as it emerges from his close engagement with beyond the human world. The centrality of focus on the "other" or "othering" in the Postcolonial studies, taking colonialism as its subject matter shares some affinities with the human-animal studies when the non-humans' othering is equally significant to address.

In order to answer the compelling questions: the animals' presence in colonial narrative and its significance, to conceptualise the "man-eating" category of animals, the underlying resistance in the big cats through agency and power, and the othering of the colonised subjects in several ways, this study implies the critical discourse analysis. The critical or critique remains an approach in this thesis as the study opts not to divulge into the pure aesthetic rhetoric of the

human and animal interaction in the jungles rather assesses the interconnection of dominance, power, discrimination and control as exercised and maintained through the discourse. The textual analysis: spoken or written is extended to analyse that social, political and cultural structure that glorifies the hunting of the animals, along with the pictorial assessment of the hunter and hunted subjects. There is a probe into the unequal power relations (maintained through ideology) when this power is exercised on the colonised humans and nonhumans[x] through the hunting practices. Ruth Wodak defines the aim of critical discourse analysis "to 'demystify' discourses by deciphering ideologies" (10). Similarly, this study endeavours demystifying the discourse of the jungle, including Corbett himself—in an environment of the proximity among the natives, a *sahib* and, the (wild) animals. The postcolonial studies interrogate the "othering" of the colonised humans; also focusing dehumanising the humans by comparing them to the animals. In such case, the animal as the subject matter of discussion becomes essential in both the senses: as an inferior object to be compared with, and a hidden perpetual urgency of the imperial enterprise to establish itself as something which is non-animal containing the substance of non-animality. Thus, the common ground between the postcolonial thought and the animal question is the all-time presence of the "animal" in various discourses. Further, it entails the question of the agency that is central to both the studies but postcolonial criticism lacks in addressing animal subjectivities while the human-animal studies are enriched with the question of animal-as-such. This study explores the "othering" of human and non-human animals. In analysing the othering of the latter, this thesis adopts the human-animal studies' stand in developing the argument of animals' presence from an objective to subjective entities. Therefore, the present thesis uses the methodological paradigms of postcolonial critics (as far as the human characters are narrated) along with the human-animal studies to address the "question of the animal" and animals-as-such.

The attempts of the postcolonial critics like Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, and Gayatri Chakraborty Spivak to decolonise the European constructs of the Orient has helped this study to analyse the "White consciousness" running between the lines in the Corbett's texts, particularly when his narratives tend to depict the rural folk of India. The presence of the cultural difference and the negation of this difference between the colonial and the colonised is probably the pursuing of a benevolent and paternalistic colonial master that turn to be the characteristics of the "good colonials" towards the twentieth-century India. As the categories of race, gender, class,

and species intertwine together when the hunting narratives of the man-eaters are analysed; there is a shift in focus of this thesis. It moves from examining the animals as the objects of colonial manoeuvres when the several imperial constructions: imperial sportsman, imperial identity, intimacy with the natives and the imperial representation of the animal as "wild" who is killable, is formulated, to the animal space when the animals are the venture of explication who are the lively powerful colonised subjects who counteract to the orientalisation.

Through the critical stance, keeping the overall six collections of narratives, written by Jim Corbett, this thesis postulates the following objectives:

1. To investigate the contested nature of Jim Corbett's narratives in the flow of bridging the gap between the colonial ideals and the colonised subjects. Also, to trace the varied underlying forms of ideological "othering": the human and the non-human entities are contingent to.
2. To expose the "man-eater" myth by situating it in the cultural practices (hunting sport) via man/animal dichotomy from which they rise. And, to analyse them as the natural creatures; liable to their "Natural" proviso.
3. To probe into the animal behaviour: situate the non-human animals as the agents in their environment.
4. To explore the non-human animal subjects (particularly big cats carnivores), as a threat to the imperial enterprise.

For achieving the above mentioned objectives, structurally this thesis is divided into five Chapters:

1. Introduction
2. Jim Corbett: White or Brown?
3. Contesting the Animal(ity): Shifting Boundaries of the Colonial-colonised Nexus
4. Demystifying the Animal: Fathoming the Roaring of the (colonised) Animals/Big Cats
5. Conclusion

The Chapter one "Introduction" opens up building the question/idea of the animal travelling from European modernity to postmodernity or postcoloniality. It embeds with the significance of the animal presence in the non-fictional narratives written by Jim Corbett. This chapter situates

Corbett's writings to analyse and understand the human and animal relations in a multilayered way. All the books, written by Jim Corbett: *Man-Eaters of Kumaon* (1944), *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag* (1947), *My India* (1952), *Jungle Lore* (1953), *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon* (1954), and *Tree Tops* (1955) are taken for study. There is a thorough consideration of the research works: thesis, dissertation, articles, essays, reviews, tribute, etc., concerned with Jim Corbett. Through the literature review, this section is able to come up with many research issues and gaps which made this further study on the writings of Corbett possible. Meanwhile, there is a short introduction to the primary texts and location of man and animal in these writings entailing all the issues of human subjectivity, anthropocentrism, speciesism, and colonialism comprising the man/animal dichotomy. The theoretical underpinnings embedded in this study involve exploring the placed animal in the Western ideological expressions, and finding its analogies against the colonial backdrop in India. The theoretical framework is followed by the research methods and methodologies carried forward to accomplish the well-defined objectives of this thesis.

Chapter two titled "Jim Corbett: White or Brown?" first of all, addresses the question of Corbett's identity, as the title suggests. Since the popularity of Corbett rests upon his image as a saviour of the Kumaoni people or the hilly people in general sense in the United Provinces of British India, so it is a challenging task to postulate and analyse him as the British administrator, a *sahib* and a White hunter first. There is a complicated question regarding the hero-ship of Corbett's tales as he has been unquestioningly the hero and the central figure in his literature for years together since he fought against the wild which imposed danger to the human life. But the postcolonial insight into the colonised animal makes a dig at this hero-ship for the animals to become equally important. Following this, the reason of the man-eating process drags the attention of the scholars which seems to be a cause and effect relationship which attributes much to the human actions and makes excessive interference in the wild domain. There is neither any question on the affinity of Corbett with the poor of India nor any attempt to dethrone the respect which Corbett earned in India. Preferably, this chapter throws light on a contested-self of Corbett. If there is no question of Corbett's proximity with the poor of India, there is not even an ounce of the doubt to see Corbett first as a British official: a hunter who is purely working on the orders passed to him by the British administration. Although he stands apart from other colonials

in many ways, while discussing the poor of India and his treatment of the animals in the sporting or non-sporting ways allows for a critical inquiry into his discourse.

Thus, this chapter takes the theoretical framework of the postcolonial critics like Bhabha, Said, and Spivak to analyse the "othering" of the colonised subjects: human and non-human in the ambiguous facet of Jim Corbett's (un)imperial relations, through a critical analysis of his texts, excluding *Tree Tops*. Rising through the colonial enterprise, Corbett's real characters turn out to be a more authentic source of the orientalist construct. His narratives substantiate colonial discourse which negates and allows the stances of difference between White and Brown people simultaneously.[xi] As a mode of representation, the repeated articulation of "the poor of India," in itself functions as a differencing category "other." The development of the discussion leads to the ironic reconstruction of caste through its subversion at the imperial hands. Precisely, this study probes into what Homi K. Bhabha says, "*mode of representation of otherness*"[xii] and argues that Corbett's discourse embeds with the White consciousness in attempting to maintain a wave of peace with his experiential closeness to the Indians.

Chapter three titled "Contesting the Animal(ity): Shifting Boundaries of the Colonial-colonised Nexus" investigates the imperial hunting sport as a marker of the British cult of prestige and masculine imperial identity. This chapter argues (what I have argued in one of my research articles):

> [T]hat the representation of the animals in the colonial texts tries to reassert and reconfigure the colonial rule on the colonised subjects. Likely, the handling of non-human animals in sporting or non-sporting ways erects an invisible and persistent hegemonic control over the native land. As far as the processing of the big cat animals, particularly a man-eater is concerned it emerges with convoluting the sound factors of race, gender and supremacy. The shooting of the man-eater animal by a white hunter is purely a forefront which designs imperial masculinity. (Rani & Kumar, "Foregrounding" 151)

Through a critical analysis of the man-eaters tales, the present study aims to analyse the "man-eaters" as a constructed category by that imperial desire to control the stout and powerful big cats carnivores whose identity is directly connected to imperial masculinity. A Man-eating process is

not a recurring phenomenon rather it is bound to a particular place and the circumstances from which it emerges. Further, the chapter also "studies the systematic controlling over the wild animals with the help of technological enrichment" (Rani & Kumar, "*Man-Eaters*" 206). There is an interlinking between the place and time in the rise of the man-eaters: the Champawat man-eater, the Chowgarh Tigers, the Mohan man-eater, the Kanda man-eater, the Thak man-eater, the man-eating leopards of Rudraprayag and Panar, the Muktesar man-eater, the Chuka man-eater, and the Talla Des man-eater. These animals appear to be the product of a particular time (likely the first half of the twentieth century 1905-1938), and their area of ranging is Kumaon and Garhwal regions of the United Provinces of British India.

There is an analysis of the cause and effect relationship among the degradation of the natural resources (deforestation), hunting practices, and the colonial policies of access to forests and weapons. Again, the argument links the depravity of the natives' access to the weapons to the emergence and glorification of a white *sahib* who is a saviour and very paternalistic towards the "simple folk" of Kumaon/Garhwal. Thus, the emanation of the man-eater and Corbett's identity as the "hero" is closely intertwined. Further, it peeks into the relationship between the animals and the British prestige. It also specifies the idea of the animal from the broader category to a specific species the *Panthera tigris* or the Tiger. The focus revolves around the cultural construction of the non-human man-eater and the role of animality in the material and ideological consolidation of the British Raj in India, and uses Corbett's hunting narratives as a potent example. The man-eaters' narratives celebrate, and solidify, the dominance of the (white male) human hunter by depicting big cats to be malevolent man-eaters, simultaneously effacing the "real" animal and ensuring the continuation of British rule in India by implicitly portraying the colonisers as valiant heroes protecting the Indian people. At its centre is an extensive discussion of the Western concept of animality. The chapter adopts the critical outlook of the historians and environmentalists who establish a connection between colonialism, environmental degradation, hunting of the animals and British masculinity: John M. MacKenzie, Harriet Ritvo, Mahesh Rangarajan, Huggan and Tiffin, J.A. Mangan, Pandian, Sramek, and others. Also, the chapter's specific claims embed with the scholarship of Ingold, Midgley, Derrida, Haraway, Tapper, and others.

The Chapter four "Demystifying the Animal: Fathoming the Roaring of the (colonised) Animals/Big Cats" analyses the human and non-human animals' relationship through Jim Corbett's hunting experiences with the help of his writings. Extending the argument of animality as a state, this chapter situates the man-eater animals as the offspring of the cultural construction of the imperial hunt in colonial India. Considering the "man-eating" phase as a suffering for the animals, the chapter tends to analyse the animal characters of the narratives liable to their Natural proviso. Although they seem to suffer in the interests of the colonial projects when their requirements clash with the hunting/sports/game practices, their retrieval glorifies the Natural prowess; they are full of. This chapter "foregrounds the animals' stance, questioning the human authorised version of a man-eater and the enduring human rule over the animals" (Rani & Kumar, "Foregrounding" 151). The animal as animal and the animal as a man-eater/"evil" is eloquent to the dynamic power relations.

The question of the animal makes this chapter a critique of the colonial dichotomy between the human and animal that sprouts on the idea of the relative (un)cognitive functionality of the non-human animals. But the discussion pays attention to the animal behaviour, animals' relationship with other animals as well as with humans. There is an attempt to revive the jungle knowledge of Jim Corbett. The contemporary significance of Corbett's first-hand experiences with the animals lies in providing an insight into the ways of the wildlife and how these ways unravel the multilayered relationships of animals with their environment; including humans. The focus on animal behaviour takes this chapter to exemplify how the interspecies and intraspecies interactions validate the non-human agency. The second part of this chapter picks up the select narratives from Corbett's collections — *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*, *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*, *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon*, and *Jungle Lore*, and brings them in dialogue with the ethological studies, that complement and precede the debate of the animal agency. Along with a discussion on non-human animal agency, there is focus on the analysis of the particular big-cats through the paradigms of power and agency that shields them from being *Orientalized*. This chapter uses the theoretical framework of the human-animal studies. Also, it opts for an interdisciplinary approach of ethology and philosophy to execute an analysis of Corbett's narratives. The befitting of the Corbett's text with the ethological and philosophical contexts shows the concerning dialogue between literature and behavioural

sciences whose approaches vary but the central argument (the question of animal) remains the same.

Chapter five named as "Conclusion" wraps up the thesis by summarising conflating the concept of the animal, the British Raj, and Jim Corbett. The (un)expressed contested nature of Corbett; the destroyer and lover of the same hunting objects: animals, makes this study to map the animals' significance in both ways: as an object and as a subject. The first half of the thesis, excluding Introduction, centring on the theme of the imperial hunt, dedicates to the muting of the animal in the colonial cultural, political, and social manoeuvres. It discusses how the concepts of race, class, and gender complement to the functioning of the imperial hunt. Further, the affiliation between "laws of Nature" and "man-eating phase" makes the rest of the thesis to excavate the animal stance. Additionally, it focuses on how the constructions of human(ity) and animal(ity) shape peculiar identities of Jim Corbett v/s man-eater animals. The emphasis on animality as a natural state makes this study critique the imperial prerogatives of the species divide. Also, the study responds to the question of animal irrationality by analysing and exemplifying the animal agency.

The implications and future scope of the current research are the following:

1. This study adopts the approach of the first stage of Human-Animal Studies where the significance of the presence of the animal is identified for the imperial gimmicks. The thesis could not avoid the analysis of animals' objectification since the primary data of the thesis is the human-authored written text.
2. However, the future scope of this research includes the more radical approach to the human-animal relationship by adopting interdisciplinary methods between social sciences and natural sciences.
3. There is a possibility of Posthumanist inquiry into the narratives of Corbett, as this methodology offers to dismantle the pure categories of "human" and "animal."
4. Although the present study pays attention to the use of technology, e.g., "gun" (slightly in a different way), leaves the scope for addressing the relevant question "how the use of technology has altered the human-animal interaction over a period of time" that needs to be addressed more comprehensively.

CHAPTER 2

Jim Corbett: White or Brown?

"There was existence of a contemplated enduring tension between two ideals, one of similarity, and other of difference, which in turn shaped differing strategies of governance of the Raj."

—Metcalf

The present chapter attempts to trace the equivoques in Corbett's writings. The autobiographical nature of his literary creations appoints him along with his narratives to be an integral part of the critical analysis. Largely, the chapter is divided into two sections; the first section focuses on Jim Corbett as a representative of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century British ideological normative of benevolence and paternalistic *Sahibs*. There is also altogether an attempt to unveil the contested-self of Corbett. In most of the narratives taken for this study, Corbett operates as a hunter, and the image of a White hunter going to the hilly areas and killing the animals/man-eaters, is, in fact, an epitome of European Self who is "only" capable of eradicating the menace (in the form of wild animals) from the lives of indigenous people. Simultaneously, it is an act of making the local people aware *who* can deal with the wild. Moreover, it is the colonial Master who is embellished with that physical and mental fortitude that is required in facing the dangerous animals. At certain instances, for example, abiding by Corbett's popular identity (as a great saviour of the colonised subjects), he seems to dissolve the well-designed boundaries between a colonial master and a colonised native. For instance, the process of living, eating, helping, etc., the hilly people introduce "in-betweenness" to Corbett where his identity falls into a pit of White and Brown colour. Therefore, the second section shifts its argument to seek the ideological "othering" of the colonised subjects: human and non-human in the ambiguous facet of Corbett's (un)imperial relations, through an inquiry into the texts *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*, *My India*, *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*, *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon*, and *Jungle Lore*. Rising through the colonial enterprise, Corbett's real characters turn to be a more authentic source of the orientalist construct. His narratives substantiate colonial discourse negating and allowing the stances of difference between White and Brown people simultaneously[xiii]. As a mode of representation, the repeated articulation "the

poor of India," in itself functions a differencing category "other." The development of the discussion leads to the ironic reconstruction of caste through its subversion at the imperial hands. Precisely, this study probes into what Bhabha said "*mode of representation of otherness*"[xiv] and argues that Corbett's discourse embeds with the White consciousness in attempting to maintain a wave of peace with his experiential closeness to the Indians. There is neither any question on the affinity of Corbett with the poor of India nor any attempt to dethrone the respect which Corbett has earned in this country. Preferably, this chapter throws light on a contested-self of Corbett. If there is no question of Corbett's proximity with the poor of India, there is not even an ounce of the doubt to see Corbett a "British official: a hunter" who is obliged to the orders of the British governance. Although he stands apart from other colonials in many ways, the pictorial and theoretical descriptions of the colonised subjects in his texts allow a critical inquiry into a discourse that indicates an oscillation of his identity.

This analysis of his selected narratives is through the postcolonial lens reflecting the cultivation of a White consciousness in the portrayal of Brown/Indian people. The occurrence of "othering" is through the articulation of colonised subjects when the gap between the British and the Indians is regulated.[xv] The repeated expressions like "Indians are fatalists," "superstitious," "uneducated," "poor and deprived," and "untouchables" create an ideological disparity and design the colonised subjects other.[xvi] This othering is critical to analyse since it is shaping the colonial discourse when these others are uttered and asserted regularly. It is apt to recall Bhabha's definition of the colonial discourse: "an apparatus that turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial/cultural/historical differences. Its predominant strategic function is the creation of a space for a 'subject peoples' through the production of knowledges" (100). Adequately, the formation of knowledge builds the terrain of colonial discourse. With the execution of the knowledge of a social, cultural, historical and racial domain, the exercise of power complements to the formation of others. Jacques Lacan introduces a distinction between other and 'O'ther which is quite relevant to avoid the interchangeability of both the terms.[xvii] For the formulation of the perspectives on the subjectivity and identity, Lacan exemplifies the mirror image of a child in which an "other" reflexive being comes into the domain. However, the subjectivity is not analogous to this reflective image/identity in the mirror rather the language destines it. As Gingrich writes, "Subjectivity, according to Lacan, thus cannot be reduced to the

reflexive identity of self awareness; it is also, and more fundamentally, marked by the unconscious, which is non-reflexive and ordered in ways that are analogous to language" (10).

Similarly, the notion of "other" is analogous to the colonised others in the postcolonial stance. Other is the signifier of power who dictates the othering by its discourse of difference and expelling it from the centre, yet ironically constructing the Other; other comes to the centre. "The construction of the dominant imperial Other occurs in the same process by which the colonial others come into being" (Ashcroft et al. 156). In organising the colonised others, belonging to different race and culture, the construction of an imperial Other is decorated with all the superior traits. In this course, the race (white) is a keynote speaker in the othering of a different race (brown/Hindu/Hindustani) with its peculiar features coming into discourse through colonial power and knowledge.[xviii] The exclusion of the colonised subjects from the centre reversely remains an object of the imperialist dialogue.

The concept of "other" is significant in many ways as it derives from the philosophical stands to the theoretical plane. If a colonial text comes into being, the inextricability of the notions of self and other almost prove to be unavoidable. As with the introduction of *Orientalism*, Said opens the ways of *how* to read a text, in order to catch the image of the Orient which has been asserted polishedly. In fact, the Orient speaks through the Occident/West. Also, one of the simplest ways to demarcate this differentiation is through the geographical otherness. The universal practice of this unfamiliarity with the others' space is critical in understanding how the Europeans articulate non-Europeans, particularly the colonisers. He says, "The geographic boundaries accompany the social, ethnic, and cultural ones in expected ways. Yet often the sense in which someone feels himself to be not-foreign is based on a very unrigorous idea of what is 'out there,' beyond one's own territory. All kinds of suppositions, associations, and fictions appear to crowd the unfamiliar space outside one's own" (54).

Aligning the idea of "other" with the Orients in the spatial perspective, Malek draws attention to the position of such foreign subjects in the objects of study: "[T]he Orient and Orientals [are considered by Orientalism] as an 'object' of study, stamped with an otherness—as all that is different, whether it be 'subject' or 'object'—but of a constitutive otherness, of an essentialist character" (qtd. in Said 97). The implication of "constitutive otherness" divides the two worlds ideologically into the dominant and the dominated. On the one hand, the self is always in the

mainstream that belongs to a superior culture, while, on the other hand, the other is submissive, dependent, female-like, bound to the different traditions and customs; a signifier of an inferior culture. Deriving its multi-meaning, the concept of other has socio-political, philosophical, and psychological implications. The thinkers like Hegel, Lacan, Spivak, and Beauvoir are among the foremost contributors to discuss the conceptuality of the term "other." Hegel's "Master-Slave Dialectic" depicts the political or historical and the psychological dimensions of the process of self and other (un)identification that later develops into the forms of othering as a postcolonial concept. The understanding of self in relation to other is complexly a psychological dimension, as Hegel says, "I cannot examine the single self and reach any important conclusions because I do not exist in isolation from other selves, and my introspection must of necessity be based on an examination of my relationships with others" (qtd. in Berenson 77). Although the understanding of the self is a central concern here, the significance of other is unavoidable in the knowledge of self. Similarly, Brons throws light on Hegel's psycho-analytical formation of the self and other in which the self-consciousness is contradictory, finding the other as both identical and not-identical to the self: "Self-consciousness does not see the other as [another] essential being, but sees itself in the other," and conversely, self-identity is (or originates in) the "exclusion of everything other outside itself" and that "other is [thus] unessential, negative," that is, "*not*-self" (qtd. in Brons 69).

However, Beauvoir is another major thinker throwing light on the understanding of self and other, predominantly, concerning the feminist standpoint. She writes about the othering of women in the male-dominated society. *The Second Sex* (1949) proves to be a cult text in the exploration of women as an othered subject. She affiliates the othering of women with the other social differences as it retains in society from the primordial times. She writes:

> The category of *Other* is as original as consciousness itself. The duality between Self and Other can be found in the most primitive societies, in the most ancient mythologies . . . alterity is the fundamental category of human thought. No group ever defines itself as One without immediately setting up the Other opposite itself . . . For the native of a country inhabitants of other countries are viewed as 'foreigners'; Jews are the 'others' for anti-Semites, blacks for racist Americans, indigenous people for colonists, proletarians for the propertied classes. (Introduction)

Beauvoir's description of how women are othered is poignant, and resembles Brons' classification of "*crude* othering . . . otherness is constructed just through self-other distantiation . . . the distribution of (un)desirable characteristic is more or less assumed or posited" (70). Similarly, the derivation of a woman only to sex by a male is an act of pushing/posing the desirable trait, and, to go beyond that is not the authority of a female subject. Further, Beauvoir asserts, "She is determined and differentiated in relation to man, while he is not in relation to her; she is the inessential in front of the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute, she is the Other" (Introduction).

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak systematically flourishes the notion of othering in the postcolonial theory where the Lacanian "other" turns to be the colonised other. Moreover, this other finds its placement in the colonial discourses through the implementation of differences from the powerful Other. In her essay "The Rani of Sirmur," she picks up the three examples of othering that exists in the collections of British "Proceedings"—surrounding the "Settlement" of the Simla Hills states in the first half of the nineteenth century. The first instance is from Captain Geoffrey Birch's pen, an assistant agent of the Governor who writes to Charles Metcalfe in reference to his journey to the hills, "[I have undertaken this journey] to acquaint the people who they are subject to, for as I suspected they were not properly informed of it and seem only to have heard of our existence from conquering the Goorkhas and from having seen a few Europeans passing thro' the country" (254). He travels the hills to make the natives aware of their master, simultaneously making the natives to see themselves others. In fact, Birch on horseback is the "representative image . . . the figure of the European on the hills is being reinscribed from stranger to Master, to the sovereign as Subject with a capital S, even as the narrative shrinks into the consolidating subjected subject in the lower case" (254). Simultaneously, he is consolidating the colonial power and making the indigenous people aware of the power and power-holders. Spivak says, "He is actually engaged in consolidating the self of Europe . . . obliging *them* (the native) to domesticate the alien as Master" (253).

The second illustration draws on an excerpt from a letter of Sir David Ochterlony. His letter reads, "I see them (Highlanders) only possessing all the brutality and perfidy of the rudest times without the courage and all the depravity and treachery of the modern days without the knowledge of refinement" (254-255). Further, Spivak draws attention to the concluding words of

the same (writing of Rajah Kurrum Perkash [sic] of Sirmoor), "I don't think the restoration will be received so much as an obligation as a right, and I look forward to discontent and murmurs, if not turbulence . . . to any plan which does not give back the Territory unalienated, and the revenue undiminished in all its feudal relations" (255). On the one hand, the letter is embellished with the inferiority connotations of the native subjects, while, on the other hand, Spivak takes the readers to identify the objectification of the native subjects. She says, "What is more interesting to us is that, although the Territory was not given back unalienated, and the revenue was more than halved, once again the 'native' (Kings)' subject-position rewrote itself as the position of the object of Imperialism" (255).

The third illustration concerns few deletions from the letter by the Board of Control of the East India Company to Lord Moira, Governor-General-in-council, reprimanding him over allowing the natives on half-payment to serve with the servicemen in Native governments. The passage contains:

> The first and the main point in which you have erred has been in permitting Europeans not in the Company's service to remain in India. [This practice] would lead to an impolitic improvement of the Discipline of the Troops of Native Powers, . . . The limited degree of science which it may be consistent with good policy to impart to the troops of native powers in alliance with the British government, should be imparted by officers in our own service: because from those officers only we have a sure guarantee that our intentions shall not be overstepped. (256)

This is the heterogeneity of the colonial powers; there is sharp discrimination between the local and colonial governments. Here, the native powers refer to colonial Indian Army, and "officers of our own service" implies to the British officials, whereas science indicates the war technology. Spivak suggests, "The science in question here is the 'interested' science of war" (256), and it is the master who has access to science. She emphasises, "The master is the subject of science or knowledge . . . The manipulation of the pedagogy of this science is also in the 'interest' of creating . . . a 'natural' difference between the 'master' and the 'native'—a difference in human or racial material" (256).

It is worth mentioning that the othering in the case of Rani of Sirmur is multilayered. Spivak brings together the process of othering through the concepts of class, race, and gender. The concept of class intervenes when the focus is on the othering of Indian subjects by the East India Company through its capitalistic, commercial, and territorial manoeuvres. It is betrothed to the cause of state-formation, "The governments of India were the *Company's* governments, the army the *Company's* army, attempts at legal re-inscription, the *Company's*" (259). The racial othering is quite prominent in elaborating the native people, as is evident from the letter of Ochterlony, mentioned above. The hilly people are racialised in different ways, as is evident from Ross' brief demographic analysis: "[T]he people there are all 'aboriginals of various kinds'; that the Sikhs, the Gurkhas, and the Moguls are varieties of 'foreign yoke'" (263). Dismissing the Rajah from his position by the British takes the discourse to the gender othering. Guarding her minor king son, Fatteh Prakash, Rani comes under the imperial authority. To open the ways of the Company's trade with Nepal through the mountainous range, the British choose the king's wife to shape the imperial schemes, as she was "a weaker vessel" (266). Even her desire to commit suicide is not allowed, "She could not be offered the choice to choose freedom . . . she must not be allowed to perform even a 'legal' *sati*" (269), as the colonial power functions disguisedly.

Thus, the idea of othering, concerning the coloniser and the colonised is of the hierarchical relationship intersected with the roles of class, race, and gender, deeply associated with this alliance. If put into Gingrich words, as he says, "Although the colonizing and the colonized are fundamentally different from each other, Spivak sees them as intrinsically linked to each other through reciprocal identity formation" (11), there is an installation of mutual inclusiveness of othering/difference and identity. Employing the notion of othering in order to analyse the well-established binaries of the colonised Indian and the coloniser British, there is a pertinent and conscientious attempt to analyse Corbett's narratives through the postcolonial lens, approaching through the concept of othering, because Corbett is already a well-established paternal figure on the colonised land. However, the "in-betweenness" of Corbett, as a British hunter and the native wildlife conservationist, leaves the scope to trace the stances of difference and colonised othering in his narratives. It is through the critical analysis of the illustration of the natives, which is colouring Corbett's identity as a White Master.

I

The name: Jim Corbett is laden with multiple identities, having the different resonances for different people. Most of the studies, indicated in the literature review are adorned with gratitude for Corbett for hailing on the land of the man-eaters' terror and rescuing the rural folk of India (particularly the hilly people of Kumaon and Garhwal, now in the state of Uttarakhand). Renaming the oldest Indian National Park on the name of Jim Corbett is collectively an act of immortalising a name whose contributions to the Indian wildlife are indelible. On the one hand, when a flashback to colonial India releases the dark colours of the colonialism, at the same time, there are a few from the Empire who paint the colonial era brightly through their inputs to the native land. Corbett is a great hunter, a great naturalist, a great conservationist, and moreover a humanist who feels for the local native people and the human cause. Remembering Corbett with his multiple personalities, the following generations inherit an idea of a person serving the native country instead of ruling it with an upper hand. Since the present thesis is confined to analyse Corbett's writings, so the focus shifts from what Corbett is remembered for to what Corbett has written. In the critical explication of his texts, the readings come up with many unresolved questions and issues that perhaps have not been addressed by the previous researchers.

The non-fictional nature of Corbett's writings makes him distinct from the other famous Anglo-Indian nature writers: Rudyard Kipling and Ruskin Bond whose writings show a deep commitment and fascination of the Western writers to the Indian non-human nature.[xix] While Corbett shares the typical gusto of non-fictionality of his tales of the wild with Kenneth Anderson, at the same time, Corbett's equal obligation to the Indian rural folk and wildlife folk makes him distinct from the other writers. Corbett's texts are a combination of the human and non-human characters, describing the landscapes, variety of wildlife, the different dialects, traditions, beliefs and customs of the hilly people. When the discussion lands on the platform of a colonial master's relationship with the colonised people, majorly the studies find Corbett an idolatry figure who disrupts the binaries of the colonial and the colonised paradigms. Bond comments on his relationship with the natives: "He (Corbett) lives amongst them, eats with them, assesses the situation, and then goes out into the jungle to track down the killer" (Introduction v). It seems very striking to see a colonial master having the meals with the local tribes. At the same time, it creates a curiosity by raising a question of *why* the two oppositional ideals are conflating.

Bond's reference to Corbett's ease with the local people obliquely embeds in an unnatural phenomenon at the colonial times, since the two hierarchical positions need to be highlighted in the social life. The sight of the contiguity between the two has its strong affiliations with the hunting expeditions of Corbett. All the narratives register his shooting missions (specifically of the man-eaters) under the British governance orders. In order to find out a good game or to locate a man-eater's adobe, the local assistance is inevitable. The role of hunting in creating a bond between the colonial hunter and rural people has been highlighted by Swati, "Colonial hunter-administrators had claimed that hunting was essential for good governance and that it helped to forge special bonds of patronage and protection with rural populations" (284).

A shift in the colonial attitudes after 1857 revolt shapes the bitter relationships among the colonial and the colonised people into paternalistic nurture. The norms of being paternalistic need to meet its requirements with the concept of being an English gentleman. As the multifaceted colonialism represents itself in many ways, its manifestation in a beneficial form for the native land proves itself a successful imperial enterprise in the subject region. When Ashcroft et al. say, "[C]olonization could be (re)presented as a virtuous and necessary 'civilizing' task involving education and paternalistic nurture" (41), they are attributing a scope to consider the implication of the paternalistic nourishment not as something which is anti-colonial or against the colonialism rather it is introducing an ideology which is more refined and elite in its nature as far as the execution of the colonial rule is regulated. Also, the nineteenth-twentieth century colonial masters show the influences of this ideology in their practical and literary practices. The patronising attitude simplifies the colonial access on the colonised subjects and influences on them. The evolution of Corbett as a *sahib* among the poor of India has intricacies with the dogma of paternalistic flavour and being a "gentleman" of the Victorian culture. Cain and Hopkins write, "By exercising authority in a manner that exemplified selfless dedication to duty, the gentleman was able to justify his continued right to rule, while also defending property and privilege" (47). The functioning of the sense of duty is central to the emergence of a *sahib* in the British colony too. Corbett, primarily a hunter, is bound to the obligations of good sportsmanship which brings him to the ways of the hilly rural folk. Rani & Kumar write, "The hunting expeditions prove to be a means in the cognisance of the various regions of the country through the close acquaintance with the language and culture of the colonised people" (210). In the view of Brinckman, "If our officers had not always been such good sportsmen, we should have had

greater difficulty in holding India. An officer in search of sport learns the language, gets a knowledge of the country and the people; all this is to our good" (127). Although Corbett is playing the role of rescuer for the local people, his duties to the colonial administrators are at the centre. The hunt of the man-eaters helps Corbett becoming a respected *sahib* by showing physical and mental fortitude in pursuing man-eaters and protecting the villagers. In persuasion of the hunt, he comes closer to the Indian jungles and the rural people. He finds great support from the villagers in his tasks of man-eaters hunting. He would offer them meat in compensation of the assistance; they provide him. Maunier highlights the same view regarding the colonial ideology of benevolent/paternalistic attitude of the white hunters: "The gentleman is not only the polite and polished man, he is more, especially the man who knows how to command; the imperial man in a certain sense, who having powers, makes it his duty and his right to use them for the common welfare. The ideas of authority- as power and authority- as duty are the heritage of an aristocratic tradition" (30).

The ambivalence in the narratives of Corbett is in his duties between his colonial identity and a cult of responsibilities which he obligates for the indigenous people. Distinguished from his fellow hunters of the time, he is able to sympathise with the natives and promise to get rid them of danger. He, often, denies being categorised as any sort of officer by the rural people. Wandering in search of the Mohan man-eater in Kartanoula, confronted with a lady asking several questions, he says, "I was not an officer of any kind, and that the sole purpose of my visit was to try to rid them of the man-eater" (*Man-Eaters* 119). Spending his life in the Indian jungles and with the rural people, he develops a harmony with the local folk. His friendship with Madho Singh is noticeable who accompanies him on many occasions. Corbett's statement after killing the sleeping Mohan man-eater, "I should have been morally responsible for the deaths of all human beings he killed thereafter (*Man-Eaters* 140), penetrates into a state of aligning himself with the loss of human life, resultant in a determination of eradicating the animals' danger from the people's lives. He accentuates his responsibility as the rescuer of the natives despite the adverse circumstances. As far as the "sport"/hunt is concerned, his differentiation between fair and the unfair is critical to his benevolent image for the natives. The prevalent idea of fairness in "game" imparts an imperial value to the hunting and the hunter because the idea of moral values of a British hunter is closely aligned to it. To follow the values in a game even amidst the adverse circumstances is significant in justifying the colonial rule as something elite and

dignified in its temperament. This sort of hunting has a colonial cultural impact when the hunter needs specific forms of knowledge about the natural elements: hills, ravines, birds, animals, wind, and other natural elements, and having this information, the man-eating hunting task is taken as a nobler undertaking. It helps in the creation of the colonials as superior and paternalistic. The colonial administrator(s) is filled with a sense of gaining the knowledge of the native culture; a tool for the smooth functioning of their rule. Metcalf revives Warren Hastings' words, to exemplify the ruling exercises:

> Shaped by the Enlightenment ideal of understanding all cultures . . . 'cultivation of language and science' in India a way to secure the 'gain of humanity.' Yet such learning would also be 'useful to the state,' as it would 'lessen the weight of the chain by which the natives are held in subjection' and at the same time 'imprint on the hearts of our own countrymen the sense and obligation of benevolence.' (10)

The functioning of the colonial ideology of benevolence begets two offspring: one, in the form of the natives' subjection and, other, in the form of an obligation of a paternal colonial master for the same subjects. It obliquely renders the intrinsic inferiority to the colonised subjects who need to be rescued, directed, and governed by the whites. Similarly, in the case of the man-eaters' pursuit, the local people group play a significant role; since they are the source of the information and facilitation of the execution of such missions. However, the assignment of the native people remains only to the additional roles; to assist the whites in the English, manly pursual of the dangerous animals. The implementation of the Arms Act 1878 acquaints a tedious procedure for acquiring a licence concerning owning a firearm results into an almost debarring the local hilly people from having the safety guards (weapons) from the dangers, particularly the peril of the wild animals. This act infuriates the British spirit of seeing the natives dependent on them. Pandian correlates the dependency of the Indians on the white hunters for their security, as he highlights the exclusion of the local folk from enjoying the ownership of weapons, "Native Indians were debarred from owning firearms. . . ." (83), so their dependence on the white hunters is, thus, clear and consolidated. Likely, the ideology of paternalism finds great facilitation in the realm of disarmament, "Paternalism in an age of disarmament was highly effective in reinforcing dependence of rural communities on their colonial sahibs. The officer-hunter masquerading as protector is one of the best examples of this brand of paternalism" (Swati 281).

The information and assistance provided by the colonised is put at the fringes from the equation of pursuing and killing the big cats. Thereupon, the hunter cum sportsman inhales as the incarnation of the greatest rescuer, respectively and affectionately termed as sahib. In the incarnation of a "sahib," the notion of fair play is deeply imbibed. To hunt under the specific rules when the equal opportunity is provided to the hunted, leaves the impression of a great hunter among the indigenous communities. The colonialist treatment of the indigenous flora and fauna, in the fashion of hunting, is naturalised in a way that shooting becomes a right of the elites. The imperial hunt proves to be a significant means of social and provincial control. Wardrop says, "If you want to preserve a ground, hunt it . . . the social amenities of life, small invitations made and received on both sides, will soon win the hearts of your bigger natives, and capital fellows you will find them" (210).

The narratives of Corbett convince that he is working for the British administration, deeply involved in hunting and the big game of sighting the big cats. His contest with himself appears to the fore when he, at times, drives out at the urges of the villagers to work for their local interests. In fulfilling the expectations of the natives, a hunter is sometimes overburdened with the idea of success in shooting a good game for meat. Corbett rejoices many times the hunt for the meat, shared among the hilly people. The idea of the game is the most pleasurable pastime for Corbett. He works at the urges of the villagers too: "After breakfast on Sunday morning the Headman of Dalkania paid me a visit and requested me to shoot them some game before I left. The request was gladly acceded to, and half an hour later, accompanied by four villagers and one of my own men, and armed with a 275 rifle and a clip of cartridges, I set off for the hill . . ." (*Man-Eaters* 62). Along with killing for meat, he assists in endangering the indigenous fauna by leaving the big-cats wounded through the inaccurate shot fired at the animals. He admits, "I have sometimes only wounded leopards and tigers, who have rampaged round before being quietened by a second or third shoot" (*Man-Eaters* 33).[1]

He gets appointment by the British officials to work in the man-eaters' afflicted areas from time to time. The empire's need of the colonised subjects, notably the human subjects, in order to groom them at the state of civility pushes the government to deal with the mess created by the

[1] This paragraph is part of my research article "*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: a Critique of Modernity," 2017, pp. 206-215.

man-eaters' reigning areas. Apart from the eradication of the dangerous beasts as a mechanism of social harmony, it is a political need of the British administration to reach out the interiors of Indian culture in order to cherish the unquestionable rule. Also, Corbett as a great hunter becomes a prima facie of serving two opposite institutions simultaneously. Following the orders of the government to kill the man-eater which is a political necessity, is an opportunity for Corbett to prove himself a true Englishman. Deriving his ancestry from Ireland, taking birth and education in India, Corbett stands low in the English social strata and, it is always a social conflict of identities among the lower Englishmen to prove their loyalty for the British legislation. The Irish lineage is critical to Corbett's lower position among the British class society, as the English saw the Irish, "not only as pagan but also as barbaric" (Canny 588) before conquering it. Foran exemplifies the hierarchy of class in the White hunters' community by stating the on-foot hunt (Corbett way of stalking the jungle) "prevalent among the military subalterns and other low-ranking colonials" (qtd. in Mandala 181). So the tension in Corbett to prove his loyalty to the British and be one amongst them is determined by his ability to fit into the colonial intellectual foundation of "just governance" as propounded by Edmund Burke. However, Corbett's popular identity as a loving *sahib* shapes the social aspect of his relationship with the native people, at the same time it delivers an acknowledgement to the imperial cultivated man. Corbett's recounting of his duties from the British authority like: "In March 1930, Vivian, our District Commissioner, was touring through the man-eater's domain, and on the 22nd of the month I received an urgent request from him to go to Kala Agar, where he said he would await my arrival" (*Man-Eaters* 83), employs the gratitude of a hunter, being honoured in a position to serve his governance. Gradually, the man-eaters become a menace for which conferences are being held to resolve the issue: "After the Chowgarh tiger had been accounted for, I was reminded by Baines, Deputy Commissioner, Almora, that only a part of my promise made at the conference had been fulfilled, and that the Mohan tiger was next on the list" (*Man-Eaters* 115). Showing the commitment to killing the targeted animals is a form of service done to the British government assisting in enacting their model of proficiency for the hilly backward areas and its people.

Corbett evolves as an exemplary figure of the two antagonist ideals: the colonial and colonised attitudes. Simultaneously, such examples raise several questions on the rule mechanisms implemented by the Raj in India. His perpetual tension and divided identities of

white/brown accomplished through his duties towards the government, and the rural folk can be understood from the statement of Linlithgow "Indeed, the destruction of these abnormal and dangerous animals (man-eaters) is a service of great value both to the afflicted population and to the government" (Foreword vii). The glorification of Corbett's contribution to the "government" and the "afflicted population" through an act of service bewilders the position of Corbett and the colonial rule (as a whole) by bringing the two most hierarchical arrays in parallel. The deliverance of this compliment from the then viceroy of India makes it more weighted and multiple in meaning. First, it indicates a threat to Nature and its non-human inhabitants. To deal with such abnormal animals only through killing them do necessarily indicate a counter-threat to the British and their power to control the wild. In order to manage an efficient rule, it is necessarily an obligation of the government to protect the colonised people who are a key factor in the whole process of constructing the civilising parameters. On the one side, when there is a serious inducement to the responsibility of securing the afflicted population, on the other side, a demarcation between the humanity and animality is leaping out. The glimpse of the humanitarian values in the guise of serving the natives excludes every other wild/animality act from the scope of acceptability. So, anything challenging the human domain appears straightforwardly killable. Secondly, the viceroy's words are capable of signifying the measures of saving the afflicted population by a colonial government, only to open new avenues of the western colonial civilisation. To civilise the colonised, it is important to draw a line between the ways of humans and wild. Now, the powerful idea of the danger in the wildness, and the imagery of Corbett, forming and shaping that imperial vision of deserting the menace in the remote hilly regions amidst the unfavourable conditions are important to make the readers acquainted with the shifting margins of Corbett's identity.

Tracing the shift in Corbett's white consciousness, as occupied with an essential link between the colonial government and the indigenous population, there is an attempt to revive the consolidation of a colonial discourse shadowing his texts. For instance, *My India* (1952) is one of the celebrated colonial writings, making the colonised people as the subject matter of its discourse. Apart from the other writings of Jim Corbett, this text focuses on the human characters with whom he comes in interaction during his stay in India. The detachment from the aesthetic fallacy and a plunge into his nostalgic state of the Kumaoni and Mokameh Ghat people offer a glimpse into the complexity of an exiled writer's psyche.[xx] Retiring to Kenya after

Independence, “My” India assures Corbett’s longing for the lost country. The memory of *My India* where he spends seventy years of his life is capable of rendering more than only the words seem to deliver. It makes a trajectory of imperialism, Corbett and the rural folk of India. Going beyond the question of compatibility with the Indians, the argument tries to clarify the consistent uncertainty between his imperial self and (un)imperial bond with the natives. Outside academia, the esteem of Corbett as a great naturalist and wildlife conservationist perhaps lead to a scant critical insight into his discourse about the colonised humans. However, the present study throws light on his liabilities to the imperial enterprise which outshine in the memories of Corbett when he writes particularly about his hilly people. The creation of *My India* solidifies Corbett’s imperialist attributes. It is the interests of the readers abroad that demand Corbett’s knowledge of the poor of India. Corbett’s letter to Hawkins in 1948 reads:

> I am writing the book in response to readers of *Man-Eaters* who have asked for more information about the poor of India. What I do mean is that I hope the people who were not interested in sport will be interested in the people of India. Not all the requests for a book on this subject have come from America; many have come from the UK, Canada, Australia, and from other parts of the world. (*My Kumaon* 51)

II

The mechanisms of the benevolent rule employed through the excursions of hunting, and other services, as discussed earlier, reconfigure the colonial power that is warmly welcomed by the colonised population. It reminds of Foucault’s notion of power capable of producing rather than destructing: “that traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse” (Foucault 119). The colonial formation of knowledge through power intertwines with other kinds of relations and perceptions, affecting the indigenous population through the acts of fortitude hunting expeditions, occasional help to the poor, unbiased judgment, close kinship with proletariats, etc. This power entraps “serving” the native land instead of ruling it; Corbett has referred several times in his narratives. It is a kind of mechanism employed in a discourse to generate “its ‘general politics’ of truth” (Foucault 131) functioning to be true associating with power in a circular form.[xxi] The linkage of colonial power with its productivity (economic production, social service, the native consent and obedience) is the construction of its regime of truth: “In order to understand the productivity of colonial power it is crucial to

construct its regime of truth" (Bhabha 96). Cohn opines India an epistemological space that the invaders could not fulfil, "Nevertheless, the British believed they could explore and conquer this space through translation: establishing correspondence could make the unknown and the strange knowable" (4).

The characters of the narratives, particularly the hilly people, float on the British construction of knowledge. In the colonial environment, the proximity between Corbett and his labour at Mokameh Ghat fulfils the requirement of the colonised subjects in smooth functioning of colonial project of railways, along with the imperial rule as a favourable stance for the depressed class. The natives find the "gentleman" in colonials, subjecting themselves to colonial power:

> But just as the husband is not the head of the house in his own sole interest, and as the owner is not the head of a farm for his own personal profit, so the European, though he still remains the ruler, must also be the protector and guardian, and must act as much in the interest of the coloured man as in his own. Even the relations between master and servant, or between ruler and subject, carry reciprocal duties like the relations between father and son. (Maunier 37)

In the establishment of the potential stout saviours (from the wild animals) and the process of empire's development, the *sahibs* tend to exclude the environmental loss borne by the native homeland through the practices of hunting and deforestation etc.[xxii] Moreover, these losses get exclusion from the parameter of exploitation since it embarks the modernisation. The exploitation of the native natural resources finds justification by its primitivism that needs to be advanced/urbanised/modernised/civilised by a more advanced and civilised race.

Stances of Difference and othering:

The tales are multilayered showing the socio-cultural ways of Indian rural folk, the methods of the colonial masters and the balance both are making to co-exist. Corbett carelessly marks the continuation of his White identity, culture and western ways in protecting rural people from the wild animals or providing them the financial help or moral support. Alastair Pennycook throws light on the concept of "bad colonials" renowned in India; if the tools of colonialism are required to be understood, one needs to blur the boundaries of strict and apparent tyrannical rule: "It is important to understand colonialism not only in terms of its macro political structures but also in

terms of the cultural politics of everyday life . . . with respect to discussions of Macaulay and his famous Minute, this tendency to work with simplistic stereotypes has led to limited understandings both of colonialism and its relationship to the present" (Pennycook 24). The episode of Sultana provides an insight into the imperial responsibilities directed towards the natives. As Freddy Young, a policeman takes the responsibility of Sultana's family after he receives death sentence: "Freddy adopted the dog, and those who know Freddy will not need to be told that he faithfully carried out his promise to care for Sultana's family" (Corbett, *My India* 131).

