

The Wild East and the White Men's and Mems' Burden of Bravado

Umer O Thasneem

This paper explores the theme of the burden of self-assumed superiority and bravado on the colonizers using short stories set in three different colonial contexts. Using these stories, the paper argues the colonizers themselves to be stuck in a precarious position, thanks to their need to constantly prove and demonstrate their bravery and superiority over the colonized. This situation forces the colonizers to assume poses and renders them vulnerable to the constant demands of self-aggrandizement. What is being enacted in such a situation is the same master-slave dialectics expounded by Hegel, wherein the master's authority is liable to gradual atrophy and erosion. This paper argues the same logic to be applicable to men in patriarchy who are similarly required to assume poses and demonstrate their 'species difference' from the 'inferior sex.'

Key words: Colonialism, Patriarchy, Westerner, Easterner, Dichotomy, Chromatic

Introduction

The cultural encounter involving the colonizing White Westerner and the brown/dark Indian/ African has always been one fraught with possibilities and hazards. Various artistic and literary artifacts produced during the colonial era reveal fascinating vignettes of these encounters. The stories being examined in this paper enact

the same in differing measures. All these stories were produced during the twentieth century and have certain common ingredients viz. a) White men/women travelling to the “heart of darkness”; b) encounter with real/imaginary beasts; c) the presence of natives as foils to the European characters; d) a sense of foreboding or vulnerability that haunts the Europeans thanks to the inimical nature and natives that surround them.

By analyzing these stories, I attempt to bring out the nature of the imperial encounter and explore the inherent precariousness of the situation in which the colonizer is forced to place him/herself in these settings. The paper contends this precariousness to be responsible for the particular “gaze” and “pose” that the colonizer is forced to assume in the colonies. S/he is forced into a role demanding a constant display of superciliousness, bravado and machismo. This is no mean task and in the long run depletes him/her completely.

The stories were written by some of the most prominent Western writers, who had personal encounters with the colonies. They are: “Mrs. Packletide’s Tiger” (Saki, 1911), “Shooting an Elephant” (Orwell, 1936), and “The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber” (Hemingway, 1936).

The Vulnerable Westerner in the East

The Westerner away from his hearth and home is in a particularly vulnerable and precarious situation in the East. Apart from the threat of the inclement weather, the hostile nature and the inimical natives, s/he faces the constant burden of maintaining his/her status as someone with a presumed superiority over the natives. This superiority is something constantly in need of iteration, reiteration and reinforcement as its flimsiness is something both the parties are aware of but choose to connive at as a useful delusion that albeit temporarily serves the interests of both in immediate practical terms. The colonizer or the imperialist maintains this fiction, since it serves as a much-needed ego-prop in his/her self-assigned role of assuming the subject position and reducing the other to the object/object position. A whole panoply of linguistic, metaphysical, symbolic and cultural arsenal was deployed to ensure the smooth functioning of this regime. This ranged

from the metaphysical foisting of the White Jesus as the divine essence to the symbolic and linguistic indoctrination that imbued everything associated with West and White with privilege and positivity and obversely everything associated with East and Black/Brown with negativity and deficiency. In the colonial situation, the boundaries between these two were patrolled and enforced not only symbolically but physically through the use of guns and goons. Though it was the physical intimidation coupled with deceit and internal disunity that mainly coerced or lured the natives into colonial trap in the first instance, it was a mutual acquiescence in a convenient fiction that helped maintain the trappings of this asymmetrical relationship in the long run.

