

I. *Tiger for Breakfast: Hunting, Ecology and Tourism*

This research deals with the relationship between human and animals on Michel Peissel's *Tiger for Breakfast* in which a Russian character Boris Lissanevitch involves in the big game, i.e. tiger hunting in China, Laos, Nepal and India. The narrator and writer, Michel Peissel is fascinated by his activities when he first visits Boris in his Royal Hotel in Kathmandu. This autobiographical text deals on Boris's behavior of introducing Nepal to foreigners as he establishes the first hotel in Nepal known as the Royal Hotel (now the house is used by The Election Commission in Kantipath) in Kathmandu which in one way or the other fulfills the confusion the foreigners had in visiting Nepal. Boris himself is a mediator among the foreigners who would help in getting visa permits in Nepal. The hotel is a meeting place between the Nepalese people and the ex-pat community. On the possibilities of tourism and the needs of Western travelers in Nepal; Boris uses the little-used half of General Bahadur Shumsher Jung Bahadur Rana's palace to begin an undertaking that will transform the social scene in Kathmandu in the early 1950s. He is depicted as the friendly person and, thus, is able to be near to elite groups of Nepal and India.

Life Magazine on March 28, 1955, writes an article on the pioneering event of establishing the Royal Hotel in Kathmandu:

The irrepressible stream of tourism, which has upset many a sanctuary, finally broke into remote Nepal. Nestled in the Himalayas, Nepal has for a century peevishly shut its borders to all but a few foreigners. But recently Boris Lissanevitch, a British-naturalized ex-Russian, managed to lease a palace in Kathmandu, capital of Nepal, and to convert it into the "Royal Hotel" by flying in everything from cutlery and cooks to flush toilets [...] Even in Nepal tourists were tourists. (50)

Though Boris has little interest in the ballet at the time he starts in Odessa, his talent eventually take him from famine-stricken Russia to the high social circles of Western Europe. Dance also provides him an introduction to the East while he goes on tour with his partner to China, Malaysia and eventually India where his knowledge about the hidden Kingdom of Nepal slowly begins to grow.

Boris establishes the Royal Hotel in Nepal that lead the ancient civilization virtually untouched by the Western life to a new destination for promoting tourism and modernization. The natural and dense forests in terai, the snow-covered Himalayas and the ancient civilizations of the cities like Kathmandu, Lalitpur and Bhaktapur are for Boris the best places which no one would escape out from its charming beauty located in remote Nepal.

Later, this beauty of dense jungles of Nepal develops a passion of sports - sports of hunting with him along with his friends. Boris enjoys 'the best sports' while he remains in India and Nepal because he is famous among the high class families and mostly the hunting activities best practiced by these families. Being the nearest friend of the high class families of Nepal and India, Boris too does not miss the golden opportunity of hunting the rare wild animals like tiger, leopards, deer, rhinos and others. No laws or restrictions are on hunting at that time. It is because the governmental officials are themselves involved in such activities. As stated, "in 1958, Boris was able to shoot his sixty-eighth tiger", Peissel writes, "this is far from a record the Maharaja of Sarguja, for example, has shot to date, despite his old age, the world record of 1,177 tigers and is still shooting [...]" (156).

Peissel describes about the Ranas of Nepal who in their grandeur palaces keep enormous stuffed heads of rhinos, crouching tigers, skins of tigers, fifteen feet crocodile, which seems inanimate zoos to decorate the corridors and the rooms. It is

common to decorate the walls and corridors with the animals that are hunted in the vast jungles. And most importantly the skins, antlers, and the heads of the rare wild animals are regarded as the trophies for the specific event the hunter is involved within. The trophies of that beautiful hunting sports are "the tiger skin rugs and mounted heads" and several trophies of leopards, buffaloes, rhinos to be "sent by a steamer to adorn the entrance of vast family estates in Europe" (97). Boris trophies were "all the skins of big cats preserved, and the horns of all the other animals packed and crated" (133). The narrator, Peissel himself, in the name of anthropological survey, is with arsenic so that he could take and preserve the birds in museum. There lies the hidden intentions of collecting valuable organs of animals in the name of anthropological surveys or the forests and mountaineering expeditions carried all over the world to destroy ecology at worst.

Today too, we find the houses of aristocratic families full of animal remains that are used to decorate the walls of house. What does this reminds of? This reminds us of the hunting sports that neglect the animal rights and eco-conservation establishing human superiority among the poor non-human world that gives the sense of anthropocentrism. This notion of 'anthropocentrism' is best depicted when the tiger shooting camps are thoroughly organized to pay the best tribute to the Queen Elizabeth II visit in Nepal. It is one of the rarest events organized by the government of Nepal. It is also Boris's privilege to take charge of all banquets during the visit of Queen Elizabeth II of Great Britain. Apart from arranging banquets for the visit, Boris takes the responsibility of feeding the Royal entourage during a tiger-hunting expedition in the terai. Boris who is in charge of managing the meals and breakfasts for the Royal guests, as pre-planned, serves the several tastes of endangered species of birds and animals found in Nepal.

Boris, in the novel, establishes the 300 Club in Calcutta which serves as a meeting place and an institution of elites and the foreigners living in India for providing tastes of the Western world. There are the stately recognized maharajas and princes of India. Among various guests, the Maharaja of Cooch Behar and Nepalese general Mahabir Shumsher Jung Bahadur Rana are his best inmates who together go on several planning from tiger hunting to the anthropological survey of Hollywood.

This novel exposes several issues of elephant taming, ways to capture wild elephant, how to make the captured elephant domestic and the ways to use elephants in tiger hunting. Drawing upon the eco-critical views on “animals” and the representation of animals in text, Boris is seen plowing under one of his own ambitions of hunting adventure which he develops the passion since childhood. The passion of shooting tiger, leopards and several wild animals and faunas, is found abundantly on several characters like Prince Bashundhara of Nepal, General Mahabir Shumser, General Kiran, Lainelot, the Maharaja of Cooch Behar, the Maharaja of Darbhanga and senior officers of British Raj.