There is a need to revise the politics employed in the day to day life the native purely fail to understand. Corbett, being a hunter cum saviour comes very close to the villagers of Kumaon during his hunting expeditions and becomes a *sahib*. The concept of *sahib* needs to be highlighted here as this is purely a signifier of hierarchy and involves the racial discrimination between the White and the Brown people. All the narratives have one thing in common, i.e., the poverty of the Indian people. They are poor, uneducated, dependent, and subordinates to the Whites whether in hunting expeditions or at the railways at Mokameh Ghat. Dirks comments on such delineation: "Not only are the subjects ruled by the state; the position of the subjects are constituted by classifying and naturalizing such categories and identities as educated or uneducated, rich or poor, male or female, young or old, Hindu or Muslim, Welsh or Scottish, and so on" (Foreword xi). Simultaneously these people are honest, loyal, trustworthy and generous too. Their loyalty lies in being faithful to their colonial masters. Corbett writes:

> Those who visit India for pleasure or profit never come in contact with the real Indian- the Indian whose loyalty and devotion alone made it possible for a handful of men to administer, for close on two hundred years, a vast subcontinent with its teeming millions. To impartial historians I will leave the task of recording whether or not that administration was beneficial to those to whom I have introduced you, the poor of my India. (*My India*154)

"The real Indian" is caught up in the criterion of interrogation? The distinction between real India and non-real Indian remains questionable. Are the real Indians only those simple folk who are voiceless against the colonial rule, and are assisting in the establishment of colonial empire? This articulation dissolute the native race in lauding the competency of the empire with "serving"

the colonised subjects despite "administering" them, since it is the "White man's burden" to civilise the uncivilised in Rudyard Kipling's term.[xxiii] It resembles Bhabha's proposition "The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction" (101).

"Loyalty and devotion" are in fact the two essential components in the subjectification of the native population since they pose neither threat nor question to the colonial rule. For instance, the story of Bala Singh; known for swallowing the demon and die, is one of the most loyal servants Corbett has on the hunting missions. Corbett writes, "It was his pride and pleasure when on *shikar* to select and carry the heaviest of my loads" (*The Temple Tiger* 1). Such portrayals determine the textual duality because they are the support of the British Raj as well as the target itself. Through such support "process of subjectification" becomes feasible.[xxiv] There is an acknowledgement of the difference in the form of "the poor of my India," where the writer is justifying the colonial rule over them as they are unlike the colonials. It is crucial to understand Said's discussion of othering. He calls the Orientalist stage a "moral and epistemological rigor . . . For the Orient ('out there' towards the East) is corrected, even penalized, for lying outside the boundaries of European society, 'our' world; the Orient is thus *Orientalized* . . ." (67). The description of these hilly people is doubly differentiated. On the larger scale, as has been discussed above, they are different from the foreign white race, and if examined minutely, the illustration implies that they are different from the Indian geographically plain dwellers also. It is not only the foreign land, but its people as well (hilly people) who require the colonial administration to guide them. It resembles Kennedy's description of the representation of the hilly people in the British mind "that these peoples became imbued with a common set of attributes, a shared moral likeness that encompassed such qualities as gentleness, grace, and simplicity" (59).

The story "Pre-Red-Tape Days" glorifies the British Raj in India since it celebrates the affable rule of General Sir Henry Ramsay and Sir Frederick Anderson. They are extolled for the characteristics of stout and determined rulers, working for the "simple uneducated people" in Terai (a lowland region in Northern India on the outer foothills of Himalayas), and the place marked with malaria: "the scourge of Terai" (Corbett, *My India* 65). The aboriginal tribe of Terai

is depicted through the imperial optics as the pre-eminence of the Whites is explicit in imparting a fair justice to all. These people are far from the hue and cry of the city accepting the British rule unquestionably: "The aboriginal tribe, living in the unhealthy Terai, is renowned for the two sterling qualities—cleanliness, and the independence of women . . . and in no other part of India would a young girl have dared, or in fact being permitted, to stand before a mixed gathering including two white men to plead her own cause" (*My India* 64). Embedded with a sense of the difference and marginalisation of the colonial country in general and Terai people in particular, it brings the two issues together: the sexual/gender discrimination and added supremacy to the White race. The practice of hierarchical racial system attributes the power of decision making to the Whites, and to the natives, the prestige of following/obeying. It reminds of Lowth's words, contained in his letter, "Those who live in the interior are to be preferred . . . their manners are more civilized; they place more confidence in Europeans and their word is more to be depended upon" (qtd. in Swati 281-282).

The acclaimed fidelity of the rural folk becomes the defining characteristic of the "real Indians." The contentment of the uneducated people, only in being remembered their names by the *sahibs*, shows the imperial style of cultivating the colonial-colonised relationship. West phrases this relationship "The British rule in India has been specially distinguished from all previous governments by the inestimable blessings it has conferred in security, justice and material development" (qtd. in Pennycook 48). Ramsay and Anderson are deeply loved by *Terai—ians*, because of the sense of justice, they shower on them. Corbett's emphasis on "cleanliness" in the above quote makes sense of something unusual in the host country. Since India is considered a land of dirt, so the diseases of India collectively emerge as the markers of the differentiation with Europe. As Metcalf puts in these words, "India's disease and dirt thus became markers of its enduring 'difference,' and so helped sustain the larger ideology that undergirded the Raj" (173). Deconstruction of the counterpart between White-ness and authority revives Fanon's assertion, "[Y]ou are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich . . ." (31). Similarly, is this the racial vantage naturalising the power? Corbett writes "Both Ramsay and Anderson were Scotsmen, and it was said of them that once having heard a name or seen a face they never forget it. It is only those who have had dealings with simple uneducated people who can realize the value of a good memory, for nothing appeals so much to a humble man as the remembering of his name, or the circumstances in which he has previously been met"

(*My India* 61). “Nothing appeals so much to a humble man as the remembering of his name” reveals the subjacent colonised mindset, preoccupied with the Whites’ position as something unattainable for them. Such “unattainability” creates the intellectual inferiority among the colonised people and assists in the process of their subjectification. Simultaneously, the category of benevolent rulers and “simple uneducated people” is mutually inclusive that show “the class and power differentials” (Batra 127). The absence of one will challenge the existence of the other. Stokes mentions in his lecture “For imperialism was above all an unformulated philosophy of life and politics. At its heart was the belief that political power tended constantly to deposit itself in the hands of a natural aristocracy, that power so deposited was morally valid, that it was not to be tamely surrendered before the claims of abstract democratic ideals, but was to be asserted and exercised with justice and mercy” (10).

Another uncertainty revolves around the writer himself in acknowledging and disallowing his colonial self contemporaneously. Although very explicitly he calls himself a White, his experiential self shrinks the boundaries between the two. The story “Mothi” entails statement, “The poor of India are fatalists, and in addition have little stamina to fight disease. Deprived of our company, though not our help, Mothi lost hope when we left for our summer home, and died a month later” (*My India* 45). Such statements show the Indian people lack the qualities of the Whites. The articulation of “our” representing the European self is entangled with the othering of the rural folk, of which Mothi is only an example. The ideology of difference explicitly implied here on the basis of “race” and “knowledge” cannot be repudiated. On the one hand, this expression shows the natives; weak and unscientific in their knowledge and temperament, while on the other, there is the assertion of the “Europeans alone . . . possessed the knowledge that permitted diagnosis, treatment, and eventual eradication of disease” (Metcalf 176). Eventually, their survival is dependent on the colonial masters because they help them to sustain the enduring diseases. The text depicts the native land as a land of diseases: malaria and cholera and many people dying with it including Sher Singh, Parbatti, and Chamari. He says, “Cholera is dreadful throughout the land, and when it comes in epidemic form as many die of stark fear as die of the actual disease” (*My India*162). Similar is the view of Metcalf, “[T]he British conceived of India as a land of dirt, disease, and sudden death” (171).

The same expression is repeated in the stories: "Lalaji" and "Chamari," with different motifs. He says, "We who live in India . . . are fatalists, believing that a man cannot die before his allotted time" and "We in India loathe and dread cholera but we are not frightened of infection, possibly because we are fatalists" (*My India* 162, 174). The pronoun "we" brings ambiguity to the text and carries the disavowal of the racial differences. However, the linkage between India and Cholera is far extensive in the British outlook of India. The fatalism, Corbett is employing here, is related to the Indians' faith in the powers of a deity or it is bound to the people's superstition. Arnold throws light on Indian mindset on Cholera: "But the dominant response was to represent cholera either as a new manifestation of the powers of an existing deity like Mari-yamma, Kali or Candi, or as an entirely new deity, known only by such descriptive titles as *jari mari* ('sudden sickness') or *kala mari* ('black death')" (*Cholera and Colonialism* 130-131). However, such ideas register opposition to the British logic and rationality as their approach to the diseases is purely scientific.

Nevertheless, on the one side, the expression "we are fatalists" minimises the difference between the coloniser and the colonised folk, while on the other side, the expression "we who live in India" is erecting a difference with the White race that is geographically and ideologically separated from India. Corbett's projection of himself as part of the Indian community is creating the ambiguity of uncertainty. This is the "in-betweenness" of the narratives as Corbett employs the articulation of difference and sameness in continuity. The "in-between" is derived from the Derridean concept of *entre,* or "between," the writer swings in-between his imperial self and his experiential connectedness with the colonised others.[xxv] Derridean entre is understood that "sows confusion between and stands between the oppositions at once" (Bhabha 182). JanMohamed also throws light on such delineation "Faced with an incomprehensible and multifaceted alterity, the European theoretically has the option of responding to the Other in terms of identity or difference. If he assumes that he and the Other are essentially identical, then he would tend to ignore the significant divergences and to judge the Other according to his own cultural values" (18).

Attempts have been made to bring the sameness, but "*not quite*,"[xxvi] since the articulation of *sahib* is fundamental to this relationship. The instances of the poor people coming to Corbett's house for the financial or any other kind of help and the graphic description in the text manifest

the gap between two races through certain dress code, the way of sitting, and addressing each other. The articulation, "On Sunday evenings Chamari and I would sit, he on a mat and I on a stool, with a great pile of copper pice between us" (*My India* 170) discloses the existing political, cultural, and at the same time the racial hierarchy, where Corbett is the administrator and Chamari, a worker. Lister detects this kind of othering as a "process of differentiation and demarcation, by which the line is drawn between 'us' and 'them'—between more and the less powerful—and through which social distance is established and maintained" (101). The Whites hold the upper rank while the natives serve at the lower. The colonials become the *sahibs* of integrity, honesty, and are considered hardworking. They become an object of imitation, to whom the colonised population wish to follow and act like them. Chamari's words to Corbett exemplify it, "If you have been wearing that suit for years, and if you can do that, why can't I?" (*My India* 172). Similarly, Corbett endorses the native people's enthusiasm for Christmas: "There was, however, one day in the year that all of us looked forward to with anticipation and great pleasure, and that was Christmas" (*My India* 191). Having spent the life under the Raj, the natives begin to see the world through the colonial gaze. Also, these natives resemble Gingrich's observation of Spivak's others, "These are the 'others' that typically represent Spivak's colonial and postcolonial subjects, who only exists through, or against the powerful gaze of the colonial discourse" (11).

"Othering" through Caste:

The turn of the nineteenth century introduces the anthropologists' ventures to understand the Indian society from the racial perspectives meshing with the biological facts. Taking the example of Risley, Arnold writes, "He held that 'race sentiment,' 'far from being a figment of the intolerant pride of the Brahmin,' rested upon 'a foundation of fact which scientific methods confirm.' He further developed that it had shaped the intricate groupings of the caste system" (*Race, Place* 261). In order to understand the interiors of Indian society, the colonial ideology goes through classification of the native social system; similar to those of the Brahmins' interpretation of the upper and the lower castes. Metcalf says:

> As the colonial sociology of India was tied to a system of power, the British necessarily eschewed at once those categories which would announce India's similarity to Britain and those which might threaten the colonial order. To be sure, classificatory schemes

> familiar to the British at home were not entirely absent. Occupation, for example, played an important role in the British ordering of Indian society. Nevertheless, categories meant to denote India's difference, above all those of caste, community, and tribe, were placed at the heart of country's social system. (114)

Colonialism embellishes the Indian society within the framework of "caste" more explicitly than ever before. Dirks is among the very few who are perceptive on the coetaneous strengthening of casteism and imperialism in India. He considers it "[T]he product of an historical encounter between India and Western colonial rule . . . I *am* suggesting that it was under the British that 'caste' became a single term capable of expressing, organizing and above all 'systematizing' India's diverse forms of social identity, community and organization" (*Castes of Mind* 5).

Now, highlighting the concept of "caste" as far as Corbett's writings are concerned, particularly his text *My India*, he seems to restructure the caste follies ironically. The illustration of the characters based on their caste strongly conveys the message of othering on the one hand, and those of justification of colonial rule, on the other hand, which seems to dismantle the caste structures. Most of the human characters in the Corbett's texts are identified through their caste. The utterance of caste unravels the two-fold functions: first, it strengthens the Raj as it provides an equal platform for all community strata working together, as is the narrative of "Chamari." Secondly, caste gets stability and becomes a symbol of Indian-ness. Dirks terms caste "cultural technologies of rule" (*Castes of Mind* 9) as the Orientalist knowledge/power reconstructs and reforms it. The repeated emphasis on the caste attributed features of the characters like Mothi, Narwa and Haria, Chamari, Kunwar Singh, and others unveil the subject knowledge of the Indian caste system and its specific features. Corbett lays out, "Mothi had the delicate, finely chiselled features that are the heritage of all high-caste people in India" (*My India* 33), similar is the narration of the old lady known as "queen of the village": "She is a Brahmin, the salt of India's earth . . . Her dress is the same as worn by all high-caste hill women: a shawl, a tight-fitting bodice of warm material, and a voluminous print skirt"[xxvii] (*My India* 16).

Corbett's emphasis on caste idiosyncrasy, particularly of untouchables determines it as an integral part of the native society and reminds of the poverty and deprivation of the lower strata of the community. "Narwa and Haria . . . had adopted the same profession, basket-making—which means that they were untouchables, for in the United Provinces baskets are only made by

untouchables" (*My India* 87). Similar is the delineation of Chamari: "Chamari, as his name implies, belonged to the lowest strata of India's sixty million Untouchables . . . an angular person whose face was stamped with years of suffering . . . was an undersized man with a poor physique" (*My India* 168). Caste basis hierarchical differences are the determinants of the native people's identity. It becomes a medium to understand and access the core of an Indian tradition. This description ascertains Cohn's argument of caste as a "thing." Tolen mentions this reference, "For British administrators, 'caste was a 'thing,' and its reification became one of the dominant modes of representation of Indian society'" (81).

Here, the argument is that caste is not only an articulation instead it is the understanding that the colonials have developed during their rule which the Indians miscarry. The native elites are deeply involved in exploiting the lower caste people. Budhu, a depressed class man, is still paying the debt which his grandfather had taken from a *bania* years ago, through harvesting his crop yearly.[xxviii] Corbett makes him free by paying his debt shows Corbett's warmth for his labour and imperialism as valuable for the depressed class. It results in such words by Budhu, "'No, Sahib, no,' he said. 'You must not burn these papers, for I am now your slave and, God willing, I will one day pay off my debt to you'" (*My India* 160). Through the financial and medical assistance provided to Lalaji and other people, the imperialism functions as a nurturing and paternalistic statute for the "simple uneducated people." The colonial rule seems to be competent in questioning the caste hierarchies and challenges this tradition by appointing Chamari, the head of the coal gang. "In the gang he commanded there were men and women of all the castes including Brahmins, Chattris, and Thakurs, and never once did he offend by rendering less respect to these high-caste men and women than was theirs by birthright, and never once was his authority questioned" (*My India* 169). Alike, equal access is provided to the students of high caste and low caste in Ram Saran's school that pleases the colonised people consequently. Raheja terms such discourse of caste ideology as an attempt "to create the illusion that the disciplinary control of the specific castes and of the Indian population as a whole was carried out with the consent of the colonized" (494). The discourse of caste justifies the patronising colonial rule. Dirks comments, "[U]nder colonialism (caste) was anchored to the service of a colonial interest in maintaining social order, justifying colonial power, and sustaining a very particular form of indirect rule" and further, asserts that indirect rule is manifested through the mechanisms of "buttress and to displace colonial authority" (*Castes of*

Mind 15). The narratives give an expression of the close contiguity between Corbett and Indian people. As he explains an incident of taking meals at the headman's home

> After a very generous and very welcome meal—for I had eaten nothing that day—I picked up the plates with the intention of washing them in a nearby spring. Seeing my intention the three girls ran forward and relieved me of my plates, saying, with a toss of their hands and laugh, that it would not break their caste—they were Brahmins—to wash the plates from which the White Sadhu had eaten. (*My India* 15)

The quote represents the prominence of casteism and the consent of the colonised others in welcoming White master. Caste substantiates the thematic structure of the tales since almost all the characters, Corbett has chosen from the depressed class. Corbett, inseparable from British colonial administration, improbably stands as a purely benevolent figure for the colonised folk. His narratives depart from the conventional opposition between the two poles: colonial and colonised but express a sound touch of cultural otherness. Fetson Kalua's words serve to illustrate Corbett's stand "[E]ngaged in a struggle within himself to come to an understanding of colonial representations of 'otherness'" (13). He is a prime figure of displacing forceful colonial authority but undoubtedly remains a dominant imperialist pole, supporting the British Empire. In analysing an ambiguous position, it is illuminating to recollect Bhabha's words, "The analytic of ambivalence questions dogmatic and moralistic positions on the meaning of oppression and discrimination" (95). In Corbett's writings, the question of discrimination is suspended but maintained camouflaged(ly). Apart from caste, there is a very interesting articulation of religion also that enables the rendering of geographical otherness imbibed in the intellectual ways of the West. He says, "In India, where there are no passports or identity discs, and where religion counts for so much—except among those few who have crossed the 'black water'" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 50).

The representation of the caste as an integral part of the native society is, in fact, the portrayal of the other culture full of depravity, disease, superstitions, and poverty. Although there are several references to the Untouchables, at times the narratives blur these differences and show the unity of the Indian community. The casteism becomes a tool to access the simple folk, understand them, and to rule them un-adversely, Bayly comments on the British Raj in India making the caste system very rigid as it is "a central mechanism of administration" (392).

Despite the synergy with the poor of India, the colonial decorum and dignity with a high-calibre fertilise the text. There is a paradoxical articulation: first, the caste conveys the dividing element of the colonised society, but simultaneously the characters like the herdsman, a Brahmin in "The Law of the Jungles" appears to bypass this division and Untouchability. Corbett says at the end, "My men and I served India at a time when the interest of one was the interest of all, and when Hindu, Mohammedan, Depressed class, and Christian could live, work and play together in perfect harmony . . . for the poor of India have no enmity against each-other" (*My India* 192). Secondly, these simple men are as honest as is Lalaji who never forgets to repay the respect but synchronously; there is a sense of difference when these people stand with their peculiar beliefs, faiths, and weaknesses regarding the diseases and other manners as well. Corbett's statement that, "I never inquired into the private affairs of my workpeople, for Indians are sensitive on this point. . . ." (*My India* 157) corresponds to a White's point of view with a detachment, while the narratives in itself are the witness of the people's interest in sharing their difficulties with Corbett.

The "superstition" of the native people has been asserted repeatedly, to affirm it as a fundamental characteristic as far as the hilly folk is concerned. Corbett illustrates the people's superstition concerning man-eater animals as well. The consideration of the Rudraprayag man-eating leopard as "fiend" who is a supernatural power in the form of an animal is worth-mentioning. The victims of this leopard relate their killings to the purely unscientific ways of being selected as the preys to this animal. Corbett writes, "[T]he people of Garhwal had ample reason to be terrified of the man-eating leopard of Rudraprayag, especially when it is remembered that Garhwalis are intensely superstitious and that, added to their physical contact with the leopard, was their even greater fear of the supernatural" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 13). However, it is not only the animal who is credited with the preternatural powers rather the Garhwalis credit Corbett also with such powers due to his ability to face the dangerous animals. To such conceptions, Corbett's demerit proves the scientific and unscientific ways of the white and brown people respectively, and surely these are the markers of differentiation between the East and West. It is evident from Corbett's contention, "However little I merit it, the people of our hills credit me with supernatural powers where man-eaters are concerned" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 43). However, Corbett's emphasis on "superstition" as an integral feature of the hilly social life leads him to the contestation again when he refutes and acknowledges it at the same

time. He says, “Superstition, I am convinced, is a mental complaint similar to measles in that it attacks an individual . . . But though I claim I am not superstitious, I can give no explanation for the experience I met with at the bungalow while hunting the Champawat tiger and the scream I heard coming from the deserted Thak village (*The Temple Tiger* 5).

“Othering” of the Non-humans:

Unsurprisingly, colonialism offers the binary opposition between Nature and culture. The authorised access of the colonists to the native natural world, mainly to the animals and forests, results in establishing the pre-eminence of the White race, revering an unprecedented streak between man and animal. Sartre asserts, “The European has become a man only through creating slaves and monsters” (Preface 22). The othering of the humans grants the preliminary idea of the double marginalisation of the non-human figures in the environment of power politics. The richness of Indian forestry has undoubtedly attracted the British since it worked as an apparatus to fulfil their capitalistic policies. Gadgil and Guha establish the relation between “western imperialism and environmental degradation”: “World ecology has been profoundly altered by western capitalism, in whose dynamic expansion other ecosystems were disrupted, first through trade and later by colonialism” (102). The human-centrism of the modernity exploits Nature in several ways, defending this action through installing the human needs as primary.

Mokameh Ghat, where Corbett works as a Fuel Inspector in the Railways, discloses the wealthy non-human nature of India and its handling by the British. Non-human nature operates as a subsidiary form of asset, directly under the mastering of the colonials whether to conserve or squander it. The befalling of the forests takes place on a large scale for the construction of the Railways. For being civilised, urbanised and modernised, one needs to alter from the wilderness to the humanised ways. It challenges the conformity of man with nature. Shiva’s view is, “Our colonial forest and wildlife conservation laws were based on the western bias that human and non-human species cannot coexist” (113). The use of the forests/timber in the name of the development is apparent when Corbett writes:

> Eighteenth months previously I had taken employment as a Fuel Inspector with the railway on which I was now travelling. I had gone straight from school to this job, and for those eighteen months I had lived in the forest cutting five hundred thousand cubic

> feet of timber, to be used as fuel in locomotives. After the trees had been belled and billeted, each billet not more and not less than thirty-six inches long, the fuel was carted ten miles to the nearest point of the railway, where it was stacked and measured and then loaded into fuel trains and taken to the stations where it was needed. (*My India* 137)

The British administration very actively operates the export functioning in India. It has worked in two ways: first, the use of the natural wealth and secondly, the use of the Indian labour. It is the colonial political, economic scenario which substantiates the legitimacy of profiteering and rule over the human and nonhuman sphere in India. Corbett says, "It was the responsibility of providing a labour force sufficient to keep the five hundred and thousand tons of good that passes through Mokameh Ghat annually flowing smoothly" (*My India* 147). Further on, the iron smelting is emptying the Indian wood treasure under colonialism, worrying Sir General Henry Ramsay, known as the King of Kumaon. The Colonials are getting benefited from the natural means of its Empire. This benefit comes from their control over the colonised subjects as well as their knowledge of it. The knowledge of the colonials remoulds the natives in such a way that they assist in the short term development programs, initiated by the British, avoiding its aftermath. The modern rationality sets its limitation in use of the natural resources but purely based on the colonial interests. Stokes in his lecture reminds of Bauer and Hilferding saying, "Imperialism was not an inevitable stage of capitalism but represented a conscious choice to exploit an extensive colonial market" (11). Corbett writes, "It was at Kaladhungi that iron was first smelted in northern India. The fuel used was wood, and as the King of Kumaon, General Sir Henry Ramsay, feared that the furnaces would consume all the forests in the Bhabar, he closed down the foundries" (*My India* 9). Befalling off the trees keeps on going and disturbs the natural wildlife system, "The felling of forests disarranged the normal life of the jungle folk . . . (*My India* 138). In fact, as a whole, it is the surge of modernity that places humans high in the hierarchy and enforces the British to draw a line between the civilised humans and wild nature/animals in order to justify the British Raj. Metcalf brings about the fundamentals of rational society affecting the native societies and its human and non-human components:

> Under the influence of Enlightenment rationalism and secularism, distant lands lost their cosmological significance for Europeans, and were described instead through the taxonomic structures of eighteenth century natural science . . . the taxonomies of natural

> history, by constructing secularized notions of the 'modern,' and the 'civilized,' inevitably emphasized at once the difference, and the inferiority, of non-European societies. (5)

The modernity of the European world that closely aligns to the concept of being civilised is immensely manifested through the hunting activities as far as Corbett's texts are concerned. The affinity and the dependency of the native people on the *sahibs* take place to a far extent due to the cultural construction of hunting. Mangan and McKenzie argue, "Following the disaster of the Indian Mutiny of 1858, it was the hunting prowess of British officers that helped reconstruct their martial image" (103). The hunting practices do not only create an aura of close recognition between the natives and the colonials instead it asserts the projection of *sahibs* to which the local people surrender. Hunting of the endangered wild animals, make the Colonials Godlike. The text exemplifies Corbett and other hunter colonials; indulged in hunting the different wild folk.

Moreover, the terms: "sport" or "game" disguises the othering of the animals. The man with a rifle is the master of the animals treating them not more than an object. Corbett writes, "The forest at the edge of which Harkwar and Kunthi built their hut was a favourite hunting-ground of mine. I had first entered it carrying my old muzzle-loader to shoot red jungle fowl and pea fowl for the family larder, and later I had penetrated to every corner, armed with a modern rifle, in search of big game" (*My India* 72).There is a crucial role of the natives in the hunting ventures too but restricts only to the assisting positions like informing the abundance of jungle folk or carrying the baggage of a White hunter.

The hunt interweaves the factors of power, domination, and superiority of the colonials. Mangan and McKenzie further argue, "The warrior and the hunter, in their view, were synonymous in virtue. The daring spirit shown by the officer-hunters in their encounter with wild animals, it was argued, not only proclaimed the prestige of the race, but also their acknowledged leadership as men" (102-103). The colonial hunters, particularly Corbett, intensely influence the rural folk regarding his hunting skills. It serves as entertainment to them. Mothi and Sher Singh are the regular companions of Corbett for shooting in the jungles. Both of them indicate Corbett of the plenty presence of the hunting material in the form of birds and animals. He says, "Mothi had been my constant companion in the Kaladhungi jungles for many years. He was keen and intelligent, gifted with good eyesight and hearing, could move through the jungles silently, and

was as brave as a man could be" (*My India* 37). Sher Singh's knowledge of the jungle is also remarkable who assists Corbett from time to time, "Intelligent and observant, his knowledge of the jungle lore was incredible" (*My India* 51). He helps Corbett in finding out the leopard, which Corbett was searching for, "'If you want to shoot the leopard, Sahib, I will take you to the kill' and 'If you are going bird shooting tomorrow I will send Kunthi out with the cattle and come with you, for I know where there are a lot of birds'" (*My India* 52, 53). It resonates Rajamannar's words, "The common goal of hunting animals thus served as the occasion for the creation of at least of some viable 'imagined communities' between those most unlikely bed fellows, the (frequently) low-caste native, and the imperial sahib" (79).

However, Corbett's relationship with Mothi, Sher Singh, and Kunwar Singh remains something of "difference," despite the appreciation of their skills and knowledge, these natives are unable to see their names under the category of "hunters"; instead, they remain "poachers." For being called a hunter in Corbett's times, it is necessary to follow the self-drafted rules of the British sportsmen, failing which the Indian hunters are condemned to poachers. Mandala writes, "Britons actively pursued the policy of 'exclusion' and denial of hunting rights to natives and indigenous tribes—a compelling historical instance of 'othering' the local population in their own geophysical landscapes through the elevation of big-game hunting into 'sport'" (164-165).

Corbett's relationship with Kunwar Singh is an exemplary one to capture the othering, Mandala is discussing about, between the Indian poacher and the white hunter. Since Corbett and Kunwar Singh are somehow bound to the same passion: hunting, so the discourse about this friendship brings forth the latent imperial self of the writer. He admits his kinship with Kunwar Singh in the following words, "What endeared him to me was the fact that he was the best and the most successful poacher in Kaladhungi" (*My India* 20). To grab the racial superiority of the hunt the Europeans induce a dividing line between the white and Brown hunters. Carrying forward the same notion, the portrayal of Kunwar Singh suffers from the same differentiation. Though Kunwar is a great poacher but he is not a hunter, Corbett writes, "Kunwar Singh was not a super-sportsman" (*Jungle Lore* 302). Through the delineation of Kunwar Singh, there is the employment of the racial superiority asserted through the hunting practices. However, Corbett does not shy away in crediting his friend Kunwar for gaining the jungle knowledge from. He writes, "I learnt many things from Kunwar Singh for which I have never ceased to be grateful,

and I am also grateful to him for having helped me to overcome some of my fears of the unknown" (*Jungle Lore* 302-303). Apart from this, there is a glimpse of the hunting activities which at the immense scale are catering to a refreshment to Corbett after strenuous work at daytime, "My work did not permit of my indulging in sport during daylight hours so I had to do all my shooting for the pot, and fishing at night" (*My India* 137). Further, he writes, "The pea fowl had to be shot while they were roosting, and I am not ashamed to say that I occasionally indulged in this form of murder . . . (*My India* 138).

Thus, there is a connection between the modernity of the European world and its manifestation through their treatment of Nature in India during the colonial period. The modernity liberalises the humans to act freely and individually as the Colonials are trying to establish their supremacy over the animals through hunting practices. Modernity, as a break from tradition, brings a change in the attitudes and thinking with a focus on intellectuality, rationality, material progress, individuality, humanistic approach and scientific progress. It introduces human at the centre, instead of a part of the whole system. It reminds of Friedrich Nietzsche's book title *Human, All Too Human*. Bell marks modernity with, "What defines modern is a sense of openness to change, of detachment from place and time, of social and geographical mobility, and a readiness, if not eagerness, to welcome the new, even at the expense of tradition and past" (qtd. in Cooper 120). Although all the modernistic follies are interrelated, in the context of the tales of the animals of colonial times the focus is laid on the humanistic approach and its complex relationship with the tradition of hunting or *shikar*, a form of the rule during the colonialism in India. McCarthy says "The conception of 'man' . . . is, according to the radical critics of enlightenment, at the core of Western humanism" (Introduction viii). The priority, given to the humans, in the social, intellectual and cultural actions or practices has produced a subject centred world, and its influences are worldwide. "The critique of subject-centered reason is thus a prologue to the critique of a bankrupt culture" (McCarthy, Introduction viii). The anthropocentric perspective fabricates wildlife in colonial India. The disunity between the inner and the outer environment of the Europeans determined the form of their modern culture. The sense of freedom from all essential factors is crucial to their indifferent demeanour towards nature. Hegel quotes of the modern thought, "the separation of the religious from the secular interest, i.e., from the special interest of individuality; and the ground of this separation lies in their inmost soul, which has lost its independent entireness of being, its profoundest unity" (440).

The detailed description of the Kumaon region is the instance of the richness of Indian forests and plenitude of animals. The natural elements: hills, ravines, wind, birds, animals, trees and the natural background constitute the chief characterisation of the stories. However, the narratives are camouflaged because it can be analysed as an encounter between the colonial power and animals as "animals sometimes constituted a vital subsidy to an often precarious imperial enterprise" (MacKenzie 7). The colonial modernity coincides with the hunting practices that they tried to designate with the sporting activities. And these hunting practices fabricate both the lives. Laurie presents a similar view, "Humanism fabricates the human as much as it fabricates the non-human animal" (Laurie 143). The terror in the hearts of Kumaoni people of the man-eaters gives a tense background to the narratives. Since the declaration of the writer in the author's note regarding the nature of the tigers "Human beings are not the natural prey of tigers, and it is only when the tigers have been incapacitated through wounds or old age that, in order to live, they are compelled to take a diet of human flesh" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* vii), raises the question over the human interference in the declining of the natural food of the wild animals. It is also a question on the careless hunting tradition that leaves the animals wounded and assists in turning them to be man-eaters. World Parks Congress opines, "Human-wildlife conflict occurs when the needs and behaviour of wildlife impact negatively on the goals of humans or when the goals of humans negatively impact the needs of wildlife" (qtd. in Madden 248).[2] The multilayered implications in this conflict present a whole political and cultural scenario consisting the different forms of domination, practised and regulated by the colonials during the colonisation in India; are going to be discussed in the next chapter.

[2] The above discussed concept of Western modernity (pp. 77-78) is taken from my research article "*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: a Critique of Modernity," 2017, pp. 206-215.

CHAPTER 3

Contesting the Animal(ity): Shifting Boundaries of the Colonial-colonised Nexus

The identification of the human othering is a widespread phenomenon since the literary discourses remain primarily concerned with and focused on humans. However, the non-fictionality of Corbett's narratives stocked with human-animal encounter through the hunting practices provides an opportunity to this study to be sensitive enough to recognise the non-human animals as a prey to the more severe othering. The position of the animal in the text of an Anglo-Indian writer, who is laden with multi and often oppositional identities, is constitutional by its nature to explore. Since Corbett stands among such British sporting gentlemen who use "[T]heir upper class hunting code to tie their sport to issues of conservation and natural history" (Gillespie 45). The inner tension in Corbett regarding his imperial self and as an evolving naturalist is an outlandish journey that captures the fundamental yet changing attitudes of the British towards the non-human animals in the realm of sport hunting. The political need of the European mission to draw a line between the civilised and uncivilised authorises the marriage between culture and civilisation; Nature and barbarism. Likely, the British lens to see Nature's components as inferior in hierarchy is naturalised in a way that the non-human animals come to be regarded considerably others. Bruno Latour's statement "[I]f we take nature away, we have no more 'others'" (46) introduces the pit fall of Nature into a specific category that is purely in opposition to humans. Seeing the humans not a part of Nature begets many classifications of the parts of non-human Nature. Apparently, the broad categorisation of the "humans" and "animals" suffers from the species layout where the superiority and priority of the human species can be well defined and well judged from the colonial hunting. However, the sub-categorisation of the animals between the domestic and wild by the colonial governance in British India reconfigure the multidimensional othering of the non-humans animals to which they are subjected.

With the help of the texts *Man-Eaters of Kumaon, The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag, My India, The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon,* and *Jungle Lore*, the present chapter makes a trajectory of the idea of the animal, the cult of being a gentle British man (a *sahib*), and the concept of humanity/animality that altogether are interrelated to make the Raj a

success particularly among the "poor of India." It captures the notion of *how* the Empire responds to its fading days in India by employing its various mechanisms related to the concept of the "animal." The actual confrontations with the big wild cats through acts of hunting offer the readers a fresh dimension to consider western cultural prerogatives, which are significant, closely associated with the notion of human supremacy. Structurally, this chapter is divided into two sections: the first section throws light on the imperial hunt or the sportsmanship as a cultural cum psychological mechanism to establish the Raj in a protective form from the predatory animals for the native people, through the implications of its paternalistic posture. At the same time, it brings the concept of *sahib* under scrutiny. Section second specifies the idea of the animal from the broader category to a specific species the *Panthera tigris* or the Tiger. Also, the discussion leads to the place of the tiger in the Western cultural domain and its introduction and treatment in colonial India by the White hunters. Further, this section explores how the concept of animality is aligned with the big cats that consequently shapes and glorifies the killing of a man-eater.

I

The location of the unbounded will animals; majorly the big cats and mammals as bounded ones in the processions and the palaces of the Mughal emperors significantly bestow the rulers with royalty. The British in India quickly grab the significance of such big animals in reaching out the common people and rule their mind through the control over these animals. Animals have always played an influential role in human societies; so is the case with the British in India. Although there is the probability of several ways of interaction with the animals, the material method of interaction: the hunt cum "sport" is the most prominent for this thesis to analyse. The mid of the nineteenth-century introduces the imperial hunt as a "sport," hence, the narratives of Corbett, a sportsman, unveils that the sportsmanship is not a solitary phenomenon. Instead, the establishment of the sportsmanship against the big cat animals is enmeshed with the colonial ideologies: paternalism, racial difference, the idea of British manliness, and disarmament of the weapons. The functioning of the colonial ideologies makes the imperial sportsmanship a mirror image of the British character. With the focus on Corbett's sportsmanship, the study argues that the hunt is imperative for him to ascertain his imperial identity in the British community. Also, the big game hunting of which Corbett is the proponent demonstrates the most influential operating system in colonial India. The colonial desire to conquer the metaphorical powerful big

cats arises to justify their right to domination. Since "Animals like the lion and tiger were often metaphors for power even as they were a source of danger" (qtd. in Rangarajan, "The Raj" 267), so it necessitates the British to control over these animals. The imperial power associated with commanding the big cats appears to be strikingly convincing in an age of hunting sport. Theodore Morison refers to a scene when the appearance of big mammals like elephants fills the audience with emotions of ecstasy, "As the cavalcade winds down the narrow streets the men pick up their swords and hurry forward; the women and children rush to the doors of their houses, and all the people gaze upon their prince with an expression of almost ecstatic delight; as the elephant passes" (49). Such scenes convey how the human-animal encounter gives shapes to people's thinking about the monarchy, and conversely about the animals. The animals' disciplined display in prince's procession symbolises power of the crown. The similar kind of gaze, though silent but speaks well to the Empire to ignite its desire of playing, domesticating, and controlling the wild animals through the convenient means of hunt. It is one of the simplest ways (non-violent for humans) to assert the colonial power over human and non-human colonised subjects; also with accessing the local inhabitants. Consequently, the European spectators of the Indian hunt in India gradually turned into the master players of the big hunting after the Mutiny of 1857. The later nineteenth-century witnesses changes in the format of the colonial hunting. The introduction of "sport" to the imperial hunt plays a vital role in legalising the difference between the British sportsmen and the local Indian poachers. The rights to hunt get penalised through the issuance of the licenses to hold the weapons and the right to enter the forests after the implementation of The Forest Act, and The Arms Act, 1878.[xxix] Corbett's reluctance in calling himself a hunter validates the hunting sport to tie a knot with racial strands. Gillespie writes in a similar context, "The British sportsmen's code outlined appropriately aristocratic methods for big game hunting that broadened the gap between, and distinguished the gentlemen hunters from, their moral, racial, and class inferiors" (44).

The colonial ideology of difference implies to distinguish the colonial hunting from that of the Indian. Though the imperial hunt derives its ancestry from the Victorian and Indian methods of hunting but the inclusion of the "fair play" and "hunting codes" brings cult of "sportsmanship" to the imperial hunt. The objective of such kind of hunting does not imply restraint only to slay down the animal rather the focus gets shifted to *how* the objective of killing the animal has been achieved. The introduction to certain rules in hunting enhances the difficulty

level for the hunter as the equal opportunity is assigned to the animal in this combat between the hunter and the hunted. John M. MacKenzie provides clarity to the hunting sports, "The sportsman indulging in the Hunt is concerned with difficulty . . . In the Hunt the animal is most valued, and by extension the hunter who slays it, according to the fight it puts up. In securing its death he follows strict rules of procedure and endangers himself in the process" (*The Empire* 11). The concept of difficulty involved in this sport is the maker of the British sportsman who not only is successful in influencing the social relations between the colonial and the colonised folk rather it plays a significant role in attaining prestige among the British officials.

It is not only the laws of the game to be pursued in the involvement of the hunt; rather it is further sub-divided into the kinds of animals to be hunted. For instance, there is a difference between hunting and the "wild" hunting. The wild hunting qualifies for more thrill and the elements of adventure since the so-called wild big cats and other wild animals are the targets of such sports. The wild hunting is nobler in its conduction and is louder enough in elaborating the character and temperament of the hunter as well. The increasing weight age of difficulty involved in the hunt leads to the trophy-winning hunts also. Among the sports, the regard for the big cats' hunt is at its zenith in colonial India. The hunting of these wild animals grows metaphorically associated with the differentiation and supremacy of the human species over the non-human animals. When faced with a big animal in the jungle with the intention to kill him is not only to ascertain and achieve the sports goal rather it is the method to *re*assert the humans' capability to deal with the wild and secure their supreme throne. Shedding light on sports hunting, Matt Cartmill states, "Hunting is not just a matter of going out and killing any old animal, in fact very little animal-killing qualifies as hunting. A successful hunt ends in the killing of an animal, but it must be a *special* sort of animal that is killed in a *specific* way for a *particular* reason" (29). Concerning Corbett's narratives, when his sportsmanship is repeatedly reminded to the reader all the three qualifiers for a hunting act become primarily significant. Corbett's offering of a deliberate illustration of the specific manner employed in killing the wild animals (particularly the man-eaters) is to refashion the particular reason behind killing them. Moreover, in most of the cases, the reason is purely humanitarian where Corbett's primary focus centres on protecting the native folk from the terror of the man-eaters, while in some other cases the reason for killing the tigers revolves around his imperial self and his obligation of being a British sports hunter. In the case of Corbett's tales, the specificity of the kind of animal secures

its place in the form of the wild animals. Roaming the jungle in order to search a good game, where the animal and the hunter stand on the similar platform as far as any favour is concerned, attributes nobility to the acts of hunting.

The particular sort of animal and the unique way endorsed to kill the same captures the imagination of a reader to the level of visualising the need of a colonial hunter to hunt the tiger known as the Bachelor of Powalgarh whom Corbett mentions, "[F]rom 1920 to 1930 [this tiger] was the most sought-after big-game trophy in the province" (*Man-Eaters* 97). In going through the tale of "The Bachelor of Powalgarh," there is a surge of pride blowing hard and making a reader cool with the suspense of *how* this tiger is going to be hunted. On the one hand, this tale is the witness of the hunting skills of Corbett as he stalks down this tiger on foot in the jungle; while on the other hand, this story manifests the obsession of tiger hunting for the imperial sportsmen. Also, Corbett is one successful amongst many unsuccessful white sportsmen who try to hunt this tiger either only for the sake of trophy or for the imperial class. It is the popularity of the Bachelor that invites and allures Corbett for hunting this animal. This emotion gets validation when Corbett first sees him, "In his rich winter coat, which the newly risen sun was lighting up, he was a magnificent sight as, with head turning now to the right and now to the left, he walked down the wide lane the deer had made for him" (*Man-Eaters* 98). It seems ironical of the imperial hunt to find its objects of killing "magnificent." However, Corbett's first attempt of blowing bullet at this creature confirms the hunt is far significant than the entity of the hunted. He writes, "As I very slowly swung the point of the rifle round and ran my eyes along the sights I noticed that his head was not quite square on to me, and as I was firing up and he was looking down, I aimed an inch below his right eye, pressed the trigger" (*Man-Eaters* 104). After this incidence of leaving him wounded, Corbett determines to kill the Bachelor more cautiously. It is not only related to the killing of an animal rather it is the question of a white hunter's acceptability of the challenge he is receiving from an animal. At the final shoot, Corbett is deeply engaged in absorbing the vanity of the Bachelor's hunt (an animal of immense size 10' 7") achieved through a series of hardships. Corbett describes: "I could get a better view of this object from two yards to the right, so lowering my head until my chin touched the ground, and on raising my head saw the tiger in front of me, with the sun shining on his left shoulder, and on receiving my two bullets he rolled over on his side without making a sound (*Man-Eaters* 110). Through making the Bachelor silent forever, Corbett earns an unforgettable name along with the

trophy in the history of hunting. A. Singh calls it an "inner compulsion" (82) of a hunter (Corbett) to kill this tiger.

Along with the Bachelor, Corbett's stories mention the tale of the Pipal Pani tiger whose kill also secures a magnificent trophy for Corbett. Being a harmless animal to the human species, the Pipal Pani loses his life to adorn the white hands with some awards. With the growing size of Pani, the beauty of the tiger and competition between the sportsmen to bag this tiger increased. Corbett's statement "To my great relief, for I had crawled through the jungle for three days with finger on trigger" (*Man-Eaters* 172) denotes to the physical fortitude of a sportsman whose prime focus lays in killing the animal. The fight between the bullet and this special animal ends with shedding the latter's death. Although the discourse of the tiger's hunt seems pathetic, the self-esteem of the sportsman is too high to peek into the Pani's pain. He states, "After the impact of the heavy bullet, he struggled to his feet and tore blindly through the forest, coming down with a crash within a few yards . . . Pleasure at having secured a magnificent trophy—he measured 10' 3" over curves, and his winter coat was in perfect condition" (*Man-Eaters* 173). Simultaneously, there is an interesting fact revealed by Corbett that unveils the specificity of the reason for killing this tiger is "the wound." Corbett's fear of turning Pani's wound into septic or converting into more serious injury makes him hunt this tiger, further, knits the strands of an imperial obligation to eradicate any danger from the beast for the human life.

The tale of "The Temple Tiger" at Dabidhura apparently talks about the features of the imperial hunt as far as the objects of the hunt are concerned. On the one hand, this story expresses the British differentiation between the "domestic" and the "wild" animals. Moreover, on the other hand, it erects a divide between the killable animals and the non-killable animals. The hunt of the wild animals as is associated with the prestige of the British hunt, the hunt of these animals is aligned with the utility function of the animal for the native people. Ironically, Corbett gets convinced to shoot the Temple tiger on the urges of the local villagers as the animal is offering a threat to their domestic animals: cows, buffaloes, goats, etc. Corbett's declaration that "[F]or the killing of this cow he would have to die, for cattle are scarce in the hills and the loss of a milch cow to a poor man was a serious matter" (*The Temple Tiger* 15) is multidimensional. It is offering knitting the feathers of the paternalism as an imperial mechanism to have the social functionality among the colonial and the colonised people, while it is also an

instance to analyse the imperial desire to understand and convey the imperial discourse in which the image of a tiger is manipulated as something intrinsically a killable animal because of its non-conformity to the human commodities. At the same time, there is an opportunity to analyse how the local native people's ideas are limited only to the utilitarian function of the animals in their lives. If the tiger is offering a danger to their domestic animals' existence, he must meet his end. One of the inflicted peasants, mentions in his reporting to Corbett his need to see the tiger dead as the prosperity of his family's life is dependent on the tiger's demise. He elaborates to Corbett: "'My holding is small and the land poor, as you can see,' he said, 'and if the tiger kills my cows, on which I depend for a living, my family and I will starve'" (*The Temple Tiger* 11).

The imperial hunt extends its sphere towards a psychological mechanism in bestowing the paternalistic attitude on the colonised human and non-human subjects. It is a way to reconfigure the Raj by convincing the native people with the superiority of the whites by working in the natives' interests. Ritvo writes in a similar Victorian context, "Hunting and protection became opposite sides of the same coin" (qtd. in Wynn xii). The gentlemen sportsmen mix the elements of humane behaviour with their hunting codes, though ironical, Corbett writes, "From Tom I learned that the year—for sportsmen—was divided into two seasons, a close season and an open season. During the close season my catapult would have to be put away, for at this time birds were nesting and it was cruel to kill them" (*Jungle Lore* 223). However, one can analyse the implication of the ideology of paternalism plentifully bestowed on the human subjects in the tales and Corbett appears to be one of the chief architects of such buildings of the British benevolent character. The sport hunting along with justifying "an eventual genocide" (A. Singh xiv); is an important means to reach out the interiors of the country. Also, the hunting expeditions prove to be a means in the cognisance of the various regions of the country through the close acquaintance with the language and culture of the colonised people. Knowing the native culture and language, it is an easy task for the hunter or the government to induce the well being of the indigenous folk. The sports develop into a remarkable resource of the social and provincial control of the British Raj. The interesting fact about the colonial hunt is the two-way fulfilment of their purpose by shooting the animals. It is an imperial manoeuvre to disguise their passion for the hunt into an act that is taking place solely to protect the indigenous folk.