This entailed the construction and maintenance of the image of the courageous, imperious and macho Westerner with an insatiable urge for adventure and bravery. Both the native people and the land with its flora and fauna were to be the background of the theatrics needed to enforce this image. As Hawkes describes it in his study, the characters of the abominable Caliban and the cerebral and all-powerful Prospero were some of the ideological weapons thus employed by imperialists to instill in colonized populations such an invincible sense of dichotomy (2002, p. 26-35). But there were other cultural tropes too, like that of the effeminate and effete native who was no match for the brawny imperialist. One of the popular ditties that young Mahatma Gandhi, used to hear as a school boy ran thus:

Behold the mighty Englishman
He rules the Indian small,
Because being a meat eater,
He is five cubits tall. (Gandhi, p.41)

The aim of this ditty and probably many others in a similar vein was to instill in the subjugated a sense of the invulnerability of the colonizer and the fragility and vulnerability of the colonized. However, like men in patriarchy, this placed the colonizers in an unenviable situation. They constantly had to prove to themselves and demonstrate to others their superiority, which they knew to be built on flimsy props. The Westerners in the East were more prone to the vagaries of weather and viruses and it was a tough task for them to maintain the aura of

invincibility and superiority. But for their gun power, local henchmen and the endemic disunities among natives they would have hardly been able to establish a foothold in the alien lands. It was this precarity that forced them to be constantly in showmanship or exhibitionist mode. All the stories chosen for this study exemplify this vulnerability of the Westerner, forced to act brave and courageous while actually lacking such qualities.

The fact that guns (the weapon that made colonialism possible as Diamond (1998) demonstrates in *Guns, Germs and Steel*), happen to be a common denominator in these stories is remarkable. The gun here has a remarkable affinity with the phallus. In patriarchy, it is the men's ability to impregnate the woman that helps him keep her in a state of subservience. With his phallus, he penetrates and wreaks havoc on the female body. The colonizer similarly penetrated into alien territories using his gun and wreaked havoc on the native cultural and social ecosystems. This puts on both the onus of a constant display of their intimidatory superiority; an onerous task that entails a continual masking of one's default, habitual self, prone to flaws and foibles and the assumption of a superhuman incarnation. This situation has an uncanny parallel with the tale of the blue fox in the fables. It was accidentally that he got himself soaked in blue dye; however, being foxy he decided to capitalize on it and claimed special status. But once, the rain washed off his dye, he was exposed. The Westerners in the imperial settings and the men in the patriarchy are guilty of the same braggadocio which is liable to be exposed and unmasked as it is born of a cockiness and crookedness, lacking the might and mettle to weather real challenges and inclemency.

In all these stories, one can also detect the gradual but often subtle and insidious construction of the other as the monster, as Cohen (1996) describes it in "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)". As Cohen argues, this construction of the Other as monster was a psychological and cultural imperative for the imperialist juggernaut to accomplish its political mission. It was not only the colonized native that was thus monsterized according to Cohen, but even women and sexual minorities who inhabited the fringes and fault-lines of Western imagination. In

these stories, barring Orwell's "Shooting the Elephant", women are subjected to the same "othering" process.

Mrs. Packletide's Tiger Hunt

In Saki's "Mrs. Packletide's Tiger", set in British India, the presence of the natives is minimal to the point of near invisibility. But the few brush strokes used to paint them serve to freeze them in the typical imperialist frame. Both the strategies of rendering the other invisible and consequently insignificant and casting them using the conventional tropes of being sly and deceitful serve the purpose of monsterizing. As is well known, this is a strain that informs the whole Western thought and imagination from Hegel to Kipling. Saki's description in 'Tiger' fully fits in with this template. However, it is in the depiction of the White man's immediate other, 'the White woman', that the tropes of 'monsterization' operate more intensely, albeit in an intricately insidious manner, in the story. Like other Saki stories, the piece is meant to be humorous and it is using the camouflage of humor that the story sneaks in its contraband sexism, classism and racism. All the three female characters in the story epitomize deep flaws attributable largely to their gender and not a single one is invested with any quality that makes them remotely likable. This is in stark contrast to Saki's many male characters, who despite lacking in heroism and charisma strike us as lovable. His Clovis for example is eminently likable and beguilingly mischievous. The same is the case with child heroes like Nicholas. On the other hand, most of his female characters like the many aunts in various stories, Hoopingtons ("The Bag"), and Mrs. Saunderses and Mrs. Cricks ("The Blood-Feud of Toad-Water: a West Country Epic") are caricaturistically drawn in order to elicit little admiration. In fact, these women indirectly help prop up the male sense of superiority.