Neglecting the tiger hunting issues and other basic issues of ecological destruction Boris and his friends - rajas and princes of Nepal and India do in the text, Arati Basnyat in *Nepal Times* with her topic “Tiger of Man” describes and evaluates Boris in a materialistic view:

Based on the legend of Boris Lissanevitch the book story follows the chance meeting of Peissel and Boris, which launched an incredible friendship. A simple read written in the first person, *Tiger for Breakfast* reveals Peissel’s obvious fascination with Boris and his lifestyle. It records in detail Boris’ life and achievements in Nepal, from being the first person to grow straw berries here to being the first

to breed fine quality pigs for bacon. At times the amazing events read larger than life then as Peissel writes, 'Boris's name could not be mentioned without someone recalling a new and even more incredible incident involving him.' (8)

Basnyat describes the book merely an autobiography where she is as attracted as narrator Peissel regarding Boris's activities. Boris is a good planter with an entrepreneurship mindset who first introduces the Western fruit straw berry in Nepal along with various vegetables like lettuce and spinach. Boris is involved with the new idea of breeding the large Yorkshire pigs in Ichangu that can fulfill the demand of the visitors of the Western world who lives in the newly established Royal Hotel in Kathmandu. He is in one way or the other involved with the activities with the Nepalese people that for the new-comers it is hard to describe the events without involving Boris.

Amy Sellmyer in *The Kathmandu Post* writes in his article "Life and Times of Boris Lissanevitch" depicting Boris personality as having diverse range of experiences with unlikely chain of events to define Boris's life:

[...]an unpredictable and unimaginable story that found the multi-talented Boris as a star in Diaghilev's Ballet Russe; founder of the exclusive 300 Club in Kolkata—the first club of its kind to be inclusive of both foreigners and Indians; a man-eating tiger hunter; best friend and entrepreneurial partner with several Indian maharajas and trusted messenger of King Tribhuvan in exile, only to finally settle as a central figure in Kathmandu's burgeoning tourism industry and definitive member of its elite social class. An unforgettable personality and diverse range of experiences all brilliantly captured by Peissel. (7)

Sellymer finds the book very interesting which describes Boris as highly intelligent one. It is sure the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia forced himself to be a ballet dancer and it is the magical key to allow him travel throughout Europe and Asian countries. He is the first person and a typical occidental hero in the oriental countries as he is able to establish a grand hotel in Kathmandu to the exclusive club in Calcutta and, thus, able to grasp the better opportunity flourishing in the Nepalese and Indian tourism. He is able to enjoy the magnificent lifestyle being near with the elites like that the pleasure of the tiger hunting.

She further writes, “Written in first person, this biographical narrative of the rich and varied life of Boris is an easy read that is not only entertaining but also illustrates the power that one idea (like tourism) along with a captivating personality to promote it can transform an entire country” (7). This book provides a reminder for those who have forgotten the true draw of Nepal to outsiders: it’s rich and diverse cultural history and the “innocent Nepali smile” that Boris was initially attracted to; something that gets lost from time to time in the rush of commercialization and Westernization in the country.

Roman Gautam in his “Waiting for Dead Morz in Kathmandu” in *Himal South Asian* magazine concerns with the Diaspora issue where Russian Diasporas like Boris who became the pioneer of tourism in Nepal leaving a legacy to Nepal. He links Boris with the diplomacy that in Nepal is able to grant the country’s first tourist visas to a group of twenty visitors. He writes:

Boris did not open the floodgates, but from then on received a fairly steady flow of visitors at his hotel, paving the way for the tourist booming out of the coming decades that led Nepal to redefine itself abandoning its insularity in favor of an open welcome to overseas. (15)

The point Gautam wants to pinpoint is that it was the hotel and the Diasporas like Boris through the establishment of the hotel assured to help the over-seas visitors provide the information regarding Nepal. In that sense, the hotel is not only the meal place for the hungry stomachs but a shelter for the Westerners to observe the country closely. Thus, the hotel is itself a message and an institution to show the new upcoming and nearby booming tourism industry.

Chris Devonshire–Ellis in this article “Boris Lissanevitch-Asian Expat Extraordinaire” in *China Expat* writes about the book, *Tiger for Breakfast* as a fitting tribute to a man who is almost certainly the king expatriate among all expatriates – ever making a new Chinese cultural observation from the western perspective. Boris acquires the taste of orient, i.e. the tiger hunting with the befriended maharajas and became the pals with the king of Nepal. Chris also describes about the women eating tigers that Boris kills to save the villagers from the attack of the ferocious human eating tiger.

Chris describes Boris as an expatriate who best managed to adjust among the South Asian countries like India and Nepal and was thus, involved in opening the 300 club in India. Chris gives a long history of Boris how and when he as a refugee flees from Russia due to the Bolshevik revolution and become pals with the King of Nepal – a friendship that later have a significant impact on his destiny. He also goes on his first Tiger hunt – padding one of the biggest specimens ever shot in Bihar.

This can be explained from the eco-critical view animals turn themselves to humans when they are over exploited by human leading a great threat to humans. This issue is get to be explored and thus, this project reveals the bad nature of humans to animals and how the two are interrelated for each other’s existence. This study will seek to prove that the depiction of human-animal relationship throughout the novel

has been carried out implicitly without an ecological consciousness.

Concentrating on the views and ideas of above mentioned critics, we cannot find the justice to the wild lives responding the logic of eco-system. These all critics are unable to depict the essence of animal ethics throughout the book, *Tiger for Breakfast*. This research, however, explores and excavates the issue regarding environmental ethics which primarily refers to strengthen the principle of organic world of nature and this describes thoroughly the tension evolved in the entire book between human and animals in the course of their survival in this earth. The best way to depict this issue, this research holds "Ecocriticism" as the applicable theory, which is concerned with the environmental and objective implications of any literary texts. It is the representation of the communion between human, animals, earthly creatures and non-human natural world, and the proper roles of human in the earthly scheme.

The term 'Ecocriticism' was coined in 1978 by William Reuckert where he described it as 'the application of ecology and ecological concept to the study of literature' (qtd. in Glotfelty xx). But, as a literary criticism, Ecocriticism got its impetus in 1990s with the establishment of the professional organization, The Association for the Study of Literature and Environment (ASLE) in 1992 which later extended its root in Germany, Japan and Korea with its concept of ecological awareness as a tool in literary criticism. Later in 1993, Patrick Murphy's journal, *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment (ISLE)* was a forum for critical studies of the literary and performing arts addressing environmental consideration. Many early works of Ecocriticism were characterized an exclusive interest in Romantic poetry, wilderness narrative and nature writing but recently the focus has been into a more general cultural criticism, with studies of popular scientific writing, film TV, art, architecture and other cultural artifacts such as theme parks,

zoos and shopping malls.