The protective approach that the colonial government implies, borrows its resemblance to the paternalistic beliefs for the configurations of the social policies that were redeveloping in the nineteenth-century Britain. Kim Lawes points out, "The paternalists looked on the interests of the individual as being inseparable from those of the state, and stressed the importance of social and economic interdependence" (8) is quite relevant with the discussions of hunting sport in the Raj. The paternalistic nurture which seems to run through the whole imperial enterprise is, in fact, very fruitful when functions against the dangerous beasts. Since the governing body adopts the interests of the local people/wild animals' afflicted population as their priority for consideration, so the social element of a peaceful relationship between the rulers and the ruled is synergised. However, the economic interdependence lies beyond the periphery of the cultural significance of hunting the animals. It is notable to mention that Corbett applies the suffering of the administrative body with the onset of a man-eater instead of referring to the individuals. He writes, "Bill Baynes and Ham Vivian . . . Deputy Commissioners of . . . Almora and Naini Tal in the year 1929, and both were suffering from man-eaters, the former from the Talla Des man-eating tiger, and the latter from the Chowgarh man-eating tiger" (*The Temple Tiger* 121). Hence, the terror of the man-eaters that is threatening the local people is equally menaced for the government. The logical preceding of Corbett for killing the Talla Des man-eater first despite the unfavourable setting denotes to the manliness of a hunter/sportsman. The tale of this man-eater describes: "The pursuit of this tiger would, I hoped, tide me over my bad time and enable me to adjust myself to my new condition. So to Talla Des I went" (*The Temple Tiger* 121). The benevolence of the English hunter is a conspicuous feature of the maturity and ability of a man. Corbett's texts are the evidence of that framework in which the British hunter is adorned with the ideology of paternalism.

Most of the tales written by Corbett is about *how* the notorious man-eaters met their end. However, some of the tales that explain at length about his hunting experiences of the non-man-eater animals are the prima facie of Corbett's paternalistic attitude. The hunting expeditions of Corbett afford a clear insight into the increasing proximity between a white hunter and the brown native. The articulation, "'The Sahib has come! The Sahib has come!' The cry was caught up from house to house and before I reached the village I was surrounded by an excited throng of men, women and children" (*Man-Eaters* 136) makes a clear image of Corbett, having a gun in his hand, the greatest protector of the rural folk. Also, in the picture of his benevolence for the

local folk, the animals seem to be the objects of facilitation of such alliance. However, the popular identity of Corbett rests upon his attitude towards the Indian people. He performs his duties conscientiously for the wellbeing of the colonised people, and this is what the Raj is supposed to be in the later decades of its tenure. As far as the patronising sensibility of Corbett is concerned, he develops it through hunting the animals, providing meat to his supporters on the hunting expeditions and other villagers, affording the economic help for his poor labour, etc. Apart from furnishing a direct help to the villagers, it is the kindness and responsibility of Corbett to show and skin off the dead man-eaters in front of the inflicted population. It leaves a substantial impact on the villagers and helps in expanding an entire faith in a hunter who is working for their well being. As exemplified earlier, few of the Tigers' pursuit, he conducts on the urge of the villagers in order to avoid any harm to their cattle. The shooting of *ghooral* on the pursuit of Champawat man-eater proves to be an instrument of confidence in a white hunter, along with providing a lump of meat for everyone. It is noteworthy to see the ostentation of such hunts:

> Lying in an uncomfortable position and shooting up to an angle of sixty degrees at a range of 200 yards at the small white mark on the *ghooral*'s throat, there did not appear to be one chance in a million of the shot coming off, and yet the heavy lead bullet driven by black powder had not been deflected by a hair's breadth and had gone true to its mark, killing the animal instantaneously . . . The expedition was a great success in more ways than one; for in addition to providing a ration of meat for everyone, it gained me the confidence of the entire village. (*Man-Eaters* 8)

The British tradition of shooting the animals to fulfil the villagers' expectation does not leave Corbett untouched. He admits, "I killed sufficient *mahseer* to feed the camp" (*Man-Eaters* 193). It is not only the fishes rather the other animals as well that Corbett opts for meat for his fellow men. The tale of the temple tiger mentions, "[I]f it would be possible for me to get some shooting in the locality, for my men had been without meat for many days" (*The Temple Tiger* 8). Further, the episode of the fight between the tiger and the Himalayan bear takes the benevolence of Corbett to another level when the fat of the bear is distributed among the villagers as these people greatly value the bear's fat for the cure from rheumatism. Corbett mentions the happiness of Bala Singh in getting satisfied his expectation of receiving the dead bear fat, "A very happy

throng of men turned their faces to Dabidhura, the happiest and the most envied of all was Bala Singh who proudly carried, strapped on his back, the bear's skin I had given him" (*The Temple Tiger* 24). The image of Corbett as a caring father is equally popular among the Kumaoni people as was of a hunter's. The monetary help to the villagers like Sher Singh and Lalaji is noteworthy to examine, as these are few of the instances that gives birth to the image of the *Carpet Sahib*. Corbett's statement about his contentment in giving the salaries to his local employees at the Mokameh Ghat seems convincing in remembering him as a man bound to the love for the poor of India. He mentions, "I do not think anyone has ever had as great pleasure in paying out money as I had when I placed a bag containing a thousand rupees into the hands of each of the twelve headmen, nor do I think men have ever received money with greater pleasure than they did" (*My India* 153-154).

Along with the paternalistic posture of the Empire, the sportsmanship was a site of asserting the calibre of the British. The multidimensional meaning formation of the imperial hunt injects its supremacy through building a character that is white and masculine in its spirit. Therefore, to bring the notion of race and gender as intimately intertwined with the sportsmanship is inevitable for this thesis to discuss over here. The notion of hunting as sports draws on the markings of split between the white hunters and the brown poachers. Such splits manifests when the idea of sports regulates itself in the shooting of the big wild cats. The notoriety of the big cat animals as the most dangerous animals in the Indian jungles recomposes the verse of colonial hunting. The alignment of the specified characteristics with the idea of sports introduces the elite and indeed the non-native spirit of the hunter. Possessing the trait of the benevolence in his aptitude, a white hunter is a symbol of Englishness that convolutes the sound factors of race and gender with hunting cum sports activities. On the one side, the handling of the animals in sporting ways by the colonial masters is controlling over the native land, while on the other side the hunting of the big cats particularly the man-eaters in sporting or non-sporting ways is competent enough to assert the supremacy of the white race.

The question of the animal presence in the colonial text is altogether a vital conveyance of the political need of the animals for the imperial missions. It is one of the ways to reaffirm and restructure the colonial rule on the colonised subjects. Moreover, the imperial calibre to deal with the dangerous animals further solidifies the factors of racial supremacy and imperial masculinity.

Also, the ritualisation of hunting into the sports plays a significant role for the British to strengthen the proficiency of their rule in their colony. Though the hunting of the animals, however, represents a callous attitude towards the animal creatures in Nature, the replacement of hunting with sports imbibe with the sporting rules made the indigenous population blind of their own bereavement through their exclusion from this sport. The dependency of the rural folk on the British for their safety from any danger of the jungles/animals proposes the racial domination of the white hunters on the native people. For the villagers, to take shelter under a white hunter's gun in the case of any peril from the wild postulates the capability of the white hunter exposed to the troublesome situations. Along with introducing the paternalistic Raj, the hunting sport performs also a means to ascertain that it is also masculine in its mental and physical endurance.

Grabbing the possession of hunting rights, the relationship between race and sports is quite linear. MacKenzie brings to notice the connection between the colonial hunt with its racial feathers, when he says the imperial hunt is "occasional display of white dominance" (*The Empire* 7). The impact of the racial domination embraces the colonised humans as well by establishing power over the non-human animals. The hunting of the wild animals with a focus on the carnivorous/dangerous beasts and the domination over the native human and non-human subjects walk side by side. The hegemonic control over the native people and their minds is having close affiliations with an image of the sportsmanship. The distinction between the sportsmen and the poachers has sound implications since it unfolds the underlying racial superiority of the empire and othering of the colonised people.

In simpler terms, the concept of race is used to facilitate the ideology of discrimination that gets its implementation in the inclusion of the white hunters in the sports club, excluding the Indian hunters to a group of poachers. "Race" as a concept in the form of discernment is a wide spectrum and comes to its culmination during the colonial period as it affects the anthropological, social, political, and cultural ways of life. It is an integral part of the colonising mission that is not only fruitful in making the mission success rather it precedes in convincing the colonised people that they are racially inferior. Likely, the practice of racism paints with bringing out the discrimination between two people or two/different nations. The idea/belief of superiority is a crucial/core feature of the proceedings of the racial thought. Benedict defines the thought of race(ism) aphoristically that: "Racism is essentially a pretentious way of saying that

"I" belong to the Best People" (Benedict 154). Moreover, that is the expression which finds its applicability to the colonising mission in India. The British establishes their Empire in India on the basis of their innate/inborn qualification for ruling the country because they are racially superior and this racial superiority permits them dominating the human and non-human spheres of life by exceeding in each way. Also, one can find the sense of justification in ruling the country because the host country does not fit into the paradigms of the superior race that can enjoy the big game hunting with a sense of Nature's appreciation. The instances of Corbett's contention in calling himself "White" (as has been discussed in the previous chapter) are notable, also, the exemplification of the imbibed racial excellence. Further, Corbett's statement, "All white people in the East are credited with being a little mad—for other reasons than walking about in the midday sun—and I am afraid my good servant thought I was a little more mad than most of kind" (*The Temple Tiger* 66). The superficiality of the statement makes it clear that the discourse is between a white man and a brown servant. Other than making the racial differences, there is an employment of the naturalised inferiority of the Indian servant by the ironic reconstruction of "madness." Here, the term "mad" is employed to convey the determination and courage of Corbett who could dare to follow the Panar leopard (a man-eater) at night.

In the specification of the big cats' hunting as the "killing" of the man-eaters, the intertwined notions of race and gender are more crystallised. The narratives of the man-eaters by Corbett validate the pre-eminence of the white government and the white hunter: "Whenever the prevalent conflict between carnivores and the human life heightens, it is always the obligation of the British official and the Government to get the indigenous people rid of the danger" (Rani & Kumar, "Foregrounding" 152). On the one hand, Corbett considers the pursuit of man-eaters as a form of sport, as it is evidenced in his account of pursuing the Champawat man-eater when he says, "I was new to this game of man-eater hunting" (*Man-Eaters* 19). While on the other hand, it is interesting to note that the regulation of the sportsmanship which is crucial to draw a line between the elite sportsman and the non-elite poachers seems to stagger in the corner when the pursuit of a man-eater animal is concerned. There is violation of the sporting rules when Corbett kills the Mohan man-eater while asleep. Although Corbett is glorified for this kind of paternalism for the inflicted population from the humanitarian point of view, there is altogether a question on *why* the disruption of the sports ethos are equally validated and rejoiced by the colonial and the colonised communities? (It will be analysed later in this chapter). However, it

presents the dualistic nature of the British hunting as far as the man-eaters are put into the objects of sports.

The killing of the man-eater animals overpowers the hunt of the wild animals. The hunt/sport carries the implications of masculine and fair play while the shooting of a man-eater surpasses an ordinary sportsman identity. "The animals decorate a platform for the empire to execute itself with masculine power and racial prestige in facing the danger of killing the man-eaters" (Rani & Kumar, "Foregrounding" 152). It implies the British masculine humane protective gesture for the man-eaters' afflicted population. MacKenzie puts his views, "The imperial hunt was a largely male affair and extolled as such. Its rituals and its alleged character-forming qualities were depicted as being 'manly,' a masculine training for imperial rule and racial domination" (*The Empire* 22). Amidst the less literature available on the significance of hunting for the Colonials in India, MacKenzie's focus on the cultural impact of such practices is of the apical relevance. As far as the hunting ethos is concerned in colonial India, it is always a matter of manliness. Since hunting is the most pleasurable pastime for the British elites on the distant land, so the British children are groomed from their childhood through the hunting competitions and the gun handling. Such kind of domination the British taught their generations to succeed in the well-established "manly" affair of hunting the animals. The training of hunting, as Corbett mentions, in his childhood by his brother (Tom) is the evidence of the importance of the hunt for the British children in India. Corbett states:

> Sitting on my bed Tom produced the catapult from his pocket, and putting it into my hands, took a cup of beef juice off the bed-side table and told me I must drink it in order to get strong enough to use catapult. Therefore I took without protest all that was offered me, and as I regained strength Tom assisted the other members of the family to keep my interest alive by telling me about the jungles and instructing me in the use of my catapult. (*Jungle Lore* 223)

Being submissive to Tom's instructions to be strong to hunt embeds the British desire and charm for hunting. Moreover, there is the introduction of mature weapons, i.e., the gun in place of the catapult as Corbett grows in age. The codes and conduct of the hunt, the mental and physical fortitude of the hunter, the handling of the gun, and most importantly the knowledge of the jungle are among the essential features to develop to stand among the British

man/hunter/sportsman. The focus of MacKenzie on the manliness aligned to the imperial hunt embraces its features from the Victorian ideals of manliness in Britain. Imbibing the characteristics of maturity, earnestness, endurance, and courage, the British concept of manliness transforms and gradually find the inclusion of the moral code of behaviour. J. A. Mangan and James Walvin throw light on the concept of manliness in Britain in the late nineteenth century where it evolves into the form of the muscular Christianity. They say, "[T]he term was appropriate to the extent that it captured that excessive commitment to physical activity which was an unquestionable feature of middle class male society in Britain" (Introduction 3), and further they say, "It established itself as a powerful moral code and as a widespread social imperative" (6). So the concept of manliness as it is emerging in Britain travels to its colonies and is securely placed in the sports of hunting. The British manliness makes the trajectory of physical activity, morality, and the social relationship. All these components turn into the specific characteristics of an imperial sportsman. Wynn writes, "Hunters on remote frontiers also exhibited and epitomized the bravery composure required of distant representatives of the crown . . . sport fostered Christian morality, physical fitness, and 'manly' character" (xii).

Corbett's popular identity of a saviour of the rural folk seems to persist timelessly because of the destruction of the notorious man-eaters by him. Since the killing of the man-eater is a noble task, so the features of a sportsman, when collided with a man-eater animal emerge more clearly and competently. However, the figure of a sportsman who is also a protagonist of the British sense of masculinity is directly related to the comprehensive understanding of the Raj as a just rule on the colonised people. The later decades of colonialism in India manifest itself as "The 'virtuous' rule of the British Raj and the new rulers of India would be lauded for their quiet and gritty determination to rule justly" (Patterson 1). Likely, the sportsmen are the model of the colonial ideal of "justness" employed in the fair play as well as in the safety of the people. And, as far as the shooting of a dangerous animal is concerned, it is not reduced merely to the annihilation of the animal. Instead, it involves a protective gesture for the locales and its inhabitants. Thus, the hunting sport is synonymous of the supremacy of the British in the physical and mental strength enmeshed with the protection of the rural people. Corbett convinces the people and the government of his devotion to killing the Rudraprayag man-eater when he spends many nights to protect the bridge which the leopard is supposed to cross. He stays there numerous sleepless nights and receives a high-level bodily affliction. He states, "There was no

handhold on the platform and even when lying flat on my stomach to increase friction and reduce wind-pressure, there was imminent risk of being blown off on to the rocks sixty feet below, off which one would have bounced into ice-cold Alaknanda" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 47).

The growing Victorian ideal of Nature conservation started affecting the colonial models in India also by the time Corbett grows a mature hunter (or conservationist). So in the case of Corbett when the ideals of the care for Nature and sports are running simultaneously, it is the sight of the man-eater carnivores against whom the British manliness is postulated. Consequently, the beginning of the twentieth century in India establishes the different aspect of imperial masculinity that partly contributes to the good image of the hunter for the colonised people and also to ascertain his image as Englishman by blood among the British colonials. It is the method to convince the colonial authorities that the white hunter is well-versed in British manners and actions. The hunting sports are the mechanism to establish the ideology of difference with the native Indians and the ideology of similarity with the British(ness); protected and maintained on the colonised land. Corbett as the destroyer of the man-eater animals appears to be an embodiment of the imperial ideals. It reminds of what MacKenzie mentions about an imperial hunter, "A supposed masculine ideal identified by a love of sports, particularly hunting . . . a vigorous pursuit of play . . . all contributing to the 'manly character' which was seen as the well–nigh unique mark of the Briton" (Introduction vii). The pursuit of the game is an emblem of being a Briton in culture and nature. Likely, it signifies the presence of the animal inseparable from the British cultural prerogative to install the position of a man in society, and comprehensively to validate the colonial rule in its colony of the rich wild folk.

The love for sports is prestigious for Corbett, and the eradication of the man-eaters binds to official cum moral duty for this sportsman. The sense of duty makes Corbett face and accept all the challenges that are laying his way of the jungle. He battles not only the dangerous beasts somewhat all those adverse circumstances which the human and non-human Nature imposed on him, particularly in context to the leopards. In following the Rudraprayag man-eater, he says, "Added to my discomfort of the wind, I suffered torment from a multitude of small ants, which entered my clothes and ate away patches of skin" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 47). The pursuit of nocturnal animals (leopards) at night in the jungles offers a platform to Corbett nobelising his identity. It is appropriate to refer to Mrinalini Sinha when she calls such a character, "manly

Englishman" (3). Thus, the idea of the Englishman flourishes in India in the jungles (as the game fields) borrows this idea of redefining the masculinity from Britain where it is taking place through the field sports in the nineteenth century. J. A. Mangan and Callum Mckenzie write, "Field sports now symbolised aristocratic privilege and sustained the traditional code of the gentleman in a period when middle-class sensibilities were reconstructing his image and redefining his masculinity on games fields ("The other Side" 41). However, in India, the field sports include the jungle field also as the place for hunting sport.

The articulation sounds same when Corbett articulates his experiences of the man-eaters' pursuit in the jungles of Kumaon. The tales of the man-eaters' killing (if) are significantly vocal about how such animals meet their end; certainly, these stories are clamourer of the hardships and determination of Corbett in fulfilling his purpose of hunting the wild beasts. However, among the other man-eaters' tales, Corbett has given lengthy and more comprehensive details of the man-eating leopard of Rudraprayag. It falls so because of the failure and success of a hunter/sportsman in following the most popular and destructive animal in the Garhwal history. The concept of British manliness is approved more adequately in case of the chase of the nocturnal carnivore. Therefore, the concept of British masculinity becomes essential to analyse since it gets entangled with the search of the man-eaters in the jungle in the night and day as well with the additional effect of the on foot pursuit by the hunter. The famous/infamous Rudraprayag leopard still haunts the minds of people whenever there is a tale about the man-eater. The frequent attempts and ways by the government to trap this man-eater become futile till Corbett's persistent pursuit resulted fruitful in 1926. The leopard reigns the Garhwal region of the United Provinces of British India for eight years, making an appearance in the newspapers and magazines in India and abroad. Corbett states, "There were twenty four hours in every day of many weeks I spent in Garhwal, and time and time again after sitting up all night, I walked endless miles next day, visiting distant villages from which reports had come of successful attacks by the man-eater" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 77). Here, the vigour and fortitude, shown by Corbett feature the imperial masculinity in opposition to nature, particularly the leopard.

The news of the emergence of a man-eater in an area creates a compelling shock, and such resemblance is with the case of the Rudraprayag man-eater. The popularity of this man-eater partly rests upon the region; he is active in. Since Rudraprayag is on the leading road of the

pilgrimage to Kedarnath, it becomes quite accessible for the leopard to come in contact with the people. There are twenty-five stories in the text including epilogue which depicts various stages and ways of chasing the man-eater. There is a sense of competition of the heroism between leopard and Corbett. It binds to the thrill of who is going to be the winner/hero. Since leopard is a nocturnal animal, it adds more difficulty in tracking the man-eater and shooting him in the dark of the night. Even though "[T]here were over four thousand licensed gun-holders in Garhwal, and host of keen sportsmen in Lansdowne" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 22), the few attempted get failure and others did not want to risk their lives. So the task is assigned to Corbett, and his acceptance depends upon his sportsmanship and prestige, he has earned in his life. "The civilian administrator developed a patriarchal approach to hunting in many parts of India, seeing it as an obligation, a source of prestige, a route to understanding his district and people, as well as a means of recreation" (MacKenzie, *The Empire* 168). It is not solely the interest of the hunter in the quest of the animal somewhat in the case of the man-eater it is the concern of the governing body too, to get the menace extinguished. However, as far as the hunting expeditions are held for such carnivores, it is less concerned with recreation and is more rationally bound to the obligation and prestige of the British government and their hunters.

"The Pilgrim Road," the opening story reveals many strands that are tied together in the upcoming course of the text. Largely, Hindus inhabit the Garhwal region, so Corbett makes his invisible companion as Hindu who is a pilgrim and travels with him up to Rudraprayag. The hardships of the pilgrimage to the sacred shrines of Kedarnath and Badrinath are the means of being rewarded, as Hindus believe

> Times there will be, a-many, when, gasping for breath, you toil up the face of steep mountains on feet torn and bleeding by passage over rough rocks, sharp shale, and frozen ground, when you will question whether the prospective reward you seek is worth the present price you pay in suffering; but being a good Hindu you will toil on, comforting yourself with the thought that merit is not gained without suffering. (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 3)

The pilgrimage serves two ways: the availability of the people in the range of the man-eating leopard and the leopard's popularity also depends on the pilgrimage. "Garhwal can claim that this leopard was the most publicized animal that has ever lived, for he was mentioned—to my

knowledge—in the press of United Kingdom, America, Canada, South Africa, Kenya, Malaya, Hong Kong, Australia, New Zealand, and in most of the dailies and weeklies in India" (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 6). The fame of the man-eater and the prestige of its hunter are firmly related. As the government appeals to all the sportsmen over the country for hunting the man-eater, Corbett's sportsman attitude in facing the danger of a significant nocturnal cat justifies Englishman masculinity. The series of the subsequent torment, Corbett faces in the jungles, makes him a hero from the humanist point of view. Since he is in the Garhwal for barricading any further loss to human life, the local people assist him at their best. Hunting of the big cat animals for sports designs the image of the hunter as a man of value and dignity. "Hunting for sport was integral not only to the lifestyle of the officials but also to their self-image as men who believed in fair play. The white man was considered 'superior' to the native and the Raj was seen as powerful enough to contain danger" (qtd. in Rangarajan, "The Raj" 265). The esteem of the masculine power in facing danger gets intensified when execution takes place for the sake of the colonised population. The animals are a defining factor in what is meant to be human as is the view of Rajamannar, "[T]he animal constituted a central element in the defining of what it meant to be human, or, more relevantly . . . an Englishman" (22).

The area of the man-eater is conspicuously pleasing as this vast portion of five hundred square miles is divided into two parts by Alaknanda River which meets Mandakini River at Rudraprayag. The icy cold water of the rivers and the cool breezing on the hills, particularly at night, make it more challenging to pursue a man-eater in the dark. The articulation; "My object in going to Rudraprayag was to try to prevent further loss of human life" (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 33) consolidates his love for the people of Garhwal and the unquestionable sovereign authority of the human species over the non-human animal species. It seems that there is an issuance of the great divine right to the humans to suffocate the dangerous carnivores and even the other alike animals are treated in the same manner. In the hunting crusade of the same leopard, there is not a slight hesitation to put the other animals at stake, "I decided to treat all leopards in the vicinity of Rudraprayag as suspect, and to shoot any that gave me a chance" (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 36). Moreover, other animals: goats, buffalos, cows, sheep, etc. are used as the bait and for installing the cyanide poison to kill the leopard but all result in vain. The ethical cum sporting ways to treat an animal are put aside when there is a battle between the deadly face of nature and humans. Val Plumwood calls it the "Eurocentric imperialism" that

distinguishes the spheres of nature from the human's. She writes, "It (Eurocentric imperialism) tends to see the human sphere as beyond or outside the sphere of 'nature,' construes ethics as confined to the human (allowing the non-human sphere to be treated instrumentally) (53). There are certainly beautiful stories about the leopard; designating him an "evil spirit" of the night which signifies the superstition of the Garhwali people and simultaneously they credit Corbett with the supernatural power. Hitherto, the leopard is put to the dark side and is an enemy of the people. At times, the description of the leopard mentions, "when I could imagine the man-eater as being a big, light-coloured animal—for so he had appeared to me the first time that I saw him—with the body of a leopard and the head of a fiend" (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 19). The redemption from this enemy is the central motif of all the population/humans. Corbett as an epitome of saviour seems to challenge the leopard, considering it merely an animal when he says over the kill of a woman, "For this pitiful kill leopard would have to pay with his life" (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 100). It displays not only the image of an animal in the empire instead enacts a fearless and determined imperial masculinity that follows the vigil nights on the pine tree, rainy nights in the jungle and endless walk on the hills in search of the leopard. Sir William Ibbotson, Deputy Commissioner of Garhwal also accompanies Corbett in the arduous expeditions while local people's business confines only to torchbearers, drum beaters, informers and serving eatables to the whites

> Fifty yards from the tree, while climbing over a rock, Ibbotson slipped . . . we eventually reached the footpath our troubles were not ended, for the path was a series of buffalo wallows, and we did not know where our men were. Alternately slipping on wet ground and stumbling over unseen rocks, we eventually came to some stone steps which took off from the path and went up to the right. (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 67-68)

All the efforts are put against an animal who is creating a massive menace in human life. The animal becomes a sight of convincing the colonised people of the colonial rule as constructive, and an awareness of safety is refashioned through the determined chasing of the carnivorous, distinctly man-eaters. Corbett and Ibbotson's crucial fruitless attempts in killing the leopard: the creaking of the plank, resulting in Ibbotson's changing position to relieve the painful cramp in his leg, rift in the gin trap tooth and the failure of the light in reloading the rifle finally result in boldness and conviction in the destruction of the animal. It seems a disgrace to the human

rationality and power that fails in trapping an animal. The use of the rifle adds substantial strength to the human body and is one of the most important weapons of the empire; Jesse Oak Taylor terms it; "weapon of manhood" (160). The empire's viewpoint on the rifle is apparent in the lines, "[H]aving discarded poisons and traps, I would get an opportunity of using my rifle as rifles were intended to be used, to put a bullet truly and accurately into the man-eater's body" (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 109). The use of the rifle is marked with the sportsman's gusto. And the sportsman spirit leads Corbett to Golabrai where he shot the man-eater in the dark in May 1926.[3]

Mangan and Mckenzie highlight the feature of selflessness involved in the sports. They say, "Manhood ideologies have always included a criterion of 'selfless generosity, even to the point of self-sacrifice'" ("Pig Sticking" 101). The wild tales of the man-eaters and the devotion to killing them by risking own's life; the hunter becomes the mouthpiece of the imperial society. Facing the extremely adverse circumstances during the hunting expeditions are the deliberate acts to ascertain the difference between the white and brown physical, mental and moral prowess. The underlying honour in achieving the adventurous task is more self-satisfactory. Corbett's description of following the Chuka man-eater resembles the British ideal of manhood when he delineates:

> The distance between Thuli Gadh and Kaladhunga via the Sarda gorge is eight miles, and via Purnagiri, fourteen miles. The Ibbotsons and I went through the gorge while our servants and the men carrying our kit went via Purnagiri. The gorge is four miles long and was at one time traversed by a tramway line blasted out of the rock cliff . . . The tramway line has long since been swept away by landslides and floods, and these four miles necessitate a great deal of rock climbing where a false steep or the slipping of a hand-hold would inevitably precipitate one into the cold water. We negotiated the gorge without mishap. (*The Temple Tiger* 92-93)

The implication of conquering the rock by the white men including Corbett falls in the symbolic achievement of the imperial ideology of protecting the dignity of the British on the colonised land. The selection of the routes by the two respective groups of the British men and the Indian

[3] The above excerpt (pp. 95-98) is taken from my research article "Foregrounding the Animal Stance: A Critical Study of *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*," 2017, pp. 151-160.

men functions as the performance of their duties that are bound to their national identities. Here, "the servants and the men" represent the local natives (a colonised identity) who are indulged in providing their share in the success of the man-eater's hunting. The honour in attempting and achieving the arduous route is altogether aligned to the virtue of the British hunters who are benevolently conscious enough to make the local people tread the safer avenues. Thus, it signifies that the British hunter/s legitimised the concept of superiority and inferiority among the white and brown people through the hunting drives. In fact, such descriptions add a charm to the hunting tales where the idea of the predominance of the imperial ideologies is running through between the lines of the text. Although at one of the places Corbett induces the act hunting as the pleasurable pastime for him, as far as the hunting of the man-eater is concerned, the dynamics involved in this sport took a slight turn. The presence of the man-eaters and their subsequent killings by a white hunter collaborate the conviction in the Raj. The certainty of danger and following courage to eradicate such danger was the striking example of the adamantine British sportsmanship. Following the Chowgarh tigress, Corbett states, "[T]he conviction grew on me that man-eater shooting, by night, was not a pastime that appealed to me, and that if this animal could not be shot during daylight hours she would have to be left to die of old age" (*Man-Eaters* 80). The man-eaters offered the challenge to the hunter, and the acceptance for the same by Corbett surpasses his imperial identity. Ross and Gunn put their view on such kind of remarkable sportsmanship: "The daring spirit shown by the officer-hunters in their encounters with wild animals, it was argued, not only proclaimed the prestige of the race, but also their acknowledged leadership as men" (qtd. in Mangan and Mckenzie, "Pig Sticking" 102-103). However, Mangan and Mckenzie relate the ordering of the colonial rule with the efficiency of the British hunters. They say, "Imperial order and control, in short, rested in no small measure on the excellence of British officers as sportsmen" (103).

A closer look at the narratives substantiates the scheme of killing the man-eaters as a governmental affair. All the strenuous efforts to hunt the man-eaters in Kumaon and Garhwal as narrated by Corbett are official missions in which Corbett plays the leading role. The idea of governmental(ity) is the indicator of two important aspects: first, Corbett is working for the British government; secondly, the moral conduct of the hunter walks hand in hand. Apart from the official orders, sometimes it is the ethical urge that pushes Corbett to re-establish his sportsmanship. As, for instance, the tale of the Thak man-eater records, "I must confess that it

was more in the interests of the local inhabitants than in the interest of the contractors that I gave my promise" (*Man-Eaters* 175). However, this statement is ironical and giving the sense of pacifying the English readers by "confession" of selecting the villagers' concern over the British contractors who are worried about the interruption in the forest felling project in the presence of the man-eater. The tale of the Chowgarh tigress states, "It was a District Conference in February 1929 that I found myself committed to have a try for this tiger" (*Man-Eaters* 44). He is being appointed by the British authorities to work in the man-eater affected areas from time to time. The political need of the colonial masters to cultivate the faith in the Raj, it is essential for the government to make advances for the well-being of the man-eaters' inflicted people. So the high officials or the exceptional sportsmen are assigned to protect the affected areas. The first man-eaters known in Kumaon are the Champawat tigress and the Panar leopard. Also, in both the cases, the obligation between the British governing bodies and Corbett is reciprocal. He writes, "When shortly after my arrival in Naini Tal I received a visit from Berthoud, Deputy Commissioner of the Naini Tal . . . he told me of the trouble that the man-eater was giving the people of his district, and the anxiety it was causing him, he took my promise with him that I would start for Champawat immediately on receipt of the news of the next human kill (*Man-Eaters* 2).

The similar anxiety the government undergoes with the advent of the Panar man-eater. Since the man-eating terror is new in Kumaon in the first few years of the twentieth century, so the novelty in how to tackle such perilous situation is directly linked to the image of the Raj and its proficiency to face the analogous danger. The empire seems to be united in dealing with a man-eater. It is a hardship for Corbett to select the priority of killing the man-eaters. He states, "[A]fter killing the Champawat tiger I was asked by the government to undertake the shooting of the Panar leopard. I was working hard for a living at the time . . . I received an urgent request from Berthoud . . . to go to the help of Muktesar where a man-eating tiger had established a reign of terror (*The Temple Tiger* 65). The chase of the man-eaters is an opportunity for Corbett to perform his loyalty for the British. On the emergence of the man-eater, all the internal differences based on the social hierarchy among the British society are ignored, and the selection of the appropriate hunter turned to be the prime focus of the higher authorities. Such episodes recall Linda Colley's statement, "[E]mpire did serve as a powerful distraction and cause in

common. Whatever their own differences, Britons could feel united in dominion over, and in distinction from, the millions of colonial subjects beyond their own boundaries" (325).

Apart from the image of Corbett as an excellent sportsman among the British administrators, it is the same hunter who is equally popular among the rural folk of Kumaon and Garhwal. He is lovingly called *Carpet Sahib* by the villagers. The local dialect of the people converted Corbett into Carpet, making an aesthetic appeal to the readers, and also strengthening Bhavya Tiwari's remark, "India is . . . a place where linguistic diversity promotes variety in aesthetics" (48). Further, *sahib* is not merely an enunciation that the Indians have used to address the Europeans instead it is an identity formation in the case of Jim Corbett. Although the superficial pronunciation of *sahib* embeds the hierarchal notions in the relationships of a coloniser to the colonised, the notion of a hunter *sahib* is fundamental to go through the dynamics of the relationship between human and non-human animal and implicates how this interaction relocates the margins of the predetermined colonial-colonised nexus. The villagers of Talla Des honour Corbett highly because this is the only European with whom they experienced likeness. He writes, "I was possibly the first white man who had ever approached that village alone and on foot, and yet, by the time I reached the assembled people, a square of carpet had been produced, a *mohra* (rush seat) placed on it, and I had hardly sat down before a brass vessel containing milk was placed in my hands" (*The Temple Tiger* 134).

Additionally, the epitome of the *sahib* is resultant from that sportsmanship that carries the ethos of the native protection from the dangerous wild beasts (as has been discussed in Chapter 2). Also, the idea of the masculine hunter who works in the interest of the villagers contributes to the image of a gentleman. The powers to kill a dangerous animal compliments to the power of dominating the colonised subjects through the performances of the duties. Distinguished from his fellow hunters of that time, Corbett fulfils the notions of a humane colonial master being involved to his duties of the subjects' well-being efficiently. His promises to the native population to get rid them of difficult situations embed with the image of a colonial gentleman. His denial of being categorised any officer wandering in search of the Mohan man-eater in Kartanoula employs his sense of duty. He accentuates his responsibility as the rescuer of the natives irrespective of any physical surroundings. The petition of Govind Singh, headman of the village Jharat, Garhwal, to Corbett in 1933, is the evidence of the faith that the native people

have only in Corbett. The extract of the petition reads "We have heard that your kind self have killed many man-eater tigers and leopards. For this you have earned a good name specially in Kumaon revenue Division. The famous man-eater leopard of Nagpur has been shoot by you. This is the voice of all the public here that this tiger also will be killed only by you" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* 160).

Corbett's accomplishes his promises to the natives with firm determination. The epitome of *sahib* or a gentleman is, though, majorly dependent on the image of the saviour but it is extensively presents the virtue of the hunter. A true *sahib* for the villagers is the one who is able to bring the skin of their greatest enemy. So there is always a throng to see Corbett on his visits to the villages. The skin and teeth of the tiger has a cultural significance for the villagers, as Corbett describes the skinning of the Champawat tigress, "[T]he trunk, legs, and tail of the tigress were cut up into small pieces and distributed. These pieces of flesh and bone were required for the lockets . . . credited with giving the wearer courage, as well as immunity from the attacks of wild animals" (*Man-Eaters* 28). Corbett consolidates the virtues that characterised the Englishness; physically stout, morally and emotionally humanitarian. Mandala comments on the practice of bringing the dead animals to the villages, "The dead predator was paraded as a proof of Corbett's ability to bring justice to sufferers and restore normalcy in their daily lives" (*Shooting* 347). He is the sahib who carries the responsibilities of the empire to make its people's surroundings liveable. Mira Matikkala states, "This is obvious when one looks at the amount of propaganda which was considered necessary to highlight the humanitarian and liberal elements in the imperial project; 'the white man's burden'" (78).

Recognisably, the discussion on hunting as a site of social influence makes this study to touch upon the broader aspects of the technological enrichment that grabs a fascinating value in the realm of hunting sports in colonial India. In this regard, it is essential to revise Cartmill's definition of wild hunting. Although the word "wild" is capable of signifying several meanings at several places, in the case of the hunting "wild" denotes to the animal who is "not friendly toward people or submissive to their authority" (29). Thus, the proper definition of the wild hunting develops like: "The hunt is thus by definition an armed confrontation between humanness and wilderness, between culture and nature. Because it involves confrontational pre-meditated and violent killing, it represents something like a war waged by humanity against the

wilderness" (30). Cartmill ignites severe issues altogether that need to be addressed comprehensively. The analysis of a great hunter's texts causes it inevitable to address the discourse of the "gun" that deeply embeds the idea of the animal (particularly the wild animals and consequently the man-eaters). The term "war" gives a horrific effect compelling the readers to imagine the extent of bloodshed (of animals). Amidst the hunting environment, the jungle life is at the stake, lacking in peace. The gun/hunt presents a threat to the tranquillity of the forests. The peace that is "the absence of war or fear of war and bloodshed" (Gill 34) is lost for the animals in their natural home. The first indicative component is "an armed confrontation"; the technology of gun/rifle is a metaphor of the cultural impulse of the British. The technological enrichment and the sporting ethos of the big cats hunting go hand in hand in colonial India.

The discourse of a white hunter pays a considerable amount of attention to the specific guns used for the specific hunting. So the interconnection between the British technological advancement representing their culture, the idea of the animal or the popularity of a man-eater, and the resultant debacle cannot be avoided. The intersectionality of the social and cultural authority of the sportsmen on the colonised subjects mainly the humans is through the subjectification of the animal as wild or a killable object of the rifle. Certainly, it is compelling to note how the development of science and technology has its cultural cum social impacts. However, Nancy Stepan considers science a "social activity": "Science is a highly social activity and is not sealed off from the values of the society in which it is practiced . . . of science as a product of culture and social life" (9-10). The juncture of any society's values and its science is clear when the focus is on the specific modelling of the weapons (particularly rifles) for the wild hunting in the Raj. Arnold has argued about the Indian tradition of science, technology, and the medicine before the arrival of the Europeans and the later developments in this field in its colony. However, the progress of science and technology in the later years of the empire in India shifts its boundaries to embrace the ideological paradigms of the elite and non-elite class. David Arnold writes, "Science became a vital factor in the articulation of class ideologies and structures, especially through the creation of novel systems of industrial organisation and production, through the creation of new professional and working-class identities and through the hegemonic authority of both established and aspiring elites" (15). Hence, the phenomenon of science and its productions in the form of technology are very inclusive that lies beyond the purpose of this study. However, to analyse the gun technology and its affiliations with the British

sportsman who is masculine and saviour of the weaker people is quite relevant. As far as the hunting sports are concerned, the gun is the symbol of manhood and power. Gun overpowers the human and non-human subjects. The use of the gun/advanced gun in the jungles does not restraint only to an imperial identity mainly post Arms Act 1878 in India instead somewhat it helps in the evolvement of the man-eaters' identity as well (to be discussed later).

As far as Corbett's tales of the man-eaters' shooting by gun/rifle is concerned, it is evident that this weapon is an instrument of power. Cartmill's inclusion of the terms "culture" and "nature" in his definition is strikingly pertinent to revive here because of the gun's significance as the symbol of culture, and the animals as the embodiment of Nature. Absolutely, Corbett's statement for killing the Rudraprayag leopard, "[H]aving discarded poisons and traps, I would get an opportunity of using my rifle as rifles were intended to be used, to put a bullet truly and accurately into the man-eater's body" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 109), inculcated the re-introduction of technology. The intention of the rifle to kill the man-eater is deeply involved with the "political ideologies" that take place at the sight of the animal. On the one hand, it is the demise of the animal, and at the same time, it is the arisen of the empire with the great trust in it. The deprivation of arms makes the colonised land to gaze at the imperial clouds for its protecting shower. It is significant to throw light on Burgh's words to understand how the disarmament has very pervasive aspiration

> No kingdom can be secured otherwise than by arming the people. The possession of arms is the distinction between a freeman and a slave. He, who has nothing, and who himself belongs to another, must be defended by him, whose property he is, and needs no arms. But he, who thinks he is his own master, and has what he can call his own, ought to have arms to defend himself, and what he possesses; else he lives precariously, and at discretion. (qtd. in Singh, abhijeetsingh.com)

In making a state successful, it is evident the contribution of the arms is considerable. So the British policy of the ownership of the arms has manifold effects. The compatibility of Arnold's statement dazzles here, "Science could not easily be divorced from the political ideologies and institutional structures that colonialism had put in place" (14), so the colonial ideological structure that ties an animal as an object to measure the efficiency of their technological product (gun) is attached to the power of this technology. Also, that is politically asserted to preserve the

supremacy of the colonial rule. Further, it is significant to quote Arnold when he reminds that despite many flaws of the colonial science; it is worth retaining "to describe the various technologies of power operating within and through science in a colonial setting" (15). The gun-shot is the characteristic of the colonial hunt. It is a kind of technological advancement, regulated the superiority of the culture over nature. The development of firearms in the 19th century empowers the hunting ways of man as it facilitates the hunting expeditions in comparison to the traditional ways of the hunt. This mastery over the wild animals and jungles of India is crucial to the British colonials' social, political and cultural advancement. MacKenzie says, "[A]n understanding of hunting requires an attempt to come to grips with the technical development of firearms in the nineteenth century" (1). In fact, in the case of Corbett, first, it is the power of the gun that helps Corbett to win the local people's faith. With the advent of Champawat man-eater, Corbett gets an opportunity to mesmerise the people and to ascertain that it is the win of the culture over nature. After the *ghooral* shooting with Martini-Henry rifle, he says, "[T]he magic bullets used had not only killed the animals—like that—but had also drawn them [villagers] to the *sahib*'s feet" (*Man-Eaters* 9). The use of the word "magic" for a bullet that hypnotises the locals identifies the power associated with the rifle along with the growing faith in the masculine shoulders of the hunter that bears the weight of the rifle. Since rifle shooting is incorporated with the manhood, so it emits a thrilling impact on the natives. Bringing the local people to the hunter's feet is the display of the natives' effeminacy.

However, the hunting purposes oblige the symbolic domination, but the introduction of guns has the capitalistic inflexion too. New models of weapons are imported for the hill shooting for fulfilling the capitalistic purposes. Corbett mentions about a new rifle when he has been to Calcutta: "He [the manager] informed me that the rifle, a .275 by Westley Richards, was a new model which the makers were anxious to introduce on the Indian market for hill shooting" (*The Temple Tiger* 9). Already, the East India Company' holds over the arms manufacturing in India, so the situation after the 1857 revolt drastically changes the fate of the Indian market in the arms production. The revolt instantly opens the British mind of the ownership of the arms and its next social and economic control over its colony. Priya Satia writes about the influence of gun in the nineteenth-century:

> The impersonal, casual violence they enabled at the start of that century remained part of common understandings of their uses, enabling the ordinary person to kill 'types' rather than individuals—on the battlefield, in conquest, in counterinsurgency, and in riot. Guns mediated the rise of a particular regime of property and the social relations it rested upon. They were a tool of violence for a society of new kinds of strangers—especially abroad. (Ch. 6)

The role of the potentiality of a gun in converting an ordinary man into the exceptional warrior is critical to understand when the British disarm the Indians. The possession of the gun only in the white hands leads the Indians to shelter under the British regime of safety. The power associated with the use of gun assures the Indians would never dare to rebel in the absence of such powerful weapon in their arms. M. K. Gandhi condemns the British judgement of the Indians' disarmament, "Among the many misdeeds of the British rule in India, history will look upon the Act depriving a whole nation of arms, as the blackest" (Ch. 151). The importance of the arms for the increasing strength of a nation is quite evident when a "non-violence" leader supported the importance of its presence. Thus, the ownership of the guns has certainly the broader significance. Apparently, the gun is not the substitute for the knife or sword, as mentioned by Satia, "The gun . . . served entirely new purposes. That is how it made its place in the world, but over time it would substitute for other instruments of violence as culture and technology both shifted" (Ch. 6). Consequently, when the gun gets its associations with the culture, it has serious impacts in the field of sport hunting and for the Indian non-human world. So making a linkage between the gun ownership and the hunting, it is essential to trace the imperial control of the sportsmen over the jungle territories and its bordering regions.

The gun symbolises the dignity of a sportsman, and its efficient handling serves the purposes of the true sportsmanship in the colonial settings. From the school grounds to the hunting grounds, the British children seize a great fascination for this weapon. The obsession with colonial hunting starts from childhood for the settled Europeans. Borrowing their ideals from Europe, all the attempts are put to indoctrinate the Anglo-Indian children with the British attitudes and culture from their schooling days. When Corbett delineates his story of getting a rifle at the age of ten, he interknits many strands that are important to demonstrate how the prestige is associated with the use of the rifle in India. He states, "The adult company

demonstrated to the visiting officer their prowess with the 450 Martini rifle. The battalion prided itself on having some of the best rifle shoots in India in its ranks and this pride was reflected in every member of the force," and further he says, "Inter-school competition in all forms of sport, and most of on the rifle range, was very keen" (*Jungle Lore* 284). The role of school Cadet Company of Naini Tal Volunteer Rifles is crucial in forming Corbett, an English sportsman in respect of his mental and physical training for the sports. Such competitions make Corbett eligible to acquire a rifle by Sergeant-Major at the age of ten years which was going to be very helpful in the functioning of the new imperialism. "The mid-nineteenth century Rifle Movement, which evolved into the Cadet Corps, produced, it was believed, pupils with martial skill, useful in the era of the new imperialism . . . a practical means of colonial enforcement—the rifle—was elevated to the status of a moral asset" (Mangan and Mckenzie, "Pig Sticking" 110).

The ideology associated with the possession of a rifle makes the existence of the non-human world very trivial. The dream of every Anglo-Indian growing child is to threaten the jungle and win the hearts of his fellow mates and family mates by conquering over the animals/birds and most importantly the triumph over the animals' fear is more glorious deriving from the possession of a rifle in hand. Mangan and Mckenzie record the experience of Hutchinson in Britain that is noticeable to throw light here, "[T]he education of future sportsmen begins with the first stone thrown from childish fingers at a confiding sparrow, and is continued with the use of that series of boyish missile weapons which leads up to the adult dignity of the gun" ("The other Side" 54). However, in the case of Corbett, the achievement of the rifle illustrates the boyish dignity of the gun with fulfilling the purpose of fearless selection of the game. He states, "[T]hough a .450 rifle firing a heavy bullet may not have been the best type of weapon for a boy to train on, it served my purpose . . . armed with a rifle, the jungles were open to me to wander in wherever I chose to go" (*Jungle Lore* 288). Evidently, it seems the use of the rifle makes the birds an object of the practice of accurate shooting while on the other hand; the rifle offers an assessment of moral care for the natives in the case of a man-eater carnivore. However, different weapons are used for various hunting grounds, but the preference to the killing of the birds in order to save the ammunition is the display of man/nature split in which the nature sands at the lower platform. Corbett accepts, "The muzzle-loader had taught me to economize ammunition and now, when I had a rifle, I considered it wasteful to practise on a fixed target, so I practised on jungle-fowl and on peafowl" (*Jungle Lore* 289). While in the case of a man-eater, a hunter

with the rifle is bound to the moral conduct of safety of the local people as Corbett did "[T]hat the tiger they [villagers] had just heard growling was a man-eater and they wanted to have the protection of my rifle . . . I had of necessity to keep them with me" (*The Temple Tiger* 103).