The eponymous Mrs. Packletide is a human amalgam of jealousy and snobbery. Her ambition to fly to India and embark upon a tiger expedition is prompted by a desire to match the accomplishment of her friend and rival Loona Bimberton who too incarnates all the vices and vanities of Mrs. Packletide. The derisive portrayal of the two women springs from the sexist perception regarding a woman's

role. By wielding a gun, the two women are overstepping the female domain and encroaching upon the male terrain. Symbolically speaking, they are wielding the phallus and acting mannish resulting in ludicrous effects.

Packletide's paid companion on the journey is Miss Mebbin. Her stinginess is legendary that "francs and centimes clung to her instinctively under [whatever] circumstances..." (Saki, 2017, p. 2438). Even before her trip to India, Packletide has made up her mind about the party she is going to give 'ostensibly' in Bimberton's honour at her house in Curzon Street: "[A] tiger skin is to occupy most of the foreground and all of the conversation". The portrayal of the British women here as snobbish, jealous and pompous sets them apart from British men in Saki's stories who even while being bumbler and fumbler radiate a mischievous and innocent charm.

This privilege however is not extended to the men belonging to the colonies. They rather fulfill the Western stereotype of the colonized as wile and cunning. Upon learning about Mrs. Packletide's intentions, the people in the village she chooses for hunting behave in the most conniving and obsequious manner. They take all precautions to make sure that the senile tiger that strays into their village remains within its boundaries; erect a tree scaffolding to facilitate a safe vantage point for the memsahib; and post children at all exit points to prevent the beast from sneaking back into the jungle. Since the reward of a thousand rupees is an unexpected windfall for them, they are determined to claim the amount by hook or crook. They, being clever bargainers, however have insisted on Mrs. Packletide paying an extra amount for the noisy bleating goat being used as a bait to lure the tiger to within Mrs. Packletide unenviable shooting range. The portrayal of natives being vile and cunning has a long colonial legacy. Hegel had famously described Indians to be "submissively low and sly to the conqueror and master and totally ruthless and ruthless to the conquered" (Izetbegovic, Chapter 1).

Things prove 'propitious' and eventually the 'venerable' beast makes his appearance. Mrs. Packletide's rifle opens fire and the beast drops dead. However, his carcass reveals no sign of a bullet injury.

Mrs. Packletide has by mistake hit the goat and missed the target by several yards. The tiger's death is attributed to a sudden heart failure caused as much by the loud gun as by senility. However, the villagers act as if Mrs. Packletide has indeed killed the beast and pocket the monetary reward. Miss Mebbin, being a paid companion, chooses to keep mum, but threatens to spill the beans in case the latter is not more forthcoming with her purse. Mrs. Packletide has to pay a huge hush money to keep Miss Mebbin satisfied. She quits tiger hunting for good and tells her inquisitive friends about the huge "incidental expenses" (Saki, 2017, p. 2473).

Though the story delivers a coup de grace to British snobbery and pride, it is firmly though subtly anchored in Western colonial, patriarchal, and class notions. The fact that it is Mrs. Packletide and not Mr. Packletide who becomes the object of Saki's ridicule shows the insidious operation of misogyny camouflaged as humor. Loona Bimberton who for days on end refuses to look at the illustrated newspapers carrying Mrs. Packletide's photo is again cast in the same sexist mould. However, it is in the portrayal of Miss Mebbin that the sexist and classist prejudices of the times find their clever but ill-disguised articulation. Being a paid companion, Mebbin does not belong to the same class as either Packletide or Bimberton. Her stinginess and hucksterism owe to her class and upbringing. She even remonstrates with Packletide for paying a hefty amount for an aged tiger and wants her to eliminate the beast before it manages to get near the goat, being used as bait. She reasons it will spare the extra expense on the goat.