As ecocriticism is an ecological approach on the study of relationship between literature and environment, it studies the inter-relationship between human being and non-human world depicted in the literary and non-literary texts. The home ground of ecocriticism is the human's inseparable attachment with the soil in its existence and its living organisms. Ecocritics view that ecocriticism is fundamentally an ethical criticism that investigates and helps make possible the connections among self, society, nature and text. Hence, it is a response to the need for humanistic understanding of our relationships with the natural world in an age of environmental destruction.

Throughout the whole book, we find Peissel possessing only the human centric environmental ethics discarding the rights of animal existence. Looking upon Peissel's anthropocentric value, this project explores the environmental ethics with the values of 'ecocriticism' to prove the logic of ecological interconnectedness among humans and especially animals and in the whole eco-system. This study too foregrounds the avocations of wild life conservation on endangered species with accurate information how they are represented as an obsessive interest of predation though, in surface it looks a great adventure book evoking a good appetite of reading.

Therefore, ecocriticism turns away from the 'social constructivism' and instead emphasizes eco-centric values of meticulous observation, collective ethical responsibility and the claims of the world beyond us. In this way, this study is thematically bound to the unity of all life so as to enhance the organic vision of the nature. So, there is no separation between human and non-human natural world. Rather, there is interrelationship, interconnection and inter-assimilation among all the ingredients of nature - the same force contexts growth, decay, beauty and terror of

of human life.

Looking through the eye of eco-criticism, this study rejects crime done against nature committed by the people alike Peissel where they visualize only of being anthropocentric. This study upholds the horizontal relationship between man and nature discarding vertical relation rooted as in Peissel's insight. Treating nature as organic whole in itself and man as a part of it, this study seeks to acknowledge the power of nature and human communion with the elemental world of nature. Hence, it reinforces to have ecological gratitude on the egalitarian earth.

II. Anthropocentrism and Representation: Dealing Human – Animal Tension

This research deals with the autobiographical novel of Michel Peissel, *Tiger for Breakfast* dealing on the relationship between human and animals that's why it is re-reading the novel from an ecological perspective. This provides the novel with a new taste on reading excited and dramatic life of a Russian man Boris Lissanevitch that traces his childhood escaping from the Bolsheviks, to his days living it up as part of a famous ballet troupe touring Europe and subsequent tour through Asia, leading to his setting up an exclusive club for socialites in Calcutta and finally becoming party planner and hotel owner extraordinaire in Kathmandu. Boris the extrovert, whimsical and full of creative energy with amazing organizational skills as proven in his key role in the royal hunt of Queen Elizabeth II in Nepal - the likes of which will probably never be seen again in terms of sheer grandeur and scale. Nevertheless, the text deals with the tiger hunting games exercised among south Asian rajas, princes and the elites. Thus, the researcher finds the loopholes in the very time of enjoying the hunting practices with a mindset of eco-critical concern that underestimates the interrelationship of animals with humans. Evoking the general eco-critical notions of anthropomorphism, anthropocentrism and dealing with the cultural and political representations of animals and the discourses in literature, this research comes in close analysis of the text through Greg Garrard's *Ecocriticism* with its especial focus on the trope "animals".

Ecocriticism examines representation of nature has accumulated the examination of the representations of landscapes and of nature in its original state, in governmental reports, developer's plans, documentaries and along with the ways animals are represented. Animals are the integral part of nature and nonetheless, are connected with human daily activities. Animals are in one way or the other in literary

texts is portrayed with or without relating the humans. . Eco-critics pay a special attention to analyze the representation of reading the animals and the hierarchies that operate in the discourses regarding the animal, natural environment and humans since we are conscious of it.

Greg Garrard argues, “The study of the relations between animals and human in the Humanities is split between philosophical consideration of animal rights and cultural analysis of the representations of animals” (136). Here, in this research in the text *Tiger for Breakfast*, to study the human relation with animals, the researcher accounts with both issues of animal rights and the issue of representations of animals.

Further, she argues drawing upon Peter Singer’s *Animal Liberation* where Singer puts arguments regarding utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham where Bentham suggests that cruelty to animals was analogous to slavery and claimed that ‘the capacity to feel pain, not the power of reason, entitled a being to moral consideration.’ Singer labels this attitude as ‘speciesism’ to the prejudice Bentham identifies as the basis of our different treatment of animals and humans, he argues, animals suffer because they fall on the wrong side of a supposedly ‘insuperable line’ (cited in Singer:8) dividing beings that counts from those that do not. Garrard argues “Yet it turns out to be impossible to draw that line in such a way that all animals are excluded and all humans are included, even if we turn, as many have done, to the faculties of ‘reason’ or ‘discourse’ [...]” (Garrard:136). Singer draws the boundary between human and animals to be arbitrary, irrelevant, since human share with animals a capacity that only ‘the hand of tyranny’ could ignore.

But Singer contends that the suffering of a human should not automatically count for more than the suffering of an animal. Viewing upon Singer’s opinion, Peissel seems to draw a big boundary between human and animals and at a time

foregrounding the former as more valuable entity. Peissel is fascinated like Singer who believes that animals suffer because they fall on the wrong side of supposed insuperable line. Human sufferings and interests in real are counted whereas animals are predated with the reason that they are on the wrong side. To be more honest, Peissel is fascinated with Boris Lissanevitch with his great adventurous tales and about the hunting camps that Boris goes with the aristocratic families, Royal Princes and the British Commissioners in India. The shootings carried out in the dense forests were innumerable and so was the animals hunted in that hunting course. Total numbers of animals that were hunted were indeed countless. The human domination and exploitation through hunting activities is carried all over the text and, thus, this book bears the name – “Tiger for Breakfast”.

The text being a biography of Boris Lissanevitch – a Russian expatriate, it preserves a good history of hunting adventures and animal predation. Moreover, it is a picturesque description of hunting and the exclusion of animal rights and sufferings. Animals are all the time suffering due to the manipulation laid on them by humans. This manipulation is done on the ground that animals are ignorant and they do not have mind. In the ensuing paragraphs, there are several instances of humans' attitude of looking towards animals.

Garrard attempts ‘animal’ as a trope having a range of important function. In discussing the relationship between human and animal, Greg Garrard notes that the likeness and differences in the relationship of humans and animals in general may be analyzed in terms of the distinction of metonymy and metaphor. "Humans can both be and be compared to animals. There is, therefore, an extensive rhetoric of animality. [...] that is as functional in description of human social and political relations as it is in describing actual animals” (140).