II

"When a man wants to murder a tiger he calls it sport: when the tiger wants to murder him he calls it ferocity. The distinction between Crime and Justice is no greater"

—George Bernard Shaw

The acts of hunting make it very obvious that the British mind is nurtured with the pre-existed man and animal dichotomy where the animal sustains only in order to fulfil the humans' requirements. The idea of hunting as sports drew a clear line between the traditional way/purpose of hunting with that of the imperial hunt. When an animal is supposed to be in a contest with a human, its value lies in the symbolic significance and supremacy of one over the other. After discussing the British attempts to establish imperial characters through their sportsmanship, there is an inevitable question that must be addressed here. If the British ideals are affirmed through their masculine physique, benevolent emotions, and technological advances, then the question of against *whom* these ornaments of a hunter are embellished becomes more pertinent. Although the hunting of the wild animals is always a joy and adventure in the natural abode, to hunt the big cats mainly the tigers is a remarkable feature of the imperial hunt. A peculiar fascination for the tiger hunt gradually blurred the importance and jest of other kinds of hunting. The tiger hunt evolves the supreme kind of sports in colonial India.

The colonial literature with the thematic inclusion of the hunting memoirs is greatly bombastic about the Tigers' hunt. MacKenzie provides clarity of the colonial obsession for the hunt when he demonstrates the special colonial hunting relationship with "[T]he tiger, the elephant and the pig" (*The Empire* 179). Although all the three animals significantly come up bringing the controversial British policies of the killable animals and later the conservation animals, the focus of this chapter is limited to address the question of *why* is the Tigers' hunt in colonial India so compelling. As far as the imperial hunt of the tigers is concerned, definitely it knits the feathers of class, gender, race, and undoubtedly speciesism which ultimately leads to the dynamics of domination, as Dipika Nath says, "An India in which boundary confusions—

between animals and humans, and native and colonizer—leads not to a rethinking of the bounds of race and species but to a reformed logic of domination" (262). The British develops a special relationship with the tiger species that they sought to extinct from the colonial land of India. The attempts of racial supremacy over Nature function as a tool to convince and rejoice the murder of a big cat. The passion for the tiger hunt has already reached its maturity in the nineteenth-century, and Corbett being the leading hunter cum conservationist British officer is an exemplary figure to analyse how the tiger image is equivalent to the spellbound effect to evade from the tiger hunting obsession. His life presents a living diversity of the hunting objects (tiger) from unethical to ethical. However, the relationship between the Indian tiger and the colonial hunt has grabbed the attention of many scholars and historians who have explored the equations between the two at length like Jalais, Schell, Sramek, Crane and Fletcher, MacKenzie, and Ritvo. Apart from making a direct engagement with their views, the argument of the present chapter develops in explicating the entanglement of the tiger with the concept of animality that ultimately rationalise the killings of these carnivores. Since Corbett's texts are the primary data for this study, so it is imperative to unveil the functioning ideologies behind the glorification of Corbett's deeds of hunting the big cats. If the tiger is "a large-hearted gentleman" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* xiii), then the notoriety of his villainy is arguable.

It seems the British conservation cult is too late to trace the role of the animal (particularly the tiger) in consolidating the imperial self of a sportsman; Jim Corbett. Corbett's texts present the thrill of the pursuit of dangerous animals in the wild, with the threat being ever-present and ever higher in the case of a carnivore who is a man-eater. However, this aesthetic interpretation of his narratives has been falling out of favour lately. Indeed, the human-animal encounter in the wilderness intended for killing the animal (the big cat), on the one hand, demonstrates the existing western human/animal split, and on the other, signifies a possible theoretical ploy to sanction British cultural immunity to consider tigers as objects to be killed. The colonial obsession for hunting tigers refashions the cult of English(ness), greatly formed by Master shooting this alien creature. Sujit Mukherjee writes, "That the tiger was an exclusively non-European creature may have been the original reason why it so fascinated the British when they came to India" (5). However, Divyabhanusinh thinks, "The lion continued to occupy centre stage until the British came on the scene. As lions became rare, the tiger took its place" (Ch. 4).

The reinforcement of the image of the tiger is invested with "several potent meanings" (Sramek 659) to understand the cultural cum social relationship between the colonial masters and the colonised people. Franklin says, "The animal world for any society is never an indivisible category but a historically constituted and morally loaded field of meanings that derive from the human habit of extending social logics, complexities, and conflicts onto the natural world, and particularly onto animals" (qtd. in Jalais 34). Thus, the relationship between the tiger species and the British is historically convulsed concept that finds meaning in its metaphorical competitive enemies. In Britain, the tiger carries the impressions of "[t]he cruellest, bloodiest, least tractable of creatures" (Donald 76). William Blake's poem "The Tyger" potentially conveys the tiger's image on the British mind: "And What shoulder, and what art, / Could twist the sinews of thy heart? / And when thy heart began to beat, / What dread hand? and what dread feet? // What the hammer? what the chain? / In what furnace was thy brain? / What the anvil? what dread grasp / Dare its deadly terrors clasp!" (230).

Hence, the British acknowledges this foreign creature a powerful object whose murder could transfer the power to the Raj. At the same time, in the Indian colonial setting, the concept of tiger evolves as "[T]he symbol of Indian monarchs. Tipu Sultan had a carved musical instrument representing a tiger pouncing on a British soldier" (Jalais 28). So this imagery corresponds to the cultural association with the conception of the Indian tiger getting heightened with awarding the medals after the Srirangapatnam victory "[f]eaturing a British lion pinning a growling tiger down on the ground" (qtd. in Pandian 79). The interconnection between a tiger and the Indian rulers bears its connotation on the British mind that predominantly reflects in literary, social, cultural, and personal spheres of the Raj.

Symbolically, the Tigers are a blend of fear and attraction, beauty and charm and overall the animal body full of strength and power who is capable of resisting any command whether of humans or other animals. The peculiar fascination to the tiger makes it more fascinating as it is the most coveted fantasy of the colonials in India. Scott Bennett puts it like, "Despite a normal willingness to slaughter whatever came along, for most hunters there was usually a definite ranking of animal" (74), and the tiger received the most qualifying category of the imperial hunt in India that every colonial dreams of "[E]very right-thinking Englishman wished to possess a tiger skin" (Mackenzie, *The Empire* 180). The tiger signifies an animal of free will and

unyielding power that additionally requires the perseverance of the hunter for handling such dynamic and energetic animal. Bearing the title of the treacherous animal, the tiger suffers from the partial categorisation of the animals between vermin and non-vermin. MacKenzie says, "[C]ombination of cruelty, furtiveness and treacherous elegance that are the essential elements of the tiger's image . . . British saw the tiger as a magnificent beast, revelling in its 'grim joy of over lordship of the jungle,' but also defined it as a vermin" (*The Empire* 180). Besides, it reminds Mahesh Rangarajan's assertion, "[T]he English distinguished not so much between 'wild' and 'domesticated' animals as between wild animals that needed to be protected and those that ought to be exterminated, and they imported this logic to their colonies" (*Fencing* 144). Many powerful colonial officers are full of the thought that, "[A] tiger was better dead than alive . . . Over 80,000 tigers, more than 150,000 leopards and 200,000 wolves were slaughtered in the fifty years from 1875 to 1925" (Rangarajan, *India's Wildlife* 31-32).

Over time, the transformation of tiger shooting into "sports" yields results by the end of the British Raj that is far more disastrous than the cultural effects. Although by this time, the need for conservation surfaced, the harm caused to Indian wildlife during colonial rule cannot be overlooked. The contest between the two species through the sport of hunting causes two-sided suffering, contributing to the substantial increase of man-eaters, resultant in the tooth and claw rule over the nearby local population. The reinstatement of the animal in the clear human-animal relationship structure is unacceptable and unethical. Thereupon, the tiger's identity is rendered complex, considering him a wild malevolent beast due to his perceived capacity to challenge humans' rule. Harriet Ritvo asserts, "Animals were supposed to serve the purposes of humanity, not appropriate it to theirs. To reverse this relationship was to rebel against the divine order, to commit sacrilege. The punishment for animals who dared to challenge the principles of hierarchy and subordination was drastic" (30).

Being considered in this light, the "nonconformist nature" of the big cats concerning the governing principles for humans leads the British to consider the species "a cunning, silent, savage enemy" (Rangarajan, *India's Wildlife* 25) whose defeat is believed to be a symbol of human supremacy. Courtenay states, "The stories that filtered back to nineteenth century England were exciting and uniformly anti-tiger . . . From now on the tiger was almost universally loathed as the embodiment of devil and the epitome of evil" (qtd. in Mukherjee 5); the British

colonial policy of conservation well consolidates the attribution of an evil nature to the tiger. Mandala's words serve to illustrate this: "The colonial policy of conservation of wild animals was selective in its approach and ran parallel to the policy of extermination of other species . . . big predatory animals—particularly tigers—were ruthlessly exterminated as 'vermin'" ("The Raj" 79). The official proclamation of tigers as "vermin" causes tremendous suffering for this species, leading it to the edge of eradication from the country. Rangarajan terms this struggle a "war" against wild animals in colonial India, stating that "Some carnivores were seen as lawless beasts, but the tiger was especially ferocious even among other flesh-eaters due to its fondness for humans as prey" ("The Raj" 270). The construction of the tiger as a human flesh-eater has far-reaching consequences as the obliteration of this danger from human lives would earn awe for British hunters. Joseph Sramek states, "[T]iger hunting was an important symbol in the construction of British imperial and masculine identities . . . Only by successfully vanquishing tigers would Britons prove their manliness and their fitness to rule over Indians" (659). The heroism of the British hunters is deeply facilitated by the establishment of the forest and arms act as discussed earlier.

Although Corbett is against calling the tigers "vermin," his narratives register an acknowledgement for the pleasure of hunting the big cats; tigers and leopards. Since tiger hunting is the most sought big game in the Raj, so Corbett evolves the biggest big game hunter of his time. Being a British sportsman, he grows as the epitome of the "double" identities and his writings as a blend of ethnocentrism and ecocentrism because his conservation arises out of his indulgence in the hunting missions like any other colonial hunter. He learns the big game shoot at the early age of ten years that his family rejoices. He explains the first shoot: "I put a bullet into his (leopard) ear . . . Trembling with joy at the beautiful animal I had shot, and trembling most of all with anticipation of the pleasure I would have in carrying the news of my great success to those at home who I knew would be as pleased and as proud of my achievement as I was" (*Jungle Lore* 292). It is an ironical expression of Corbett who is putting the object of Nature despite his beauty, only as "someone" against whom his achievements are measured whether great or trivial. Thus, the killing of a big cat is substantial in meaning. It indicates the British attitude towards the animals, and at the same time, it employs the successful hunt as a mark of prestige to ascertain the Englishness among the British family and community at the larger scale. The hunt of the first leopard by Corbett conveys the meaning simply that he belongs

to the race that dares to face the dangerous animals in the exotic jungles and conquer them. The pleasure of shooting the big cat is too big to accommodate any British at that time. Similarly, in order to get a trophy, Silver's (a friend) demand is fulfilled by Corbett of killing a leopard. He says, "[I]t had not been my intention to blow his head off at a range of a few feet, but to put a bullet into his body and so avoid ruining Silver's trophy" (*Jungle Lore* 300-301). If put into Surya Nath Pandey's words, Corbett's longing for hunting the big cats testifies his craving to be "more English than the English" (70).

However, the majority of the tales written by Corbett describe the man-eaters, but the non-man-eaters tales of the tigers and the leopards seem to deliver the image of a wild animal who is less preferred even in comparison to the other domestic animals. It is interesting to note that Corbett always seems to justify the killings of the big cats by some lame excuses. To disturb any of the human domains is a crime for the tiger species, Corbett writes:

> And it was in this jungle that I shot my last tiger, on my release from the army after Hitler's war. The tiger killed—at different times—a horse, a calf, and two bullocks, and a sit resisted all my attempts to drive it away I shot it. Sister Maggie doubted my ability to hold a rifle steady, for many forms of malaria contracted in many jungles had, she thought, impaired the steadiness of my hands. However, to make quite sure of my shoot I called the tiger up for my judgement, found it guilty, and shot it through the eye as it was looking at me at the range of a few feet. It was murder, of course, but justifiable murder; for though I was willing to let the tiger live in the dense patch of lantana it had selected for its home—two hundred yards from the village—and pay compensation for all the animals it killed, it was difficult to replace these animals owing to the country-wide shortage of farm animals bought about by the war, and—as I have said—the tiger resisted all my attempts to drive it away. (*Jungle Lore* 251)

The employment of the idea of "wild" and "domestic" that Corbett seems to disseminate here, focuses on his Westernised character in majorly three ways: first, the participation in the British army proposes him the British counterpart that the British history celebrates. Representing a model for the martial skills, he altogether jumps into the discourse of a sportsman whose skills and abilities are quite corresponding to an army man. Corbett's elder brother Tom plays a significant role in taking Corbett to the jungles and teaching him the jungle signs along with the

use of the weapons for shooting. Now, the proud the family will be off, in fact, is camouflaged with the desire of a British middle-class family who could now enjoy the reputation of an "officer" through the successful hunts overseas. Since the hunt in the Victorian time in Britain is an aristocratic affair, so to enjoy the access to the big games is an overwhelming element for the lower strata family. Heather Schell writes, "[M]iddle-class men now had access to the big game as officers in India. They stayed abroad for decades, and they became the expert shikari whose advice and aid was sought by visiting aristocratic hunters. It mattered to them that others see them as both professionals and gentlemen" (235). The similar sense of honour Corbett feels when he arranges/provides good hunting grounds to the Viceroy in India and Princess Elizabeth in Africa. That is the professionalism of the hunter (Corbett) that makes him remarkable among the aristocrats. The formulation of the doubt by her sister regarding his steadiness results in a ruthless murder of a tiger. It aligns to the nationalistic passion for fitness to rule the natural world that Corbett appears to prove here. Evidently, with the notion of wild and domestic that the Europeans have laden finds justification in the sense of challenging the functions of the animals used in the war. Since the domestic animals have been efficiently used for conveyance of the ammunition and soldiers, their shortage defends Corbett's argument of the violence done to the tiger. It consolidates Ritvo's argument, "In fact, subordination to human purposes transfigured and elevated the animal itself" (17). Based on the utility and the subordination of like the domestic animals, they seem to receive an upper claim in the humanitarian arguments. The disobedience in the nature of the tiger leads him to be categorised among the worst animals. Further, it is relevant to bring to light Ritvo's views, "Descriptions of individual animals routinely expressed subordination in terms of service. The best animals were those that displayed the qualities of an industrious, docile, and willing human servant; the worst not only declined to serve, but dared to challenge the human supremacy" (17). However, it seems purely humanitarian in its tone and permits Corbett as an ardent follower of the European structure of thought where the tiger's presence is always in question whether with the interaction between the tiger and other animals or between the tiger and the humans.

The tract of Terai and Bhabar jungles in the lower range of Himalayas was the favourite hunting spot of the British sportsmen (including Corbett) because of the plentiful availability of the big cats to shoot over in this area. The association of pleasure and prestige with the killing of a tiger gives a preliminary idea of the loss of this species under the racial bandages of

sportsmanship. The idea of the tiger hunting as entertainment/sports is certainly covered with racial plumage. The increasing worry over the loss of the game is significant in making the government reserve the forests for their officers towards the middle of the nineteenth century. Consequently, the hunting power shifts to the colonial masters. Huggan and Tiffin say, "The very ideology of colonisation is thus one where anthropocentrism and Eurocentrism are inseparable" (5). The connection between the mastery over Nature and the establishment of the centrality of the human species with their requirements are prioritised. The shooting of the Powalgarh tiger substantiates Corbett's passion for the tiger's shoot by displaying his skills of a hunter sportsman. By virtue of his size, Mrs Anderson christened this tiger the "Bachelor of Powalgarh." Corbett says, "I had long wished to see this famous tiger that all the sportsmen in this province were trying to bag" (*Jungle Lore* 278). The size of the animal is crucial in determining him a good hunting material since the hunting ethos are bound to provide a good sporting chance to the animal. Along with Powalgarh, such is the fine example of the biggest leopard in Bindukhera, Terai. Corbett delineates the shooting of this leopard: "The morning sun was shining on it and from its colouring and size we took it to be a tiger . . . we saw from the length of its tail that it was a leopard. 'Sahib,' said Bahadur . . . this is the biggest leopard in Terai, and it is worth shooting" (308), Corbett has a trial for this animal and finally he shoots the animal, "Fortunately for us my bullet had gone through its neck and paralysed it, and by the time we had dragged it fifty yards to safety it was dead" (*Jungle Lore* 310). The bigger the animal is, the higher the prestige gets associated with his shooting. Also, the pictures of such big animals lying dead at the feet of Corbett deliver a powerful image of the hunter in particular and the empire in general. Mandala says, "Hunting was an important aspect of the imperial showcasing of power in colonial India as well as a vital means of governance and rule. The figure of the white hunter sahib standing with a gun in hand over the carcass of a tiger was one of the most powerful and enduring images of the empire, inspiring awe and respect among viewers" (*Shooting* 1).

Besides, the hunt is also vocal about the social status of the hunters among the white community. The way of the hunt is an indicator of the existing class hierarchy among British society. The necessity of the hunt for the British aristocrats in India is obliged to their dignity as the big game hunting is a right of the upper class in Britain, so along with the showcasing of the British prestige and power, the hunt is also a display of domination on the colonised subjects.

However, the aristocratic hunt's elementary purpose lies in the objectives of "pleasure" and "entertainment" but cannot be divorced from the formation of power and supremacy. The statement of Corbett when he conversant to Stable for the best shooting grounds for the Viceroy is an instance of the Victorian ideal of hunt nobility. He says, "Kaladhungi; that this village was surrounded by jungles in which there was a variety of game; and that I knew of no place in India where a more pleasant holiday could be spent" (*Jungle Lore* 330). The visit of the Viceroy Linlithgow to Kaladhungi with his family exemplifies the high-class British hunt for which the blocks in the jungles are reserved, and the nearby activities are purely restrained only to those who are supposed to partake in the "royal" hunt. On the one hand, this mission demonstrates the different royal ways of hunting the tiger, and on the other, it convinces the reader to see Corbett as an obedient, loyal sportsman to make all the preparations along with a sense of dignity to be recognised as a trustworthy able professional British Indian sportsman. About the company he writes, "From Hugh I learnt that the Viceregal party would consist of Their Excellencies Lord and Lady Linlithgow, and their three daughters, the Ladies Anne, Joan, and Doreen (Bunty) Hope" (*Jungle Lore* 331). A number of personnel, administrative and defensive bodies follow them to Kaladhungi. There is a pageantry of the sixteen elephants to be used for the Tigers' hunt. The success of the inaugural day shoots follows "[f]our tigers had been cleanly shot, with the minimum expenditure of ammunition" (*Jungle Lore* 331). It is interesting to note each of the Viceroy's family members bags the tigers on this holiday. It seems the prestige of the British highly depended on proving their power through the successful hunts. There are further such subsequent holidays that are gratifying because of the Tigers' killing. The violence against the Tigers and their pain is neglected in such cases.

The negligence of the animal's presence indeed leads this study to investigate *why* the big cat animal is straightforwardly put into a killable category. Corbett's description of the humans and animals' relations is primarily shadowed with the havoc of the so-called villainous animals/big cats man-eaters in the realm of having a multifaceted rivalry between the animals and humans. Corbett's mastery in portraying the non-humans as the characters of the tales is truly unmatched to anyone's sense of Nature along with its delineation, in that particular time. Reading Corbett multiple times with the thought of his heroism capable of eroding the menace of the most dangerous animals, somewhere introduces the anthropocentric approach to his texts. So there is an attempt to peek into the imperial hunting as a tradition that is closely implicated not only in

shaping Corbett's identity but also it manifests the implications of the two most closely intertwined images: one of the animal; and other of a *sahib*, corresponding to each other, in the case of the writings of Corbett. The non-human man-eaters' stories are embroidered by "real" encounters with the big cats, in this case, majorly the man-eaters, in the jungles of Kumaon in colonial India. The practice of Human intrusion into the habitat of wildlife through hunting/sports allows this study to contextualise these man-eater animals, captured in the discourse of animality.

"If there were no man-eaters, there would have been no Corbett" (emphasis mine); this premise seems to be correct in the case of Corbett as a specific example. Even after nearly seven decades of his death, Corbett continues to live, particularly in the memories of the Garhwali and Kumaoni people of Uttarakhand, India. Although he is considered a conservationist by the rest of the country, the hill people still worship him as a saviour who freed them from the persistent danger the man-eaters presented to them and their families. The recent article by Anupma Khanna, written in commemoration of Corbett's 140th birth anniversary, recalls his heroic exploits of hunting man-eateing tigers.[xxx] Evidently, the discussion on Corbett is closely intertwined with the animals/man-eaters. Since the big cat man-eaters are marked as the most dangerous and active animal threat to human lives, eliminating this fear from people's lives made him the memorable *Carpet sahib* for this group.[xxxi] Certainly, the apotheosis of Corbett does not represent an isolated phenomenon, rather a complex one, enmeshed in the negative fearlessness of a man-eater animal. The attribution of an infernal nature to a man-eater animal, in fact, constitutes an exercise of pushing a real carnivore into the human constructed framework of humanity and animality. The man-eater tales evidence the significant contribution of the animal(ity) in rationalising the malevolent bloodshed of the big cats. Further, there is an assertion on the concept of "animality" as a state of being (to be discussed in chapter 4) that functions as an apparatus to justify violence against animals while also restructuring the dynamics of the colonial-colonised relationship.

The concept of animal, as a point of interest for scholars in humanities, raises several complex questions concerning role of the animal in the colonial writings on hunting. There are broadly two ways to analyse the animal presence: first, as an object that carries the connotation of Descartes' perception of the animal automaton, and secondly, the animal as a subjective entity,

under the theoretical underpinnings of Derrida's tradition. Setting the "question of the animal" (Derrida, 2008; Haraway, 2008; Agamben, 2004; Wolfe, 2010) in the backdrop of the subjective presence of the animals, the analysis takes a plunge into the colonial environment of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century India. However, in the context of encounters with man-eater tigers in the jungle, the act of eating humans offers wider possibilities of analysis of human-animal relations. As "animal" and "man-eater" represent two distinct identities, the dominance of the latter excludes acknowledgement of the existence of the former in human interpretations.

Therefore, equating the animals' attacks to acts of animality, the focus is placed on *how* a "real" animal is effaced in the face of human grief. The examination of the aura of animality surrounding Corbett's texts, based in the first half of the twentieth century, reveals that the act of animal attacks produce and serve "identity politics" (Anderson 302) associated with the presence of a colonial hunter, operating on a colonised land. The analysis of animality continually engages with the conception of the animal and its place in the western cultural and philosophical system. The then prevalent tradition of hunting wild animals following the glorification of this activity appears to be entrenched in the paradigms of man-animal dichotomy; therefore, there is a deliberate attempt to revise and re-signify the historically convoluted concept of animal(ity) and how this construction of the animal is central to the imperial imperatives of the British Raj in India. Specifically taking the example of the tiger's role in the image formation of the Empire, Crane and Fletcher write, "[T]igers were used as a cipher for hegemonic Victorian attitudes to India and its people . . . the tiger's role in the iconography of the British Empire is most potent in those images that overtly display encounters between humans and tigers" (371). Thus, in the literature concerning the Empire, the tales of the "wild" are capable of depicting the dualistic nature of the British elite's dispositions. There is always a question as to the model of the animal's presence in the colonial texts. The Empire's common tendency to orientalize the other human groups makes the presence of other non-human groups (animals) arguable in its writings. However, to present a critique of the focused recurrent appearance of the animal ferocity in Corbett's narratives, it is inevitable to throw light on the etymology of the terms like animal and animality.

The first implication of the term "animality" appears to contain a negative overtone as this term has been applied in close association with the term humanity to demonstrate what it is not. In other words, to understand the notion of animality, one needs to comprehend "[T]he ways in which ideas about humanity and human beings have shaped, and been shaped by, ideas about animals" (Ingold, "Humanity" 14). Therefore, the need to trace the western construction of animality and humanity necessitates an inquiry into the intellectual revolutions of the Renaissance and Enlightenment, which incarnated humans on the absolute throne. The elaborate discussion on the humanism/humanity in Chapter 1 proves the Western attempts to place the human at the centre of all discourses by his unique abilities of reasoning, language, consciousness, and speech. Also, interestingly all the superior traits of the humans are established by bringing the animal into the discourse. The eighteenth century marks the most recurrent use of the terms: "human" and "animal." The understanding of being human entails possessing the following characteristics: compassion, kindness, gentleness, a refined nature; the concept of being civilised is replaced by more politicised and modern concepts that legitimise the uniqueness of human beings through their unique abilities that collectively create a civilised sphere. Ingold states, "Every generation has recreated its own view of animality as a deficiency in everything that we humans are uniquely supposed to have, including language, reason, intellect and moral conscience" ("Humanity" 14). If the word "deficiency" is considered, it raises a question of the etymology and subsequent application of the term "animal/animality." The anti-human element of animality divorces it from etymological associations with the word "animal." Mary Midgley's analysis of replacing the words *beast* and *brute* with the animal shows the use of language and its arbitrary use in determining the negative overtone of the terms: animal and animality. In fact, it is the erroneous use of the word "animal" in the philosophical parlance that replaces its ontological essence along with losing its identity as equivalent to the humans. The proficiency of the language gradually alters the usage of the word "animal" and its aligning meanings. The fulfilment of the basic instincts of the animals and the factorial actions for doing so results in popularly known as "animality." The animal kingdom's actions or sometimes the aggressive deeds for reproduction, hunger, protection of their cubs, and the rule of their areas evolve to be known "animality." However, the feature of animality is also attributed to the humans when their behaviour deprives of the so-called rational attire. The growing opposition

between humanity and animality leads Claude Lévi-Strauss to critique the western man for opening the possibilities of a cursed world. He says:

> [C]ould not the western man understand that in assuming the right to radically separate humanity from animality, in granting to the first what he was denying from the other, he was opening a cursed circle, and that the same border, constantly pushed back would serve to separate more men from other men, and would serve to claim, for always more limited minorities, the privilege of a humanism, corrupt at the start for having borrowed from his pride its principle and its notion. (41)

To establish one's identity against the other (animal) represents an altogether surreptitious deed based on humans' desire and need for the animal's presence. The broad western classification of animals as wild or domestic is based on their definition of the word "wild" that may induce human grief if the counter situation takes place. Therefore, colonial literature relates a sense of honour in killing a wild animal. The carnivore animals' stories described by Corbett consolidate the "model of disorder" (Tapper, "Animality" 51), that the wild animals' conception seems to carry with itself. While Tapper asserts that animals' category is "[c]ulturally constructed . . . animals are sometimes represented as the Other, the Beast, the Brute . . . the way things should not be done" ("Animality" 51). In such cases, the discourse of animality seems to be discursive; apart from the actions of the animals as a form of animality, sometimes the humans' actions are also termed as marked with the stigma of animality. The basic idea functioning behind the humans' animality, by popular notion, manifests itself in the irrational behaviours and deeds of a human. So this is the way how the modern culture perceived the animal and the human. However, the presence of animality in the actions of the humans and animals is dualistic and indicates Darwin's proposition of the difference between both of degree, not of kind. Matthew Calarco says while analysing Heidegger's statement of humans as *animal rationale*:

> Likewise, in the definition of the human as *animal rationale* that comes to dominate in modernity, the rationality of the human is thought as emerging from and through the human's animality. In this sense, the Darwinian rejection of any kind of radical break between the human and animal registers of existence is not entirely foreign to the dominant metaphysical tradition but is in fact one of its logical possibilities. (249)

However, the active usage of an unquestionable linking of irrationality with animality (as Kant does) in modernity is problematic. For instance, if animality is conceived in both structuring a simple standard; "irrationality is animality," then on the other hand, the dismantling of the preconceived notion of the animal and animality becomes possible. As things go, it opens the possibility of the wider viewpoint to see the humans' animality as irrational and the animal's animality as rational. If the environmental factor is taken into consideration, then the compatibility of the animals with their surroundings appear more sensible in comparison to the humans' treatment of their milieu. Evidently, the killings by the animals are reinforced by their basic instincts in which the mechanism of "survival" rules. However, humans seem to stand amidst many unfavourable questions for their animality since they can be driven by many personal/social/cultural/political ostentations: pleasure and prestige. Returning back to the argument that the construction of animal(ity) serves as a tool for the Empire to make a re-drawing of their Raj, the next chapter analyses animality as a "natural" state of the animals and attempts to demystify the myth of the man-eaters in the texts of Corbett through analysing them as a spatiotemporal identity.

CHAPTER 4

Demystifying the Animal: Fathoming the Roaring of the (colonised) Animals/Big Cats

Continuing the discussion over animality as a state and how it serves as a mechanism to push the animal into the realm of enmity, with the primary source of Corbett's texts: *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*, *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*, *My India*, *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon*, *Jungle Lore*, and *Tree Tops*, the present chapter makes a thorough understanding of the implantation of the man-eaters as the offspring of the cultural construction of the imperial hunt in India. Concisely, this chapter is concerned with *why* the notorious man-eaters arise and fall at a particular time. Developing the argument to the "man-eating" phase as suffering for the animals, the first section deconstructs the human discourses of a man-eater and considers them as the significant characters of Corbett's tales; subjected to their natural state. The section second, concerned with the question of the animal makes this chapter a critique of the existing colonial dichotomy between the human and animal that sprouts on the idea of the relative (un)cognitive functionality of the non-human animals. There is delve into the animal behaviour, animals' relationship with other animals as well as with humans, since "The discourse or the words with which we describe wildlife not only articulate the view of the wildlife in question, but also inscribe a set of relationships" (Herda-Rapp and Marotz 76). A probe into the animal behaviour demystifies the animal and comes up seeking the non-human animal agency. The role of the animal's agency into forming these non-human entities as subjective unveils the animals/big cats in particular paradigms of power that resists and challenges the colonial desire to orientalise the colonial non-human animal subjects. Also, the animals' retrieval glorifies the prowess; they are full of, as a bit of Nature.

I

To understand "animality" as a state, Ingold's approach to animality is important. Animality is a domain or "kingdom" that includes humans as a biological taxonomy, one amongst several animal species inhabiting this earth and connected to each other in a complex web of ecological interdependencies, while the second approach entails a state or a condition that is opposite to humanity, i.e., it characterises behaviour as "natural" when actions are devoid of reason or

values.[xxxii] Thus, behaviours disciplined by "culture" and those regulated by "nature" stand in opposition to each other. While the "natural" state of being can be subjected to both, the human and non-human animals, here the discussion is confined to the natural state of non-human animals. Here, the "natural" denotes to the expression of the capacity of any species under the specific form of circumstances. Stephen Clark says, "What is 'natural' to a given kind is what members of that kind would do, under 'normal' or 'ideal' circumstances. Those circumstances, in turn, are to be defined as the ones in which members of the kind would realize their natures" (24). Since "[N]ature represents the outsider" (Douglas 262), the natural actions of an animal (may be a result of environmental factors) lay beyond the characteristics of humanity. The natural behaviour of an animal in its natural environments is species-specific, internally motivated and biologically required. Bracke and Hopster define natural behaviour, "Natural behavior is behavior that animals tend to perform under natural conditions, because it is pleasurable and promotes biological functioning" (80).

Therefore, the "instinctive" actions/reactions are assumed to constitute the distinctive feature of animals. Though the idea of human actions laden with symbols offers a narrow understanding of their "culture," the animal species' ability to learn and adopt behaviour opens a new area of understanding concerning animals' enculturation. While the "instinctive reactions" form a key element of the western construction of animality, this tradition deprives animals of responses and ascertains them to be full of reactions; in this regard, Derrida says, "The animal is deprived of language. Or more precisely, of response, of a response that could be precisely and rigorously distinguished from a reaction; of the right and power to 'respond' and hence so many other things that would be proper to man" (*The Animal That* 32). Derrida's critique of pushing an animal into the realm of reactions, stripping them of responses, offers an insight into the analysis of a man-eater's animality (the act of killing people) as a response to a particular state in which the animal has been put through external factors. Thus, the concept of animality is not an alien feature; instead Haraway considers it a discursive notion "[t]hat gender, race, and animality are deeply entwined concepts in our culture—they are concepts that discursively construct one another" (qtd. in Birke, "Intimate Familiarities?" 430). Similarly, it gets relevance to Corbett's animals' tales where the role of gender and race is inevitable from the construction of animality, as has been focussed in the previous chapter.

Already there has been an extensive consideration on hunting of the big-cats as a structural feature of the British Empire in India. So, now, the attempt is made to analyse the other side of the imperial hunt that rise in answering the question: what falls into being an animal? The argument lies in unfolding the phenomenal nature of the hunting sport; if it is capable of rendering the image of British men, then it certainly embraces the image of the powerful animal that the imperial men crave for to dominate. Corbett pens down the pursuit of man-eating tigers and leopards in Kumaoni forests due to the human problem this causes in this hilly area, with the inhabitants living at the mercy of the man-eaters. The complete volume of the man-eating tales appears to mourn the killings of human beings and celebrate killing of man-eaters. The "killing" plays a pivotal role as far as the man-eating tales are concerned because human-animal relations become antagonistic when people suffer the danger of a man-eater, a development that ignores the nature of a "real" animal. The creation of a man-eater cannot be understood in isolation as it is caused due to numerous factors that lead a tiger to become a man-eating one; similarly, the killing of man-eater tigers is also founded in the enthusiasm for sports held by the British, their relationship with the colonised people and the assimilated role of technology in this English, patrician pursuit. The man-eater forms the most infamous and devilish representation of the animal that everyone would prefer to unlearn. Furthermore, to stay in a man-eater's territory is the most terrifying task as Corbett acknowledges in one place, "[T]here is no more terrible thing than to live and have one's being under the shadow of a man-eater" (*Man-Eaters* 14).

The elaborated narratives of the man-eaters offer a glimpse of the immense human loss caused due to man-eaters by looking at the animal's animality while also celebrating the similar act of killing the animal. Indeed, this raises a question with regard to the human-animal relations shaped by nature/culture dichotomies and an animal's basic temperament. The hunting of wild animals, including that of man-eaters, is considered a humanitarian act, performed to serve a cause for humans. The humanity (protecting the rural people) that the Raj is trying to portray derives its accessories from the elements of being animalistic in nature. Plumwood says, "[T]he western definition of humanity depended—and still depends—on the presence of the 'not-human': the uncivilised, the animal and animalistic" (qtd. in Huggan and Tiffin 5). In the case of a man-eater animal, the idea of animal as anti/un-human gets reinforced and follows the tradition of asserting humanity against animality. Corbett's statement "Sentiment, however, where a man-eater was concerned was out of place" (*The Temple Tiger* 112-113), exhibits the systems of

human-animal spaces when a threat to the human authority shuts the scope for the (un)ethical judgements. The war between humanity and wilderness forms the core element of the narratives. Corbett, being a sportsman, is keenly interested in delineating *how* the man-eater animal met his end since the respect associated with hunting in the wilderness has close affiliations with the construction of the notion and conferment of the title of *sahib* as discussed earlier. In the whole process of hunting for a man-eater, the human killing or the animal's animality forms the cynosures while the reasons behind this unnatural phase of man-eating the tiger reach the weak fringes of the glorious narratives. Also, the utterances of the laws of jungles appear as the "helpless realisation" (Ravichandran 28) unless the animal perspective is revived. This chapter contextualises the man-eaters in Corbett's texts, known by the regions in which they operate: the Champawat, Chowgarh, Mohan, Kanda, Thak, Muktesar, Chuka and Talla Des man-eating tigers and tigresses along with the Panar and Rudraprayag man-eating leopards, accounts detailed by Corbett. These man-eaters emerge in a particular temporal context of hunting, due to lack of natural food or a wild encounter with other animals at a specific time, in the approximate period 1905–1940. The immediate popularity of Corbett's man-eaters' tales arguably depicts the public's obsession with the big cats and their manner of attacking human beings. Further, the factor that serves as an alluring element in the narratives is *how* the man-eaters are killed. The bloodshed of a man-eater is considered an imperial act of a colonial hunter replete with the ability to eradicate human suffering.

Although the British administration acknowledges Corbett a great hunter, his identity as the man-eaters' destroyer is more believable and convincing for the rural folk of the above-mentioned regions of India. The discourse between Corbett and the local people reveals a complex and unsettled engagement with the animal. The information offered by the people about the Champawat man-eater's attacks allows us to observe a real animal entangled in the humanitarian rhetoric of animality. The story of the jungle is capable of rendering the basic and natural instincts of the animal that is directly analogous to the desire for food. At the same time, processing human grief in the whole episode of suffering intensifies the adaptation of the animal's image into a signifier of violent and devilish desires. The description of the tigress' attack on villagers of Champawat is given as follows: "[P]resently in view came a tiger, carrying a naked woman. The woman's hair was trailing on the ground on one side of the tiger, and her feet on the other—the tiger was holding her by the small of the back—and she was beating her

chest and calling alternately on God and man to help her" (*Man-Eaters* 13). Further, the tiger's 436th victim, a little girl, was an extremely disturbing case, provided here as recounted by Corbett: "[A]t the edge of the pool was an object which had puzzled me as I came down the watercourse, and which I now found was part of a human leg . . . I have not seen anything as pitiful as that young comely leg—bitten off a little below the knee as clean as though severed by the stroke of an axe—out of which the warm blood was tricking" (*Man-Eaters* 18). Through the concept of animal savagery, the politics of social relations is enacted between the colonial hunter and the affected people. The possibility of representing the victims in a barbarous way is performed by the natives to an equal degree, and Corbett here indicates an attitude of unacceptability with regard to transcending the ideals of nature. As this tigress is the first man-eater introduced to Kumaon, the laws of Nature she is subjected to are despised in the light of suffering she creates for the human victims. The resembling perspective is raised by Garry Marvin regarding the fox-hunting in the British terrain. For the English countryside people (particularly farmers), fox is "vermin" because she entitles as an "illegitimate killer." Also, in such cases "[t]he illegitimate killer becomes an object of legitimate killing" (208). This is the same notion of illegitimate killing of the human beings that awaits and honours the slaughtering of the man-eater tigress.

The aspect of Nature and what is natural is thrown completely out of the scope of consideration when people transmute the animal into an evil spirit: "This is the *shaitan* . . . our enemy" (*Man-Eaters* 25–26); the transformation of a "real" animal into an imaginary devil adds a layer of significance. The discourse relating this kind of animality of a man-eater allows it to be construed more as a metaphorical and powerful anti-human entity than a natural animal with inevitable physical needs. The barbarity of carrying a "naked" woman and killing a young girl serve to further emphasise the horrific ways of a man-eater and its wild ways of dealing with humans. Being ashamed to see a naked woman, there is illiteracy in the animal's ignorance of nudity. Derrida asserts, "There is no nudity 'in nature'" (*The Animal That* 5), since animals are not aware of the concept of nudity or its association with good and evil "[a]nimals would not be in truth, naked" (*The Animal That* 5), and being oblivious to concept of nudity themselves, they are obviously similarly blind to the implication of evil attached to the act of carrying a human's naked body. The perception of treating a human being like an animal is consolidated by Corbett when he writes of the Chowgarh man-eater, "[W]hen a tiger becomes a man-eater it treats human

beings exactly as it treats wild animals" (*Man-Eaters* 48). Owing to a gunshot wound on her teeth, this tigress becomes a man-eater, essentially a human-induced and natural act. The description of people assembling together to see this dead enemy attributes a particular identity to Corbett who is capable of killing the local people's dreaded enemy: "[W]hen all the people of the countryside were assembled, the trunk, legs and tail of the tigress were cut up into small pieces and distributed" (*Man-Eaters* 28).

The act of forcing an animal into the unnatural sustenance mode of man-eating through the cultural action of hunting is completely overlooked and the killing and mutilation of the same man-eater is highly exulted since the construct of animality functions as a leading mechanism here, rationalising the bloodshed of an animal. The cultural notion of the inevitability of the man-eater's demise is so deeply rooted that it avoids the bestiality of the human actions that lay in the treatment of an animal. The irony lies in the similar act of "killing" when taking place against the animal body, assures the humanity. If Nik Taylor's words are taken into consideration that "[h]umanity stands for all that is good—*culture*, reason, intelligence, language—and animality stands for all that is to be avoided if one wants to be a good human being—irrationality, *bestiality*, [Italics, emphasis mine] impulse and so on" ("Animals" 41), then the difference between the acts of bestiality and humanity overlaps when the object of killing is a wild animal. It conveys an image of colonial power intersecting with the gun or weapons over the animals as well as the local crew: "Protecting the people gave the colonisers power over animals, and protecting animals gave it a power over people. Notions of animality and criminality intersected at the site of the man-eater" (qtd. in Sharma 65).

The evident antagonism between humans and the animals culminates when the man-eaters begin to be perceived as demons in the form of killers. The man-eaters' attack on the young ones leads them to be considered the greatest enemy of the people, whose punishment even in the form of severe suffering is legitimatised. A poor lady's contempt for the Chowgarh man-eater who selects her grandson as her meal demonstrates a sense of violence that is equal to the man-eater's act of animality. Simultaneously, using domestic animals as bait for killing wild animals depicts the utilitarian exploitation of animals in human society: "She pressed me to accept her three milch buffaloes to use as a bait for the tiger, saying that if I killed the tiger with the help of her buffaloes, she would have the satisfaction of feeling that she had assisted in avenging her

grandson" (*Man-Eaters* 45). Similar satisfaction is noted on the face of the father of Kanda man-eater's victim. Corbett writes, "When at my request he sat down near the man-eater to enable me to take a photograph he looked up at me and said, in a quiet and collected voice, 'I am content now, sahib, for you have avenged my son'" (*Man-Eaters* 163).

The prominence of human bereavement unscrupulously sacrifices the domestic animals to pacify the emotions of anguish in quietus cases. Assertively, there are no codes of conduct in the sports of man-eaters' hunting. Corbett shoots the sleeping Mohan man-eater, offering, in turn, the following justification: "The tiger was a man-eater that was better dead than alive . . . therefore it made no difference whether he was awake or asleep when killed" (*Man-Eaters* 140). The violation of the statute of sports by killing a sleeping animal solidifies the seriousness of an animal caused human loss. It indicates the functioning of modern ethics; placing the animals' beastly acts outside the scope of human morality, as Keith Thomas says, "For most persons beasts were outside the terms of moral reference" (148). The passivity of morality in handling the animals vindicates the humanitarian mind-set, justifying all kinds of retribution against animals. Such retaliation, in fact, represents a deconstruction of human animality or the natural human instinct, stimulated further by human agony. Certainly, an animal's response to their anguish constitutes the same human instinct of violence. Michael Lundblad strengthens this argument by saying, "In the discourse of the jungle, the behaviour of 'real' animals soon represents 'natural' human instinct, particularly in terms of violence and heterosexuality" (498). The animals' attacks on people leave a high impact on the witnesses of such incidences. A carnivore's basic tendency to find food in the form of human flesh turns his identity into a metaphorical monster, in the rural folks' understanding. Gradually, all the Tigers and Leopards get a homogeneous identity (among the villagers) of vengeful tyrants, witnessing whose slaughter becomes the right of every afflicted human being.

However, the concept of subsistence that is central to all killings suffers from ignorance. The statement, "[f]or tigers do not kill unless they are hungry" (*Man-Eaters* 201) underlines the animal's circumstantial urgency actualized through the loss of human life. The attack on an elderly woman by the Thak man-eater leaves her son dumb-stricken with grief when he sees the tiger carrying and killing his mother on a steep bank. The human tribulation fuels Corbett's conviction in hunting the animal, "[f]or all these occasions I am amply rewarded if my hunting

has resulted in saving one human life" (*Man-Eaters* 223), and such humane acts shape Corbett's identity of a saviour *sahib*, since such hunts are the nobler undertaking.

It is noteworthy that most of the animal attacks take place in the jungles or in its periphery. There is also a factor of the local people's vulnerability that exposes them easily to the man-eater. The villagers are dependent on the forests for their livelihood; grazing their cattle or collecting the wood sticks or grass from the jungle vicinity. The sudden human-animal encounter terminating the human breathe fills the locals with full of remorse. Therefore, the induced anger glorifies the animal killing in a retaliatory mode. Conversely, the similar irascible retaliation by a carnivore in response to his wounds is reviled. The Muktesar man-eater's attack on a lady instantly kills her, "[T]he tigress struck once, the blow crushing the woman's skull. Death was instantaneous" (*The Temple Tiger* 41), presents an animal power in terms of physicality and the human's body as a vulnerable object serving an easy meal for the man-eater. There seems to be a contest between the gravity of human suffering v/s animal suffering, in the case of Talla-Des man-eater. This tigress rules for eight years in Kumaon, crediting a toll 150 human lives. The great weight age attributed to the human ordeal makes the people offer every possible help to eliminate this man-eater. Corbett appears to blind himself against the animal pain when he justifies animal cruelty: "The people of Talla Des had suffered and suffered grievously from the tigress, and for the suffering she had inflicted she was now paying in full" (*The Temple Tiger* 173).

In comparison to the man-eating tigers, the man-eating leopards are capable of creating more precarious environments as Panar and Rudraprayag man-eaters are responsible for a total of 526s killings. The leopards caused dismay is partially due to their inadmissible way of dragging their victims. Since leopards are nocturnal animals so the danger they constitute is unsurpassable by any other animal. The elaboration of the Panar man-eater's attack illustrates the wildness: "[T]he man-eater climbed on to the balcony and getting a grip of his wife's throat started to pull her head-foremost out of the room . . . the leopard—to get a better purchase—drove the claws of one paw into her breast" (*The Temple Tiger* 67–68). The employment of the thrill factor rendering the extent of the people's suffering created by the man-eaters demonstrates the inhumane characters of the animals; strengthening the decisive difference between humanity and animality. The description of the twelve-year-old boy (last victim of the leopard) of a widow mother is

pathetic as the leopard drags him near his house, "When the leopard clamped his teeth round the boy's throat, the canine tooth dislocated the head from the neck and the boy was already dead" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 141).