Though the story delivers a coup de grace to British snobbery and pride, it is firmly though subtly anchored in Western colonial, patriarchal, and class notions. The fact that it is Mrs. Packletide and not Mr. Packletide who becomes the object of Saki's ridicule shows the insidious operation of misogyny camouflaged as humor. Loona Bimberton who for days on end refuses to look at the illustrated newspapers carrying Mrs. Packletide's photo is again cast in the same sexist mould. However, it is in the portrayal of Miss Mebbin that the sexist and classist prejudices of the times find their clever but ill-

disguised articulation. Being a paid companion, Mebbin does not belong to the same class as either Packletide or Bimberton. Her stinginess and hucksterism owe to her class and upbringing. She even remonstrates with Packletide for paying a hefty amount for an aged tiger and wants her to eliminate the beast before it manages to get near the goat, being used as bait. She reasons it will spare the extra expense on the goat.

At the surface level, the story is innocuous. But the way it polices class and racial boundaries is both politically and culturally loaded. The figure of Miss Mebbin, in this sense jells well with those of the natives. They both are greedy, hucksterish and conniving. Both the lower classes and the colonized are portrayed in imperialist representations as sharing this kind of negative attributes which set them apart from the privileged white men who belong to the imperialist center. But even the white woman is an aberration of sorts and like Mrs. Packletide and Bimberton largely act as foils to the true representative of the species, i.e. the upper class white man.

However, short stories, like novels being basically dialogic in nature, seldom allow easy closures. Through the inherent fissures built into their structure, most often than not, the precarity of the colonialist pop through, exposing the cracks in the wall. After all, the walls that divide are not merely flimsy, but chimeric. This chimeric wall is built using a lot of ego props that can hardly stand the wind and the elements of the tropics. It relies heavily on a color-coded vocabulary suggestive of valor, courage, invincibility and indomitability. In this scheme, the white colonizer possesses qualities that place him several rungs above the brown-skinned men whom he conquers and rules. This vocabulary and the ideological symbology it represents were systematically instilled in the minds of the colonized that they too could not remain immune to the stereotype pressure it engendered.

Rudyard Kipling's depiction of the natives as 'Half-devil and half-child' (Kipling, "The White Man's Burden") was one of the manifest attempts of this project, which was institutionally propelled by the decision to introduce English literature as a discipline in Indian institutions of higher education, before it gained an academic status in

British universities. What is evident in texts ranging from the earlier quoted ditty and the Nobel-laureate's depiction are the ideologically-driven attempts to police the borders between the white man and the natives. However, unlike poems, that preclude dialogic possibilities, fiction, even while attempting to be monologic is susceptible to the intrinsic dialogic dynamism of the genre and ends up, if not openly admitting, at least acknowledging and hinting at alternative versions and possibilities. Viewed thus, the fear that Saki, the son of an imperialist police officer serving in India, foists on Mrs. Packletide, the foil of the colonizing man thanks to her birth on the fault lines of gender, is a psychological transposition of the fear that the imperialist man himself feels in the colonies.

The Burden of Elephantine Image

The predicament of the two male heroes of the other stories I examine below again illustrates the burden of assumed bravery; there is also a close resemblance between their situation and that of the parodic Mrs. Packletide's. In Orwell's autobiographical "Shooting an Elephant," the author-narrator recounts an incident during his stint as police officer in Burma. Unlike Mrs. Packletide, he is no greenhorn when it comes to wielding the gun or handling the natives. Being an imperial police officer, he has often been at the receiving end of their barbs and taunts. Once, he is summoned to restrain an elephant in musth. Like Mrs. Packletide, he too trembles at the prospect of confronting the beast; but by the time, he gets to the spot, the animal has calmed down after wreaking considerable havoc in the locality and trampling to death an Indian coolie.