The hunters like Boris Lissanevitch in the text *Tiger for Breakfast* long to live with the animals make themselves as animals. They are so connected with animals that sometimes they even forget that they are human. Boris too is engaged with animal hunting that it looks he forgets that he is with a human mind – a rational being. He can be judged himself as an animal and having the animalistic behaviors that can categorize him as having the sense of animality. Animals hunt to have their food but Boris's reason of hunting is void. A man is not equal to an animal, not one particle of him. Human life is stinking, corrupt, and meanwhile there are beautiful creatures that lived with delicacy on the earth without doing anyone any harm.

The representation of animals and its focus on discourse and discursive constructs in the literature or wildlife documentaries in the modern readers shapes the perceptions of wild animals. There is an interest in the way to picture the ideas where human beings and their doings intervened in natural process or affected the perception of our natural environment and animals. These led humans, a rationale creature as a supreme and posit as a self-confident and assertive position vis-à-vis nature that conceptualizes the 'domination' upon nature and especially animals. There is no question that wildlife narratives, films and documentaries have made important contributions to the environmental campaigns but this may 'misinterpret its objects various ways, substituting errors for ignorance' (151). Garrard explains:

In particular, the way the relationship of the viewer to the wildlife is constructed may be highly problematic, narrowing our experience of nature from full sensory, intellectual and political engagement to purely visual relation that is further distorted by over emphasis on violence and sex. In other words, it may be little better than 'eco-porn'.

(151)

In the following paragraphs we can look at the animal representation and how they are the part of the socio-political constructs in the book like *Tiger for Breakfast*. This book has plenty examples how animals are killed mercilessly in front of the human interests that develops their identity as nothing. Let's have a glimpse of shooting and hunting done on India as well as South Asian countries as it is described in the book, *Tiger for Breakfast* where these places works as the enigmatic and exotic taste of hunting the big cats, elephants, rhinos as well as the rare animals found in the dense forests. Travelers who used to visit India too with their commissions – the Colonial officers, British Civil servants, and officers of British army sought a new life in India regarding sports – polo, pig sticking and 'big game shooting' too.

Peissel explains that Boris had a passion of shooting since he was child as, when he was ten; his father gave him a 16-bore gun. He quotes, 'Ever since childhood Boris had had a passion for shooting' (108). This passion of shooting got exposed first in China when he was in a tour as a ballet dancer and met with M. Lainelot in Cholon, who was an official of French civil service and now engaged in building the famous Route Number 13 from Cambodia to Tokin through Laos. Boris's first hunting experience was of a big clouded leopard and two large banteng bulls. This made Boris more enthusiastic and that night killed the first tiger from fifteen yards away and thus, proudly showed to the corporeal – his hunting mate. Further, Peissel demonstrates:

Boris spent in all three months in the bush in Indochina, hunting like mad. Meat being in great demand, there was no restrictions; everything was welcome. When they left Kratie he had shot thirteen – odd bantengs, ten bison, six leopards, two clouded leopards, innumerable deer, six tigers and also two rare gray gaur – the latter was later identified as an almost extinct separate species, but was then

thought to be a cross bred of gaur and buffalo.(112)

Such were the trophies of a man who hunted in the South East Asia - 'Boris had had all the skins of big cats preserved and the horns of all the other animals packed and crated' (113).

Andreas-Holger Maehle's "Cruelty and Kindness to the 'Brute Creation': Stability and Change in the Ethics of the Man- Animal Relationship, 1600 – 1850" is an illuminating work on the "development of the discourse on the ethics of using animals." In this article Maehle examines the role of biblical exegesis and Christian morals, animal psychology, theory of moral rights and duties, vegetarianism, and love for pets within the development of the aforementioned discourse. Frances Hutcheson is one of the important figures cited by Maehle on the debates on the rights of animals. Hutcheson declares that animals "have a *right* that no useless pain or misery should be inflicted on them" (Maehle 92). However, his observation that animals "can have no right ... against mankind in anything necessary for human support," was clearly anthropocentric. Maehle also tells us that "in 1776, Humphrey Primatt in England made the decisive second step towards animals' right to happiness." He argued that since animals have no hope for a future, their suffering is worse than that of humans. Their lack of the capacity for human speech makes them unable to accuse their tormentors and, therefore, suffer all the more. Besides, animals' lack of rationality, according to Primatt, means that they cannot "act immorally and therefore [can]not endure pain as punishment" (93). Primatt's argument anticipated Jeremy Bentham's well known plea for the recognition of animal rights. Bentham's famous dictum on animals "the question is not, Can they *reason*? nor Can they *talk*? But, Can they *suffer*?" (Maehle 93) has proved influential on current philosophers such as Peter Singer and Tom Regan who have made sentience or the ability to feel pain (and the

fact that animals are subjects of life) the criteria which gives a moral status to animals.

As in the novel *Tiger for Breakfast*, we see animals are suffering in the name of human passion of enjoying hunting as the sports. Torments on animals are worst as they cannot talk and accuse the rational minded humans and to think being an eco-critic their sufferings is worst. Moreover, human are using animals to hunt animals themselves. Elephants are used widely enough for hunting the wild animals like tigers. Human interest is superior among the animals and thus, animals are made to struggle among each other if something wrong happens during the hunting time. It is not the humans that get hurt but the poor animals get hurt and most probably get killed in the encounter. The peaceful environment of the jungle and the great chain of the biodiversity and eco-system can get challenged.

The statistics of hunting in the dense forests of the elites and high personnel of the country is high. In the novel, *Tiger for Breakfast*, the statistics of hunted animals mentioned in such vast number reveals that such number can be with everyone who is involved in hunting in India elsewhere. Every corners and persons who hunted have more numbers of hunted animals than Boris have. The rare species of animals and animal preservation is almost not noticed and as quoted above everyone, in one way or the other, involves in shooting the rare and nearly extinct animal species in the name of developing a new passion of sports like that of polo or pig sticking within themselves. The relation whom animals share with the humans – a rational being, is to be of non-hierarchical and inter-relationship to keep the eco-system an organic whole with equal status in each other. The sense of interdependence to sustain the life on earth and maintaining the bio-diversity in earth is disregarded completely in the novel. Such hunting and in a sense poaching in large, accounts ecological disturbance.