Concerning Corbett's narratives, when the man-eaters' hunting is considered a "game" by him, the hunt renders a complex phenomenon that constructs contested identities of Corbett v/s man-eating big-cats.[xxxiii] There is a focus on how Corbett (an epitome of humanity) and man-eaters (embodiment of animality) reconfigure each other's identity formation amidst an environment of hunting sport in colonial India. In this case, the animals appear to be "[i]nterpellated as 'objects,' on the one hand, while whites are held up as representing the epitome of humanity, on the other" (Kalua 14). The tensed man-eaters' stricken territories contributes to solidifying the British Raj in India by producing the valiant heroes (Corbett an example) whose bravery settles with destructing the malevolent animals and protecting the meek colonised people. Throughout the tales, animality recurs as a functioning agent, lionising the carnage of the big cats. Also, establishes "[a]n unholy alliance of domination and destruction: an order of death that despite its intended movement towards zoological truth, (towards animals as themselves) constitutes a Euro/anthropocentric regime through which colonial discourse expresses a sense of its own centrality" (Miller 66).

However, the above analysis of the tales indicates the presence of animality in the form of a "state" of being which is "natural" in biological terms. Here, the animals' acts of selecting the prey and defying the bullets multiple times refutes the western definition of animality that entails being devoid of reason. In fact, the natural state of the man-eaters reduces the gravity of animality only to one of the basic requirements: subsistence. Specifically, inquiring the reasons behind the man-eating state make strong revelations of human-caused factors that lead the big-cats deviating from their regular diet patterns. The Champawat, Thak, Chuka, and Kanda man-eaters are among the gunshot wounds bearers; rendering incapability of the predators to find their natural prey; thus, turning to the easy and soft flesh (humans) accessible to them is obvious. The careless hunting ripens into the prodigious suffering of the animals as well as humans. While the Mohan and Talla Des man-eaters' anguish results from their encounter with porcupines; get quills buried into their skin and teeth leading them to depend on humans for their survival. The carnivores, particularly the big cats, rely largely on their canine teeth for hunting, and the

malfunctioning of this part can lead a big-cat to be a man-eater. Similar is the case of Chowgarh man-eater who claims many lives in Kumaon but not to be mistaken, her man-eating career accelerates after Corbett erroneously shoots her cub whom she remains predominantly dependent on for securing prey and thus food. The Muktesar man-eater also becomes a man-eater after losing an eye. Her blindness restricted her to hunt other animals commandingly, and she consequently turns to easy preys. Precisely this relationship between the man-eater animals and the human beings along with their generated actions implies to John Law's contention, "[t]hat entities achieve their form as a consequence of the relations in which they are located" (4).

The nature of leopards differs from tigers when it comes to becoming man-eaters: "Leopards . . . become man-eaters by acquiring a taste for human flesh when unrestricted slaughter of game has deprived them of their natural food" (*Man-Eaters* xiii). The Panar leopard is the first emerged Indian man-eating leopard in Kumaon in 1905 and accounts for 400 human lives. Additionally, this time marks the collapse of Indian wildlife. Furthermore, the 1918 epidemic of Garhwal has close relations with the leopard turning to be a man-eater; since the death rate is faster than the corpses can be disposed of, the hilly people adopt an alternative ritual of "[p]lacing a live coal in the mouth of the deceased . . . the body is then carried to the edge of the hill and cast into the valley below" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* xiv). This rite creates the leopards' easy accessibility to human bodies and getting habituated to its taste. Therefore, there is an association between the emergence of the Rudraprayag man-eater and the occurrence of the Garhwal epidemic in the same year. Rani & Kumar state, "The appearance of the man-eater after the epidemic in Garhwal justifies his fondness for the human flesh. In scientific terms, it is the cause and effect relationship, performed by the man-eater which results in 126 human killings, mentioned in Government records" ("Foregrounding" 156). The deviation from the natural food patterns implies the instinctual affiliations with the "stress of circumstances" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* vii). However, Kruuk finds an association between the process of man-eating and people's behaviour towards the carnivores: "The rarity of maneating is related to the rarity of the perpetrators. Yet individual large carnivores are a substantial risk, and it is that risk that is relevant to our behavioural response to the animals" (75).

Along with the functionality of the concept of animality that licenses a divine right to the hunter to unthink of the animal's pain and straightforwardly put them to end altogether generates

the (im)probability of the man-eating phase as a seldom anomaly. The notoriety cum popularity of the man-eater animals/big cats and Corbett collaboratively appears to get reinforced in a particular time at a particular place. On analysing relevant records and literature, it appears that the man-eating state is not a recurring phenomenon, rather a spatiotemporal identity that rise and ends within a time frame. In this regard, Sharma reports an exciting relationship between the British gun and man-eaters, "[T]he man-eater was an instance of nature that sprung from the realm of technology" (56). The role of weapon technology and animals has sound affiliations because it shatters the animal world. Ritvo writes, "[W]eapon technology made actual animals easier to manage" (3). "Gun" the representation of the culture plays a pivotal role in the creation of the so-called wild elements of the big cats. As discussed in the previous chapter also, the rifle is one of the markers of the British advances. Divyabhanusinh states, "The British introduced the telegraph, the railways, the motor car, and the high-powered rifle. In spite of these 'advances' there were still about 40,000 tigers at the dawn of the twentieth century" (Ch. 4). Thus, the clash between the colonial cultural advances and the Indian rich wildlife is clear. To ascertain the wild animals as killable animals is the gesture towards the man-animal dichotomy that rules the European mind for centuries and now witnessing its offspring growing in India in the form of the war between the hunters and the animals. This study intends to explore the man-eaters as the by-product of the colonial hunt because "[c]onflict over wildlife is particularly instructive of the ways people construct wildlife" (Herda-Rapp and Marotz 76).

If the so-called carnivores are been the inborn man-eaters, then the co-existence of the wildlife and human life could never be possible. In the early twentieth-century, the Indian villages, notably at the fringes of the jungles, are highly dependent on the resources provided by the forests, for their livelihood. Although the animals harm the people, it is less accounted for because it is tolerable. The defamation of the big animals as precarious always, is not justifiable. Corbett deplores such type of knowledge over jungles and animals

> I think of a small boy . . . wandering through the jungles of the terai and *bhabar* in the days when there were ten tigers to everyone that now survives; sleeping anywhere he happened to be when night came on, with a small fire to give him company and warmth, wakened at intervals by the calling of tigers, sometimes in the distance, at other times near at hand; throwing another stick on the fire and turning over and continuing his

> interrupted sleep without one thought of unease; knowing from his own short experience and from what others, who like himself had spent their days in the jungles, had told him, that a tiger, unless molested, would do no harm. (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* xi-xii)

The author's note signifies the nature of tigers that don't turn to human flesh usually. However, the subsequent stories show stark dissension with the author's note as the Tigers are deeply engaged in human killings. The man-eating animals have become the reason of complete havoc in the suburban villages. There is a reign of terror in Champawat man-eater area, "[a]nd that one coming from the outside should feel that he had stepped right into a world of stark realities and the rule of the tooth and claw, which forced man in the reign of sabre-toothed tiger to shelter in dark caverns" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* 14). It ignites the extent of disturbance, done to the tiger, by the humans' mode of modernisation which has taken every non-human as secondary and an object to hunting. Champawat man-eater is directly a product of careless hunting, later found by Corbett:

> When the tigress had stood on the rock looking down at me I had noticed that there was something wrong with her mouth, and on examining her now I found that the upper and the lower canine teeth on the right side of her mouth were broken, the upper one in half, and the lower one right down to the bone. This permanent injury to her teeth—the result of a gunshot wound—had prevented her from killing her natural prey, and had been the cause of her becoming a man-eater. (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* 26)

In the context of this text, the two preeminent reasons have been analysed for the Tigers and leopards turning to be man-eaters: "wound" and the "scarcity of their natural food." Both are directly related to the acts of hunting. Corbett says, "Leopards, unlike tigers, are to a certain extent scavengers and become man-eaters by acquiring a taste for human flesh when unrestricted slaughter of game has deprived them of their natural food" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* xiii). Here, the argument is that "hunting" functions twofold: the creation of the man-eaters and an apparatus for colonial political and cultural practice of dominance. Joseph Sramek comments on tiger hunting, "British tiger hunting represented imperial domination not just of India's politics but also of its natural environment" (661). Through hunting, the natural world of India is being colonised, and it can also be analysed as an opportunity to make the colonials superior by their access to control

the endangered animals.[4] The dominance over the animals paves the path for the provincial rule also. John Miller throws light on the political aspect of the imperial hunt: "[T]he political value of hunting as a tool for administering colonial space" (20).

The subject access goes beyond controlling over the animals to use the whole Nature as a commodity for their capitalistic fulfilments. Sramek's statement is well cemented as there is a linkage of the British control over the forests with the hunting activities, and majorly a precarious impact on the wild animals. The control over the forests largely serves two purposes for the Raj: the extraction of the timbers for the railways, and the smooth execution of the imperial hunt. Richard Tucker says, "The *tarai* forests . . . were cut and floated down the tributaries of the Ganges . . . Almost overnight the hardwood forests of the mountains were transformed into highly valuable commodities. For nearly two decades the sal and deodar stands were cut in totally unregulated ways" (329). The phase of the middle nineteenth-century needs the supply of wood to ascertain the success of the British railway project in India along with the export purposes of timber to metro pole also. Mukherjee and Singh mention, "The transformation of ecological landscape in India was caused by the railways" (228). Similarly, the Britons try to establish their superiority through the other projects also like the Great Trigonometric Survey of India in the 19th century, embedded with the power and control over the native territory by mapping it out. Matthew Edney commented on the GTSI, "Its continued existence stemmed not from its utility but from its embodiment of cultural values. It struck a cultural nerve in providing the image of system, uniformity, accuracy and precision in accordance with the contemporary enlightenment concerned with rationality and progress" (qtd. in Sarkar 1). Making the intellectual progress as the trademark of the British, they deal with the natural world too, with the purpose of justifying the sacrifice of the non-human natural realm. The colonisation of wild animals or Nature (as a whole) is a more comprehensive apolitical rink of life.

Even the establishment of the zoos/game parks in the 19th century embeds with the entertainment purposes but regulates through political power relations. The zoo formation has the social, aesthetic, economic, political, and scientific significance for the Britons. The

[4] The present discussion (pp. 132-134) on the animals turning to be man-eaters is an excerpt from my research article "*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: a Critique of Modernity," 2017, pp. 206-215.

collection of the wild species and preservation sound the Colonials' concern over the increasing loss of game/sports, in the first phase of zoo formation. Kisling terms the European sensibility of establishing zoos with the "utilitarian or mechanistic values" (Kisling 256). The anthropocentric perspective makes the animals a badge of power and dignity. "Early captive collections and wildlife (or game) parks in India were for pleasure, aesthetic and humanitarian, as well as for power and the hunt" (Kisling 257). Taking the same notion further, Miller attaches study of the natural history with the determinant factor of the imperial power, "Natural history museums, and like them zoos, stood as emblems of state success and expanding influence . . . Like the proliferation of animal commodities, these sites provided a narrative of political domination and national prowess" (63).

The Colonials added more spice to the act of slaughtering the animals by designating this activity "sport" or game. Since Lyle Munro's words expose, "[T]he killing of wildlife for 'sport' as another unwanted feature of an increasingly violent society" (182), so Corbett's repeated emphasis on the hunt as "sports" gives the preliminary idea of loss done to the wild animals. The hunt is excessively in vogue before the arrival of Corbett as a full grown sportsman. He grooms seeing hunting as an inseparable part of the life stratum of the colonials in India that leaves a high impact on him. Although this game is full of thrill, endurance, and audacity but the careless shot results in the fatal wounds to the animals. Gillespie captures a similar view of British hunting in nineteenth-century Canada "The bounty of wildlife, in addition to the enthusiasm of the hunters and their quest for horns and trophies, meant that hunting in the wilderness of nineteenth-century Canada often resulted in reckless slaughter" (44).

Consequently, the man-eaters destroy many families, and consequently they are seen as devils, a person reports regarding Champawat man-eater, "This is the *shaitan* that killed my wife and my two sons" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* 25). A perilous image of the animals is projected and maintained in the present age too. Such anthropomorphic sketching of animals; chiefly of the Tigers arises in the cultural alliances in social frameworks. To put in Bagemihl's words, "We ascribe meanings and values to their (animals) existence and behaviors in ways that usually have little to do with their biological and social realities, treating them as emblems of nature's purity or bestiality" (qtd. in Szarycz 149). The expressions of the writer like: "On reaching the dead goat he (bear) sat down and took it into his lap, and as he started nosing the goat, I fired. Maybe I

hurried over my shot, or allowed too much for refraction; anyway the bullet went low and struck the bear in the stomach instead of in the chest" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* 66) shows the ruthless hunting of the animals. Even to fulfil the superstitions of the hunter cum sportsman, snakes are killed only for an auspicious sign: "My own private superstition concerns snakes. When after man-eaters I have a deep-rooted conviction, that, however much I may try, all my efforts will be unavailing until I have first killed a snake" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* 149). *Mahseers* (fishes) are killed in large numbers for the meals. The hunting takes place at the large scale and in the trophy form, causing these animals' immense suffering. The Chowgarh tigress becomes doubly dangerous as her cub is killed mistakenly by Corbett

> The tigress's claws were broken, and bushed out, and one of her canine teeth was broken, and her front teeth were worn down to the bone. It was these defects that had made her a man-eater and were the cause of her not being able to kill outright—and by her own efforts—a large proportion of the human beings she had attacked since the day she had been deprived of the assistance of the cub, I had, on my first visit shot by mistake. (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* 96)

The Thak tigress also has the same fate. She, too, has been preyed. Her wound turns to be septic which affected not only her, instead; the whole vicinity

> Her dark winter coat was without a blemish, and in spite of her having so persistently refused the meals I had provided for her she was encased in fat. She had two old gun-shot wounds, neither of which showed on her skin. The one in her left shoulder, caused by several pellets of homemade buckshot, had become septic, and when healing the skin, over quite a large surface, had adhered permanently to the flesh. To what extent this wound had incapacitated her it would have been difficult to say, but it had evidently taken a very long time to heal, and could quite reasonably have been the cause of her having become a man-eater. (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* 223)

The native cannot apprehend the dual role of the gun-shot. Their reliance on the white hunter, having a gun, as their saviour, is the actual face behind the damage, they are undergoing for years together. The detriment done to the native people by endangering their animals is camouflaged with the benevolent policy of rescue missions of the government. Protecting the

native people through the hold over the weapons shows that the technological preferment produced a belief system of the colonised people on the governing authorities as a fact that their interests in owning the firearms serve the concerns of the wild animals' distressed race. The colonial masters are deeply involved in providing the firearms. "The Tahsildar had let it be known that he would turn a blind eye towards all unlicensed firearms, and further that he would provide ammunition where required; and the weapons that were produced that day would have stocked a museum" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* 22). Such kind of colonial advances secures the white supremacy over the colonised subjects.[5] It resembles Miller's assertion, "European could contentedly look to science for a validation of racial superiority" (66).

Although the tiger population in India depletes significantly by the end of the nineteenth-century, the Terai (a submontane tract in Kumaon region) jungles for being extremely dense hilly area becomes a spot of the tigers' favourable habitat. Terai is a malarial and unhealthy locality with very less number of populations, but the need for timber for the railway construction entices the colonials to this place and alters the ways of wild space. In fact, Rangarajan considers the unhealthiness of Terai as a fresh opportunity for the tigers' lives: "Elsewhere prime tiger habitat like the tarai grasslands of north India or the mangroves of the delta of the river Ganga was inhospitable for humans. The animal was no longer safe where humans lived" (*India's Wildlife* 33). Similarly, Eric Strahorn writes, "It [Tarai] was primarily a land of swamps, forests and grasslands and was known as the home of tigers and malarious mosquitoes" (1). Atkinson also considers "Terai was mainly swampy and malarial, and thus largely uninhabited" (qtd. in Dangwal 111). In this case, it is extremely fascinating to see the arisen of cross cultural conflict between the humans (colonial masters) and the non-human (wild) animals over the possession of Terai territory. For the former, this land is materially profitable while for the latter it is a natural and safe abode. Soon, this cosy zone of the animals is going to be shattered with the humans' intrusion into it. Richard English sees Terai a "commercially significant" (62) place for the British. The dense forests of Terai become the major source of the timber supply for the British railways in India, along with settling down the tea-plantations. While for Lionel Caplan "The terai was a major source of government revenue" (577). Richards et al. trace the colonial

[5] The discussion on zoocriticism and the role of "gun" (pp. 134-136) for ascertaining the racial supremacy, and for making the animals man-eaters is derived from my research article "*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: a Critique of Modernity," 2017, pp. 206-215.

economic system (approximately the beginning of twentieth-century) in which the forests get cut down for the other settlements, "The most important trend over the years has been the extension of agriculture at the expense of forest cover, first in the Gangetic plains below the Himalaya, and then in the mountains themselves" (qtd. in Tucker 328).

Taking birth in the Nainital district and spending his life in Kumaon, Corbett is well acquainted with the conditions of this place. In the mature phase of his sportsmanship, Corbett starts understanding the wild ways of the tigers and other animals too. Corbett's assertion that "Human beings are not the natural prey of tigers" (*Man-Eaters* vii) allows an analysis of the nature of a carnivore that deeply engages with the violence the hunt has offered. The findings, "[G]lobal decline of the tigers as a consequence of habitat loss and fragmentation, prey depletion and poaching" (qtd. in Chanchani et al. 1) affirm these prime factors for bringing the carnivores in the battlefield with the humans in Terai also. Because this region is marked with the practices of great forest felling, Guha calls, "The sub-Himalayan forests of Garhwal and Kumaon, for example, were all '*felled in even to desolation*'" ("Forestry" 1884). While the carnivores require a wide range of space and prey, as Sillero and Laurenson say, "[D]ue to their body size and high trophic position, large carnivores require extensive home ranges and large prey populations. Thus only vast, relatively intact ecosystems can support viable populations . . . these species are the first to suffer when human populations expand and cultivate previously untouched habitats (1).

Reciprocally, it finds relevance with the Terai/Kumaon region, and currently, it is essential to revise the carnivores' engagement with their landscape and its surroundings, for going beyond the limitations of merely comprehending the human-animal relationship to approve the marriage between humans and humanity's animality. The loss of the human life conceivably obstructs to have an objective insight into the carnivores' manners. Corbett's statement, "No mention is made in government records of man-eaters prior to the year 1905 and it would appear that until the advent of the Champawat tiger and Panar leopard, man-eaters were unknown in Kumaon" (*The Temple Tiger* 64) gives the preliminary idea of the background plotting which the big-cats become the victims of. The absence of the man-eaters before 1905 shows it an unusual recurring occurrence and is related to the physical factors, taking place in that particular area. The conflict in the narratives between the man-eaters and human beings is due to the nature of a carnivore

that in the absence of his natural prey turns to deviate from his food habits. Most of the carnivores are meat-eaters who hunt the other animals for their meals and this predatory nature of the carnivores, though all the carnivores are not predators but the tiger is not the exception in this list, makes them unusual and sharp predators who hunt adroitly. Hans Kruuk says:

> The composition of the carnivore diet is directly relevant to the interaction between the animals and humans . . . Diet is the result of foraging and hunting behaviour, and it is the outcome of the predators' interactions with prey. We therefore need an understanding of hunting behaviour, in order to describe the effects of carnivores on prey individuals and populations, and to help to understand the animals' significance to mankind. (45-46)

The interaction between the animals and humans take place substantially through the imperial hunt that ultimately affects the prey selection of the big cats. The story of Talla Des man-eater mentions:

> It was on these islands that we hoped to find the game that had brought us to Bindukhera for a week's shooting. I had shot over this ground for ten years and knew every foot of it, so the running of the shot was left to me . . . for in addition to the variety of game to be shot—on a good day I have seen eighteen varieties brought to bag ranging from quail to snipe to leopard and swamp deer . . . Birds were plentiful that morning, and, after the guns had settled down, shooting improved and in our first beat along the edge of the forest we picked up five peafowl, three red jungle fowl, ten black partridges, two bush quails, and three hares. (Corbett, *The Temple Tiger* 117-118)

Shooting the animals with the gun is an apparent obsession in British India. Gradually, the animals get disappeared from the jungles, and the shrinking areas for the big cats make them enter the human habitats and snatching their lives. As the need of the timber impulse the colonials to clear many of the native jungles in the nineteenth century, Sramek writes, "Various environmental historians have stressed the extent to which the British exerted control over India's timber supply, among other natural resources, over the course of the nineteenth century" (661). In fact, it is the whole non-human Nature of which animals are only a significant artefact of the Empire's expansion and its justified conduct. First, the destruction of Nature and later the

conservative steps for the same by the imperials suggests the colonial power. Miller calls the natural history a "worthwhile investment" (62) for the imperial expansion.

During one of the stories, Corbett also refers to the extraction of *sal* timber from Kaladhunga, surrounded by Sarda River on three sides and ridge of hills on the fourth side. It is one of the friendliest places for the animals to live: "[T]here appears to be an abundant stock of game in the valley. It was from this valley that Collier extracted the million cubic feet of timber" (*The Temple Tiger* 93). The great economic attraction of the colonial masters to the *sal* timber is one of the chief factors of Terai's settlement. Strahorn acknowledges Terai a great source of *sal* timber, "The forests of tarai are comprised of a variety of tree species, most notably sal (*Shorea robusta*) . . . The tarai's extensive grasslands ('phantas') contain over thirty-seven species of grasses as well as a large number of bushes, creepers, climbers, and shrubs" (8). Further, Dhirendra Dangwal discusses the commercialisation of the natural wealth of India, "In the early 19th century, trade in forest products in general and timber in particular, was confined to the Terai-Bhabar region and the outer hills . . . Henry Ramsay, the Commissioner of Kumaun, produced a report on the forests of submontane tracts in 1861; he identified rich *sal* forests and recommended the construction of roads to them" (112-113).

The annihilation initiated in the form of forests cutting and the hunting obsession has a beeline effect on the whole ecosystem: human and nonhuman. Corbett states about Tarai as a changing place, "In my lifetime I have seen great changes in the forests of the Tarai and Bhabar. Some of these changes have resulted from exploitation, others have been brought about in a natural manner" (*Jungle Lore* 219). Therefore, the changes that happen in these areas have a great impact on the big cats, owing to the subtraction of the jungle and their natural food. Also, it incorporates to the hunting practices too as Panar, and Talla Des man-eaters are responsible for killing four hundred and hundred fifty human lives respectively, operating more than the period of five years in the area. Panar man-eater is a leopard, who unlike tigers, becomes man-eater out of attaining a taste of the human flesh. The hunting exercises extend its periphery for making accountability for depleting the natural prey of the carnivores with embracing its effects to make the tiger(s) man-eaters, attributing the wounds to them. As the Chuka man-eater turns to be a man-eater after receiving many buck shots: "[D]istrict officials sat up all night on *machans* over kills, and though the tiger had been wounded on two occasions—unfortunately only with

buckshot—he continued to prey on human beings" (Corbett, *The Temple Tiger* 90). Another tale of an innocent mother tigress who, unselfishly indulges in teaching her cubs meets the misfortune of getting the wounds and becoming a man-eater, Corbett mentions: "I did not know . . . that the tigress I watched with such interest that day would later, owing to gunshot wounds, become a man-eater and a terror to all who lived or worked in the Ladhya valley and the surrounding villages" (*The Temple Tiger* 108).

Another reason for the carnivore's intruding in human life is his lack of capacity to hunt other animals or the course of his interaction with the prey that affects his diet patterns and prey selection. "[I]t is only when tigers have been incapacitated through wounds or old age that, in order to live, they are compelled to take a diet of human flesh" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* vii) or the encounter with a porcupine also proved crucial in turning a big cat to be a man-eater and prove to be a great cause of creating an aversion in the people against tigers. Certainly, there are other touchstone remarks by Corbett like "The jungle folk, *in their natural surroundings* do not kill wantonly" (238), and "Nothing in the jungle is deliberately aggressive, but circumstances may arise to make some creatures so" (*Jungle Lore* 288), strengthens the motive of having an insight into the cause and effect relationship: when the man-eaters create chaos in Kumaon villages and sooner or later meet a ruthless end; however, they are against the laws of humans, not against the laws of nature. The Muktesar and Talla Des man-eaters share the similar cause of turning to be man-eaters and both meet the harsh ruination: "Here she [tigress] lived very happily on *sambhar*, *kakar*, and wild pig, until she had the misfortune to have an encounter with a porcupine. In this encounter she lost an eye and got some fifty quills" (Corbett, *The Temple Tiger* 40). This tigress is unpopular for taking more than twenty human lives and much other livestock. Corbett's prudence about the carnivores comes forward when he explains the Talla Des man-eating tigress:

> Eight years previously, when the tigress was a comparatively young animal, she had been seriously injured in an encounter with a porcupine. At the time she received this injury she may have had cubs, and unable for the time being to secure her natural prey to feed herself in order to nourish her cubs, she had taken to killing human beings. In doing this she had committed no crime against the laws of Nature. She was a carnivorous animal, and flesh, whether human or animal, was the only food she could assimilate. Under stress

> of circumstances an animal, and a human being also, will eat food that under normal conditions they are averse to eating. (*The Temple Tiger* 173)

However, the modern consciousness succeeds in trapping Corbett's mind, and ruthless killing of a man-eater is justified because of the animal's fundamentality of a murderous creature. It is a sin to harm any of the people, or their property and Corbett has no repentance for killing this tigress' cubs, though mistakenly, "The cubs had died for the sins of their mother" (*The Temple Tiger* 143). Corbett intends to target this (Talla Des) tigress' heart as there is a strong feeling of revenge, and her pain is considered as the reward of her deeds. Moreover, finally, there is a great sense of satisfaction in killing this man-eater: "Wounded and starving though she was, she was game to fit it out. Her spring, however, was never launched, for, as she rose, my first bullet raked her from end to end, and the second bullet broke her neck" (Corbett, *The Temple Tiger* 178). However, the version of losing her cubs and the state of her animality, as discussed above simultaneously invokes a sense of sympathy for her. It reminds of Ritvo's words, "Wildness became attractive rather than ugly; wild animals, . . . might evoke sympathy rather than scorn" (3).

Although there is a sense of prestige and satisfaction in the assassination of the man-eaters, the tale of the "temple tiger" facilitates the reader to question Corbett's existing notion of tiger hunting as he approaches purely a harmless animal who does not molest any human being, with the intention of shooting him. This story cajoles the reader of Corbett's longing for this animal's body. The correlated adventure with the big cat's pursuit is one of the easiest facets of colonial power. Also, this tale suggests that the desire in the humans remains for the animal's body (also signifying the human's animality) beyond its coveted manipulations of the reasons for slaughtering the animal. "On my assuring him that I had no desire to shoot his tiger he rejoined with a laugh, 'I have no objection, Sahib, to your trying to shoot this tiger, but neither you nor anyone else will ever succeed in killing it'" (*The Temple Tiger* 8), and the loss of the herdsman's cow that seems goofy as the domestic animals are bestowed with the arbitrary importance over the wild animals. Further, this tale raises a question on the humanity engaged in celebrating the fake ostentations in murdering an inoffensive animal, Corbett writes, "The distance between the muzzle of my rifle and the tiger's head was about five feet . . . The ivory foresight of my rifle was on the exact spot of the tiger's heart—where I knew my bullet would kill him

instantaneously" (*The Temple Tiger* 14). However, Corbett remains unsuccessful in shooting the temple tiger despite several attempts to kill him only to ensure the safety of the people and their belongings.

However, the killing of the Rudraprayag man-eating leopard sheds off the discourses of enmity and an acknowledgement to the existence of "real" animal glimpses. The dead lying animal suddenly appears innocent to Corbett because the leopard was succumbed to his nature under unusual conditions. Corbett's recalling of dead Rudraprayag leopard's innocent face finds suitability with Burt's words that "[d]eath is so striking it is easy to overlook the state of livingness" (qtd. in Buller 53). The reference to "Laws of Nature" provides credibility to the growing eco-consciousness in Corbett. He states: "But here was no fiend, who while watching me through the long night hours had rocked and rolled with silent fiendish laughter at my vain attempts to outwit me . . . the best-hated and the most feared animal in all India, whose only crime—not against the laws of nature, but against the laws of man" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 158).

"Laws of nature" attracts the attention of the recent scholarship due to the present day environmental studies and its aligned sub-fields. The aspect of laws of Nature is under scrutiny because the study remains incomplete without explicating the animals' version of the man-eater. The encounter between human and the animal (leopard) though notorious as a man-eater, enforces this study to probe the other aspect (of the animal) that abides by negligence in the hue and cry of the human loss in the narratives. The contemporary slogans and cries over "save the wildlife" create the urgency to excavate the "thinking" leads to the current critical scenario and knit a thread between past, present and the future of the wildlife. The thought makes a distinction between two animals: human as a rational animal and animal as an irrational animal. Also, the same thought leads to the projection of human in the positive light where "For centuries nonhuman animals have been locked in representations authored by humans, representations that moreover have justified the use and abuse of nonhuman animals by humans" (Weil 4). Also, animals are categorised substantially in a hostile way, because the tradition of rational animal, "[i]n fact opposed us to all the rest of animalkind, going so far as to erase all animality in us and, conversely, to define the animal, in an essentially negative way" (Mallet, Foreword x). There are certain propositions needing addressing: is it the philosophical stance that makes animal

intrinsically inferior to man? Alternatively, is this the same position where man initiates his breakdown by mastering over the other species?

The scholarship in human-animal studies questions the distinction between animal and human, and the treatment; the animals have undergone by in the name of power, rationality, difference, otherness and so on. The narratives are the witness to register the otherness that the leopard endures irrespective of the reasons and nature of a carnivore that Nature has thrust upon him. The resentful demeanour towards the man-eater in the text is pathetic on account of the cause and effect relationship between humans and the leopard's turning to be a man-eater. It invokes Bentham's proposition of the animal's suffering. Is this the suffering of the leopard that he is undergoing the phase of man-eater? Or is it not the suffering that he has become man-eater? Derrida addresses the question of Bentham on animal suffering in his lecture "The response to 'can they suffer?' leaves no doubt. In fact it has never left any room for doubt; that is why the experience that we have of it is not even indubitable; it precedes the indubitable, it is older than it. No doubt either, then, about our giving vent to a surge of compassion, even if it is then misunderstood, repressed, or denied" (*The Animal That* 28).

The question on the animal suffering is very pertinent to revise while studying on a man-eater animal. It challenges the cultural tradition of being blinded to the distress of the other-than-human animals. In a similar context, it becomes indispensable to throw light on Corbett's contention:

> Leopards do not become man-eaters for the same reasons that tigers do. Though I hate to admit it, our leopards—the most beautiful and most graceful of all the animals in our jungles, and who when concerned or wounded are second to none in courage—are scavengers to the extent that they will, when driven by hunger, eat any dead thing they find in the jungle . . . when disease in epidemic form sweeps through the hills, and the inhabitants die faster than they can be disposed of, a very simple rite, which consists of placing a live coal in the mouth of the deceased, is performed in the village, and the body is then carried to the edge of the hill and cast into the valley below. A leopard, in an area in which his natural food is scarce, finding these bodies, very soon acquires a taste for human flesh, and when the disease dies down and normal conditions are re-established, he, very naturally, on finding his food supply cut off, takes to killing human beings. In

> the wave of epidemic influenza that swept through the country in 1918 and that cost India over a million lives, Garhwal suffered very severely, and it was at the end of this epidemic that the Garhwal man-eater made his appearance. (*Man-Eating Leopard* 4-5)

First, the articulation "driven by hunger" and "an area in which his natural food is scarce" bring robustness to the analysis as it is one of the leading reasons for the conflict between humans and wildlife, and moreover in the animal itself. Hunger compels to go beyond the natural dietary habits of the carnivores. Lack of the natural prey in the area makes a carnivore to step out of his habitat and find out an alternative in the form of the human being. Sanderson throws light on the habits of leopard and sometimes how they come in conflict with the people, "From the habit of lurking in the vicinity of the habitations of man, to prey upon cattle, ponies, donkeys, sheep, goats and dogs, the panther and leopard are frequently brought into collision with Indian villagers . . . bite the claw half-a-dozen people before he is dispatched or makes his escape is no uncommon in India" (Sanderson 329-330).

There is the human invasion into the wildlife that disturbs the natural ecological system. As the carnivores require a broad range of area as their habitat but the shrinking of the natural regions with the increasing of human population or the people's intrusion into the wildlife territory for their livelihood is again an act of inviting the danger. Secondly, the ritual of disposing of the dead bodies in epidemic time signifies the human indigent reasoning and vulnerability that circularly proves a threatening to the people. Studies have shown that leopards are very adaptable and try to survive on the availability of the food, "[L]eopards are very catholic in their diet, tending to take whatever is available in the area" (qtd. in Edgaonkar & Chellam 354). Moreover, finally, the emergence of the Rudraprayag man-eater in 1918 is credited to all the human actions responsible for it. The leopard comes under a safeguard of a natural process of becoming a man-eater. It flares up the imagination of an animal's suffering in search of his food and the loss of his habitat. Again the statement that leopards "when concerned and wounded are second to none in courage" substantiates the nature of the leopard who firmly believes in retribution. Undoubtedly, the carnivores are the dangerous animals full of acute mental and physical power and awareness which the leopard shows in dealing with his prey in the text. Before categorising the leopard as an "evil spirit," "a fiend" or "a *shaitan*" and a destroyer of the human life, it obligates a revision to probe into the villagers' vulnerability that lies across the

relationship between man and nature. The poor people and Rudraprayag pilgrim road provide the right amount of food to the leopard in the form of humans, that the leopard waits for. The threat, the man-eater is imposing on the villagers to a far extent is their dependency on the jungle for earning their livelihood and the lack of protection they can arrange for themselves. It is the limitations of the Garhwali people who insist the leopard obliquely enter the human domain.

Simultaneously, there are the factors of race, class, and gender intertwining together as far as the affair between the man-eater and his victims are concerned. Since a large number of villagers are not exposed to the weapons of prestige: rifle, gunshot, cartridges, etc., so remain defenceless and depend on the whites for their protection. The poverty of the villagers forces them to risk their lives and expose to the attack. The assertion "[t]here are no sanitary conveniences in the houses of our hill-folk" (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 64) adds weight to the vulnerability of the poor folk and their capability of inviting the peril increases. In the beginning years of the man-eater, the leopard kills the people who, with due respect to their financial fragility, are readily available to him. The social, cultural, and religious way of life also, of rural people, makes them sacrifice their lives at the hands of the man-eater. The *sadhu*, on his pilgrimage to Badrinath, prefers to sleep at the open platform adjoining the shop, serves himself as the first and convenient victim to the man-eating leopard. The twelve-year-old Gujar girl in the story "Terror" becomes a prey to the man-eater while sleeping in the camp of his father in the jungle, settled for herding the thirty buffaloes. Women's going for sanitation at night is a sight of fulfilling the leopard's wish. The brief description of the hill folk and the locale notifies: "The houses are small and without conveniences or means of sanitation, and it would not be surprising if, hearing the man-eater was operating in a village ten, fifteen, or twenty miles away, some man, woman or child should, at the urgent dictate of nature, open a door for a brief minute and so give the leopard the chance for which he had perhaps been waiting many nights" (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 35). There are a lot many people who come across the leopard's hunger as a depressed class man, Gawaiya builds a home in the forest area for his family and offers himself as open bait: "Gawaiya had been sitting near the door of the house when the leopard had seized him. The leopard had caught the unfortunate man by the throat, thus preventing him from making any sound" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 93), the man-eater is creating nuance on both the sides of the Alaknanda river as well as on the pilgrim road. Mukandi Lal, member of Garhwal in the United Provinces Legislative Council, in his report to the council states that "[s]eventy-five human

beings had been killed by the leopard in the course of that one year and asked the Government to launch a vigorous campaign against the man-eater" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 133). On the other side, the leopard develops the habit to prey upon the pilgrims.

The inquiry of the text finds the role of the gender and age are other crucial aspects to examine. Most of the victims, elaborated by Corbett in the narratives, are women and children. Since the women in hilly areas are not limited only to the household work and very often visit the forests for collecting woods or grazing the cattle, so it becomes entirely possible for them to encounter the wild animals. Moreover, their household work too exposes them to danger at night. The leopard secures his second kill in the form of a pregnant female while washing the utensils in the dark after the meals, "On reaching the door the woman sat down on the doorstep, as she did so the utensils clattered to the ground. There was not sufficient light for the man to see what had happened, and when he received no answer to his urgent call he dashed forward and shut and barred the door" (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 37-38). The story "Touch and Go" mentions another woman's ruthless slaughter while closing the door of her house. Furthermore, the small children become prey to the man-eater by virtue of their innocence and unknowingness of the presence of the leopard in the vicinity just as the little Gujar girl (has already been discussed) and the last victim of the man-eater, a twelve-year-old boy unknowingly approaches the leopard.

No doubt, the interactions between human and other-than-human animals has attracted the attention of the recent studies, particularly because of the questions that the animal rights and animals studies raise against the treatment, behaviour, marginalisation; including all the basics that claim rightful domination of the humans over animals. When there is a discussion on the use of animals in literature and their portrayal, it becomes essential to evaluate the animals' position critically. Although the title character is characterised as a dangerous wild beast, Corbett's statement at the death of the leopard "here was no fiend" (*Man-Eating Leopard* 158) brings a contradiction to the text. Further, this animal breaks the boundary of the core differentiation in the form of "rationality" between human and animal. The leopard is attributed with the rational awareness to deal with the human beings and wild animals as well: it lies in following up Corbett and Ibbotson silently; finding out his food; avoiding the cold Alaknanda river water; hearing the plank sound; avoiding the cyanide poison in the carcass or changing his habit to far extent when in contact with the people from a long time.

The text seems to justify Deleuze's statement ironically, "*Bêtise* is a human thing and not that of the beast" (qtd. in Derrida, *The Beast* 152). The text seems to consolidate the propositions of Deleuze where stupidity runs in the actions of the humans and ultimately results in the bestiality, ignoring the animals' pleasures and pains, and their nature as a whole (Bestiality is used as torture or barbarity, not as a zoophilic aberration). Other than the man-eater, the narratives discuss the leopard in general, and the cruelty is done to them only for sports or profit. There is a painful detail of the ruthless animal killing:

> The most exciting, and the most interesting, method of killing leopards for sport is to attack them down in the jungles and, when they are located, stalk and shoot them. The easiest and the most cruel, method of killing leopards for profit is to insert a small and very highly explosive bomb in the flesh of an animal which are been killed by a leopard . . . when one of them comes in contact with the leopard's teeth, it explodes and blows the leopard's jaws off. Death is instantaneous in some cases, but more often than not the unfortunate animal crawls away to die a lingering and very painful death. (Corbett, *Man-Eating Leopard* 28)

It exhibits the ostentations of the humans in killing a big cat, and the shrewd and tyrannical attitude towards the wildlife suffers from evasion. When the question of animal suffering arises, it simultaneously takes the reader back to that narrative in *Jungle Lore* which describes the distress of a female leopard throughout the night whose cub is shot by Colonel Ward. Such actions blur the differentiation between "humanity" and "animality" and put the question on both the terms which have been so long the basis of the essentialised othering of the animals.[6]

Corbett's small efforts to bring these animals out of their metaphorically perceived image of an evil spirit render further ambiguity to his narratives. Placing the act of man-eating within the framework of the "laws of Nature" (*The Temple Tiger* 173; *Man-Eating Leopard* 158) suggests the existence of a human body as a natural element that can be potentially transformed into an animal's comestible under adverse occurrences. The notoriety associated with the animals' attacks on people and the manner in which a human body is treated arises out of a refusal to affording animals equal rights to hunt human beings as humans exercise on animals. However, if

[6] The above excerpt (pp. 143-148) is part of my research article "Foregrounding the animal stance: A Critical Study of *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*," 2017, pp. 151-160.

the natural laws are taken into consideration, it expels the constructed cruelty of the narratives that victimises the humans through animal attacks on them. The idea of humans as "the most valuable species on earth" (Mishra 337) operates in the backdrop of the man-eaters' tales. The narratives' preference to the human victimisation or the human suffering exposes the power of language and discourse that naturalises the animal suffering and un-naturalises the human loss. Because "[i]t is through discourse that Nature is constructed" (Herda-Rapp and Marotz 76). If the specified circumstances compel the humans to kill the man-eater regardless of their pain and suffering, then the same factors can govern the animals too, for their survival.

Putting the human and animal on the same platform in context of "Nature's laws" Rukmani makes a reference to *Pañcatantra*, India's ancient animal fables collection, "Humans and other share the world equally in the *Pancatantra*, and they are all governed by the same natural laws" (qtd. in Kemmerer 107). Thus, the phase of animality as discussed above centres around the food depravity of the animals that make them adapt to the man's flesh. Further, it raises the question of the unacceptability of the human body as "food" for any other species. Plumwood asserts:

> This concept of human identity positions humans outside and above the food chain, not as part of the feast in a chain of reciprocity but as external manipulators and masters of it: Animals can be our food, but we can never be their food. The outrage we experience at the idea of a human being eaten is certainly not what we experience at the idea of animals as food. The idea of human prey threatens the dualistic vision of human mastery in which we humans manipulate nature from outside, as predators but never prey. (qtd. in Wilbert 43)

Thus, the idea of excluding humans from the food chain reciprocally revives the concepts of humanity and animality. In which the animal(ity) is seen within the boundaries of the human-constructed sphere of humanity. In the same way, "[A]nimals are lost through the various transcription devices used to 'make sense' of them within humanist and anthropocentrically ordered disciplines" (Talyor 40). The contrast of these two phenomena with each other in the humans' cultural world considers the cultural use of a gun and hunting for killing innocent cum guilty animals a mark of prestige. Instead, the human act represents a part of that animality involved in avoiding the safeguards of natural stress and is enmeshed in the pleasure of killing animals and winning trophies. There is appropriation of Midgley's statement when she compares

humans with animals along with their natural characteristics, "[T]he use of animal models of 'beastliness' and 'brutality' is inappropriate and unfair; and that the degree to which humans are animals can be assessed in terms of 'natural' characteristics such as aggression" (qtd. in Tapper 57).

II

The question of the "animal" as has been the concern of this thesis as it seeks to challenge the notion of the passivity of the animal existence. On the one hand, the idea of the animal refers to be so dynamic for the Raj, at the same time the treatment of animals appears to be based on deriving the animals out of the catalogue of rights that are apt for the humans on the other hand. Conversely, the shifting behaviours of the animals, as discussed above, at the same time reduce the possibility of analysing the animals merely a colonial subject to prepare a platform for re-enacting and implementing their ideologies. Instead, the behaviour of changing the food patterns by an animal is directly the outcome of his right to sustain or to life in broader terms. Also, a peek into the natural world of animals, and their relationships with each other is a focal point to analyse the animal for the animal's sake. Instead, the subjectivity of the animals offers the readers to go beyond the constructed boundaries of "us" and "them" rather a different viewpoint is ready to make a difference in the human thinking that always finds out the "human" what the animal is not. However, the studies that challenge the foundational difference between the animal and human in the form of "using tools," and "learning languages" as referred by Taylor ("Animals" 38-39), also indicates towards the new emerging basis of the difference between the two in the name of "morality." This changing human attitude is a critique of the constructed difference between the two species, and simultaneously generates a fluidity of the human concept of difference.

Mainly, *Jungle Lore* offers a delineation of the ways of the wild and Corbett's skilful use of the same laws for the two most contradictory phenomenon(s): the destruction and conservation of the wildlife. The question of agency in animals, as discussed above, gives a curve to the debate of (post)colonial animal. It is the mode of the human interaction with the animals that have changed their wild spaces from safe to unsafe. Interestingly, the same interaction has altered into similar ways for the humans also. Thus, to address the question of the animals' retaliation becomes equally significant in the animal/jungle discourse. For instance, considering

Corbett's text, there seems to be a shift of literary discourse as an author from *My India* to *Jungle Lore* or/to the narratives of the man-eater big cats in particular. The former text elaborates many rural folks and finds the repeated words like "poor," "simple," and "uneducated" (in a postcolonial lens, here uneducated signifies to the people's incapability to resist). While the latter text or other texts that primarily revolves around the (powerful) animals, there is always a word of praise for these animals for being "courageous" though a source of "danger." The expressions like: "A tiger that has made up its mind to avenge an injury is the most terrifying animal to be met with in an Indian jungle" (*The Temple Tiger* 177), and "To me looking into the tigress eyes and unable therefore to follow the movement of the barrel, it appeared that my arms was paralysed" (*Man-Eaters* 93) bestow a sense of discarding the subjection to the Colonial motifs. Literally, this shift is noticeable in a colonial context where the non-human colonial subject is offering more threat to the imperial rule in comparison to the human subjects. Birke' words seem entirely appropriate to recall here: "In other ways, though, the animal has tended to disrupt the smooth unfolding of Enlightenment ideology. Defined as that bit of nature endowed with voluntary motion, the animal resists the imperialist desire to represent the natural—and especially the colonial terrain—as a passive object or a blank slate ready for mapping by Western experts" (qtd. in Armstrong 415). Such analyses make it clear that "anything can potentially have the power to act, whether human or non-human" (Philo and Wilbert 16). However, in order to avoid any superficial counter-narrative, it is essential to revive the argument of non-human othering (in Chapter 3) through the acts of "imperial hunt." The specificity of Corbett's writings allows a researcher to analyse the duality of the acts of "hunt"; one the one hand, it offers an understanding of the animal as marginalised other when the focus is on the building of a sportsman character. Simultaneously, on the other hand, that is the same practice which allows the other view of such phenomenon; to analyse the animals under the umbrella of power and agency. It is quite significant to see the animals powerful because "only in relatively small measure have animals been able to evade this domination or to become themselves dominant over local humans" (Philo and Wilbert 4).

The imperial craving to invade these powerful subjects allegorises the animals' challenge to the colonial rule whom they found very troublesome to represent a plain slate, written with orientalised discourse easily. The wild animals appear to be among the principal colonised subjects to resist the colonial statute in particular and human rule in general in their own way.

Unerringly, Indian wildlife has gone through a drastic change under colonialism through the material as well as philosophical, social and economic interactions. However, the retrieval of the animals, though lesser in number, finds strong expression in Corbett's writings which recollects Philo and Wilbert's words:

> If we concentrate solely on how animals are represented, the impression is that animals are merely passive surfaces on to which human groups inscribe imaginings and orderings of all kinds. In our view, it is also vital to give credence to the practices that are folded into the making of representations, and—at the core of the matter—to ask how animals themselves may figure in these practices. This question duly raises broader concerns about non-human agency, about the agency of animals, and the extent to which we can say that animals destabilize, transgress or even resist our human orderings, including spatial ones. (5)

With the development of the scientific studies of the sign-language cognition in apes provides a platform to see the human-animal relations with collapsing that boundary which negates any commonality of the humans with animals. Robert Mearns Yerkes, the primatologist in 1925 indicates the possibility of teaching apes the language, "Perhaps they can be taught to use their fingers somewhat as does the deaf and dumb [sic] person, and thus helped to acquire a simple, non-vocal 'sign language'" (qtd. in Seidenberg and Petitto 177). This idea of language flourishes in the second half of the twentieth-century when Allen and Beatrice Gardner, the psychologists report that their female ape named Washoe is not only able to learn the gestures; instead, Washoe's knowledge extends to "sentence constituents" (qtd. in Seidenberg and Petitto 177-178) also.