Orwell is in two minds about shooting the elephant. He knows an elephant is valuable like an expensive piece of machinery. But in the village, surrounded by hundreds of yellow Burmese men and women, he feels himself like a "fool" being egged on by the mob. A Sahib in the East, he says must "act like a Sahib." At last, he shoots the elephant; but being inept shooter, he bungles the job. The elephant dies a slow, agonizing death causing him great distress. Orwell confesses that it was the compulsion to act brave that forced him to kill the pachyderm. Unlike Kipling, Orwell is under no illusion about

the White Man's civilizing burden in the colonies; instead, he states how a white man forced to act as a tyrant ends up destroying "his own freedom." Despite this realization and the ambivalence, he expresses about colonial mission, his narrative is saturated with racist stereotypes. Racial boundaries as dictated by chromatic codes seem to be uppermost in his mind, while wielding the gun in the field and years later while chronicling the same with his pen. This color scheme is wrought in such a way as to effect a tripartite classification with the white European on top, the yellow Burmese in the middle and the dark Dravidian South Indian at the bottom.

When Orwell finally succumbs to the temptation of acting brave and ends up killing the elephant, the opinion among the British officers is divided. The older men approve of his action but the younger ones consider it "to be a damn shame to shoot an elephant for killing a coolie, because an elephant was worth more than any damn Coringhee coolie" (p. 2555). Though this statement is dressed up as an observation by callow colonial officers, Orwell's own tenor in the story is not far removed from the toxicity contained in this observation.

Reading "Shooting an Elephant" against the larger canvas of his *Burmese Days* serves to reinforce this. The novel abounds in a mélange of racist epithets and stereotypes often inserted as utterances made by members of the ruling class. Though, the author places himself at a remove from these not so respectable representatives of his own race, the technique serves little to absolve him of complicity. The profusion of the animal metaphors he employs to describe the native Burmese and Indian migrants illustrates this. The wife of U Po Kyin is portrayed to have a "pale brown, simian face" (Orwell, 2013, p. 30); U Po Kyin himself possesses a brain which is "quite barbaric" as well as "cunning" (Orwell, 2013, p. 23); and Flory's Indian butler has "liquid, yellow-irised eyes like those of a dog" (Orwell, 2013, p. 39). Just as in the "Elephant" story, an acute awareness of the chromatically coded racial prejudices and perceptions punctuate the novelistic plot. Color terms like brown, black and yellow serve to mark definite racial boundaries which the colonial masters seem eager to police and patrol, while at the same time being aware of their porousness and perilousness. These boundaries are something even the anti-imperialists

like Flory are eager to maintain and fortify. Hence even while being critical of European racism he never considers “it appropriate to marry a non-European” and contents himself with a “Burmese Mistress” (Orwell, 2013, p. 14). Like the story, the novel too maintains strict racially coded color lines that constitute a neat hierarchy with the top rung occupied by the European and the lowest by the black skinned Dravidian Indian. The Aryan Indian on the other hand occupies a higher position, closer to the ruling European. Nevertheless, the objection raised to Dr. Veeraswami’s admission to the elite officers’ club by Ellis betrays the bigotry of the Europeans as well as the slipperiness concerning the Aryan question:

DEAR, Dr. Veeraswami, for instance. Dr. Very-Slimy I call him. That WOULD be a treat, wouldn’t it? Little Pot-bellied niggers breathing garlic in your face over the bridge- table. Christ, to think of it! We’ve got to hang together and put our foot down on this at once. What do you say, Westfield? Flory? (Orwell, 2013, p. 40-41).