The more vivid appearance of the representations of animals, especially

the wild animals is on the chapter VIII entitled 'A Women Eating Tiger' of the novel *Tiger for Breakfast* with lots of evidences how animals are deified in front of human interest and passion. The narrator, Michel Peissel, was too well aware of seeing ever-present reminders of India and Nepal like the stuffed trophies, the great tiger skin rugs and the 'mounted heads' of rhinos and crocodiles, etc. made him feel this sub-continent possess the great skill of tiger hunting, "the sports of the sports, the sport of kings and princes, tiger shooting" (143).

Peissel in visiting Nepal and India was clear and had accepted the tiger hunting as one of the sports:

A small tiger cub that crept into the drawing room while we had drinks reminded me that all these trophies were not just so many dead reminders of the past. A true pet, the little cub made me forget what fierce and formidable beasts the tigers are, and how hunting them is one of the most risky and exciting sports in the world [...] a sport still much practiced today. (143)

Peissel traces the tiger hunting history of India when at first hunting tigers is only performed by rajas and high dignitaries upon the solicitation of the local peasants to rid an area of man-eater beast of a particularly dangerous animal who had claimed a heavy toll of local cattle. As India is covered by dense jungles and plenty of marshlands, the natives had no right to kill the men-eating tigers but, rajas and princes do it. Later, hunting was highly popular and especially tiger hunting as court firstly places hunting as an amusement with a tamed cheetah for Mogul emperors to pass time. Likewise, stag hunts in Europe are equal to legal tiger shooting of India. And for the tiger shooting elephants were used and many maharajas prided themselves on keeping a large number of good hunting elephants.

Dan Wylie, in his article, “Elephants and Compassion: Ecological Criticism and Southern African Hunting Literature” attempts to contextualize the elephant-hunting accounts by looking on the economic aspects in reading any literary texts, which offers rich prospects for further study:

[...] the growth of capitalistic enterprise in Africa, and elephants' place in the global economy. Ivory was always, and continues to be, the primary motive behind the hunting of elephants; but it is now also economically integrated through tourism - and in some places, the controlled 'cull.' The rhetorics of economics are thus particularly important. (86)

In fact, Occidentals are always looking for their internal interests to manipulate on the Oriental places as it is the same psychological mind setup that Bhaya or the Maharaja of Cooch Behar makes his place, in one sense, notorious for its big game hunting. He is unaware of the hunting and cannot account to his ecological biodiversity. Every people whether it be a foreigner or a native is unaware of the ecological and environmental concerns and thus, are involved in shooting to fulfill their innate or developed passions within. Peissel hints the motive behind hunting:

Others, like Prince Hans Henry of Plesse, would be out of for shikar in the hope of “padding” a few tigers, several leopards, some buffalo and perhaps, with luck, a rhino or two – trophies that would fill an additional thirty cases and would be sent by steamer to adorn the entrance halls of vast family estates in Europe. (97)

The motive behind the hunting is crystal clear as the above paragraph details hunting strategy for the adoration on the decorative buildings of the Western world. The economic aspect runs behind in any thing just like Dan Wylie counts in this

contemporary capitalistic society. As stated above, Prince Hans Henry of Plesse will go out for hunting in the hope of hunting some animals but that turns out to be vast number because of his capitalistic and colonial mindset that anyhow they have to loot the Asia and Africa and live the blissful life in Europe with the Oriental luxuries they have sent through the steamers.

The favorite location for wildlife narratives and documentaries circles around African and Asian wildlife with mega faunas as elephants and giraffes, where the narrator sometimes seems to stand in for the colonial figure of the white game hunter. Despite the fact that Africans and the Asians have co-existed with these species ours evolved there, humans are introduced in of two roles: destroyers or saviors. All too often, black hunters are simply the demon 'poachers' while white conservationists are valorized, and the complex economic and political factors involved in poaching and game management are ignored at all.

Among present theories of justice, Harvard philosopher John Rawls asserts, "The destruction of a whole species can be a great evil," but also admits that in his theory "no account is given of right conduct in regard to animals and the rest of nature" (60). Killing an individual animal adds the destruction of whole species; this is because all humans have this attribute of killing animals.

The way animals are hunted in large number now has the negative effect in the earth and thus, now we have to make environmental preservation programs such as establishing national parks and animal reserves. This can only be the only way to preserve the animals and control poaching activities. The days novel is written, animals are treated as merely puppets with no real existence which would entertain the ruling class, aristocrats, White men, travelers, businessmen, commissioners of the colonial empire. The animals are the agents to grow the passion of the hunting game

among these personnel. Nothing can hinder human from shooting and it is a trend of getting entertainment neglecting the back draws that would sure invite the environmental hazards.

In 1936, December 18, Boris establishes a club – The Three Hundred Club, named with the idea that Calcutta is the second city of the British Empire and it must have a 300 Club in opposition to famed 400 Club in London. Though, Boris handles all the management of the club but it is in fact financed by one hundred and eighty founder members – the elites of Calcutta, distinguished names and titles of every Indian state, millionaires and mostly in the master plan of the prominent leader of Calcutta society, Allen Lockhart. It is a meeting place of the most important men of Calcutta, civil servants, businessmen, and professional leaders, distinguished and bejeweled Indian princes, and their elegant spouses. Working as the secretary of the 300 club, he is acquainted with the Maharaja of Cooch Behar known as ‘Bhaya’, a remarkable big game hunter and a Nepalese general Mahabir Shumsher Jung Bahadur Rana. This friendship is later known as “the Three Musketeers”. This group is engaged in ventures of hunting. The state of Cooch Behar have had an unrivaled reputation for its big game shoots, to which has come the nobility of Europe and the highest dignitaries of India. Cooch Behar is the place where it is:

Covered by marshes, jungles and savannahs of elephant grass, the state of Cooch Behar, if it was not one of the largest or richest in India, was beyond a doubt the most famous for its wild game. In its swamp and jungles roamed the fierce tiger, the great one horned Indian rhino, wild buffalos, and the herds of wild elephants that annually were rounded up and the best specimens captured for taming [...]. (138)

The most popular subject of conversation of the 300 Club in Calcutta is shooting. In

fact, this club is the sole institution and the meeting place to draw upon the plans to exercise the big game hunting adventure among and beyond the high class Calcutta people. This game ranges in groups from bird (snipe) shooting to the big game tiger hunting. The Maharaja of Cooch Behar, a reputed shooter invites Boris for hunting. For this, camps are established to make it a finest sport. Shooting tiger methods vary greatly and Boris tries them all. The methods involve from shooting tigers on foot, on elephant backs to the shooting from *machans*. Among these, shooting from the *machan*, Boris know to be least sporting as it involves a buffalo tied in a tree to attract a tiger so that a hunter sitting in a machan – a platform in a tree, kills it.