The possibility for the non-human animal to learn and transmit the languages using American Sign Language through the example of Washoe contributes to the dissenting views on the (un)cognitive abilities of the animals. Following the example of Washoe, there are subsequent significant researches in the ape language project in America, as has been detailed by E. Sue Savage-Rumbaugh, et al. (1980); and Bishop (2009).[xxxiv] The argument here lies in bringing forward the concept of animal intelligence that makes them the agents in the natural world whose roles are lively in their environment. Broadly speaking, the animal cognition is taken as defined by Sara Shettleworth, "Cognition, broadly defined, includes all ways in which animals take in

information through the senses, process, retain and decide to act on it" (277). The study of Roger K. Thomas makes the different hierarchical levels for examining the cognitive/learning ability of the animals and results in the potentiality of the animals' ability to learn. In which the species of squirrel monkeys, rhesus monkeys, and chimpanzees have qualified for the level 7 and 8 that comprise concepts of conjunctive, disjunctive, or (bio)conditional relationships. He writes, "[S]ome designs have confounded the possibility of conjunctive and conditional reasoning, and it seems clear that squirrel monkeys, rhesus monkeys, and chimpanzees have accomplished either conjunctive or conditional reasoning" (164).

Adequately, the repeated occurrence of the references to the primates' behaviour in Corbett's jungle lore substantiates the latter's ability to learn and having the adaptive behaviours. Also, there is an element of sociality making them friends of other species like *cheetals*; who always prefer to stay near monkeys and *langurs*. Since the deer(s) and other social animals always get an indication of the danger from predatory big cats, so the primates' roles in the jungle become dynamic and follow the strategies of cooperation to sustain in the open environment. Corbett says, "*Langurs* act differently from red monkeys on seeing a leopard. This may be due to better organization, or to their being less courageous than their red cousins. All the red monkeys in a troupe will chatter and bark at the same time on seeing a leopard" (*Jungle Lore* 347). Apart from having the interspecies communication, these animals share and follow certain rules like "[w]hen the leader of the troupe, taking direction from the young one, sees the leopard and takes up the call the young one will stop. Thereafter only the leader and the oldest female will give the alarm call" (*Jungle Lore* 347), shows the conformity of the group to certain rules. Enacting the codes and conducting them by any species allows the perceiver to see the cognitive faculty in animals. Having the leader in the group exhibits the agreement of the other members to his leadership (however, it also shows the possibility of non-conformity to the group), that states the sense of justice and reliability in non-human animals.

Further, there are the studies that exhibit the similarity between the human and the birds' brain in the context of learning the vocalisation of the words. Such studies argue that the humans and the other species share the common mental capacities. The study of Irene M. Pepperberg seems to be a milestone in the field of proving the higher cognitive capacities of the Grey Parrot, named as Alex. The relationship between Alex and Pepperberg is prospective of the interspecies

communication. Since her argument is based on the imitative (not mimicry) capacity of Grey Parrot (*Psittacus erithacus*) for "the intentional, referential reproduction of a novel English vocalization" (2). So she states:

> [O]f particular interest is what happens when the targeted novel vocalization can be constructed from related elements already in the parrot's repertoire. This particular type of combinatory behaviour is actually a form of vocal segmentation. Successful segmentation shows that the bird understands that his *existent* labels are comprised of *individual* units that can be *recombined* in novel ways to create novel vocalizations. (2)

Based on the identification and creation of the words, on the one hand Jarvis et al. postulate the finding that "[t]hose areas of the human brain responsible for vocal learning and production appear to have analogues (and possible homologues) in parrots," while on the other hand, Warren et al. write, "[S]ome parrots use a two-tube system and frequency modulation as do humans, and employ their tongues, glottis, and larynx in some of the same ways used by humans to produce vowels and consonants" (qtd. in Pepperberg 2).

Thus, the scientific perspective on the human-animal interrelatedness goes beyond to claim that the constructed basis of the differences between these species appears to lose its strong roots and simultaneously strengthens Darwin's thoughts of the cognition in the non-human animals. In a similar context, shifting argument to the Corbett's writings, if the birds are taken into consideration, their capacity to make calls is unquestionable. They show the empathetic capability by signalling the presence of danger in the jungle for their fellow jungle folk. Moreover, the active participation in successfully accomplishing their task of making other social animals aware of asocial animals is inherently an act of self-awareness. They seem to be the agents whose actions are planned. Corbett says:

> The next step was to make myself familiar with the language of the jungle folk, and to learn to imitate the calls of those birds and animals whose calls are within the range of human lips and of a human throat. All birds and all animals have their own language and though—with few exceptions—one species cannot speak the language of another species, all the jungle folk understand each other's language. The best three of the exceptions are, the racket-tailed drongo, the rufous-backed shrike, and the gold-fronted green *bulbul*. To

> bird lovers the racket-tailed drongo is a never ending source of pleasure and interest for, in addition to being the most courageous bird in our jungles, he can imitate to perection the calls of most birds and of one animal, the *cheetal*, and he has a great sense of humour. Attaching himself to a flock of ground-feeding birds—jungle-fowl, babblers, or thrushes—he takes up a commanding position on a dead branch and, while regaling the jungle with his own songs and the songs of the other birds, keeps a sharp look for enemies in the way of hawks, cats, snakes, and small boys armed with catapults, and his warning of the approach of danger is never disregarded. (*Jungle Lore* 253-254)

The canine behavioural studies are a step forward to develop the communication between dogs and the humans, also, the cognitive faculties of the dogs. Since dogs are among the most liked pets to have stayed in the human habitat with their caretakers, so it grabs the attention of the researchers to prove the intercommunication between a dog and a human being scientifically and his ability to learn the language. The project of Kaminski et al. on canine behavioural studies discusses the dog Rico who is put into selecting different items in different locations. Over time, Rico is able not only to identify the items rather is able to locate the new referent which they call "fast map" (1682). His vocabulary gets assimilated with 200 words. This study shows "[t]hat Rico reliably associates arbitrary acoustic patterns (human words) with specific items in his environment. Apparently, Rico's extensive experience with acquiring the names of objects allowed him to establish the rule that things can have names" (1683). However, at the same time, few of the studies that remain unsuccessful in teaching the chimpanzees language open a way to discard the comparison between the learning and cognitive aspects of a human and an animal. They are unjust on the basis of the respect of the "difference" each species carries with itself. However, the central motto is not to compare the human and the animal and their abilities to convey their faculties in the similar ways; rather the present discussion is concerned with bringing the animal out of that un-intellectual tag that made them only an "object" to the human requirements. Concerning the same context, Paul Bloom refers to Lila Gleitman's words, "If any child learned words the way Rico did, the parents would run screaming to the nearest neurologist" (1605), by contending, "Rico's limitations might reflect differences in degree, not in kind" (1605).

Discussion on the canine's cognitive ability undoubtedly leads to examining the relationship between Corbett and his canine through the story "Robin" that is named after the same pet's name Robin appeals an effusive sentimentality between a spaniel (gun dog) and his caretaker. Robin accompanies Corbett on all his big game hunting grounds who not only appears to indicate Corbett the impending danger but is also capable of tracking the big cat's pug marks in the dense jungle silently. Robin shows his emotions of fear, joy, relaxation, sadness that Corbett understands well. He writes, "The method we [Corbett and Robin] employ is to go out early in the morning, pick up the tracks of a leopard or tiger, and follow them. When the pug marks can be seen, I do the tracking, and when the animal we are after takes to the jungle, Robin does the tracking" (*Man-Eaters* 33). This writing is indicating the two functions: leave the track and trace the track. Majorly both functions are performed by the non-human animals; leopard and Robin. On the one hand, in Derridean sense, the leopard can be the subject of signifier who is capable of creating a track/mark and simultaneously erasing a track, however, on the other hand, Robin's ability to track the traced marks situates him equipped with the cognitive aptitude. Moreover, it introduces the communication between the species which is taking place through the pug marks, smell, and also through the animal languages. There is a noticeable remark of Robin's competence of tracking after entering the jungle; it makes him directly a non-human agent whose competency is required and also utilised by Corbett in the natural surroundings. Robin is much aware of finding an animal across the winds. Corbett mentions the incident of following a wounded leopard: "Robin knew all that was worth knowing about this method of locating the position of an animal by cutting across the wind, and we had only gone a short distance, and were still a hundred yards from the bush, when he stopped, turned and faced into the wind, and communicated to me that he could smell the leopard" (*Man-Eaters* 39). Simultaneously, there are also instances of animal empathy as has been discussed above in the views of Bekoff and Pierce. The transmission of the empathetic vibes is between Corbett and Robin. After an encounter with the wounded leopard, Robin seems to feel sorry leaving Corbett alone to face the dangerous situation. Whereas empathy includes the feelings of "sympathy, compassion, caring, helping, grieving, and consoling" (87), thus Robin is the embodiment of such empathetic animal; "with a large capacity for fellow feeling and behavior that reflects strong social attachments that endure over time" (Bekoff and Pierce 87). As explained by Corbett: "[A] little later, with drooped eyes and drooping ears, he crept silently to my feet . . . for the second time in his life, he

licked my face—telling me as he did so, with little throaty sounds, how glad he was to find me unhurt, and how terribly ashamed he was of himself for having parted company from me" (*Man-Eaters* 41).

In the philosophical parlance, Derrida presents a critique of Lacan on a lengthy note in *The Animal That Therefore I Am* of the animal's incapacity to be the "subject of the signifier" (120). Further, making a thesis of Lacan's argument that "[t]he animal has neither unconscious nor language, nor the other, except as an effect of the human order, that is by contagion, appropriation, domestication" (121), Derrida argues of the animal's presence negating the false pretences of the philosophical trend to see an animal. Lacan's depravity of the animal the authority of the imagery and the symbolic order where the language plays a key role determines the animal's existence with the fixity of its appearance with the "information and communication to a type of originary perfection of that animal" (122). And, this is the Cartesian fixity which deprives an animal of response and makes him full of reactions. Lacan disapproves "language as a sign" over the "spoken language/human language" and puts it into two different phenomenon(s) for supporting his theory of the animal who can only *react* but not *respond*. Lacan gives the example of a bee:

> I shall show the inadequacy of the conception of 'language as a sign' by the very manifestation that best illustrates it in the animal kingdom, a manifestation which, if it had not recently been the object of an authentic discovery, it seems it would have been necessary to invent for this purpose.
>
> It is now generally admitted that when the bee returns to the hive from its honey-gathering it indicates to its companions by two sorts of dance the existence of nectar and its relative distance, near or far, from the hive. The second type of dance is the most remarkable, for the plane in which the bee traces the figure-of-eight curve—which is why it has been called the 'wagging dance,'—and the frequency of the figures executed within a given time, designate, on the one hand, exactly the direction to be followed, determined in relation to the inclination of the sun (on which bees are able to orient themselves in all weathers, thanks to their sensitivity to polarized light), and, on the other hand, the distance, up to several miles, at which the nectar is to be found. And the other bees respond to this message by setting off immediately for the place thus designated.

> It took some ten years of patient observation for Karl von Frisch to decode this kind of message, for it is certainly a code, or system of signalling, whose generic character alone forbids us to qualify it as conventional.
>
> But is it necessarily a language? We can say that it is distinguished from language precisely by the fixed correlation of its signs to the reality that they signify. For in a language signs take on their value from their relations to each other in the lexical distribution of semantemes as much as in the positional, or even flectional, use of morphemes, in sharp contrast to the fixity of the coding used by bees. And the diversity of human languages [*langues*] takes on its full value from this enlightening discovery. (qtd. in Derrida, *The Animal That* 123-124)

However, for Tim Friend, to analyse the bee's action and her way of communication is very complicated and not easy to derive a standard meaning, as he says, "The most complex system of communication next to that of humans is found in the dance steps of the honeybee" (8).

Similarly, for Derrida, the psychoanalysts' distinction between the response and the reaction is problematic. Since the "logic of the unconscious is founded in on a logic of repetition . . . will always inscribe a destiny of iterability," hence, there is the possibility of "some automaticity of the reaction in every response" (125). To make an address to the cybernetic program when Derrida offers to include that "it must conserve the notion of writing, trace, grammé [written mark], or grapheme, until its own historico-metaphysical character is also exposed" (*Of Grammatology* 9), he includes the grammé/mark as the important unit of language. If the mark is the unit of language, then the animal's capability of producing the "mark" or "trace" becomes significant in the discourse of Lacan and Derrida as well. Because a "trace" is produced after its inscription by an animal, so it indicates the presence of the animal in his absence to the tracking hunter. However, for Lacan, the animal can be capable of the "strategic pretense" in order to have food, mating, or hunting, but he is beyond the "deception of speech" (*The Animal That* 127); a speech which can hide the truth in order to deceive others, that the animal cannot. But the attribution of capacity of pretense catches the eye here because it could not make the animal "subject of the signifier": "But to be subject of the signifier is also to be a subjecting subject, a subject as *master*, an active and deciding subject of the signifier, having in any case sufficient mastery to be capable of pretending to pretend and hence of being able to put into effect one's

power to destroy the trace" (*The Animal That* 130). In a derisive tone, Derrida critiques such traditional approach of philosophy to the animals

> This mastery is the superiority of man over the *animot*, even if it gains its assurance from the privilege constituted by a defect [*de´faut*], a lack [*manque*], or a fault [*faute*], a failing [*de´faillance*] . . . It is there that the passage from imaginary to symbolic is determined as a passage from animal to human order. It is there that subjecthood, as order of the signifier from the place of the Other, appears as something missed by the traditional philosophy of the subject and of relations between human and animal. (*The Animal That* 130)

Likely, Lacan's emphasis on the element of "pretense of pretense" required for an animal to become a subject is entangled in complexity, and simultaneously in anthropocentric dogmatism also. Because the elaboration of pretense of pretense in the human domain is imperceptive in nature and hence fails to prove its credibility "[t]hat it is indeed difficult, even impossible, to discern between pretense and a pretense of pretense, between an aptitude for pretense and an aptitude for the pretense of pretense" (Derrida, *The Animal That* 133). However, for Derrida, in the context of the animal, further, the notion of "trace" is also problematic because he substituted "the concept of trace for that of signifier" (*The Animal That* 135). The capability to trace itself shows the potentiality of erasing a trace. Also, every conscious effort to erase a trace, at the same time, inscribes another trace. He condemns that psychoanalyst/philosophical trend that has given the right to the human to attribute all the features that it deprives the animal of; pretense of pretense, covering the tracks, etc. Moreover, no one can be the so-called master or have the power of "erasure" of a trace; instead, it is inherent in the trace to be erased. Addressing the psychoanalysts, Derrida writes:

> Is it necessary to recall that every erased trace, in consciousness, can leave a trace of its erasure whose symptom (individual or social, historical, political, etc.) will always be capable of ensuring its return? . . . And to recall that every reference to the capacity to erase the trace still speaks the language of the conscious, even imaginary ego? . . . It is inherent to a trace that it is always being erased and always capable of being erased . . . In this regard the human no more has the *power* to cover its tracks than does the so-called 'animal.' (*The Animal That* 136)

Thus, taking the notion of the animals' language as a mode of communication is pertinent to Corbett's texts where he analyses the behaviour of the animals. The motto of the changing animal behaviour is to ascertain the balance in Nature. Each animal folk has its own role to play in the jungle. Corbett talks about the animals' languages at great length without any hesitation of acknowledging the animals and birds with the faculty of language/communication. He writes about his early days in the jungle, "I had yet to learn the habits of the animals, their language, and the part they played in the scheme of nature . . . I was also absorbing the language of the birds and understanding their function in nature's garden" (*Jungle Lore* 252). The different species play different roles significantly as few of them are assigned to beautify the natural surroundings; others are to maintain the balance. The categorisation of Corbett of these creatures in certain groups is inevitable to understand the birds and animals' agency:

> (a) Birds that beautified nature's garden: minivets, orioles, and sunbirds. (b) Birds that filled the garden with melody: thrushes, robins, and *shamas*. (c) Birds that regenerated the garden: barbets, hornbills, and *bulbuls*. (d) Birds that warned if danger: drogos, red jungle-fowl, and babblers. (e) Birds that maintained the balance in nature: eagle, hawks, and owls. (e) Birds that performed the duty of scavengers: vultures, kites and crows . . . (g) Animals that beautified nature's garden: deer, antelope, and monkeys. (h) Animals that helped to regenerate the garden by opening up and aerating the soil: bears, pigs and porcupines. (i) Animals that warned of danger: deer, monkeys and squirrels. (j) Animals that maintained the balance in nature: tigers, leopards, and wild dogs. (*Jungle Lore* 252-253)

To develop an understanding of the natural world and to see the animals as agents, there is a core value to understand the ways of interaction between the species. Simultaneously, it is interesting to note that by knowing the animals' communication, it is possible for Corbett to access the big cats for the hunt. So the roles of certain animals are not confined to their species rather it became meaningful for those who comprehend their signals. For instance, Corbett mentions the changing nature of the alarm calls in context to whether the immediate action is required, "It is the sound that is only heard once, like the snapping of a twig, a low growl, or the single warning call of bird or of animal, that is difficult to locate, is of immediate danger, and calls for instant action" (*Jungle Lore* 266). Upamanyu Mukherjee considers that the

understanding of an ecosystem is liable to both human and non-human "'environment' as an integrated network of human and non-human agents acting historically" (5). In the course of narrating the man-eater big cats, Corbett comes very close to authenticate the animal agency through their behaviour. Monkeys and the *langurs* (leaf monkey) are the crucial informants to their fellow animals like *sambhar* (sambar deer), deer, *kakar* (Indian muntjac) and others, of the presence of the big cats because of their hunting nature. Helen Steward's statement, "Animals do such things as build nests and burrows, seek food, attempt to elude predators. The more sophisticated among them appear to communicate with one another, even play. They fight. They groom" (217), reinforces the noticeable reactions of the animals towards Tall Des tigress, "The jungle appeared to be well stocked with game, and I repeatedly heard *sambhar*, *kakar*, and *langur* giving their alarm calls, and more than once I heard pheasants, jays, and white-capped laughing thrush mobbing the tigress" (*The Temple Tiger* 157).

Other than the inevitable communication among the animals, the animals/tigers insinuate to jest Corbett in the serious sports of tigers/man-eating hunting. Being habituated to stalk the tigers and hunt on foot, Corbett grabs more chance to observe the animals in their natural surroundings and sometimes to credit the physical and mental vitality to these animals. There is an immense sense of awareness in Chuka man-eater:

> It would not have been possible for a human being to have got over that steep and difficult ground without using his hands and without making considerable noise, but the tiger accomplished the feat without making a sound the nearer he came to the flat ground the more cautious he became and the closer he kept his belly to the ground. When he was near the top of the bank he very slowly raised his head, took a long look at the tree the men had climbed, and satisfied that it was not tenanted sprang up on to the flat ground and passed out of sight under me. (*The Temple Tiger* 111)

The incredible strength and the reasoning of the tiger reconfigure the notion of reasoning as the sole propriety of humans. Even the narratives imply the Tigers' consciousness in stalking the jungles, attacking the predators, soothing their wounds, caring for their mates, teaching and loving their cubs, hiding their foods and above all the sense of humour which they possess and at times show towards Corbett. The temple tiger plays many times with Corbett and evades his bullet, "I saw the tiger . . . When he saw me looking down on him he flattened his ears . . . I

could imagine him saying to himself, 'Well, you have now seen me, and what are you going to do about it?'" (*The Temple Tiger* 32) so he realises the tiger makes fun of him, "I know that crows and monkeys have a sense of humour, but until that day I did not know that tigers also possessed this sense" (*The Temple Tiger* 38).

The discussion on the animal agency implants the similarities between the human and nonhuman subjectivities. Gompertz tries to minimize the gap between the two by assigning a common share of emotions by men and animal, "Things which affect us, generally seem to affect them in the same way: and at least the following sensations and passions are common to both, viz. hunger, desire, emulation, love of liberty, playfulness, fear, shame, anger, and many other affections" (qtd. in Mayer 185). Minimising the gap between the human and the animals' emotions, Corbett says, "Fear stimulates the senses of animals, keeps them 'on their toes,' and adds zest to the joy of life; fear can do the same for human beings" (*Jungle Lore* 288). Likely, the emotions of love and affection of the Chuka tigress for her cubs draw irresistible attention which shows the animal world is full of the unique passion of the motherhood including the transmission of instructions, teaching, facing the danger for her cubs etc. when she leads them to take the food:

> This was quite evidently the first occasion on which the cubs had ever been taken to a kill, and it was very interesting to see the pains the mother took to impress on them the danger of the proceeding and the great caution it was necessary to exercise. The behaviour of the cubs was as interesting as their mother's. Step by step they followed in her tracks; never trying to pass each other . . . The ground was carpeted with big sal leaves as dry as tinder over which it was impossible to move silently; however, every pad was put down carefully and as carefully lifted, and as little sound as possible was made . . . Her lying down was apparently intended as a signal to the cubs to go forward in the direction in which her nose was pointing . . . By what means the mother conveyed the information to her cubs that there was food for them at this spot I do not know, but that she had conveyed this information to them there was no question. (*The Temple Tiger* 105-106)

On the other way, Tall Des tigress challenges and faces Corbett intermittently and escapes too. She becomes more dangerous after losing her cubs by Corbett's bullet, "A tiger that has made up

its mind to avenge an injury is the most terrifying animal to be met with in an Indian jungle" (*The Temple Tiger* 177). She seems to be more aware in the game of "killing" with a human being and advances to the safe positions to protect herself and having a revert attack on the hunter, "As soon as she becomes aware that I was following her and she considered that I was within her reach, she would launch an all-out attack on me" (*The Temple Tiger* 177). Even though she gets badly wounded by Corbett's assaults but is capable of showing her prudence, he is impressed with "[w]alking downhill with an injured leg is far more painful than walking uphill and as soon as the tigress recovered from her dazed condition she would stop going downhill and would make for cover in which to nurse her injury" (*The Temple Tiger* 149). Another noticeable example of an amazing sense of motherhood caring is of the "red monkeys" when the alarm call is deliberately made to protect their young ones. Corbett writes, "The warning given by the red monkeys has been heeded, and all the mothers in the troupe have got hold of their young ones, and all eyes are turned in the direction from which the warning came" (*Jungle Lore* 347).

The difference between response and reaction and the animals' ability to respond to inter/intra-species are the fundamental ideas to see the animal world as animals' natural world, not to get it intermixed or compared with the humans. The above arguments, on the one hand, help to dismantle the lens that sees animals as mere mechanical objects and, on the other hand, they postulate the animal agency making them the aware agents in (of) their environments. Their actions can be understood as a result of an aware state of mind, not merely an accidental "happening" to them. This is an extended view of Darwin's thoughts when he considers the animals the actors, "Simple ideas—like a bird weaving for pleasure or singing for its own amusement—embody assumptions and consequences that are far from simple, namely, that animals' actions are experientially meaningful and actively authored" (qtd. in McFarland and Hediger 2-3). Similarly, there are several instances of the authorship of the animals' actions to remind here from Corbett's text: first, when the alarm call is given by the leader of a *langur* group followed by a female's call *tch* (like the sound of a sneeze) indicates the young ones to be unafraid from the leopard's presence because "if he had been hungry and out to kill he would not have walked out on to the open watercourse as he has done" (348). Secondly, it is worth mentioning to see the big cats' method of carrying their kills by prudently avoiding any trace for the other animals to follow: "[T]igers and leopards when crossing a road with a kill lift the kill clear of the ground, and this I believe they do to avoid leaving a scent trail for bears, hyaenas,

and jackals to follow" (*Jungle Lore* 277). Since these carnivores are asocial animals, so their cognitive abilities to some extent can be mapped in stark contrast to the social animals. They show prudence in silent tracking of their prey and then hiding their kills. Natalia Borregoa writes, "[C]ognition in leopards and tigers evolved in the absence of social complexity" (262). They are seen seldom in an association, "Leopards, tigers, and jaguars are asocial and associate only during mating and with dependent offspring" (qtd. in Borregoa 262). A probe into a natural world primarily requires a human consciousness to be placed misaligned from the animal motives, and not to measure the animals' consciousness purely in context to the humans. Corbett calls the knowledge of the jungle as something that can be absorbed virtuously with firsthand experience with it. He says, "I have used the word 'absorbed,' in preference to 'learnt,' for jungle lore is not a science that can be learnt from textbooks; it can, however, be absorbed, a little at a time, and the absorption process can go on indefinitely, for the book of nature has no beginning, as it has no end" (*Jungle Lore* 233).

So, before reemphasising the concern of this chapter to analyse the animals as agents in Corbett's texts, there is a need to highlight what makes an animal an agent? In the words of McFarland and Hediger, there are firmly interrelated terms that form an agency "free will, ability, rationality, mind, morality, subjectivity" (3). Although these terms seem to overlap each other and signify the existence of one over the other (as discussed above the animals' ability to communicate their message to human and beyond the human species), the question of morality in animals is very pertinent to address here. Since the question of morality in animals is a very uninvited and unconvincing phenomenon in the philosophical trend, there are the issues of defining the morality in animals, however, at the same time the categorisation of the social and asocial animals through their behaviour can be a shred of authentic evidence to find out the question of morality in the non-human animals. Steve Sapontzis writes, "The reason why animals cannot act morally, if they cannot, is not to be found at the behavioral level" (31). Breaking the traditional Western thinkers' notion of the interlinking between rationality and morality, David Hume is amongst the ones who introduces "emotions" the basis of morality, and that be common in both: the humans and the animals. He says, "[T]he three relations of resemblance, contiguity and causation operate in the same manner upon beasts as upon human creature" (213), further, pays attention to the union of emotions among the animals and humans, notably, calling the animals as inferior species: "[T]here is an union of certain affections with

each other in the inferior species of creatures as well as in the superior, and that their minds are frequently convey'd thro' a series of connected emotions" (213). But the deprivation of virtue or vice in the animals keeps them beyond any moral judgment. However, Sapontzis reacts to the un-virtuous state of the animals and says, "[M]any animals possess sufficient sensitivity and intelligence to recognize virtues and to do virtuous deeds, they seem to lack the ability to lead a fully moral life dedicated to the attainment of an ideal" (44).

When there is a discussion on the morality in animals, the primatologist, Frans de Waal's study is inseparable from this idea. Although primarily his work is concerned with the evolution of human morality, the entanglement of human and animal morality makes his study a remarkable contribution to understanding the morality in animals. Objecting the Veneer Theory (considering humans bestial by nature), in the contention of Huxley's remarks Waal makes an indicative expression: "Humans are, he suggests, by nature good" and this goodness is inherited from "our nonhuman ancestors" (xii). However, he indicates the variation of the degree of the human goodness and the nonhuman goodness, but the nonhuman morality is "the *foundation* of more complex human morality" (qtd. in Ober and Macedo xii). In opposition to the Western philosophy's claims of rationality as an active agent in making the possible functioning of moral behaviour, Waal considers sociality and emotions the root cause of morality. It is not a unique phenomenon or a cultural innovation that is achieved only by the humans rather it results from an "evolution" that is social in its nature: "[M]orality is neither unique to us nor a conscious decision taken at a specific point in time: it is the product of social evolution" (6). Also, this sociality is common to the human and non-human spheres. He considers monkeys and apes are the "highly social ancestors" and states that "sociality has become ever more deeply ingrained in primate biology and psychology" (4). The positioning of morality has more direct and clear affiliations with the emotional core of the human and non-human nature and, that is evidenced in the social animals who live in groups and always involve communicating the presence of food, danger, and the other resources for their lives. Going beyond the emotional faculty in primates, ethologist Niko Tinbergen and biologist George Schaller suggest: "We might learn a lot about the evolution of human social behavior by studying social carnivores, species whose social behavior and organization resemble that of early hominids in a number of ways (divisions of labor, food sharing, care of young, and intersexual and intrasexual dominance hierarchies)" (qtd. in Bekoff and Pierce 9). Likely, the sociality in animals is a noteworthy constituent of Corbett's

elaboration of the jungle lore. Other than the primates, there are the other species that seem to be social enough to help and care for their group. The animals adopt different vocalisations for communicating the specific state of affairs with their peers. The examples of *cheetal* (spotted deer) as analysed by Corbett strongly convey the ways of the jungle folk to help each-other from the predators. He writes:

> [A] herd of *cheetal* in an open glade . . . One of the young ones that had been sleeping in the sun got to its feet, stretched itself, and kicking up its heels raced across the glade towards a fallen tree; this was a signal to the other young ones that a game of 'follow the leader' was on . . . the leader carried on into the jungle . . . A hind that had been lying down now got to her feet, looked in the direction in which the young ones had gone, and gave a sharp bark. (*Jungle Lore* 264-265)

Following the rules of the group shows that there are specific codes to be followed which further exhibit the animal agency. Also, the sharp bark given by the young one is against the presence of a woodcutter that means only for the young ones. Bark to the whole herd is given when the man is within the range of hundred yards. However, there is a variation between the call of a mother for young one and the call of a hind warning his fellow mates against a human being: "[C]alling for different reasons was not to be found in the call itself, but in the intonation of the call" (Corbett, *Jungle Lore* 265). Also, the nature of the signal also indicates the possibility of the instant action taken in the situation of danger. In Corbett's views, the alarm calls by the *langurs*, *cheetals,* and by the peafowl is easy to understand, but the discretion of the call determines the actions of the animals. In many instances, the language of *cheetal* proves to be very crucial for Corbett to locate the predatory animals. It is not only by birds or the animals who can move on treetops to secure distance rather there are other animals like *kakar*, *sambhar*, and *cheetal* who make the jungle folk aware of the predators. Against the predominant notion, Corbett considers *kakar* as one of the most reliable informants. Although his physique seems defenceless, he is a courageous animal who dares to stay with a tiger in a dense forest. The story of Robin mentions the role of the deer(s) in making Corbett aware that the leopard whom he had fired at was still alive and was in his vicinity in the jungle. The story adds, "From the manner in which the *chital* were calling it was evident that the leopard was in full view of them . . . the leopard was alive

and had moved . . . the position of the leopard . . . we could get by stalking the *chital*" (*Man-Eaters* 35).

Marc Bekoff and Jessica Pierce make a study of animal behaviour and probes into animal morality. Entering into the lives of the non-human animals, they say, "Morality is a broadly adaptive strategy for social living that has evolved in many animal societies other than our own . . . they (animals) have a complex and nuanced repertoire of emotions as well as a high degree of intelligence and behavioral flexibility" (3). Their purview of interrogation embraces primarily the social animals, their behaviour, widely focused on the morality in animals. In order to understand the moral behaviour patterns of the animals, they categorise such behaviour into three clusters: cooperation, empathy, and justice. These are the three phenomenon(s) that broadly describe the animals' interactions with their world and certainly to the human world as well. They go beyond primates and study morality in other animals too: elephants, rats, mice, wolves, coyotes, hyenas, cetaceans (dolphins and whales), etc. Also, the selection of the animal categories does not hinge with any idea of pre-determined morality in such animals rather it is through the behaviour of these (above mentioned) animals that the conclusion of morality in animals is drawn. The morality in animals is not confined to their species instead there are instances of interspecies morality. They cite the striking examples of the non-human animals' empathy for human beings:

> In New Zealand, a pod of dolphins was observed forming a protective circle around a group of swimmers to fend off an attack by a great white shark. Philosopher Thomas White tells of a dolphin named Tursi who changed her behavior when she discovered that a young boy was blind. Tursi herself was blind in one eye and White wonders if this had anything to do with the way in which she related to the boy. There's also a story of three lions in Ethiopia who rescued a twelve-year-old girl from a gang who had kidnapped her. Numerous stories about dogs helping humans emerged from the tragic events of 9/11and the Asian Tsunami. And, of course we have Binti Jua, who helped the young boy who fell into her enclosure at the Brookfield Zoo. There's also a wonderful story of a young chimpanzee named Joni, raised by the Russian primatologist Nadia Ladygina-Kohts some eighty years ago. Joni often went onto the roof of Kohts's house, and calling for her, scolding her, or offering food didn't work to get her down. (108-109)

With the above mentioned theoretical arguments on the animals' agency, this study opens the doors to analyse the relationship of the animal with the other animals along with the human beings that is a fascinating, multilayered element in Corbett's narratives of the jungle. On the one hand, such tales exhibit the growing eco-centric awareness in a sportsman while it also allows examining the possibility of interspecies and intraspecies communication in various ways on the other. The ways of the jungle and its knowledge is the significant prime determinant of an added factor that results in reputing Corbett, a great naturalist. His urge to convert his hands' occupancy from a gun to camera, though primarily might have motivated from the same Victorian ideal of using the camera that teaches him using the gun. However, his "absorption" of the jungle lore in having prospective emotional affinity/interspecies communication with the non-human animals precedes the later scientific studies.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

The thesis finds that the animal presence in *shikar* literature is of vital importance. Moreover, in an age of sharply growing animal awareness through increasing scholarship on animal ethics, animal rights, and animal welfare, the portrayal of animals in literature becomes doubly significant to analyse how the idea of animal qualifies for a convoluted historical subject. In such contexts, the writings of the legendary figure, e.g., Jim Corbett prove strikingly significant to participate in the contemporary debates of the animals' issues concerning their representations in literature and animals-as-such. Corbett's texts provide the best opportunity for this thesis to have a comprehensive understanding of the idea of the animal. The thesis imports the animal existence from an objective to a subjective entity in Corbett's narratives. The tales concerning incredible insight into the animals' ways and their lives offer this study to see the animals-as-such. Since the imperial hunt is the governing theme of the narratives, so the underlying meaningful alliance between the hunting sport and the Empire remains inevitable for this thesis.

By and large; the argument revolves around the hero ship of Corbett v/s big cats. The first half of the thesis pays considerable attention to the leading role of Corbett with an objective presence of animals; focusing on the myriad ways of interconnection among race, gender, human supremacy, and the imperial identity of Corbett. It shows *how* the hunting sport is a site for emphasising the imperial identity for the White hunters (for example Corbett). Meanwhile, the thesis has discussed how the killings of the man-eaters are essentially glorified as the notion of Corbett's humanity gets fastened against the man-eaters' animality. The distinctness of Corbett's narratives brings the "demise" of the man-eaters a central element to focus on; it is the death scene of the animals/man-eaters that causes an eco-consciousness in Corbett and the "laws of Nature" surfaces the discourse. Hence, contemplating the animals as a bit of Nature, the thesis has turned the analysis towards the animals as the subject of the evaluation. It sees how the animality state of the man-eaters has commenced out of the external factors occurring in their environment at a particular time in human history. The study has discussed how the big cats present a threat to the smooth governing of the Raj and dismantle the colonial desire to

orientalise the Indian non-human animal subjects. Further, the study has used the jungle knowledge of Corbett as a tool to demystify the animal and significantly contributes to release the animals out of Descartes' notion of animal automata. It argues that the animals are the agents in their environment; their actions are well authored by themselves, and assuredly not a happening to them.

Setting the "question of the animal" in the backdrop of this entire thesis, the analysis takes a plunge into the colonial environment of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century India. As the titles of the primary texts: *Man-Eaters of Kumaon* (1944), *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag* (1947), *My India* (1952), *Jungle Lore* (1953), *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon* (1954), and *Tree Tops* (1955) suggest Corbett's writings are a blend of human and non-human properties. Most of the narratives capture a grim picture of the animal attacks on people in the hilly areas of lower Himalayan range: Kumaon and Garhwal. Corbett is not solely a detached author of such thrilling narratives; instead, these are the personal narratives in which he is instrumental in annihilating the predators. As far as Corbett's identity is concerned, it is hard to locate him in any single frame, since he has been a legendary in India: a great Anglo-Indian hunter, a destructor of man-eater big cats, a pioneer conservationist, and a naturalist. Similarly, the existing substantial scholarship on Jim Corbett flourishes chiefly in two strands. First, most of the studies give weight age to his conservation career and acknowledge his contributions to Indian wildlife (Guha 1999; Rangarajan 1998; 2001; 2003; Ponde 2012, Rajamannar 2012; Mhangore 2013; Deshmukh 2014; Mandala 2014; 2015; 2019). Secondly, on the other hand, in few of the academic writings, Corbett finds critical references concerning his identity as a hunter (Singh 1993; Pandian 2001; Taylor 2007; Shresth 2009; Das 2009; Sharma 2016). Conversely, this study finds Corbett an ambivalent figure swinging between his ideological otherness and experiential closeness with the colonised subjects: human and non-human animals.

However, none of the theses specifically addresses the question at length: why did Corbett remain the most popular and read author of the *shikar* (hunting) literature in India; particularly consigning the pursuit of man-eaters in the jungles? Despite the then contemporary White hunters' careers closely resemble with Corbett's: Kenneth Anderson and Colonel Burton. Their writings also contain the tales of man-eaters and a final appeal for wildlife conservation but are scantly attended by the scholars. Attending the same question, this study has argued that the

specificity of Corbett's narratives heavily depends on the Western cultural and ideological constructions of animal(ity) v/s humanity that glorifies, justifies, and rationalises violence against the animals. Simultaneously, the study finds that the concept of "human service" has played a key role in assigning Corbett distinct among the White hunters' group.

At the same time, as far as the relationship of *Carpet Sahib* with the rural folk is concerned it seems warm-hearted, but the articulation of the same colonised human subjects in the narratives suffers from a sense of othering and difference. The discussion unfolds Corbett a contested figure who gets driven by his inner compulsion of a colonial master; simultaneously consolidating his distinctness from his fellow British men. *My India* imprints the complexity of an expatriated imperial man and his nostalgic remembrance of the poor of India. The analysis brings together: the White and Brown identities of the writer in portraying the rural folk of India as he is holding both in continuity. The text creates a flux of "sameness and otherness," and the argument peeks into the "contested self" of Corbett.[xxxv] There are constant recognition and disavowal of difference comprising the colonised subjects: the human and beyond the human world. It is a discourse which shows colonial power and knowledge over the colonised subjects. The experience of the native land makes it feasible to portray the colonised subjects in specific ways. It brings the ambiguity in between the lines of the text when the articulation works double. The colonial rule is the justification for the poor of India since they are imprudent and economically deprived. However, these are the people who make colonial rule a success, as they need it and actively participate in their own subjectification by accepting their inadequacy. Although they are honest and diligent, they lack in leadership. At the same time, the inquiry into the text finds the mechanisms of colonial rule in the form of knowledge, benevolence, and superiority of the White race which attribute power to the colonials and consequently they remain untroubled and unquestioned imperial identities among the poor of India. The dynamics of the relationship between coloniser and colonised people resurrect Sartre's words, "A relentless reciprocity binds the colonizer to the colonized" (24). Corbett appears to represent the British ideological normative of benevolence and paternalistic *sahibs*, but sustaining the ideological "othering" in the delineation of the colonised people.

The study perceives the then in vogue hunting tradition as a form of "othering" of the non-human animals. Also, it finds "constant strife between nature and culture through the attempts in

establishing the superiority of one over the other. Man, having a "gun," an emblem of culture and power shows his supremacy whenever gets chance and the reaction of nature; "tigers" through man slaughtering, violates coexistence of man with nature unlike the pre-existence of both" (Rani & Kumar, "*Man-Eaters*" 213). The tale of Putali and Punwa illustrates the laws of the jungles that show a remarkable co-existence of human and non-human animals.[xxxvi] "Although the colonials introduce hunting as an entertainment/sporting exercise, its precarious consequences disturb not only the wildlife but human life as well. Hunting becomes a site for exercising the power relations with the colonised population by employing various social, cultural, political, and psychological mechanisms related to the concept of the 'animal'" (Rani & Kumar, "*Man-Eaters*" 213). The imperial hunt plays a significant role in justifying the Raj protective in nature for the rural people. The disarmament of the weaponry helps to make the animals' afflicted population dependent on the White hunters. MacKenzie mentions, "[S]hiker offered opportunities for the British to encounter ordinary Indians, bringing subaltern and peasant together" (189-190).

Simultaneously, the cultural construction of hunting into "sport" and its codes of conduct have racial affiliations. It serves a potential means to demarcate the White hunters from the native poachers. It altogether brings the social affiliations between the coloniser and the colonised individual entities. Moreover, the politics of the identity of "man-eaters" is the most convincing in asserting the authority of the Empire. The animal or the man-eaters prove to be (a)political need for the British solidifying the Raj in India by producing the valiant heroes (Corbett an example) whose bravery settles with destructing the malevolent animals and protecting the meek colonised population. It resembles Storey's statement: "The hunt symbolized the triumph of culture over nature and of colonist over colonized" (149). The jungles of the Kumaon region—a source of living for the rural people gradually transform into the haunting places due to the possibilities of man-eaters' arrival. The modernity that privileges culture or the material progress over Nature has led to the quietening of animals in the clamorous human world.

Conversely, the study is a critique of the human-centred approach that challenges the existence of others. The analysis has gone through understanding the stages of the human and non-human animals' interaction discerning the animals' and humans' living estate. The study

finds sharp strife between the Garhwali/Kumaoni people and the big cats (tigers and leopards in particular). Even though the animals (domestic and wild) play a significant role in the lives of the Kumaoni people varying their socio-cultural, and economic values but these animals appear to stand in the perpetual "other" form. Although the majority of Corbett's collections of narratives are titled after the animals, its significance lies beyond simply an animal's identity. Focusing on the "man-eaters" tales, there is an inquiry into the constructed contested identities of Corbett v/s man-eating big-cats. The focus revolves around how Corbett (an epitome of humanity) and man-eaters (embodiment of animality) reconfigure each other's identity formation amidst an environment of hunting sport in colonial India. The hunting of the man-eaters solidifies the masculine identity of the White hunters (as is the findings of one of my research articles):

> The efforts of the government to kill the man-eater and control the turmoil in the man-eater vicinity furnish the insight into broader perspectives that all the possible actions taken by a superior race are for the well-being of rural India. The killing of the evil or fiend man-eater makes Corbett an incarnation of saviour among the Garhwali and Kumaoni hilly people. Corbett becomes a *sahib* who is an Englishman by virtue and identity, and is full of supernatural power and unyielding determination as far as the hunt is concerned. (Rani & Kumar, "Foregrounding" 159)

The study finds the multi-faceted aspects of human-animal and human-human relationships at a particular time in human society. The establishment of the notion of the man-eaters as monstrous creatures, in fact, failed to appreciate the existence of a "real" animal lost due to humans' increasing use of technology and resultant human misery caused by the animal attacks. Besides being a skilled hunter, it is the sight of the man-eaters in Kumaon and Garhwal that shapes Corbett's popular identity, not only for the native people but also for higher British authorities, for securing a safe place among the "true" Englishmen capable of controlling the savage beasts and indigenous people on a distant land. Meanwhile, the study also locates:

> Nature's encroachment and the local people's susceptibility as the prime factor for the man-eater's fondness for the human flesh. There is a vigorous prejudice against humans as a species of high and prime importance whose loss becomes the loss of all. However, the de-escalating natural habitat and food of the carnivores, and their resultant sufferings, requirements, pains and pleasures lack attention. The emergence of the man-eater is

> reason-specific/human-specific and not a natural recurring occurrence. Furthermore, it is misleading to categorise the animals straightforwardly into the Descartes' notion of the animal automata as scrutiny of the text puts a question on such thinking and discovers that a lot can come out of rational thought of the animals and close engagement with them. (Rani & Kumar, "Foregrounding" 159)

Corbett's love for the human race is apparent but his imperial masculinity and eco-sensibility that evolves out of his close encounter with the wildlife in the Indian jungles, are stuck together and can be seen when the laws of nature come into consideration. By contextualising the man-eater animals, the study critiques the Western cultural prerogative of dressing animality into negative attire by addressing the effacing of real animals in the tensed man-eaters' stricken territories. Further, this reading suggests the replacement of "animality" with "a state of being" to present an alternative view of the hunted and the hunter.

The analysis has sharpened the argument of situating animal attacks into a spatiotemporal identity created and dismantled by the same source. The elimination of the man-eaters is the primary act that grants some strength to colonialism in its fading days in India. This study focused on animality as a physical condition of the animal; at the same time, the natural and essential drive to find the dietary patterns in the human flesh is dressed in a state responsive to those deficiencies that take place under the animal's suffering. Indeed, the particular historical context concerning wildlife and human living conditions and their relations facilitates colonial efforts of putting animals and animality at the edge. The investigation of *why* the "large-hearted gentleman" (Corbett, *Man-Eaters* xiii) becomes the most sought after villains of the time dives into the particular context of "man-eaters" appearance in the beginning of the twentieth century. The study finds the man-eating phase as a suffering for the animals who are caught into the humanitarian discourses of animality. However, the animality in the form of "killing people" has strong relations with the acts of hunting practices accountable to the human realm, and the bitter human-animal encounters remain the big cats' only mode of survival. It reminds one of Lundblad's words, "The animal within you, just like the animal in the wild, is naturally hardwired for survival in the jungle" (499). Simultaneously, the animals/man-eaters serves the purpose of reconstructing the crumbling Empire at least in a few of the regions of India where a White hunter is popular for securing people's safety. In the falling days of imperialism, it is the

killing of the “man-eater” (though done with technological help) that presents the counter-arguments for the new-born nationalist surge in the nation.

Corbett’s stories evoke India as an inevitable memory of an expatriated writer. Although he is a celebrated conservationist icon, his narratives of the British hunt hold an unavoidable dichotomy between man and animal. The implacable idea of the animality arises to notice the (in)human*e* motives and desires through the colonial project of dominating the colonised(s) where the classification of man as superior and animal as inferior is naturalised. Interestingly, the attempts put to premise the humanity rolls to build the so-called “animality” and expose to the animalised humanity. However, the retrieval of the animals, particularly of big cats, points out the inherently strong resistance of the colonised animals for being orientalised by the Empire. The big-cats’ non-conformist nature follows the self-rule. They initiate fracturing the easy proceedings of domination.

Further, the study contributes a little to the present debate on the animal agency and tries to understand the animals as agents who create and influence their environment. The study presents a compact view of animal agency and through the examples of changing animal behaviour in different situations reacts to the Western philosophical thesis of “animal poverty” in the world. Also, such philosophical discourses make the animals insignificantly significant. Also, this significance lies in studying the animals’ world from a species’ point of view, certainly not to be understood in comparison with the human species. There is also a need to bring the term “animality” out of the clutches of negativity and irrationality. The actions of animals are deliberate that indicates the different levels of rational process on the animal mind.

Although the natural sciences’ periphery is well developed in this area, such issues are certainly needed to be addressed through the literary creations as well to enrich the comprehensibility of literature and its areas of studies. The relevance of Corbett’s writings in the present scenario lies in immortalising the relationship of the animals with the texts. Also, the revival of jungle narratives unfolds the value of personal encounters with non-human animals that are abundant in conveying the concept of animal agency. Also, it presents a counter-narrative to that second-hand knowledge which is conveyed in philosophy with the centeredness of humans. The study also finds the various levels of possible interspecies and intraspecies communication that goes beyond the linguistic limitations of language as such. The befitting of

the Corbett's text with the ethological and philosophical contexts shows the concerning dialogue between literature and science whose approaches vary but the central argument (the question of the animal) remains the same. At any point in time, this study does not negate the degree of differences between the human animal and non-human animal, instead; it ventures to admirably acknowledge the similarities and differences: *animals* and *humans* are imbibed with. This assertion resonates with Haraway's clear understanding of the animal rights movement: "Movements of animal rights are not irrational denials of human uniqueness; they are clear-sighted recognition of connection across the discredited breach of nature and culture" (152).

NOTES: Chapter 1

[i] See Midgley 36 for an insightful analysis of the trend of using the terms *beast* and *brute* in an inclusive sense and finally the replacement of these words with the "animal."