When his friend Macgregor, tries to reason with him by pointing to the Aryan credentials of the doctor, Ellis, the most bigoted of the lot, objects by emphatically stating he wanted neither Aryans nor Mongolians. “I don’t like niggers, to put it in one word” he pronounces (p. 49). This shows Ellis’s stubbornness on the race question and Macgregor’s ambivalence on the same, caused by the ‘Aryan’ identity of the North Indian.

Classificatory schemes which sought to pin down the natives as the “Other” and “nearer to the beast” than the European homo-sapiens was at the core of the colonial enterprise. This is well-reflected in the way both the story and the novel seek to portray the natives as distant and distinct from the Europeans. However, Europeans themselves are aware of the arbitrariness and the flimsiness of this officially enforced classificatory scheme and dread its unravelling. The gun in both the stories is a metaphoric and literal symbol using which the boundary is sought to be patrolled and enforced. The Europeans are aware that once the natives acquire the knowledge of wielding the gun, the mask of superiority they wear will wear off and the European blue foxes will be exposed. Part of the strategy of

maintaining the White man's distinctiveness was in denying the natives the 'know-how' of firearms and other technology. Flory in his conversations with Dr. Veeraswami admits this:

We have never taught a single manual trade to the Indians. We daren't; frightened of the competition in industry. We've even crushed various industries. Where are the Indian Muslims now? Back in the forties or thereabouts they were building sea-going ships in India, and manning them as well. Now you couldn't build a seaworthy fishing boat there. In the eighteenth century Indians cast guns that were at any rate up to the European standard. Now, after we've been in India after a hundred and fifty years, you can't make so much as a brass cartridge-case in the whole continent. The only Eastern races that have developed are the independent ones...(Orwell, 2013, p. 62-63)

By crushing the native industries and by monopolizing the use of the gun, the European was confirming his status as a different and more "powerful beast." This was the aim of the ditty that Gandhi heard as a child, just as this is the burden of the reflections of U Po Kyin, as he muses thus watching columns of British troops march past his village:

He remembered the terror he had felt of those columns of great beef-fed men, red-face and red-coated; and the long rifles over their shoulders, and the heavy, rhythmic tramp of their boots...In his childish way he had grasped that his own people were no match for this race of giants. (Orwell, 2013, p. 20)

It is not incidental that beef forms a motif in both the ditty and the above passage; it serves to heighten the image of the foreigner as brawnier, braver and brasher than the native. The reference to the tramp of the boots and the long rifle connects the passage with the story. In both instances, the Sahibs act brave as Sahibs are expected to and impress the natives as beings belonging to a different species, a higher order. However, just as Hegel observed in his analysis of the slave-master dialectics, the position of the master is vulnerable because it involves assuming of a definitive pose, bound to crumble in the long run (Bulhan 102-05).

The Not So Happy Life of Macomber

“The Short Happy Life of Francis Macomber” is another story that illustrates the theme of the burden of bravado. Unlike the two earlier stories, the setting is Africa, the colonial British Kenya. The familiar tropes of the White man vs. the native as well as man vs. woman propel the story. The central character is Francis Macomber, an American. He shares many commonalities with Mrs. Packletide. Like Packletide, his journey in search of a game is meant to boost his ego. If Packletide’s aim is to impress her rival Loona Bimberton, Francis Macomber’s is to impress his wife Margot, a model whose face once “commanded five thousand dollars for endorsing beauty products that she never used” (Hemingway, 2022, p. 9).

However, his attempt ends in total disaster. He panics while shooting a lion and leaves the job, half done. He has to be carried to the tent after this fiasco and spends the night shivering and visualizing nightmarish scenes of a likely attack by the injured lion. His wife cuckolds him by sleeping with Wilson, the English Safari operator, fully realizing that Francis is no “man” in the real sense of the term. In short, she equates Francis’s failure with the gun as suggestive of his failure as a man.