And the funny thing is that the narrator describes the physiological make up of the fingers that is six in number of the Raja of Barwani and the Maharaja of Darbhanga who with their two thumbs in each hand, are excellent hunters – “As for the Raja of Barwani, he, like the Maharaja of Darbhanga, also had six fingers – rather, two thumbs to each hand. This profusion of fingers in no way prevented their owners from possessing excellent trigger fingers” (140). It means the sixth finger acts as a good sign and by fortune good hunting skill inherits in them. All the environment and situation in India made a realization of the greatest ambition among the princes was shooting it was called more fascinatingly that princely occupation was hunting and that deals the contemporary hunting scenario.

In the words of Martin Luther King, injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. Introducing several methods to kill a tiger and categorizing shooting as a sport reminds the negligence upon the animals as they are the poor little things that should serve humans and fulfill the great passions involved within human beings. The tiger shooting to Boris is an adventurous game and he rarely misses the opportunity when someone plans in it and invites him. He takes part enthusiastically and as a

result, he turns out to be best among the amateurs. He himself later proves to be a more professional one.

Ecological reading helps to establish a culture, to respect to non-human world. If the interconnectedness between human and non-human members is understood, it in many ways can heal the environmental wounds human have inflicted upon it. On the one hand, Ecocriticism looks at how text represents the physical world and on the other hand, more importantly, it examines at how literature raises moral questions about human interactions with nature. Most ecocritical works shares a common motivation: the awareness that we have reached the age of environmental limit, a time when the consequences of human actions are damaging the planet's basic life system.

According to the book entitled *Thirty-seven Years of Big Game Shooting*, it was the Maharaja of Cooch Behar who made his state famous for its great "shikars" (148). The Maharaja of Cooch Behar records the incredible list of tigers, bears, rhinos, panthers, and buffalos either by him or his fellow distinguished guests including the highest aristocracy of Europe and the Orient like Prince Esterhazy, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Hamilton, Prince Christian Victor, Prince Hans Henry of Pless, HRH Count of Tunis and others. The outstanding reputation of the shooting in Cooch Behar is also based upon the number of fine elephants owned by the Maharaja as it is practically impossible by foot to shoot the tigers in those dense forests because the elephant grass grow often some twenty to thirty foot tall. Humans sometimes make animals to have enmity among each other. They are more or less used to fulfill human desires. As stated in the book *Tiger for Breakfast*, elephants are used to hunt the tigers as it would be safe for the hunters from being attacked back. This makes a clear reference that tiger regards elephant as its enemy but it is human who drives elephant. Thus, this book explains the several incidents that tiger counter attacked the elephants

with their sharp claws and elephants were in fury with tigers and attacked the tigers too:

If roughly disturbed by noisy beaters or elephants, tiger will not hesitate to pounce on the elephants, gashing them with their claws and at the same time burying their teeth in the elephant's skin. Elephants when attacked by a tiger will generally get the better of the beast [...] can lift a tiger with its trunk and flying it against a tree. It sometimes kicks the tiger and with a remarkable speed runs up and stamps the tiger to death with one hammering blow of its gigantic foot, and kneels on him. Nevertheless, tigers are very dangerous adversaries, even for elephants. (149)

A remarkable explanation of man-eater tiger in the eighth chapter helps us know how tigers turn out to be man eating one. This issue is to be explored more sensitively regarding the eco-critical eye. According to Peissel, tigers and even the panthers turn to be man-eaters and these man-eaters “stalk human right into their huts”. Single man-eater can take at least two or three human lives and sometimes more. A man-eating tiger eats nothing but human flesh. These man-eaters travel a great distance catching new victims in the outskirts of villages where the news of their whereabouts is not spread. The villagers with their primitive means of weapons cannot put to the end of that beastly creature. Boris is too involved in assisting to kill man-eaters in 1939 when he is in the state of the Raja of Bamra, south-west of Calcutta where the tiger kills three women and later two men till late evening. Boris follows the tiger tracks and later was able to kill. Boris discovers that it turned out to be man-eater because it is old – “on all four paws it only had three whole claws, and in its mouth it had only one tooth that wasn't broken. There was no doubt that it had turned man-eater from older

age” (151). Likewise, in Poona area, in Bombay province, he kills another man-eater when he is in his usual hunting of the leopards.

It is not only the hunters that win the battle of hunting, it is sometimes usual where the wild animals can pit the humans to realize the battle just lost among the charms of the massive jungles, the open marshy spaces. The human like Hollenstein gets killed by the dangerous wild elephant in 1938 December. It is calculated that Hollenstein dies as he get off the elephant and began walking in foot which no hunter should ever do.

Why do tigers turn out to be man-eater needs to examine through eco-critical perspective. Though there may be several reasons behind it but one of the main reasons is the over domination of humans in the environment and making it lose its habitat. The natural home of tigers – jungle encroached by humans, has certainly a negative consequence and animals will take the revenge on humans for it. Besides this, with the rise of population and the human shooting the animals made the scarcity of food for the tigers so that the hungry and infuriated tiger would enter villages and the nearby human areas and make an easy prey whether it is a little cattle or a civilized human being.

But, a human approach of defining a man-eater tiger will be different. A tiger would be a man-eater after only it turns out to be in an old age. This all reveals politicizing the human interests and creating a discourse – the old ones are man-eaters and they are eligible to get killed as per the human’s will because such tigers will “stalk human right into the hut”. This is only an example how human create discourses about animals so that their interests will get implanted among the poor little creatures. It is the eco-critics’ job to account and address for such discourses ruling over all the human civilizations. Animals are the most tolerating creatures on

the earth. Tigers too know the fact that it is unjust to attack upon the humans because they are not their real prey. But, the over encroachment and over poaching activities carried on the earth make them realize in their old age as they become experienced in the later years of their life, it is the human activities responsible for their loss of the habitat and thus, they attack to the humans to take revenge. There lies the tension between the humans and animals. They turn to humans when they know that they are over-exploited.

Humans are actually the irrational creatures who have their minds but that very mind has manipulated on the earth. It is true that with his master mind has dominated the earth and space but this domination must be fair and everyone should have equal status on the earth and have to live freely in its surrounding. Human interest is not only the legitimate interest on earth; it is of all creatures of the earth to account for.