[ii] See Ingold "Introduction" 4-5 for throwing light on the animal and animality.

[iii] The attribution of sensibility and rationality to the human being is the basis of differentiating between animal and human-animal. See Kant *The Metaphysics* 215.

[iv] Corbett's encounter with the supernatural spirits is termed as the "eerie experiences" by his biographer Martin Booth. See Booth 138-143.

[v] In describing the nature of the leopard man-eater, Kruuk exemplifies many hilly (Garhwali) area man-eating leopards, including Corbett's Panar and Rudraprayag man-eaters also. See Kruuk 59.

[vi] Swati in her dissertation uses "hunter-protector" as a phenomenon, and it is a tool also for Corbett to achieve eminence among the elite Britons. See Swati 191, and Chapter 4.

[vii] Orientalism is the mode of presenting/interpreting the East/Orient in certain ways by the West. This chapter uses the concept of "being *Orientalized*," see Said 61. The process of being *Orientalized* is used in relation to the big cats when they disrupt the colonial desire to present the colonized subjects dependent and insignificant.

[viii] See Bentham "On the Suffering of Non-human Animals."

[ix] "othering" is a process in which the colonized become the signifiers of others in the construction of the European self. G. C. Spivak flourished "othering" as a concept fully in "The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives." This process takes place in several ways: race, class and gender. In this thesis, I have used the concept of "othering" in analysing the human and nonhuman subjects against the backdrop of the colonial missions in India. See Spivak 1985.

[x] As Wodak asserts that for Critical Discourse Analysis, "ideology" is an important aspect in establishing and maintaining unequal power relations. See Wodak 10.

[xi] White is to used denote the European/British colonials, whereas Brown stands for the Indians people.

[xii] Homi K. Bhabha's reading of the colonial discourse is mainly concerned with questioning the otherness which has been articulated in different modes, rejecting the traditional ways of

employing specific differences, in the colonial texts. This phrase accentuates the deconstructing of the text and questions the articulation of differences, entangled ambivalently. See Bhabha 97.

Chapter 2

[xiii] Since Corbett calls himself and other colonial masters "White," so this chapter uses this terminology to denote the European/British colonials, whereas Brown stands for the Indian people.

[xiv] Homi K. Bhabha's reading of the colonial discourse is mainly concerned with questioning the otherness which has been articulated in different modes, rejecting the traditional ways of employing specific differences, in the colonial texts. This phrase accentuates the deconstructing of the text and questions the articulation of differences, entangled ambivalently. See *The Location of Culture* (97).

[xv] "othering" is a process in which the colonized become the signifiers of others in the construction of the European self. G. C. Spivak flourished othering as a concept fully in "The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives" (1985). This process takes place in several ways: race, class, and gender. In this essay, I have used the concept of "othering" in analyzing a discourse about the simple rural folk of India who is geographically and socially distanced from the mainstream. It is to explore the contested nature of Jim Corbett's narrative where he is entangled in his white/brown identity, and consciously/unconsciously the racialised othering opens up prominently in the text. It is serving the dual purposes as Riggins says, "[O]thering tells more about those who do the othering than those who are being othered" (10).

[xvi] See Corbett (*My India* 162,61,154,45,87).

[xvii] The use of Lacan's distinction between Other and other emphasises its relevance in the postcolonial thought by making a difference between imperial Other and colonised other. See Bill Ashcroft et al. (156).

[xviii] I have used *Hindustani* as a race because the articulation of the word *Hindustani* was almost missing from the literature till the Europeans used it to designate a race. Kant divides the human beings into four races, "I believe that we only need to assume four races in order to be able to derive all of the enduring distinctions immediately recognizable within the human genus. They are: (1) the white race; (2) the Negro race; (3) the Hun race (Mongol or Kalmuck); and (4) The Hindu or Hindustani race" (11). See *The Idea of Race*.

[xix] Kipling and Bond's writings fall into the criterion of having close affiliations with the non-human nature. Kipling shows his fictional creativity in alliance with the nature particularly through the jungle books, whereas Bond shows his love for the Northern hills region in India. The hilly region does not confine only to a setting of the novel(la)s rather the atmosphere and the nature' elements step out to be a lively effect on the characters. See *The Jungle Book*, *A Book of Simple Living*, etc.

[xx] Kumaon region/Kumaon Province in North India was a non-regulated mountainous province of the British Raj. See Martin.

Mokameh Ghat was an essential and connecting trading/transporting railway link in eastern India. It was in the Danapur division of the East Central Railway Zone, where Corbett worked as a fuel inspector.

[xxi] The mechanism of *serving* the native country is explained through the production of truth when it plays in the hands of power, seen by lenses of Foucault's "'general politics' of truth" (131).

[xxii] *Sahib* is a means of addressing the higher authority (here in the Hindi/Kumaoni language). See <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/sahib>

[xxiii] This title revives the responsibility of the civilized white race to educate/civilise the non-white race.

[xxiv] See Bhabha (103) to go beyond the conventional ways of reading a text (mainly colonial) as embedded with oppression and discrimination and to trace the welcoming ways of the colonised people's own subjectification.

[xxv] The explanation of the French word *entre* has been taken as "between." See Hobson (85).

[xxvi] Initially, the term takes place in order to show the colonial mimicry when the colonised other is in the process to be recognised as a reformed Other. Although it is subjected to the difference, superficially appears the same but not entirely because the innate difference persists. See Bhabha (122).

[xxvii] Brahmin is an upper caste in India, maintaining its refined culture and features and plays a dominant and respectable role in Indian society. See Ambedkar (1917), and Risley (1999). Risley described the racial basis of Indian culture, particularly interested in the classification of people

based on their language, dress, colour, physical characteristics, behaviour etc. (I am using this caste description particularly in context to the pre-independence era).

[xxviii] *Bania* in Indian society is known as a businessman involved in money lending, shop keeping, and trading. See Blunt.

Chapter 3

[xxix] The Indian Forest Act 1878 reserves the forests for the government and their officials, obliquely licensing colonial hunters. The effective execution of the Arms Act that prevents Indians from manufacturing, acquiring and bearing firearms (without undergoing an exhausting process of gaining license for the arms) make Indian villagers entirely dependent on colonial hunters for protection from animals. See, for instance, The Indian Forest Act and Arms Act 1878.

[xxx] Khanna (2015) commemorates Corbett in parallel to the horrific human loss caused by the man-eaters hunted by him. He is alive in the memories of people more strongly as a destroyer of man-eaters. See Khanna.

[xxxi] "Carpet Sahib" is the popular and adored name and identity of Corbett among the indigenous hill people. The Kumaoni dialect renders the pronunciation of *Corbett* as *Carpet*, and *Sahib* is the honorific title for a British man in colonial India. Booth writes Corbett's biography titled with the same name to convey a sense of empathy with him. See Booth (1986).

Chapter 4

[xxxii] Ingold shed light on animality as a natural instinct or domain. For further reading, see Ingold ("Introduction" 4–5).

[xxxiii] Killing the man-eaters was a "sport" for Corbett. As evidenced in his account of pursuing the Champawat man-eater, "I was new to this game of man-eater hunting." See Corbett (*Man-Eaters* 19).

[xxxiv] Rebecca Bishop discusses in detail the efforts to teach the language to chimpanzees through various projects which remained successful in America. It mentions the studies of David Premack in 1970s to work on sign language with Sarah, a chimpanzee the words through the discs and then forming the sentences. In 1972, the LANA project by Duane Rumbaugh aspired the chimpanzee Lana to use lexigrams on the computer keyboard. In 1976, Francine Patterson tried for teaching sign language to gorilla Koko. In 1978, Herbert Terrace taught sign language

to Nim (chimpanzee), and H. Lyn Miles' project with orangutan Chantek. For details, see, Bishop ("Forms of Life," pp. 220-221).

Also, see, in detail E. Sue Savage-Rumbaugh et al. ("Do Apes Use Language?" pp. 49-61).

Chapter 5

[xxxv] The notion of *sameness and otherness* asserts the dubiety of the text. As the colonised subjects are fully knowable and accessible yet remain other. And at times, through the delineation of the same colonised subjects, the otherness is being put at stake by the writer.

[xxxvi] Through the story of "The Law of the Jungles," Corbett illustrates the un-harmful nature of the animals for humans. Harkwar and Kunthi builds their hut near the forest (a favourite hunting ground for Corbett) that contains five tigers; eight leopards; a family of four sloth bears; two Himalayan black bears; hyenas; wild dogs; jackals and foxes; pine martens; pythons; snakes; tawny eagles; and hundreds of vultures. Along with many other animals considered harmless to human beings like deers, antelopes, and pigs.

Harkwar and Kunthi's children Punwa (three years boy) and Putali (two years girl) get missing in the forest and are found after seventy-seven hours. Corbett writes, "[I]t would be unreasonable to assume that none of the animals or birds saw, heard, or smelt the children. And yet, when the herdsman put Putali and Punwa into their parents' arms, there was not a single mark of tooth or claw on them" (*My India* 81).

CHAPTER-WISE WORKS CITED

CHAPTER 1

Adams, Carol J. *Neither Man nor Beast: Feminism and the Defense of Animals*. Reprint ed., Lantern Books, 2015.

Adams, Carol, and Josephine Donovan, editors. *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*. Duke University Press, 1995.

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal*. Edited by Werner Hamacher, translated by Kevin Attell, Stanford University Press, 2004.

Bennett, Scott. "Shikar and the Raj." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1984, pp. 72-88, doi: 10.1080/00856408408723059.

Bentham, Jeremy. "Jeremy Bentham on the Suffering of Non-human Animals." 16 Aug. 2017, www.utilitarianism.com/jeremybentham.html.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. 3rd Indian reprint, Replica Press, 2015.

Bond, Ruskin. Introduction. *The Jim Corbett Omnibus*. Rupa Publications India. 2016, pp. v-vi.

Booth, Martin. *Carpet Sahib: A Life of Jim Corbett*. 21st imp., Oxford University Press, 2016.

Chowdhury, Iti Roy. "Man Eaters and the Eaten Man: A Study of the Portrayal of Indians in the Writings of Jim Corbett." *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*, vol. 5, no.1, 2017, pp. 37-41.

Coetzee, John Maxwell. *The Lives of Animals*, edited by Amy Gutmann. Princeton University Press, 1999.

Cooper, David E. *The Measure of Things: Humanism, Humility and Mystery*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

Corbett, Jim. *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 24th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1944).

---. *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*. 37th imp., Oxford University Press, 2014. (First published in 1947).

---. *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 39th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1954).

---. *The Second Jim Corbett Omnibus: My India, Jungle Lore, Tree Tops*. 33rd imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (This omnibus edition was first published in 1991).

---. *My Kumaon: Uncollected Writings*. 5th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 2012).

Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man, And Selection in Relation to Sex*. Princeton University Press, 1981.

Das, Prasanta. "Jim Corbett's 'Green' Imperialism." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 44, no. 15, 11-17 Apr. 2009, pp. 20-22. *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/40279127.

Gilles, Deleuze. *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton, The Athlone Press, 1994.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Corrected ed., translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

---. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. Edited by Marie-Louise Mallet, translated by David Wills, Fordham University Press, 2008.

---. *The Beast and the Sovereign*. Vol. 1, edited by Michel Lisse, Marie-Louise Mallet, and Ginette Michaud, translated by Geoffrey Bennington, The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Descartes, René. *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*. Vol. 3, translated by John Cottingham et al. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

---. *Discourse on Method*. Translated by Donald A. Cress, Hackett publishing Company, 1998.

Deshmukh, Archana. "There is a Message of Nature Conservation in Corbett's Writings." *The Times of India* [Nagpur], 27 Apr. 2014, www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/nagpur/There-is-a-message-of-nature-conservation-in-Corbetts-writings-Archana-Deshmukh/articleshow/34268420.cms

Guerrini, Anita. “The Ethics of Animal Experimentation in Seventeenth-Century England.” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 50, no. 3, Jul.-Sep. 1989, pp. 391-407.

Guha, Ramachandra. Introduction. *Lives in the Wilderness: Three Classic Indian Autobiographies*, by Jim Corbett et al. Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. v-xii. *Archive.org*, www.archive.org/stream/LivesInTheWilderness-ThreeClassicIndianAutobiographies/oup-3-in-1#page/n5/mode/2up. Accessed 26 May 2018.

Hailey. Introduction. *The Second Jim Corbett Omnibus: My India, Jungle Lore, Tree Tops*. Oxford University Press, 33rd imp., 2015, pp. 373-379.

Hallett, Maurice G. Introduction. *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*, by Jim Corbett. Oxford University Press, 1944, pp. v.

Haraway, Donna J. *When Species Meet* (Posthumanities, vol. 3), edited by Cary Wolfe, University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*. Translated by William McNeill and Nicholas Walker, Indiana University Press, 1995.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Edited by Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, translated by Edmund Jephcott, Stanford University Press, 2002.

Husserl, Edmund. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Translated by David Carr, Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Ingold, Tim. “Introduction.” *What is an Animal?* Edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 1-16.

Jaleel, Jerry A. *Under the Shadow of Man-Eaters: The Life and Legend of Jim Corbett of Kumaon*. Orient Blackswan, 2001.

Kant, Immanuel. *The Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by Mary Gregor, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

---. *Lectures on Ethics*. Edited by Peter Heath and J. B. Schneewind, translated by Peter Heath.

Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Kruuk, Hans. *Hunter and Hunted: Relationship between Carnivores and People*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Linlithgow. Foreword. *Man-eaters of Kumaon*, by Jim Corbett. Oxford University Press, 1944, pp. vii-viii.

Mandala, Vijaya Ramadas. "'Go After a Man-Eater that has Killed a Hundred People? Not on Your Life!'" *Global Environment: A Journal of History and Natural and Social Sciences*, vol. 7, The White Horse Press, 2014, pp. 572-609, doi. 10.3197/ge.2014.070212.

---. "The Raj and the Paradoxes of Wildlife Conservation: British Attitudes and Expediencies." *The Historical Journal*, vol. 58, no. 1, 2015, pp. 75-110, doi. 10.1017/S0018246X14000259.

---. *Shooting a Tiger: Big-game Hunting and Conservation in Colonial India*. Oxford University Press, 2019.

McFarland, Sarah E., and Ryan Hediger, editors. "Approaching the Agency of Other Animals: An Introduction." *Animals and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, edited by McFarland and Hediger, vol. 8, Brill, 2009, pp. 1-20.

Mhangore, G. S. "Jim Corbett's Conservationist's Approach towards the Wildlife of India." *International Journal of Advance and Applied Research*, vol. 1, no. 2, Nov-Dec. 2013, pp. 85-89.

Midgley, Mary. "Beasts, Brutes and Monsters." *What is an Animal*?, edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 35-46.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Untimely Meditations*. Edited by Daniel Breazeale, translated by R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Nikhat, Mirdhe Rabiya. *Jim Corbett as Prose Writer: A Study.* PhD Thesis, Gulbarga University, 2017, *Shodhganga*, www. hdl.handle.net/10603/183511.

Pandian, Anand S. "Predatory Care: The Imperial Hunt in Mughal and British India." *Journal of*

Historical Sociology, vol. 14, no. 1, Mar. 2001, pp. 79-107.

Plumwood, Val. *Environmental Culture: the ecological crisis of reason*. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2005, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/917896/235275. Accessed on 05 May. 2018.

Ponde, Rajendra Satyashil. *Man, Nature and Wild Life as Depicted in the Jungle Literature of Jim Corbett and Kenneth Anderson: A comparative Study*. PhD Thesis, Shivaji University, 2012, *Shodhganga*, www. hdl.handle.net/10603/25467.

Rajamannar, Shefali. *Reading the Animal in the Literature of the British Raj*. Palgrave Mcmillan, 2012.

Rangarajan, Mahesh. "The Raj and the natural world: The war against 'dangerous beasts' in colonial India." *Studies in History,* vol. 14, no. 265, 1998, pp. 265-299, doi: 10.1177/025764309801400206.

---. "Five Nature Writers: Jim Corbett, Kenneth Anderson, Salim Ali, Kailash Sankhala, and M. Krishnan." *An Illustrated History of Indian Literature in English*, edited by Arvind Krishna Mehrotra. Permanent Black, 2003, pp. 351-365.

---. *India's Wildlife History*. Permanent Black, 2017.

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: A Critique of Modernity." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities,* vol. 9, no. 1, 2017, pp. 206-215, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.21

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "Foregrounding the Animal Stance: A Critical Study of *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities,* vol. 9, no. 3, 2017, pp. 151-160, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n3.16

Roffe, Jon, and Hannah Stark. "Deleuze and the Nonhuman Turn: An Interview with Elizabeth Grosz." *Deleuze and the Non/Human*, edited by Roffe and Stark. Palgrave Mcmillan, 2015, pp. 17-24.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. 1978. Penguin Books India, 2001.

Sengupta, Tuhin. “The Aporia in the Writings of Jim Corbett: The Paradox of Preservation and Destruction.” *Galaxy: International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, vol. 4, no. 4, Jul. 2015, 157-162.

Sharma, Varun. “Rise and Fall of the ‘Man-eater’: The Changing Science and Technology of a Species (1860-present).” *History and Sociology of South Asia*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2016, pp. 53-73, doi. 10.1177/2230807515600087.

Shresth, Swati. *Sahibs and Shikar: Colonial Hunting and Wildlife in British India, 1800-1935*. PhD Dissertation, Duke University, 2009, www.dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/handle/10161/1647. Accessed on 24 Feb. 2017.

Simmons, Laurence, and Philip Armstrong. “Bestiary: An Introduction.” *Knowing Animals*, edited by Simmons and Armstrong, vol. 4, Brill, 2007, pp. 1-24.

Singh, Arjan. *The Legend of the Maneater*. Ravi Dayal Publisher, 1993.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation: The Definitive Classic of the Animal Movement*. Open Road Media e-book, 2009, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.xyz/book/2719545/6d048d. Accessed 26 May 2018.

---. “Introduction.” *The Defense of Animals: The Second Wave*, edited by Peter Singer. Blackwell Publishing, 2006, pp. 1-10.

Singh, Arjan. *The Legend of the Maneater*. Ravi Dayal Publisher, 1993.

Singh, Jairaj. “Jim Corbett and Chudail of Kumaon.” *Hindustan Times*, 07 Aug. 2012, www.hindustantimes.com/india/jim-corbett-and-the-chudail-of-kumaon/story-O42UJdjpICogxstKq7cVoJ.html.

Singh, Rameshwer, and Rimjhim Singh. “Sport and Anti Sport: Big Game Hunting in Jim Corbett’s India.” *Research Gate*, 12 Sep. 2016. www.researchgate.net/publication/304315141.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives.” *History and Theory*, vol. 24, no. 3, Oct. 1985, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/2505169. Accessed 10 Jun. 2017.

Tapper, Richard L. "Animality, Humanity, Morality, Society." *What is an Animal?*, edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 47-62.

Taylor, Jesse Oak. "Environmentalism and Imperial Manhood in Jim Corbett's *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*." *Mosaic*, vol. 40, no. 4, Dec. 2007, pp. 151-167.

Tripathi, Vandana, and Smita Sharma. "An Assessment into the Life of Jim Corbett—The Conservationist." *Academia.edu*, www.academia.edu/8071499/An_assesment_into_the_life_of_Jim_Corbett. Accessed on 17 May. 2017.

Waal, Frans de. *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved*. Edited by Stephen Macedo and Josiah Ober, Princeton University Press, 2006.

Waldau, Paul. "Religion and Animals." *In Defense of Animals: The Second Wave*, edited by Peter Singer, Blackwell Publishing, 2006, pp. 69-83.

Weil, Kari. *Thinking Animals: Why Animal Studies Now*? Columbia University Press, 2012.

Weitzenfeld, Adam, and Melanie Joy. "An Overview of Anthropocentrism, Humanism, and Speciesism in Critical Animal Theory." *Counterpoints*, vol. 448, 2014, pp. 3-27, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/42982375. Accessed on 01 Apr. 2018.

Wilde, Lawrence. "'The creatures, too, must become free': Marx and the Animal/Human Distinction." *Capital and Class*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2000, pp. 37-53, doi. 10.1177/030981680007200103.

Wodak, Ruth. "What CDA is about – a Summary of its history, important concepts and its developments." *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, Sage Publications, 2001, pp. 1-13.

Wolfe, Cary. *What is Posthumanism?* (Posthumanities 8), University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

CHAPTER 2

Ambedkar, Bhim Rao. "Castes in India: Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development." *Indian Antiquary* XLI: May 1917, www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00ambedkar/txt_ambedkar_castes.html.

Accessed 27 July 2017.

Arnold, David. “Cholera and Colonialism in British India.” *Past & Present*, no. 113, Nov. 1986, pp. 118-151. *Jstor*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/650982.

Arnold, David. “Race, place and bodily difference in early nineteenth-century India.” *Historical Research*, vol. 77, no. 196, May 2004, pp. 254-273.

Ashcroft, Bill,et al. *Post-colonial Studies: the Key Concepts*. 2nd ed., Taylor and Francis e-library, 2007.

Batra, Kanika. “‘Daughters Who Know the Languages of Power’: Community, Sexuality, and Postcolonial Development in Tess Onwueme’s *Tell it to Women*.” *Interventions*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2007, pp. 124-138, doi. 10.1080/13698010601174245

Bayly, Susan. *The New Cambridge History of India: Caste, Society and Politics in Indiafrom the Eighteenth Century to the Modern age*. Vol. 4, no. 3, 1999, Cambridge Histories Online: CambridgeUniversity Press, 2008.*b-ok.org*, http://b-ok.org/book/818353/4de437. Accessed 24 November 2017.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier, Vintage e-book, 2011. *b- ok.org*, www.b-ok.xyz/book/1317458/3be4d6. Accessed 22 September 2018.

Berenson, Frances. “Hegel on Others and the Self.” *Philosophy*, vol. 57, no. 219, Jan. 1982, pp. 77-90. *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/4619540.

Bhabha, Homi K.*The Location of Culture*. Third Indian Reprint: Replica Press, 2015.

Blunt, Edward. *The Caste System of Northern India.archive.org*, 13 January 2017, www.archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.187247/page/n0.

Bond, Ruskin. Introduction. *The Jim Corbett Omnibus*. Rupa Publications India. 2016, pp. v-vi.

Bond, Ruskin. *The Best of Ruskin Bond*. Repro Knowledgcast Ltd., 2016.

Brinckman, Arthur. *The Rifle in Cashmere*. Smith, Elder & Co., 1865, *Google Books*, http://books.google.com.

Brons, Lajos. “Othering, an Analysis.” *Transcience*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2015.

Cain, P. J. and Anthony G. Hopkins. *British Imperialism, 1688–2000*. Longman, 2002.

Cohn, Bernard S. *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton University Press, 1996.

Canny, Nicholas P. "The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 4, Oct. 1973, pp. 575-598. *Jstor*, https://www.jstor.org/stable/1918596.

Cooper, Frederick. *Colonialism in Question*: *Theory, Knowledge, History*. University of California Press, 2005.

Corbett, Jim. *My Kumaon: Uncollected Writings*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2012.

---. *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 24th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1944).

---. *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*. 37th imp., Oxford University Press, 2014. (First published in 1947).

---. *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 39th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1954).

---. *The Second Jim Corbett Omnibus: My India, Jungle Lore, Tree Tops*. 33rd imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (This omnibus edition was first published in 1991).

Dirks, Nicholas B. *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*. Princeton University Press, 2001.

Dirks, Nicholas B. Foreword. *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge—The British in India*, by Bernard S. Cohn, Princeton University Press, 1996, pp. ix-xvii.

Faber, Marion, translator. *Human, All Too Human: A book for Free Spirits*, by Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, U of Nebraska Press, 1996.

Fanon, Franz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington, Penguin Classics, 2001. (first published in 1965).

Foucault, Michael. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Edited by Colin Gordon, Translated by Colin Gordon et al.

Vintage Books: The Harvester Press, 1980.

Gadgil, Madhav and Guha, Ramachandra. *This Fissured Land*. Oxford India Perennials, 2013.

Gingrich, André. "Conceptualising Identities: Anthropological Alternatives toEssentialising Difference and Moralizing about Othering." *Grammmars of Identity/Alterity – A Structural Approach*, edited by Gerd Baumann and André Gingrich, Berghahn Books, 2006, pp. 3-17.

Hegel, Georg W.F. *The Philosophy of History*. Translated by J. Sibree, Batoche Books, 2001.

Hobson, Marian. *Jacques Derrida: Opening Lines*. 1998. Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2001. *b-ok.org*, 30 Dec 2017, http://dlx.b-ok.org/genesis/494000/bd21eaa1aa517f988ab6b694f73d1905/_as/[Dr_Marian_Hobson,_Marian_Hobson]_Jacques_Derrida(b-ok.org).pdf.

Janmohamed, Abdul R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, edited by Bill Ashcroft, et al. Taylor & Francis, e-library, 2003, *Google Books*,12 Aug 2016, pp. 18-23.

Kalua, Fetson. "Locating the Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*." *Text Writing: Text and Reception in South Africa*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2014, pp. 12-18, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.1080/1013929X.2014.897462

Kant, Immanuel. "Of the Different Human Races." *The Idea of Race*, edited by Robert Bernasconi and Tommy Lee Lott. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000, pp, 8-22.

Kennedy, Dane. "Guardians of Edenic Sanctuaries: Paharis, Lepchas, and Todas in the British mind." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol.14, no. 2, 1991, pp. 57-77, doi: 10.1080/00856409108723154.

Kipling, Rudyard. *The Jungle Book*. The Century Co., 1920.

Kipling, Rudyard. "The White Man's Burden." *Peace Review*, vol. 10, no.3, 1998, pp. 311-312, doi: 10.1080/10402659808426162.

Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits: A Selection*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, W.W. Norton & Co., 1977.

Laurie, Timothy. "Becoming Animal is a Trap for Humans: Deleuze and Guattari in *Madagascar*." *Deleuze and the Non/Human*, edited by Jon Roffe and Hannah Stark, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Linlithgow. Foreword. *Man-eaters of Kumaon*, by Jim Corbett, Oxford University Press, 1944, pp. vii-viii.

Lister, Ruth. *Poverty.* Polity Press, 2004.

MacKenzie, John M. *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and Imperialism*. Manchester University Press Series (Studies in Imperialism), 1988.

Madden, Francine. "Creating Coexistence between Humans and Wildlife: Global Perspectives on Local Efforts to Address Human–Wildlife Conflict." *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, vol. 9, 2004, pp. 247-257,doi: 10.1080/10871200490505675.

Mandala, Vijaya Ramadas. *Shooting a Tiger: Big-game Hunting and Conservation in Colonial India*. Oxford University Press, 2019.

Mangan, J.A. and Callum, McKenzie. "Pig-Sticking is the Greatest Fun': Martial Conditioning on the Hunting Fields of Empire." *Militarism, Sport, Europe: War Without Weapons*, edited by J. A. Mangan. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2005, pp. 100-122. *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.xyz/book/850069/243f99. Accessed 04 Oct. 2018.

Martin, Robert Montgomery. *History of the Possessions of the Honourable East India Company*. Vol. I. 1837, *Google Books*, 24 Nov 2017.

Maunier, Rene. *The Sociology of the Colonies [Part 1]: An Introduction to the Study of Race Contact.* Routledge, 2013. *Google Books*, 01 Jan 2017.

McCarthy, Thomas. Introduction. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, by Jürgen Habermas, translated by Frederick Lawrence, Polity Press and Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1998, pp. vii-xvii.

Metcalf, Thomas R. *The New Cambridge History of India: Ideologies of the Raj*. Vol. 3, No. 4, Cambridge Histories Online, Cambridge University Press, 2008. *Bookz.org*, www.bookzz.org/ireader/887601. Accessed 13 January 2017.

Pandian, Anand S. “Predatory Care: The Imperial Hunt in Mughal and British India.” *Journal of Historical Sociology*, vol. 14, no. 1, Mar. 2001, pp. 79-107.

Pennycook, Alastair. *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2002,*bookz.org*, 30 Aug 2016, www.bookzz.org/ireader/689268.

Raheja, Gloria Goodwin. “Caste, Colonialism, and the Speech of the Colonized: Entextualization and Disciplinary Control in India.”*American Ethnologist*, vol. 23, no. 3, Aug 1996, 494-513, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/646349.

Rajamannar, Shefali. *Reading the Animal in the Literature of the British Raj*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. “*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: A Critique of Modernity.” *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2017, pp. 206-215, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.21

Riggins, Stephen Harold. “The Rhetoric of Othering.” *The Language and Politics of Exclusion – Others in Discourse*, edited by Riggins, Sage, 1997, pp. 1-30.

Risley, Herbert Hope. *The People of India*. 2nd ed., edited by William Crooke. Asian Educational Services, 1999, *Google Books*, 14 Apr 2017.

Sartre, Jean Paul. Preface. *The Wretched of the Earth*, by Franz Fanon, translated by Constance Farrington, Penguin Classics, 2001, pp. 7-26.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Penguin Books India, 2001.

Shiva, Vandana. *Making Peace with the Earth*. Women Unlimited, 2015.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives.” *History and Theory*, vol. 24, no. 3, Oct. 1985, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/2505169.

Stokes, Eric. *The Political Ideas of English Imperialism: An Inaugural Lecture*. College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Shresth, Swati. *Sahibs and Shikar: Colonial Hunting and Wildlife in British India, 1800-1935*. PhD Dissertation, Duke University, 2009, www.dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/handle/10161/1647. Accessed 24 February 2017.

The Arms Act, 1878. www.bdlaws.minlaw.gov.bd/print_sections_all.php?id=38. Accessed 10 April 2017.

Tolen, Rachel J. "Colonizing and Transforming the Criminal Tribesman: The Salvation Army in British India." *Deviant Bodies: Critical Perspectives on Difference in Science and Popular Culture*, edited by Jennifer Terry and Jacqueline Urla, Indiana University Press, 1995, pp. 78-108.

Wardrop, Major A. E. *Modern Pig-Sticking*. Macmillan and Co., 1914. *Archive.org*, 27 September 2018, www.archive.org/stream/modernpigstickin00ward#page/n7.

CHAPTER 3

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal.* Edited by Werner Hamacher, translated by Kevin Attell, Stanford University Press, 2004.

Anderson, Kay. "'The beast within': race, humanity, and animality." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 18, 2000, pp. 301-320, doi:10.1068/d229.

Arnold, David. *The New Cambridge History of India: Science, Technology and Medicine in Colonial India*. Vol. III.5, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Benedict, Ruth. *Race: Science and Politics*. Modern Age Books, 1940.

Bennett, Scott. "Shikar and the Raj." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1984, pp. 72-88, doi: 10.1080/00856408408723059.

Blake, William. "William Blake Poems." PoemHunter.com-The World's Poetry Archive, 2004. *libgen.io*, www.libgen.io/book/index.php?md5=7FB7B7D88AE242CCF3B5D27AE0C54108. Accessed 07 Jan. 2019.

Booth, Martin. *Carpet Sahib: A Life of Jim Corbett*. 21st imp., Oxford University Press, 2016.

Calarco, Matthew. "Theorizing Animals: Heidegger, Derrida, Agamben." *Animals, Animality, Literature*, edited by Bruce Boehrer et al. Cambridge University Press, 2018, pp. 248-264.

Cartmill, Matt. *A View to A Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature Through History*. Harvard University Press, 1996.

Colley, Linda. "Britishness and Otherness: An Argument." *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 31, no. 4, October 1992, pp 309-329, doi: 10.1086/386013.

Corbett, Jim. *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 24th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1944).

---. *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*. 37th imp., Oxford University Press, 2014. (First published in 1947).

---. *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 39th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1954).

---. *The Second Jim Corbett Omnibus: My India, Jungle Lore, Tree Tops*. 33rd imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (This omnibus edition was first published in 1991).

Crane, Ralph, and Lisa Fletcher. "Picturing the Indian Tiger: Imperial Iconography in the Nineteenth Century." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 42, 2014, pp. 369–386, doi: 10.1017/S1060150314000047.

Derrida, Jacques. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. Edited by Marie-Louise Mallet, translated by David Wills, Fordham University Press, 2008.

Divyabhanusinh. "Lions, Cheetahs, and Others in the Mughal Landscape." *Shifting Ground: People, Animals, and Mobility in India's Environmental History*, edited by Mahesh Rangarajan and K. Sivaramakrishnan, Oxford Scholarship Online, 2015, E-book, *libgen.io*, www.libgen.io/book/index.php?md5=1AE641E9CFEA5FBE27ED7BAB9334FCEB. Accessed 07 Jan. 2019.

Donald, Diana. *Picturing Animals in Britain 1750–1850*. Yale University Press, 2007.

Gandhi, Mohandas K. *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. E-book, *library genesis*, 10 Dec. 2018, www.gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=67CCBC150619AAEC1B2E260B17E8E3C1.

Gill, Stephen. “Stephen Gill on His Writing and Diaspora: An Interview,” interviewed by Nilanshu Kumar Agarwal. *Contemporary Vibes*, vol. 4, no. 14, 2009, pp. 33-38.

Gillespie, Greg. “The Empire’s Eden: British Hunters, Travel Writing, and Imperialism in Nineteenth-Century Canada.” *The Culture of Hunting in Canada*, edited by Jean L. Manore & Dale G. Miner. UBC Press, 2007, pp. 42-55.

Haggan, Graham, and Helen Tiffin. *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environment*. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2009, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/1165227/e125f2. Accessed 09 May 2017.

Haraway, Donna. *When Species Meet* (Posthumanities, vol. 3), edited by Cary Wolfe, University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Ingold, Tim. “Humanity and Animality.” *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture and Social Life*, edited by Tim Ingold, Taylor and Francis e-library, 2003, pp. 3-13, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/662540/83db93. Accessed 20 Apr. 2018.

Jalais, Annu. “Unmasking the Cosmopolitan Tiger.” *Nature and Culture*, vol. 3, no. 1, Spring 2008, pp. 25-40, doi: doi:10.3167/nc.2008.030103.

Khanna, Anupma. “Remembering Corbett! A Legend, man of many parts.” *The Pioneer*. 26 Jul. 2016, Dehradun, www.dailypioneer.com/todays-newspaper/remembering-corbett-a-legend-man-of-many-parts.html. Accessed 20 Jan. 2018.

Latour, Bruno. *The Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy.* Translated by Catherine Porter, Harvard University Press, 2004.

Lawes, Kim. *Paternalism and Politics: The Revival of Paternalism in Early Nineteenth Century Britain*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.

MacKenzie, John M. Introduction. *Colonial Masculinity: The ‘Manly Englishman’ and ‘The Effeminate Bengali’ in the Late Nineteenth Century*, by Mrinalini Sinha. Manchester University Press, 1995.

MacKenzie, John M. *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and Imperialism*. Manchester University Press Series (Studies in Imperialism), 1988.

Mandala, Vijaya Ramadas. “The Raj and the Paradoxes of Wildlife Conservation: British Attitudes and Expediencies.” *The Historical Journal*, vol. 58, no. 1, 2015, pp. 75-110, doi.10.1017/S0018246X14000259.

Mandala, Vijaya Ramadas. *Shooting a Tiger: Big Game Hunting and Conservation in Colonial India*. Oxford University Press, 2019.

Mangan, J. A., and Callum Mckenzie. “‘Pig-Sticking is the Greatest Fun’: Martial Conditioning on the Hunting Fields of Empire.” *Militarism, Sport, Europe: War Without Weapons*, edited by J.A. Mangan. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2005, pp. 100-122, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.xyz/book/850069/243f99. Accessed 04 Oct. 2018.

Mangan, J. A., and Callum Mckenzie. “The other side of the coin: Victorian masculinity, field sports and English elite education.” *A Sport-Loving Society: Victorian and Edwardian middle-class England at play*, edited by J. A. Mangan. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2006, pp. 41-59, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.cc/book/915339/4c55cd. Accessed 04 Oct. 2018.

Mangan, J. A., and James Walvin. Introduction. *Manliness and Morality: Middle-class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*, edited by J. A. Mangan and James Walvin, Manchester University Press, 1987, pp. 1-6.

Matikkala, Mira. *Empire and Imperial Ambition: Liberty, Englishness and Anti-Imperialism in Late-Victorian Britain*. I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2011.

Midgley, Mary. “Beasts, Brutes and Monsters.” *What is an Animal*?, edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 35-46.

Morison, Theodore. *Imperial Rule in India: Being an Examination of the Principles Proper to the Government of Dependencies*. A. Constable & Co., 1899, *archive.org*, www.ia802605.us.archive.org/12/items/imperialruleinin031364mbp/imperialruleinin031364mbp.pdf. Accessed 03 Jan. 2017.

Mukherjee, Sujit. “Tigers in Fiction: An Aspect of the Colonial Encounter.” *Kunapipi*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1987, pp. 1-13.

Nath, Dipika. ““To Abandon the Colonial Animal”: “Race,” Animals and the Feral Child in

Kipling's Mowgli Stories." *Animal and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration,* edited by Sarah E McFarland and Ryan Hediger, Brill, 2009, pp. 251-277.

Pandey, Surya Nath. "Angularities of a Prodigal Son: Colonial Approach to Dom Moraes' Poetry." *Writing in a Postcolonial Space*, edited by Surya Nath Pandey, Atlantic Publisher, 1999, pp. 65-76.

Pandian, Anand S. "Predatory Care: The Imperial Hunt in Mughal and British India." *Journal of Historical Sociology*, vol. 14, no. 1, Mar. 2001, pp. 79-107.

Patterson, Steven. *The Cult of Imperial Honor in British India*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Plumwood, Val. "Decolonizing Relationships with Nature." *Decolonizing Nature: Strategies for Conservation in a Post-colonial Era*, edited by William M Adams and Martin Mulligan, Earthscan Publications Ltd, 2003, pp. 51-78.

Rajamannar, Shefali. *Reading the Animal in the Literature of the British Raj*. Palgrave Mcmillan, 2012.

Rangarajan, Mahesh. *Fencing the Forest: Conservation and Ecological Change in India's Central Provinces, 1860-1914*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

---. "The Raj and the natural world: The war against 'dangerous beasts' in colonial India." *Studies in History*, vol. 14, no. 265, 1998, pp. 265-299, doi:10.1177/025764309801400206.

---. *India's Wildlife History*. Permanent Black, 2017.

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: A Critique of Modernity." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2017, pp. 206-215, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.21

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "Foregrounding the Animal Stance: A Critical Study of *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities,* vol. 9, no. 3, 2017, pp. 151-160, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n3.16

Ritvo, Harriet. *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age*.

Harvard University Press, 1987.

Satia, Priya. *Empire of Guns: The Violent Making of the Industrial Revolution*. Penguin Press, e-book, 2018, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/3524878/6466b6. Accessed 10 Dec. 2018

Schell, Heather. "Tiger Tales." *Victorian Animal Dreams: Representations of Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture*, edited by Deborah Denenholz Morse and Martin A. Danahay, Routledge, 2017, pp. 229-248.

Shaw, George Bernard. *Man and Superman: a Comedy and a Philosophy*. Indiana, 2008.

Singh, Abhijeet. "Gun Ownership in India." *abhijeetsingh.com*, www.abhijeetsingh.com/arms/india/. Accessed 10 Dec. 2018.

Singh, Arjan. *The Legend of the Maneater*. Ravi Dayal Publisher, 1993.

Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: The 'Manly Englishman' and 'The Effeminate Bengali' in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Manchester University Press, 1995.

Sramek, Joseph. ""Face Him like a Briton": Tiger Hunting, Imperialism, and British Masculinity in Colonial India, 1800-1875." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 48, no. 4, 2006, pp. 659-680, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/4618910.

Stepan, Nancy Leys. "*The Hour of Eugenics*": *Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America*. Cornel University, 1991.

Strauss, Claude Lévi. *Structural Anthropology*. Vol. 2, translated by Monique Layton, Allen Lane, 1977.

Tapper, Richard L. "Animality, Humanity, Morality, Society." *What is an Animal?*, edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 47-62.

Taylor, Jesse Oak. "Environmentalism and Imperial Manhood in Jim Corbett's *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*." *Mosaic*, vol. 40, no. 4, Dec. 2007, pp. 151-167.

The Arms Act, 1878. www.bdlaws.minlaw.gov.bd/print_sections_all.php?id=38. Accessed 10 Apr. 2017.

The Forest Act, 1878. www.bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/oldlegislation/1878.07.pdf. Accessed 10 Apr. 2017.

Tiwari, Bhavya. “Rabindranath Tagore’s Comparative World Literature.” *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*, edited by Theo D’haen et al., 2012, pp. 41-48.

Wolfe, Cary. *What is Posthumanism?* (Posthumanities 8), University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Wynn, Graeme. Foreword. *Hunting for Empire: Narratives of Sport in Rupert’s Land, 1840-70*, by Greg Gillespie. UBC Press, 2007, pp. xi-xx.

CHAPTER 4

Armstrong, Philip. “The Postcolonial Animal.” *Society and Animals*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2002, pp. 413-419.

Bekoff, Marc, and Jessica Pierce. *Wild Justice: The Moral Lives of Animals*. The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Birke, Lynda. “Intimate Familiarities? Feminism and Human-Animal Studies.” *Society and Animals*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2002, pp. 429-436.

Bishop, Rebecca. “Forms of Life: The Search for the Simian Self in Ape Language Experiments.” *Animal and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, edited by Sarah E. McFarland and Ryan Hediger, Brill, 2009, pp. 207-228.

Bloom, Paul. “Can a Dog Learn a Word.” *Science*, vol.304, no. 5677, 2004, pp. 1605-1606, doi: 10.1126/science.1099899

Borregoa, Natalia. “Big cats as a model system for the study of the evolution of intelligence.” *Behavioural Processes*, vol. 141, 2017, pp. 261–266, www.dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2017.03.010

Bracke, M. B. M., and H. Hopster. “Assessing the Importance of Natural Behavior For Animal Welfare.” *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, vol. 19, 2006, pp. 77-89, doi:10.1007/s10806-005-4493-7

Buller, Henry. “Animal geographies I.” *Progress in Human Geography*, 2013, doi: 10.1177/0309132513479295

Caplan, Lionel. “‘Bravest of the Brave’: Representations of ‘The Gurkha’ in British Military

Writings." *Modern Asian Studies*, vol. 25, no. 3, Jul. 1991, pp 571-597, doi: 10.1017/S0026749X00013937

Chanchani, P. et al. "Status and Conservation of Tigers and their Prey in the Uttar Pradesh Terai." WWF India, 2014.

Clark, Stephen R. L. "Is Humanity a Natural Kind." *What is an Animal?* Edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 17-34.

Corbett, Jim. *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 24th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1944).

---. *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*. 37th imp., Oxford University Press, 2014. (First published in 1947).

---. *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 39th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1954).

---. *The Second Jim Corbett Omnibus: My India, Jungle Lore, Tree Tops*. 33rd imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (This omnibus edition was first published in 1991).

Dangwal, Dhirendra Datt. "Commercialisation of Forests, Timber Extraction and Deforestation in Uttaranchal, 1815-1947." *Conservation & Society*, vol. 3, no. 1, Jan.-Jun. 2005, pp. 110-133, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/26396602. Accessed 05 Jan. 2019.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Corrected ed., translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

---. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. Edited by Marie-Louise Mallet, translated by David Wills, Fordham University Press, 2008.

---. *The Beast and the Sovereign*. Vol. 1, edited by Michel Lisse, Marie-Louise Mallet, and Ginette Michaud, translated by Geoffrey Bennington, The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Divyabhanusinh. "Lions, Cheetahs, and Others in the Mughal Landscape." *Shifting Ground: People, Animals, and Mobility in India's Environmental History*, edited by Mahesh Rangarajan and K. Sivaramakrishnan, Oxford Scholarship Online, 2015, E-book,

libgen.io, www.libgen.io/book/index.php?md5=1AE641E9CFEA5FBE27ED7BAB9334FCEB. Accessed 07 Jan. 2019.

Douglas, Mary. *Implicit Meanings: Selected Essays in Anthropology*. 2nd ed., Taylor and Francis e-library, 2001, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.xyz/book/1177800/30ba73. Accessed 27 May, 2018.

Edgaonkar, Advait, and RAVY CHELLAM. "Food habit of the leopard, Panthera pardus, in the Sanjay Gandhi National Park, Maharashtra, India." *Mammalia*, vol. 66, no. 3, 2002, pp. 353-360, doi: 10.1515/mamm.2002.66.3.353

English, Richard. "Himalayan State Formation and the Impact of British Rule in the Nineteenth Century." *Mountain Research and Development*, vol. 5, no. 1, Feb. 1985, pp. 61-78, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/3673223. Accessed: 05 Jan. 2019.

Friend, Tim. *Animal Talk: Breaking the Codes of Animal Language.* Free Press, 2004.

Gillespie, Greg. "The Empire's Eden: British Hunters, Travel Writing, and Imperialism in Nineteenth-Century Canada." *The Culture of Hunting in Canada*, edited by Jean L. Manore & Dale G. Miner. UBC Press, 2007, pp. 42-55.

Guha, Ramachandra. "Forestry in British and Post-British India: A Historical Analysis." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 18, no. 44, Oct. 1983, pp. 1882-1896, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/4372653. Accessed: 07 Jan. 2019.

Herda-Rapp, Ann, and Karen G. Marotz. "Contested Meanings: The Social Construction of the Mourning Dove in Wisconsin." *Mad about Wildlife: Looking at social conflict over wildlife*, edited by Ann Herda-Rapp and Theresa L. Goedeke, BRILL, 2005, pp. 73-98.

Haggan, Graham, and Helen Tiffin. *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environment*. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2009, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/1165227/e125f2. Accessed 09 May 2017.

Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature: A Critical Edition.* Vol. 1, edited by David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton, Oxford University Press, 2007.

Ingold, Tim. “Introduction.” *What is an Animal?* Edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 1-16.

Kalua, Fetson. “Locating the Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse in Joseph Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness*.” *Current Writing: Text and Reception in Southern Africa*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2014, pp. 12-18, doi. www.dx.doi.org/10.1080/1013929X.2014.897462

Kaminski, Juliane, et al. “Word Learning in a Domestic Dog: Evidence for ‘Fast Mapping.’” *Science*, vol. 304, no.5677, Jun. 2004, pp. 1682-1683, doi: 10.1126/science.1097859

Kemmerer, Lisa. *In Search of Consistency: Ethics and Animals*. BRILL, 2006.

Kisling, Vernon N., editor. *Zoo and Aquarium History: Ancient Animal Collections to Zoological Gardens*. CRC Press, 2001.

Kruuk, Hans. *Hunter and Hunted: Relationship between Carnivores and People*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Law, John. *After Actor Network Theory: complexity, naming and topology*. The Editorial Board of The Sociological Review, Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Lundblad, Michael. “From Animal to Animality Studies.” *PMLA*, vol. 124, no. 2, 2009, pp. 496-502.

Macedo, Stephen, and Josiah Ober. Introduction. *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved*, edited by Macedo and Ober, Princeton University Press, 2006, pp. ix-xix.

Mallet, Marie-Louise. Foreword. *The Animal That Therefore I am*, by Jacques Derrida. Fordham University Press, 2008, pp. ix-xiii.

Marvin, Garry. “The Problem of Foxes: Legitimate and Illegitimate Killing in the English Countryside.” *Natural Enemies: People-Wildlife Conflicts in Anthropological Perspective*, edited by John Knight, Routledge, 2000, pp. 189-211.