The next day, he is however able to redeem himself in some measure by shooting a buffalo. He basks in his momentary glory and sets out to further parade his newfound bravery. This time a buffalo comes charging at him. In order to protect him/ to get rid of the unwanted man in her life, Margot, surveying the scene from their vehicle, opens fire and ends up killing Macomber. The story is open-ended and the conclusion throws up a host of questions. Margot’s aim at opening fire will always remain an enigma for readers and herein lies the power of the story as Hemingway conceived it. Like Mrs. Packletide and Orwell, the gun-wielding Macomber too, is under the stereotype pressure of having to impress and prove his credentials as a member of a superior courageous species, not only before his wife, but in front of African helpers. This task proves too much for him and eventually leads to his undoing.

But what is apparent is the burden bravado places on the “top dog”. For Shakespeare’s Falstaff “the better part of valor is

discretion” (*Henry IV, Part 1*, Act 5 Scene 4). However, this is a piece of wisdom the colonialist is hardly able to practice in the oriental setting nor a man in a patriarchal setting. The gun wielding men and women in the stories we examined exemplify this. This further illustrates how bravado is inherently burdensome and bound to exhaust and wear out the ones assuming an aura of superiority. After all, every aura is built on myths and ‘myth’ itself means a ‘false story’. Salman Rushdie brilliantly punctures this myth through the figure of Evie Burns, the American child in *Midnight’s Children* who descends upon the Methwold Estate and becomes the child hero there with her air-gun and bicycle antics. It is by shooting the stray cats wandering around Methwold Estate that Burns establishes her credentials. Through the character of this American girl, who arrives in India immediately after the British departure, Rushdie points to the looming new imperial power on the horizon while at the same time having a laugh at the expense of the whole colonial enterprise by pointing to its fraught but ludicrous and flawed nature. By arming Burns with an air-gun, and portraying her exaggerated machismo, and her bicycle stunts, Rushdie is caricaturizing the colonialist who always has to be in the showmanship mode, be it by shooting senile tigers or stray felines. In this sense, Burns is a latter-day Mrs. Packletide, younger in age, but invested with the same trappings of fake imperialist bravado.

Conclusion

All systems based on domination and subordination inhere in them the potential seeds of their own undoing. In other words, even the most robustly built systems contain cracks concealed to the outside observer. Like the fissure in the house of the Usher family in Edgar Allan Poe’s story, systems built on domination and exploitation inhere in them the dynamics of their own destruction. It might be slow like the gradual attrition of patriarchy or quicker like the decline of colonialism or precipitous like the fall of the Eastern European dictators, but is inevitable and ineluctable.

References

- Cohen, Jeffrey. (1996). "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)." In Cohen, Jeffrey (Ed.) *Monster Theory: Reading Culture* (pp.3-25). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Diamond, Jared. (1998). *Guns, Germs and Steel*. London: Vintage.
- Gandhi, M. K. (1968). *An Autobiography or The Story of My Experiments with Truth*. Translated by Mahadev Desai, Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House.
- Hawkes, Terence. (2002). "Swisser-Swatter: Making a Man of English Letters." In Drakakis, John (Ed.) *Alternative Shakespeares* (pp.26-46). London: Routledge.
- Hemingway, Earnest. (2022). *The Complete Short Stories of Ernest Hemingway*. New Delhi: Pharos Book Private Limited.
- Izetbegovic, Alija. (2006). *Notes from Prison, 1983-1988*. Rabi-Awal: Taskforce Ezania.
- Kipling, Rudyard. (1899). "The White Man's Burden" The Kipling Society. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/poem/poems_burden.htm
- Orwell, George. (2013). *Complete Works of George Orwell*. East Sussex: Delphi Classics.
- Rushdie, Salman. (2006). *Midnight's Children*. New York: Random House. (Original work published 1981)
- Saki. (2017). *The Complete Novels and Stories*. Book House Publishing.

Dr. Umer O Thasneem

Assistant Professor

Department of English

University of Calicut

India

Pin: 673 635

Ph: +91 89433 80323

Email: umerothasneem@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-1532-3078