However, the notion of eco-friendly narrative prevails in the first part of the text where the narrator, Peissel is travelling first in Nepal through the plane is most charmed by the natural beauty of plains of Terai to the rare sights of the highest peaks and mountain ranges. The spontaneous use of language he uses makes a clear picture of eco-friendly narrative but this imagination on the readers shatters in the leading chapters thereon. Peissel, when traveling by plane in the broad plains of terai contemplates as:

‘rapidly replaced by the first upheavals of the earth’s crust, the first longitudinal mountain ranges, ridges upon which the jungles still clung’ and that was ‘replaced by a welter of mountains [...] forming narrow, dark valleys and gorges’ and ‘the mountains seemed to start rising in a succession of prisms with jagged crests.’ (22)

The Kathmandu valley is described as alive with animals, insects, and various birds. Giant flying foxes share the sky with the countless flocks of crows whose chorus is the most characteristic background music of entire valley and the most picturesque is the cranes in paddies. Peissel describes the Himalayas – the snow-covered mountains, jungles of terai – the home of tigers, elephants and rhinos, dark valleys, city architects, gorges, etc that have drawn to Nepal so many adventurers, sportsmen and prophets. Boris is able to grant visas for foreigners in 1955 with the consent of the governmental officials and his Royal Hotel in Kathmandu initiates and mobilizes the tourism industry in Nepal. The Royal Hotel becomes the meeting place of European and Nepalese elites and Boris personality is the leading spirit of town's social activities- 'Boris is the number two attraction in Nepal after Everest'. 'More people dropped in to see Boris than to look at Everest' (51).

Hunting never ends and this passion is one of the deadly ones. This gives better chances to exercise hunting the new brand of animals and even for the rare and near extinct animals. Same as in 1942, when Boris is with Kira, his wife in tiger haunt, 'by luck' hunts 'a strange-looking animal' (158), a white leopard – a near extinct animal. Measuring six feet, six inches long and the skin was sent to famous taxidermist Van Ingen of Mysore. Later an article in *Natural History*, magazine of Bombay discusses about the white leopard. Today, the skin is with Maharaja of Dumraon's son.

Likewise, later in Nepal, there became a rumor that Boris tracked snowmen 'yeti':

[...] he declares that in 1959 he followed the tracks of a yeti for hundreds of yards, and had numerous photographs of the footprints. Boris himself has shot an animal that was believed to

be nonexistent (his white leopard) and as far back as his days in Laos was familiar with a species of bison so rare that it was not known to science. He is perfectly willing to agree that an animal yet unknown could and very well may exist. (233)

It is not the case with animals only but with birds also. With his small prudence, he can trap a rare bird found in the mountain, Boris buys large number of nets from Calcutta discussing with famous ornithologist Dr. Dillon Ripley and provides him some rare birds as a specimen. Hunters like Boris make themselves busy with everything of nature like birds and even plunder the poor birds too-“Boris has tried to find and catch a specimen of the mountain quail, a bird so rare it was once believed to be extinct” (233).

It means authorities are fascinated with the hunting activities and they never monitored or evaluated in such activities whether it is right or wrong. It is true that the contemporary administration of India is with the British Empire and this colonization history is the history of plundering and ravaging the natural resources of the host colony. So, the hunting activities are exercised and carried out by number of British officials and commissioners themselves and the hunting is as legal as the colony remained in India. Nobody have the care of the environmental and nature awareness. The colonizers’ or the British interests and in a sense human interests are accounted and notified. The rare animals like white leopard are simply registered in the office of the authority. And later, Bombay Natural History Society runs a discussion on the rare animals like white leopard when the near extinct species get killed and the one who kills it is free and let unpunished which is one way a reward to hunt the other rare species.

These all above mentioned evidences and details are not sufficient about

big game hunting. One of the most remarkable hunting experiences is carried in the Second World War time with the colonels and the high military officials when Boris is in the 300 club and the club is an artillery unit HQ. Later, the club gets closed in 1961. The colonials and the high military officials also develop interest into a big game enthusiast. These high military officials are General Haggett, Colonel Ormond Hunter, etc. along with Boris. Boris takes many of the generals and the senior officers who passed through into the jungle for shooting. These officers are too good for shooting profession. These war officials set up the record of killing one of the big tigers in hunting history of India which is “a nine-foot-four-inch tigress” and “a ten-foot-two-inch tiger”.

The last but not the least important notorious hunting adventure with which Boris is involved is with Queen Elizabeth II hunting party organized in Nepal. This shooting adventure is done in Meghauli, Chitwan in the bank of Rapti River. This hunt was popular among the world and Peissel writes, “Newspaper and magazines throughout the world have described, and published hundreds of photographs to illustrate, the spectacular pageantry and grandeur of this Royal Hunt” (253). Hunting in Nepal until 1960 is exclusively a royal privilege, and in the days of Ranas the tiger shoots in the terai have already acquired the reputation of being the most elaborate, fabulous and one of the luxury in the world. By using 376 elephants, shooting was conducted where plenty of tigers, rhinos and deer were spotted dead. Before this royal hunt, King George V’s party on his visit to Nepal in 1911 had shot thirty-nine tigers, eighteen rhinos and four bears.

Apart from this, several dishes of endangered species is served to please Queen like saddle of *muntjak* (barking deer). Likewise, Peissel describes the dishes like this: “[...] The Queen was offered twenty-two varieties of Nepalese game,

including such gourmet delicacies as black partridge, wild boar shashlik, shredded venison curry, and rare florican crane” (260). All these meals are prepared and served by Boris and in return Boris gets thanks with peacock pilau that he serves. This gives a glimpse how humans treat animals and the governmental officials are completely focused to please others relying on the poor animals to give the rare tastes of life and long their rule. They completely neglect the environmental activities.

All these activities of hunting and poaching mentioned above reveals a new sense of eco-critical idea of anthropocentrism – a concept where human interests are valued first neglecting others. Whether it may be pleasing himself or fulfilling his psychological demands, Boris, not only pleases himself but also his nearby companions. Anthropocentrism is the human-centered view that legitimizes and rationalizes the exploitation of both land and wildlife. This creates the sense of hierarchy – human on the top of all and is legitimate to exploit the earth and the natural resources as if the natural resources are all meant for voluntary usurpation and arbitrary subjugation. This view regards man and nature as two different entities: former as master and the latter as slave.