Mayer, Jed. “Representing the Experimental Animal: Competing Voices in Victorian Culture.” *Animal and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, edited by Sarah E. McFarland and Ryan Hediger, Brill, 2009, pp. 183-205.

McFarland, Sarah E., and Ryan Hediger, editors. “Approaching the Agency of Other Animals:

An Introduction." *Animals and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, edited by McFarland and Hediger, vol. 8, Brill, 2009, pp. 1-20.

Miller, John. *Empire and the Animal Body: Violence, Identity and Ecology in Victorian Adventure Fiction*. Anthem Press, 2014.

Mishra, Ajit K. "Navigating Precarity: (Re)mediation, Agency, and Human Security in *Airlift*." *Literary Endeavour*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2019, pp. 337-342.

Mukherjee, Akaitab, and Rajni Singh. "From Postcolonial Vision of Nature to Ecocinema: A Study of Satyajit Ray's *Aranyer Din Ratri* and Goutam Ghose's *Abar Aranye*." *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2017, pp. 224-242. DOI: 10.1093/isle/isw045.

Mukherjee, Upamanyu Pablo. *Postcolonial Environments: Nature, Culture and the Contemporary Indian Novel in English*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Munro, Lyle. *Confronting Cruelty: Moral Orthodoxy and the Challenge of the Animal Rights Movement*. BRILL, 2005.

Pepperberg, Irene M. "Grey parrots do not always 'parrot': the roles of imitation and phonological awareness in the creation of new labels from existing vocalizations." *Language Sciences*, vol. 29, 2007, pp. 1-13, doi:10.1016/j.langsci.2005.12.002

Philo, Chris, and Chris Wilbert. "Animal spaces, beastly places: an introduction." *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: New geographies of human—animal relations*, edited by Philo and Wilbert. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2005, pp. 1-35, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/886972/59104e. Accessed 05 Jan. 2018.

Rangarajan, Mahesh. *India's Wildlife History*. Permanent Black, 2017.

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: A Critique of Modernity." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2017, pp. 206-215, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.21

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "Foregrounding the Animal Stance: A Critical Study of *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in*

Humanities, vol. 9, no. 3, 2017, pp. 151-160, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n3.16

Ravichandran, T. "Beyond Nation, Region and Ideology: The Hyperreal Locale in Postmodern Films." *Research and Criticism,* Banaras Hindu University, pp. 23-28.

Ritvo, Harriet. *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age.* Harvard University Press, 1987.

Sanderson, George P. *Thirteen Years Among The Wild Beasts of India: Their Haunts and Habits from Personal Observation with an Account of the Modes of Capturing and Taming Elephants.* Mittal Publications, 1983.

Sapontzis, Steve F. *Morals, reason, and animals.* Temple University Press, 1987.

Sarkar,Oyndrila. "The Great Trigonometrical Survey: Histories of Mapping 1790-1850." eTraverse, *The Indian Journal of Spatial Science,* vol. 3, no.1, 2012, pp. 1-6.

Savage-Rumbaugh, Sue E., et al. "Do Apes Use Language? One research group considers the evidence for representational ability in apes." *American Scientist,* vol. 68, no. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1980, pp. 49-61, *Jstor,* www.jstor.org/stable/27849719. Accessed 10 Jan. 2019.

Seidenberg, Mark S., and Laura A Petitto. "Signing behavior in apes: A critical review." *Cognition,* vol. l, 1979, pp. 177 – 215.

Sharma, Varun. "Rise and Fall of the 'Man-eater': The Changing Science and Technology of a Species (1860-present)." *History and Sociology of South Asia,* vol. 10, no.1, 2016, pp. 53-73, doi: 10.1177/2230807515600087

Shettleworth, Sara J. "Animal cognition and animal behaviour." *Animal Behaviour,* vol. 61, 2001, pp. 277–286, doi:10.1006/anbe.2000.1606

Sillero-Zubiri, Claudio, and Karen Laurenson. "Interaction between carnivores and local communities: Conflict or co-existence?" Proceedings of a Carnivore Conservation Symposia, edited by J Gittleman et al., Zoological Society of London, 2001, pp. 282-312, *b-ok.org,* 03 Jan. 2017

www.dlx.b-ok.org/genesis/470000/da557f6ba027a02c0e737c56b77c4122/_as/[Rosie_Woodroffe,_Simon_Thirgood,_Alan_Rabinowitz](b-ok.org).pdf

Sramek, Joseph. ""Face Him like a Briton": Tiger Hunting, Imperialism, and British Masculinity in Colonial India, 1800-1875." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 48, no. 4, 2006, pp. 659-680, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/4618910

Steward, Helen. "Animal Agency." *Inquiry*, vol. 52, no. 3, 2009, 217-231, doi: 10.1080/00201740902917119

Szarycz, Gregory S. "The Representation of Animal Actors: Theorizing Performance and Performativity in the Animal Kingdom." *Theorizing Animals: Rethinking Humanimal Relations*, edited by Nik Taylor and Tania Signal, BRILL, 2011, pp. 149-174.

Tapper, Richard L. "Animality, Humanity, Morality, Society." *What is an Animal?*, edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 47-62.

Taylor, Nik. "Animals, Mess, Method: Post-humanism, Sociology and Animal Studies." *Crossing Boundaries: Investigating Human-Animal Relationships*, edited by Lynda Birke and Jo Hockenhull, BRILL, 2012, pp. 37-50.

Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800*. Penguin Books, 1984.

Thomas, Roger K. "Investigating Cognitive Abilities in Animals: Unrealized Potential." *Cognitive Brain Research*, vol. 3, 1996, pp. 157-166.

Tucker, Richard P. "Dimensions of Deforestation in the Himalaya: The Historical Setting." *Mountain Research and Development*, vol. 7, no. 3, Aug. 1987, pp. 328-331, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/3673213. Accessed 05 Jan. 2019.

Waal, Frans de. *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved*. Edited by Stephen Macedo and Josiah Ober, Princeton University Press, 2006.

Weil, Kari. *Thinking Animals: Why Animal Studies Now*? Columbia University Press, 2012.

Wilbert, Chris. "What is Doing the Killing? Animal Attacks, Man-Eaters, and Shifting

Boundaries and Flows of Human-Animal Relations." *Killing Animals*, by The Animal Studies Group, University of Illinois Press, 2006, pp. 30-49.

CHAPTER 5

Corbett, Jim. *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 24th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1944).

---. *The Second Jim Corbett Omnibus: My India, Jungle Lore, Tree Tops*. 33rd imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (This omnibus edition was first published in 1991).

Haraway, Donna J. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, 1991.

Lundblad, Michael. "From Animal to Animality Studies." *PMLA*, vol. 124, no. 2, 2009, pp. 496-502.

MacKenzie, John M. *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and Imperialism*. Manchester University Press, 1988.

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: A Critique of Modernity." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2017, pp. 206-215, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.21

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "Foregrounding the Animal Stance: A Critical Study of *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2017, pp. 151-160, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n3.16

Sartre, Jean-Paul. Introduction. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, by Albert Memmi. Earthscan Publications Ltd., 2003, pp. 17-25.

Storey, William K. "Big Cats and Imperialism: Lion and Tiger Hunting in Kenya and Northern India, 1898-1930," *Journal of World History*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1991, pp. 135-173.

Bibliography

Adams, Carol J. *Neither Man nor Beast: Feminism and the Defense of Animals*. Reprint ed., Lantern Books, 2015.

Adams, Carol, and Josephine Donovan, editors. *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*. Duke University Press, 1995.

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal*. Edited by Werner Hamacher, translated by Kevin Attell, Stanford University Press, 2004.

Ambedkar, Bhim Rao. "Castes in India: Their Mechanism, Genesis and Development." *Indian Antiquary* XLI: May 1917, www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00ambedkar/txt_ambedkar_castes.html. Accessed 27 July 2017.

Anderson, Kay. "'The beast within': race, humanity, and animality." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 18, 2000, pp. 301-320, doi:10.1068/d229.

Anderson, Kenneth. *The Kenneth Anderson Omnibus: Tales from Indian Jungles, Man-Eaters and Jungle Killers*. Vol. 1, Rupa Publications, 2014.

Arnold, David. "Cholera and Colonialism in British India." *Past & Present*, no. 113, Nov. 1986, pp. 118-151. *Jstor*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/650982.

---. "Race, place and bodily difference in early nineteenth-century India." *Historical Research*, vol. 77, no. 196, May 2004, pp. 254-273.

---. *The New Cambridge History of India: Science, Technology and Medicine in Colonial India*. Vol. III.5, Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Armstrong, Philip. "The Postcolonial Animal." *Society and Animals*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2002, pp. 413-419.

Armstrong, Philip. *What Animals Mean in the Fiction of Modernity*. Routledge, 2008.

Ashcroft, Bill, et al. *Post-colonial Studies: the Key Concepts*. 2nd ed., Taylor and Francis e-library, 2007.

Batra, Kanika. "'Daughters Who Know the Languages of Power': Community, Sexuality, and Postcolonial Development in Tess Onwueme's *Tell it to Women*." *Interventions*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2007, pp. 124-138, doi. 10.1080/13698010601174245

Bayly, Susan. *The New Cambridge History of India: Caste, Society and Politics in India from the Eighteenth Century to the Modern age*. Vol. 4, no. 3, 1999, Cambridge Histories Online: Cambridge University Press, 2008. *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/818353/4de437. Accessed 24 Nov. 2017.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier, Vintage e-book, 2011. *b- ok.org*, www.b-ok.xyz/book/1317458/3be4d6. Accessed 22 Sept. 2018.

Bekoff, Marc, and Jessica Pierce. *Wild Justice: The Moral Lives of Animals*. The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Benedict, Ruth. *Race: Science and Politics*. Modern Age Books, 1940.

Bennett, Scott. "Shikar and the Raj." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1984, pp. 72-88, doi: 10.1080/00856408408723059.

Bentham, Jeremy. "Jeremy Bentham on the Suffering of Non-human Animals." 16 Aug. 2017, www.utilitarianism.com/jeremybentham.html.

Berenson, Frances. "Hegel on Others and the Self." *Philosophy*, vol. 57, no. 219, Jan. 1982, pp. 77-90. *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/4619540.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Third Indian Reprint: Replica Press, 2015.

Birke, Lynda. "Intimate Familiarities? Feminism and Human-Animal Studies." *Society and Animals*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2002, pp. 429-436.

Birke, Lynda, and Jo Hockenhull, editors. *Crossing Boundaries: Investigating Human-Animal Relationships*. BRILL, 2012.

Bishop, Rebecca. "Forms of Life:The Search for the Simian Self in Ape Language Experiments." *Animal and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, edited by Sarah E. McFarland and Ryan Hediger, Brill, 2009, pp. 207-228.

Blake, William. “William Blake Poems.” PoemHunter.com-The World’s Poetry Archive, 2004. *libgen.io*, www.libgen.io/book/index.php?md5=7FB7B7D88AE242CCF3B5D27AE0C54108. Accessed 07 Jan. 2019.

Bloom, Paul. “Can a Dog Learn a Word.” *Science*, vol. 304, no. 5677, 2004, pp. 1605-1606, doi: 10.1126/science.1099899

Blunt, Edward. *The Caste System of Northern India. archive.org*, 13 Jan. 2017, www.archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.187247/page/n0.

Bond, Ruskin. Introduction. *The Jim Corbett Omnibus*. Rupa Publications India. 2016, pp. v-vi.

---. *The Best of Ruskin Bond*. Repro Knowledgcast Ltd., 2016.

Booth, Martin. *Carpet Sahib: A Life of Jim Corbett*. 21st imp., Oxford University Press, 2016.

Borregoa, Natalia. “Big cats as a model system for the study of the evolution of intelligence.” *Behavioural Processes*, vol. 141, 2017, pp. 261–266, www.dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2017.03.010

Bracke, M. B. M., and H. Hopster. “Assessing the Importance of Natural Behavior For Animal Welfare.” *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics,* vol. 19, 2006, pp. 77-89, doi:10.1007/s10806-005-4493-7

Brinckman, Arthur. *The Rifle in Cashmere*. Smith, Elder & Co., 1865, *Google Books*, www.books.google.com.

Brons, Lajos. “Othering, an Analysis.” *Transcience*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2015.

Buller, Henry. “Animal geographies I.” *Progress in Human Geography*, 2013, doi: 10.1177/0309132513479295

Burton, Edmund Francis. *Reminiscences of Sport in India*. W. H. Allen & Co., 1885.

---. *An Indian Olio*. Spencer Blackett, 1888.

Cain, P. J. and Anthony G. Hopkins. *British Imperialism, 1688–2000*. Longman, 2002.

Calarco, Matthew. “Theorizing Animals: Heidegger, Derrida, Agamben.” *Animals, Animality, Literature*, edited by Bruce Boehrer et al. Cambridge University Press, 2018, pp. 248-

264.

Canny, Nicholas P. “The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America.” *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 4, Oct. 1973, pp. 575-598. *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/1918596.

Caplan, Lionel. “‘Bravest of the Brave’: Representations of ‘The Gurkha’ in British Military Writings.” *Modern Asian Studies*, vol. 25, no. 3, Jul. 1991, pp 571-597, doi: 10.1017/S0026749X00013937

Cartmill, Matt. *A View to A Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature Through History*. Harvard University Press, 1996.

Chagani, Fayaz. “Can the Postcolonial Animal Speak?” *Society and Animals*, 24, 2016, 619-637, doi: 10.1163/15685306-12341421

Chanchani, P. et al. “Status and Conservation of Tigers and their Prey in the Uttar Pradesh Terai.” WWF India, 2014.

Chowdhury, Iti Roy. “Man Eaters and the Eaten Man: A Study of the Portrayal of Indians in the Writings of Jim Corbett.” *Research Journal of English Language and Literature*, vol. 5, no.1, 2017, pp. 37-41.

Clark, Stephen R. L. “Is Humanity a Natural Kind.” *What is an Animal?* Edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 17-34.

Coetzee, John Maxwell. *The Lives of Animals*, edited by Amy Gutmann. Princeton University Press, 1999.

Cohn, Bernard S. *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton University Press, 1996.

Colley, Linda. “Britishness and Otherness: An Argument.” *The Journal of British Studies*, vol. 31, no. 4, October 1992, pp 309-329, doi: 10.1086/386013.

Cooper, David E. *The Measure of Things: Humanism, Humility and Mystery*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

Cooper, Frederick. *Colonialism in Question*: *Theory, Knowledge, History*. University of

California Press, 2005.

Corbett, Jim. *My Kumaon: Uncollected Writings*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2012.

---. *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 24th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1944).

---. *The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*. 37th imp., Oxford University Press, 2014. (First published in 1947).

---. *The Temple Tiger and More Man-Eaters of Kumaon*. 39th imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (First published in 1954).

---. *The Second Jim Corbett Omnibus: My India, Jungle Lore, Tree Tops*. 33rd imp., Oxford University Press, 2015. (This omnibus edition was first published in 1991).

Crane, Ralph, and Lisa Fletcher. "Picturing the Indian Tiger: Imperial Iconography in the Nineteenth Century." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 42, 2014, pp. 369–386, doi: 10.1017/S1060150314000047.

Dangwal, Dhirendra Datt. "Commercialisation of Forests, Timber Extraction and Deforestation in Uttaranchal, 1815-1947." *Conservation & Society*, vol. 3, no. 1, Jan.-Jun. 2005, pp. 110-133, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/26396602. Accessed 05 Jan. 2019.

Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man, And Selection in Relation to Sex*. Princeton University Press, 1981.

Das, Prasanta. "Jim Corbett's 'Green' Imperialism." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 44, no. 15, 11-17 Apr. 2009, pp. 20-22. *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/40279127.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Corrected ed., translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

---. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. Edited by Marie-Louise Mallet, translated by David Wills, Fordham University Press, 2008.

---. *The Beast and the Sovereign*. Vol. 1, edited by Michel Lisse, Marie-Louise Mallet, and Ginette Michaud, translated by Geoffrey Bennington, The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Descartes, René. *The Philosophical Writings of Descartes*. Vol. 3, translated by John Cottingham et al. Cambridge University Press, 1991.

--- . *Discourse on Method*. Translated by Donald A. Cress, Hackett publishing Company, 1998.

Deshmukh, Archana. "There is a Message of Nature Conservation in Corbett's Writings." *The Times of India* [Nagpur], 27 Apr. 2014, www.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/nagpur/There-is-a-message-of-nature-conservation-in-Corbetts-writings-Archana-Deshmukh/articleshow/34268420.cms

Dirks, Nicholas B. Foreword. *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge—The British in India*, by Bernard S. Cohn, Princeton University Press, 1996, pp. ix-xvii.

---. *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*. Princeton University Press, 2001.

Divyabhanusinh. "Lions, Cheetahs, and Others in the Mughal Landscape." *Shifting Ground: People, Animals, and Mobility in India's Environmental History*, edited by Mahesh Rangarajan and K. Sivaramakrishnan, Oxford Scholarship Online, 2015, E-book, *libgen.io*, www.libgen.io/book/index.php?md5=1AE641E9CFEA5FBE27ED7BAB9334FCEB. Accessed 07 Jan. 2019.

Donald, Diana. *Picturing Animals in Britain 1750–1850*. Yale University Press, 2007.

Douglas, Mary. *Implicit Meanings: Selected Essays in Anthropology*. 2nd ed., Taylor and Francis e-library, 2001, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.xyz/book/1177800/30ba73. Accessed 27 May, 2018.

Edgaonkar, Advait, and RAVY CHELLAM. "Food habit of the leopard, Panthera pardus, in the Sanjay Gandhi National Park, Maharashtra, India." *Mammalia*, vol. 66, no. 3, 2002, pp. 353-360, doi: 10.1515/mamm.2002.66.3.353

English, Richard. "Himalayan State Formation and the Impact of British Rule in the Nineteenth

Century." *Mountain Research and Development*, vol. 5, no. 1, Feb. 1985, pp. 61-78, *Jstor*,www.jstor.org/stable/3673223. Accessed 05 Jan. 2019.

Faber, Marion, translator. *Human, All Too Human: A book for Free Spirits*, by Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, U of Nebraska Press, 1996.

Fanon, Franz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington, Penguin Classics, 2001. (first published in 1965).

Foucault, Michael. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Edited by Colin Gordon, Translated by Colin Gordon, et al. Vintage Books: The Harvester Press, 1980.

Friend, Tim. *Animal Talk: Breaking the Codes of Animal Language.* Free Press, 2004.

Gadgil, Madhav and Guha, Ramachandra. *This Fissured Land*. Oxford India Perennials, 2013.

Gandhi, Mohandas K. *An Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. E-book, *library genesis*, 10 Dec. 2018, www.gen.lib.rus.ec/book/index.php?md5=67CCBC150619AAEC1B2E260B17E8E3C1.

Gill, Stephen. "Stephen Gill on His Writing and Diaspora: An Interview," interviewed by Nilanshu Kumar Agarwal. *Contemporary Vibes,* vol. 4, no. 14, 2009, pp. 33-38.

Gilles, Deleuze. *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton, The Athlone Press, 1994.

Gillespie, Greg. "The Empire's Eden: British Hunters, Travel Writing, and Imperialism in Nineteenth-Century Canada." *The Culture of Hunting in Canada*, edited by Jean L. Manore & Dale G. Miner. UBC Press, 2007, pp. 42-55.

Gingrich, André. "Conceptualising Identities: Anthropological Alternatives to Essentialising Difference and Moralizing about Othering." *Grammmars of Identity/Alterity – A Structural Approach*, edited by Gerd Baumann and André Gingrich, Berghahn Books, 2006, pp. 3-17.

Guerrini, Anita. "The Ethics of Animal Experimentation in Seventeenth-Century England." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 50, no. 3, Jul.-Sep. 1989, pp. 391-407.

Guha, Ramachandra. "Forestry in British and Post-British India: A Historical Analysis."

Economic and Political Weekly, vol. 18, no. 44, Oct. 1983, pp. 1882-1896, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/4372653. Accessed: 07 Jan. 2019.

---. Introduction. *Lives in the Wilderness: Three Classic Indian Autobiographies*, by Jim Corbett et al. Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. v-xii. *Archive.org*, www.archive.org/stream/LivesInTheWilderness-ThreeClassicIndianAutobiographies/oup-3-in-1#page/n5/mode/2up. Accessed 26 May 2018.

Haggan, Graham, and Helen Tiffin. *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environment*. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2009, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/1165227/e125f2. Accesses 09 May 2017.

Hailey. Introduction. *The Second Jim Corbett Omnibus: My India, Jungle Lore, Tree Tops*. Oxford University Press, 33rd imp., 2015, pp. 373-379.

Hallett, Maurice G. Introduction. *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*, by Jim Corbett. Oxford University Press, 1944, pp. v.

Haraway, Donna J. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, 1991.

---. *When Species Meet* (Posthumanities, vol. 3), edited by Cary Wolfe, University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

Hawkins, R. E. *Jim Corbett's India: Stories*. Oxford University Press, 1960.

Heidegger, Martin. *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*. Translated by William McNeill and Nicholas Walker, Indiana University Press, 1995.

Hegel, Georg W.F. *The Philosophy of History*. Translated by J. Sibree, Batoche Books, 2001.

Herda-Rapp, Ann, and Karen G. Marotz. "Contested Meanings: The Social Construction of the Mourning Dove in Wisconsin." *Mad about Wildlife: Looking at social conflict over wildlife*, edited by Ann Herda-Rapp and Theresa L. Goedeke, BRILL, 2005, pp. 73-98.

Hobson, Marian. *Jacques Derrida: Opening Lines*. 1998. Taylor and Francis e-Library, 2001.

b-ok.org, 30 Dec 2017, www.dlx.b-ok.org/genesis/494000/bd21eaa1aa517f988ab6b694f73d1905/_as/[Dr_Marian_Hobson,_Marian_Hobson]_Jacques_Derrida(b-ok.org).pdf.

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Edited by Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, translated by Edmund Jephcott, Stanford University Press, 2002.

Hume, David. *A Treatise of Human Nature: A Critical Edition.* Vol. 1, edited by David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton, Oxford University Press, 2007.

Husserl, Edmund. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Translated by David Carr, Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Ingold, Tim. "Introduction." *What is an Animal?* Edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp.1-16.

---. "Humanity and Animality." *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology: Humanity, Culture and Social Life*, edited by Tim Ingold, Taylor and Francis e-library, 2003, pp. 3-13, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/662540/83db93. Accessed 20 Apr. 2018.

Jalais, Annu. "Unmasking the Cosmopolitan Tiger." *Nature and Culture*, vol. 3, no. 1, Spring 2008, pp. 25-40, doi:10.3167/nc.2008.030103.

Jaleel, Jerry A. *Under the Shadow of Man-Eaters: The Life and Legend of Jim Corbett of Kumaon*. Orient Blackswan, 2001.

Janmohamed, Abdul R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory." *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader,* edited by Bill Ashcroft, et al. Taylor & Francis, e-library, 2003, *Google Books*, 12 Aug 2016, pp. 18-23.

Kalua, Fetson. "Locating the Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*." *Text Writing: Text and Reception in South Africa*, vol. 26, no. 1, 2014, pp. 12-18, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.1080/1013929X.2014.897462

Kaminski, Juliane, et al. "Word Learning in a Domestic Dog: Evidence for 'Fast Mapping.'" *Science*, vol. 304, no.5677, Jun. 2004, pp. 1682-1683, doi: 10.1126/science.1097859

Kant, Immanuel. *The Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by Mary Gregor, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

---. *Lectures on Ethics*. Edited by Peter Heath and J. B. Schneewind, translated by Peter Heath. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

---. "Of the Different Human Races." *The Idea of Race*, edited by Robert Bernasconi and Tommy Lee Lott. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000, pp, 8-22.

Kemmerer, Lisa. *In Search of Consistency: Ethics and Animals*. BRILL, 2006.

Kennedy, Dane. "Guardians of Edenic Sanctuaries: Paharis, Lepchas, and Todas in the British mind." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol.14, no. 2, 1991, pp. 57-77, doi: 10.1080/00856409108723154.

Kipling, Rudyard. *The Jungle Book*. The Century Co., 1920.

---. "The White Man's Burden." *Peace Review*, vol. 10, no.3, 1998, pp. 311-312, doi: 10.1080/10402659808426162.

Kisling, Vernon N., editor. *Zoo and Aquarium History: Ancient Animal Collections to Zoological Gardens*. CRC Press, 2001.

Khanna, Anupma. "Remembering Corbett! A Legend, man of many parts." *The Pioneer*. 26 Jul. 2016, Dehradun, www.dailypioneer.com/todays-newspaper/remembering-corbett-a-legend-man-of-many-parts.html. Accessed 20 Jan. 2018.

Kruuk, Hans. *Hunter and Hunted: Relationship between Carnivores and People*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits: A Selection*. Translated by Alan Sheridan, W.W. Norton & Co., 1977.

Latour, Bruno. *The Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy.* Translated by Catherine Porter, Harvard University Press, 2004.

Laurie, Timothy. "Becoming Animal is a Trap for Humans: Deleuze and Guattari in *Madagascar*." *Deleuze and the Non/Human*, edited by Jon Roffe and Hannah Stark, Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Law, John. *After Actor Network Theory: complexity, naming and topology*. The Editorial Board

of The Sociological Review, Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Lawes, Kim. *Paternalism and Politics: The Revival of Paternalism in Early Nineteenth Century Britain*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.

Linlithgow. Foreword. *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*, by Jim Corbett, Oxford University Press, 1944, pp. vii-viii.

Lister, Ruth. *Poverty.* Polity Press, 2004.

Lundblad, Michael. "From Animal to Animality Studies." *PMLA*, vol. 124, no. 2, 2009, pp. 496-502.

---. *The Birth of a Jungle: Animality in Progressive-Era U.S. Literature and Culture*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

---. *Animalities: Literary and cultural Studies Beyond the Human*. Edinburgh University Press, 2017.

Macedo, Stephen, and Josiah Ober. Introduction. *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved*, edited by Macedo and Ober, Princeton University Press, 2006, pp. ix-xix.

MacKenzie, John M. Introduction. *Colonial Masculinity: The 'Manly Englishman' and 'The Effeminate Bengali' in the Late Nineteenth Century*, by Mrinalini Sinha. Manchester University Press, 1995.

--- *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and Imperialism*. Manchester University Press Series (Studies in Imperialism), 1988.

Madden, Francine. "Creating Coexistence between Humans and Wildlife: Global Perspectives on Local Efforts to Address Human–Wildlife Conflict." *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, vol. 9, 2004, pp. 247-257, doi: 10.1080/10871200490505675.

Mallet, Marie-Louise. Foreword. *The Animal That Therefore I am*, by Jacques Derrida. Fordham University Press, 2008, pp. ix-xiii.

Mandala, Vijaya Ramadas. "'Go After a Man-Eater that has Killed a Hundred People? Not on Your Life!'" *Global Environment: A Journal of History and Natural and Social Sciences*, vol. 7, The White Horse Press, 2014, pp. 572-609, doi.

10.3197/ge.2014.070212.

---. “The Raj and the Paradoxes of Wildlife Conservation: British Attitudes and Expediencies.” *The Historical Journal*, vol. 58, no. 1, 2015, pp. 75-110, doi. 10.1017/S0018246X14000259.

---. *Shooting a Tiger: Big-game Hunting and Conservation in Colonial India*. Oxford University Press, 2019.

Mangan, J.A. and Callum McKenzie. “‘Pig-Sticking is the Greatest Fun’: Martial Conditioning on the Hunting Fields of Empire”. *Militarism, Sport, Europe: War Without Weapons*, edited by J.A. Mangan. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2005, pp. 100-122. *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.xyz/book/850069/243f99. Accessed 04 Oct. 2018.

---. “The other side of the coin: Victorian masculinity, field sports and English elite education.” *A Sport-Loving Society: Victorian and Edwardian middle-class England at play*, edited by J. A. Mangan. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2006, pp. 41-59, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.cc/book/915339/4c55cd. Accessed 04 Oct. 2018.

Mangan, J. A., and James Walvin. Introduction. *Manliness and Morality: Middle-class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*, edited by J. A. Mangan and James Walvin, Manchester University Press, 1987, pp. 1-6.

Martin, Robert Montgomery. *History of the Possessions of the Honourable East India Company*. Vol. I. 1837, *Google Books*, 24 Nov 2017.

Marvin, Garry. “The Problem of Foxes: Legitimate and Illegitimate Killing in the English Countryside.” *Natural Enemies: People-Wildlife Conflicts in Anthropological Perspective*, edited by John Knight, Routledge, 2000, pp. 189-211.

Marvin, Garry, and Susan McHugh, editors. *Routledge Handbook of Human-Animal Studies*. Routledge, 2014.

Matikkala, Mira. *Empire and Imperial Ambition: Liberty, Englishness and Anti-Imperialism in Late-Victorian Britain*. I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd., 2011.

Maunier, Rene. *The Sociology of the Colonies [Part 1]: An Introduction to the Study of Race*

Contact, Routledge, 2013. *Google Books*, 01 Jan 2017.

Mayer, Jed. "Representing the Experimental Animal: Competing Voices in Victorian Culture." *Animal and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, edited by Sarah E. McFarland and Ryan Hediger, Brill, 2009, pp. 183-205.

McCarthy, Thomas. Introduction. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, by Jürgen Habermas, translated by Frederick Lawrence, Polity Press and Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 1998, pp. vii-xvii.

McFarland, Sarah E., and Ryan Hediger, editors. "Approaching the Agency of Other Animals: An Introduction." *Animals and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, edited by McFarland and Hediger, vol. 8, Brill, 2009, pp. 1-20.

Metcalf, Thomas R. *The New Cambridge History of India: Ideologies of the Raj*. Vol. 3, No. 4, Cambridge Histories Online, Cambridge University Press, 2008. *Bookz.org*, www.bookzz.org/ireader/887601. Accessed 13 Jan. 2017.

Mhangore, G. S. "Jim Corbett's Conservationist's Approach towards the Wildlife of India." *International Journal of Advance and Applied Research*, vol. 1, no. 2, Nov-Dec. 2013, pp. 85-89.

Midgley, Mary. "Beasts, Brutes and Monsters." *What is an Animal*?, edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 35-46.

Miller, John. *Empire and the Animal Body: Violence, Identity and Ecology in Victorian Adventure Fiction*. Anthem Press, 2014.

Mishra, Ajit K. "Navigating Precarity: (Re)Mediation, Agency, and Human Security in *Airlift*." *Literary Endeavour*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2019, pp. 337-342.

Morison, Theodore. *Imperial Rule in India: Being an Examination of the Principles Proper to the Government of Dependencies*. A. Constable & Co., 1899, *archive.org*, www.ia802605.us.archive.org/12/items/imperialruleinin031364mbp/imperialruleinin031364mbp.pdf. Accessed 03 Jan. 2017.

Mukherjee, Akaitab, and Rajni Singh. "From Postcolonial Vision of Nature to Ecocinema: A

Study of Satyajit Ray's *Aranyer Din Ratri* and Goutam Ghose's *Abar Aranye*." *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, vol. 24, no. 2, 2017, pp. 224-242, doi: 10.1093/isle/isw045.

Mukherjee, Sujit. "Tigers in Fiction: An Aspect of the Colonial Encounter." *Kunapipi*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1987, pp. 1-13.

Mukherjee, Upamanyu Pablo. *Postcolonial Environments: Nature, Culture and the Contemporary Indian Novel in English*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Munro, Lyle. *Confronting Cruelty: Moral Orthodoxy and the Challenge of the Animal Rights Movement*. BRILL, 2005.

Nath, Dipika. ""To Abandon the Colonial Animal": "Race," Animals and the Feral Child in Kipling's Mowgli Stories." *Animal and Agency: An Interdisciplinary Exploration*, edited by Sarah E McFarland and Ryan Hediger, Brill, 2009, pp. 251-277.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Untimely Meditations*. Edited by Daniel Breazeale, translated by R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Nikhat, Mirdhe Rabiya. *Jim Corbett as Prose Writer: A Study.* PhD Thesis, Gulbarga University, 2017, *Shodhganga*, www. hdl.handle.net/10603/183511.

Olga, Pchelina. "Ethics as Philosophical Foundation of Science." *Proceedings of the International Conference on Science, Spirituality, and Civilization*, vol. 2, March 16-17, 2018, edited by Sanjit Mishra, and Rajeev Tamhankar, Pothi Publications, 2018, pp. 13-25.

Pandey, Surya Nath. "Angularities of a Prodigal Son: Colonial Approach to Dom Moraes' Poetry." *Writing in a Postcolonial Space*, edited by Surya Nath Pandey, Atlantic Publisher, 1999, pp. 65-76.

Pandian, Anand S. "Predatory Care: The Imperial Hunt in Mughal and British India." *Journal of Historical Sociology*, vol. 14, no. 1, Mar. 2001, pp. 79-107.

Patterson, Steven. *The Cult of Imperial Honor in British India*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Pennycook, Alastair. *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. Taylor and Francis

e-Library, 2002, *bookz.org*, 30 Aug 2016, www.bookzz.org/ireader/689268.

Pepperberg, Irene M. "Grey parrots do not always 'parrot': the roles of imitation and phonological awareness in the creation of new labels from existing vocalizations." *Language Sciences*, vol. 29, 2007, pp. 1-13, doi:10.1016/j.langsci.2005.12.002

Philo, Chris, and Chris Wilbert. "Animal spaces, beastly places: an introduction." *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: New geographies of human—animal relations*, edited by Philo and Wilbert. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2005, pp. 1-35, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/886972/59104e. Accessed 05 Jan. 2018.

Plumwood, Val. "Decolonizing Relationships with Nature." *Decolonizing Nature: Strategies for Conservation in a Post-colonial Era*, edited by William M Adams and Martin Mulligan, Earthscan Publications Ltd, 2003, pp. 51-78.

---. *Environmental Culture: the ecological crisis of reason*. Taylor and Francis e-library, 2005, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/917896/235275. Accessed 05 May. 2018.

Ponde, Rajendra Satyashil. *Man, Nature and Wild Life as Depicted in the Jungle Literature of Jim Corbett and Kenneth Anderson: A comparative Study*. PhD Thesis, Shivaji University, 2012, *Shodhganga*, www. hdl.handle.net/10603/25467.

Raheja, Gloria Goodwin. "Caste, Colonialism, and the Speech of the Colonized: Entextualization and Disciplinary Control in India." *American Ethnologist*, vol. 23, no. 3, Aug 1996, 494-513, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/646349.

Rajamannar, Shefali. *Reading the Animal in the Literature of the British Raj*. Palgrave Mcmillan, 2012.

Rangarajan, Mahesh. *Fencing the Forest: Conservation and Ecological Change in India's Central Provinces, 1860-1914*. Oxford University Press, 1996.

---. "The Raj and the natural world: The war against 'dangerous beasts' in colonial India." *Studies in History*, vol. 14, no. 265, 1998, pp. 265-299, doi: 10.1177/025764309801400206.

---. "Five Nature Writers: Jim Corbett, Kenneth Anderson, Salim Ali, Kailash Sankhala, and M.

Krishnan." *An Illustrated History of Indian Literature in English*, edited by Arvind Krishna Mehrotra. Permanent Black, 2003, pp. 351-365.

---. *India's Wildlife History*. Permanent Black, 2017.

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: A Critique of Modernity." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2017, pp. 206-215, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.21

Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "Foregrounding the Animal Stance: A Critical Study of *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities,* vol. 9, no. 3, 2017, pp. 151-160, doi: www.dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n3.16

Ravichandran, T. "Beyond Nation, Region and Ideology: The Hyperreal Locale in Postmodern Films." *Research and Criticism*, Banaras Hindu University, pp. 23-28.

Riggins, Stephen Harold. "The Rhetoric of Othering." *The Language and Politics of Exclusion – Others in Discourse*, edited by Riggins, Sage, 1997, pp. 1-30.

Risley, Herbert Hope. *The People of India*. 2nd ed., edited by William Crooke. Asian Educational Services, 1999, *Google Books*, 14 Apr. 2017.

Ritvo, Harriet. *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age*. Harvard University Press, 1987.

Roffe, Jon, and Hannah Stark. "Deleuze and the Nonhuman Turn: An Interview with Elizabeth Grosz." *Deleuze and the Non/Human*, edited by Roffe and Stark, Palgrave Mcmillan, 2015, pp. 17-24.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. 1978. Penguin Books India.

Sanderson, George P. *Thirteen Years Among The Wild Beasts of India: Their Haunts and Habits from Personal Observation with an Account of the Modes of Capturing and Taming Elephants.* Mittal Publications, 1983.

Sapontzis, Steve F. *Morals, reason, and animals.* Temple University Press, 1987.

Sarkar,Oyndrila. "The Great Trigonometrical Survey: Histories of Mapping 1790-1850."

eTraverse, *The Indian Journal of Spatial Science*, vol. 3, no.1, 2012, pp. 1-6.

Sartre, Jean Paul. Preface. *The Wretched of the Earth*, by Franz Fanon, translated by Constance Farrington, Penguin Classics, 2001, pp. 7-26.

---. Introduction. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, by Albert Memmi. Earthscan Publications Ltd., 2003, pp. 17-25.

Satia, Priya. *Empire of Guns: The Violent Making of the Industrial Revolution*. Penguin Press, e-book, 2018, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.org/book/3524878/6466b6. Accessed 10 Dec. 2018

Savage-Rumbaugh, Sue E., et al. "Do Apes Use Language? One research group considers the evidence for representational ability in apes." *American Scientist*, vol. 68, no. 1, Jan.-Feb. 1980, pp. 49-61, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/27849719. Accessed 10 Jan. 2019.

Schell, Heather. "Tiger Tales." *Victorian Animal Dreams: Representations of Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture*, edited by Deborah Denenholz Morse and Martin A. Danahay, Routledge, 2017, pp. 229-248.

Scott, Bennett. "Shikar and the Raj." *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1984, pp. 72-88, doi: 10.1080/00856408408723059.

Seidenberg, Mark S., and Laura A Petitto. "Signing behavior in apes: A critical review." *Cognition*, vol. l, 1979, pp. 177 – 215.

Sengupta, Tuhin. "The Aporia in the Writings of Jim Corbett: The Paradox of Preservation and Destruction." *Galaxy: International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, vol. 4, no. 4, Jul. 2015, 157-162.

Sharma, Varun. "Rise and Fall of the 'Man-eater': The Changing Science and Technology of a Species (1860-present)." *History and Sociology of South Asia*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2016, pp. 53-73, doi. 10.1177/2230807515600087.

Shaw, George Bernard. *Man and Superman: a Comedy and a Philosophy*. Indiana, 2008.

Shettleworth, Sara J. "Animal cognition and animal behaviour." *Animal Behaviour*, vol. 61, 2001, pp. 277–286, doi:10.1006/anbe.2000.1606

Shiva, Vandana. *Making Peace with the Earth*. Women Unlimited, 2015.

Shresth, Swati. *Sahibs and Shikar: Colonial Hunting and Wildlife in British India, 1800-1935*. PhD Dissertation, Duke University, 2009, www.dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/handle/10161/1647. Accessed 24 Feb. 2017.

Sillero-Zubiri, Claudio, and Karen Laurenson. "Interaction between carnivores and local communities: Conflict or co-existence?" Proceedings of a Carnivore Conservation Symposia, edited by J Gittleman et al., Zoological Society of London, 2001, pp. 282-312, *b-ok.org*, 03 Jan. 2017

Simmons, Laurence, and Philip Armstrong. "Bestiary: An Introduction." *Knowing Animals*, edited by Simmons and Armstrong, vol. 4, Brill, 2007, pp. 1-24. www.dlx.b-ok.org/genesis/470000/da557f6ba027a02c0e737c56b77c4122/_as/[Rosie_Woodroffe,_Simon_Thirgood,_Alan_Rabinowitz](b-ok.org).pdf

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation: The Definitive Classic of the Animal Movement*. Open Road Media e-book, 2009, *b-ok.org*, www.b-ok.xyz/book/2719545/6d048d. Accessed 26 May 2018.

---. "Introduction." *The Defense of Animals: The Second Wave*, edited by Peter Singer. Blackwell Publishing, 2006, pp. 1-10.

Singh, Abhijeet. "Gun Ownership in India." *abhijeetsingh.com*, www.abhijeetsingh.com/arms/india/. Accessed 10 Dec. 2018.

Singh, Arjan. *The Legend of the Maneater*. Ravi Dayal Publisher, 1993.

Singh, Jairaj. "Jim Corbett and Chudail of Kumaon." *Hindustan Times*, 07 Aug. 2012, www.hindustantimes.com/india/jim-corbett-and-the-chudail-of-kumaon/story-O42UJdjpICogxstKq7cVoJ.html.

Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: The 'Manly Englishman' and 'The Effeminate Bengali' in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Manchester University Press, 1995.

Singh, Rameshwer, and Rimjhim Singh. "Sport and Anti Sport: Big Game Hunting in Jim Corbett's India." *Research Gate*, 12 Sep. 2016,

www.researchgate.net/publication/304315141.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives.” *History and Theory*, vol. 24, no. 3, Oct. 1985, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/2505169. Accessed 10 Jun. 2017.

Sramek, Joseph. ““Face Him like a Briton”: Tiger Hunting, Imperialism, and British Masculinity in Colonial India, 1800-1875.” *Victorian Studies*, vol. 48, no. 4, 2006, pp. 659-680, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/4618910.

Stepan, Nancy Leys. “*The Hour of Eugenics*”*: Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America*. Cornell University, 1991.

Steward, Helen. “Animal Agency.” *Inquiry*, vol. 52, no. 3, 2009, 217-231, doi: 10.1080/00201740902917119

Stokes, Eric. *The Political Ideas of English Imperialism: An Inaugural Lecture*. College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland: Oxford University Press, 1960.

Storey, William K. “Big Cats and Imperialism: Lion and Tiger Hunting in Kenya and Northern India, 1898-1930,” *Journal of World History*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1991, pp. 135-173.

Strauss, Claude Lévi. *Structural Anthropology*. Vol. 2, translated by Monique Layton, Allen Lane, 1977.

Szarycz, Gregory S. “The Representation of Animal Actors: Theorizing Performance and Performativity in the Animal Kingdom.” *Theorizing Animals: Rethinking Humanimal Relations*, edited by Nik Taylor and Tania Signal, BRILL, 2011, pp. 149-174.

Tapper, Richard L. “Animality, Humanity, Morality, Society.” *What is an Animal?*, edited by Tim Ingold, Routledge, 1994, pp. 47-62.

Taylor, Jesse Oak. “Environmentalism and Imperial Manhood in Jim Corbett’s *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*.” *Mosaic*, vol. 40, no. 4, Dec. 2007, pp. 151-167.

Taylor, Nik. “Animals, Mess, Method: Post-humanism, Sociology and Animal Studies.” *Crossing Boundaries: Investigating Human-Animal Relationships*, edited by Lynda Birke and Jo Hockenhull, BRILL, 2012, pp. 37-50.

Taylor, Nik, and Tania Signal, editors. *Theorizing Animals: Re-thinking Humanimal Relations*. BRILL, 2011.

The Arms Act, 1878. www.bdlaws.minlaw.gov.bd/print_sections_all.php?id=38. Accessed 10 Apr. 2017.

The Forest Act, 1878. www.bombayhighcourt.nic.in/libweb/oldlegislation/1878.07.pdf. Accessed 10 Apr. 2017.

Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England 1500-1800*. Penguin Books, 1984.

Thomas, Roger K. "Investigating Cognitive Abilities in Animals: Unrealized Potential." *Cognitive Brain Research*, vol. 3, 1996, pp. 157-166.

Tiwari, Bhavya. "Rabindranath Tagore's Comparative World Literature." *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*, edited by Theo D'haen et al., 2012, pp. 41-48.

Tripathi, Vandana, and Smita Sharma. "An Assessment into the Life of Jim Corbett—The Conservationist." *Academia.edu*, www.academia.edu/8071499/An_assesment_into_the_life_of_Jim_Corbett. Accessed on 17 May. 2017.

Tolen, Rachel J. "Colonizing and Transforming the Criminal Tribesman: The Salvation Army in British India." *Deviant Bodies: Critical Perspectives on Difference in Science and Popular Culture*, edited by Jennifer Terry and Jacqueline Urla, Indiana University Press, 1995, pp. 78-108.

Tucker, Richard P. "Dimensions of Deforestation in the Himalaya: The Historical Setting." *Mountain Research and Development*, vol. 7, no. 3, Aug. 1987, pp. 328-331, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/3673213. Accessed 05 Jan. 2019.

Waal, Frans de. *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved*. Edited by Stephen Macedo and Josiah Ober, Princeton University Press, 2006.

Waldau, Paul. "Religion and Animals." *In Defense of Animals: The Second Wave*, edited by Peter Singer, Blackwell Publishing, 2006, pp. 69-83.

Wardrop, Major A.E. *Modern Pig-Sticking*. Macmillan and Co., 1914. *Archive.org*, 27 September 2018, www.archive.org/stream/modernpigstickin00ward#page/n7.

Weil, Kari. *Thinking Animals: Why Animal Studies Now*? Columbia University Press, 2012.

Weitzenfeld, Adam, and Melanie Joy. "An Overview of Anthropocentrism, Humanism, and Speciesism in Critical Animal Theory." *Counterpoints*, vol. 448, 2014, pp. 3-27, *Jstor*, www.jstor.org/stable/42982375. Accessed 01 Apr. 2018.

Wilbert, Chris. "What is Doing the Killing? Animal Attacks, Man-Eaters, and Shifting Boundaries and Flows of Human-Animal Relations." *Killing Animals*, by The Animal Studies Group, University of Illinois Press, 2006, pp. 30-49.

Wilde, Lawrence. "'The creatures, too, must become free': Marx and the Animal/Human Distinction." *Capital and Class*, vol. 24, no. 3, 2000, pp. 37-53, doi: 10.1177/030981680007200103.

Wodak, Ruth. "What CDA is about – a Summary of its history, important concepts and its developments." *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, Sage Publications, 2001, pp. 1-13.

Wolfe, Cary. *What is Posthumanism?* (Posthumanities 8), University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Wynn, Graeme. Foreword. *Hunting for Empire: Narratives of Sport in Rupert's Land, 1840-70*, by Greg Gillespie. UBC Press, 2007, pp. xi-xx.

Publication Details

1. Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "*Man-Eaters of Kumaon*: A Critique of Modernity." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2017, pp. 206-215, doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n1.21
   [SCOPUS and Web of Science indexed]
2. Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "Foregrounding the Animal Stance: A Critical Study of *Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag*." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, vol. 9, no. 3, 2017, pp. 151-160, doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.21659/rupkatha.v9n3.16
   [SCOPUS and Web of Science indexed]
3. Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "Contesting the Man-Eater Animal(ity): Relocating the Margins of the Colonial-colonized Nexus." (under review, Brill)
4. Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "Demystifying the Non-human Animal: Analysing the Animal Agency through the Select Narratives of Jim Corbett." (under review, UPM)
5. Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "Jim Corbett's *My India*: A Study of Ideological Otherness." (Under review, Sage)
6. Rani, Parul, and Nagendra Kumar. "The Idea of the Animal: An Overview." (This Chapter is under review for the book *Animal, Literature and Cinema: A Critical Interface*)