The view of anthropocentrism got its impetus from the concept ‘dominion’ because the very concept of dominating relationship with the natural world has been remained unquestioned as our domination of the world is anchored in God’s word. Had not God Himself, in Genesis 1, verse 26 (King James Version), ordained that we, human beings, would have a special place in the His Creation, and would have ‘dominion over the fish of the sea, and over every creeping thing upon the earth’. Bertens explains, “The exact meaning of dominion in this particular context was indeed debated by theologians – after all, dominion may give rise to all sorts of practices ranging from responsible stewardship to exploitation – but the hierarchy it

implies, with us as masters and the natural world in the position of servitude, seemed clear enough” (198-199). Thus, Lynn White blamed on the Judeo Christian notion of man’s domination over nature – “Christianity is the most anthropocentric religion in the world” (143). He blames Christianity for giving overpowering position to men to rule over nature and creatures. And it is the Christianity that established a dualism of men and nature and it is God’s will that man exploit nature for his proper end.

This concept of dominion prevails from the primitive time and till is in way. The relationship of dominion, so central to Western culture’s view of humans and the natural world, still remains largely unchallenged. It was perhaps, not to invalidate the order established at the beginning of the Creation. In 1854, American nature writer, Henry David Thoreau in his *Walden*, complained about the deformed landscape was the result of ‘avarice and selfishness’ and the farmer ‘knows Nature but as robber’. And by the time of 1890, there was the mass slaughter of millions of bison on the American Great Plains, resulting in near extinction of species. It is only among hundreds of evidences how the concept of dominion gets its way to kill the living species other than human in large amount- “Clearly, ‘dominion’ is not supposed to include the reduction, within one single century, of herds totaling tens of millions to a bare three hundred surviving animals” (199).

This novel describes and provides several issues of anthropocentric views which time and again recur in the text. Mostly, the novel describes about the central character Boris Lissanevitch and his hunting activities. It looks as if hunting and the name Boris can be used interchangeably. Hunting in itself an anthropocentric activity and the outcome is too the same. Meanwhile, hunters continue to kill hundreds or thousands of animals; they still continue to do so, albeit at a lower scale, in trophy hunting. Hunters hunt abundantly and so does Boris. It is sure he does not

miss the golden opportunity. In 1958, Boris shoots his sixty-eighth tiger and others like him were quite ahead of the statistics of that of Boris:

[...] In 1958 he shot his sixty-eighth tiger. this is far from a record – the Maharaja of Sarguja, for example, has shot to date, despite his old age, the world record of 1,177 tigers, and is still shooting – but it does place Boris among a select few, considering that he is neither a professional nor given the opportunities that await maharajas. (156)

If this is the case and the reality, it proves how a man turns to be anthropocentric and run after a campaign to set a world record. The number of tiger hunting which Boris is itself large in his personal statistics of his lifelong hunting career. But as far as concerned to the Maharaja of Sarguja, his statistic of killing tiger (1,177) is a large and of the world record that really needs to be mattered. Bringing the highest and comparably the lowest number of tiger killing, Peissel seems to have anthropocentric mindset considering the hunting a preferable and considerable one. Despite this large number of killing tigers, the statistics of killing other small animals besides tiger is innumerable.

The ruling class and the aristocrats of the then time used to decorate their corridors and rooms with the animal skin, the heads and the horns as the decorative element of the room. It seems among them quite fashionable to brag with each other about the ‘trophy’ of the animals possessed. While Peissel meets Boris for the first time in the Royal Hotel in Kathmandu, Peissel observes “the enormous stuffed heads of rhinoceroses, who were gazing at each other with sympathetic small beady eyes” (25). The rooms are decorated with many of the animal properties that, it can be better to say the exhibition hall of some Victorian museum. It contains a tiger-skin rug with a wide open, pink and jeering one to the fifteen feet crocodile skin hanged in the great

gigantic walls. In fact Boris's hotel is no less 'Victorian museum' of animals where guests will be impressed by:

[...] the innumerable tiger skins and other members of the strange, inanimate zoo that populates the corridors and the rooms of the hotel. Not least remarkable of these stuffed inmates is a fifteen-foot-long crocodile whose ever-open mouth awaits the tipsy tourist as he leaves the bar. (28)

The Royal Hotel of Kathmandu owns its zoo too. Boris creates a zoo in the hotel premise so that every guest will know about his passion of hunting and it will be easy to introduce about it. In fact, this zoo is the result of the several hunting adventures that Boris goes in Nepal with his fellow hunters. Peissel writes, "From his numerous shoots Boris has brought not only skins and antlers as trophies, but occasionally also live animals" (159). Peissel further writes about the animals kept in the Royal Hotel:

Today the Royal Hotel still harbors two full-grown Himalayan black bears, dangerous brutes with "V" markings in their dark fur under their necks. They are the last remnants of Boris's zoo, which at one time included spotted and barking deer, an albino barking deer, three jharals (mountain goats), a scaly anteater, several panthers, and four binturongs (bear cats), along with many lesser pandas. (233)

Boris had a pet leopard named Puss Puss kept from the age of four months while he is on the 300 Club in Calcutta. Peissel says that it remained tamed when it fully grow up. Boris snatches the poor creature from their natural habitat and keeps within himself to amuse him, parents and especially may be to the fellow guests visiting the 300 Club. A man is really anthropocentric always looking for own benefits as

Boris, the central character of the novel, *Tiger for Breakfast* is.

Boris even assists to the film crew entitled *High Adventure* for the television and it is chosen to shoot in India as Nepalese governmental officials did not give permission to do it. The film is to be on tiger and elephants. He manages this operation with the Raja of Gauripur where he and his men are renowned for capturing over “six hundred elephants by means of lassos” in the border of Assam and Bengal. Peissel, in this book gives the detail information how a wild elephant is captured and made domestic undergoing lots of trials and tribulations. The poor creature has to follow and after the seventh day of capture it turns out to be fully domesticated. Peissel gives some details of commands that the elephant must obey throughout its life:

Kneel down	<i>beit</i>
Back	<i>peichu</i>
Stop	<i>dhut</i>
Break an overhead branch	<i>upoor dale</i>
Smash	<i>mar doob (248)</i>

The film crews also do shooting on the tiger shooting activities with the primitive tribe of northern Assam and east Bhutan who capture tigers with nets and spears. Boris actually is involved in such shooting as a managing agent in Nepal and India. Later, he helps French super production to help shoot in the terai of Nepal. Here lies the true intention of the Western world in the name of making documentaries and films or super production are involved in the mass domination and make a discourse that dominates the human mind and create a fake representation in the world. Western people like Boris come into the ‘real paradise’ and calling the true poachers from Europe and America make the place a ‘hell’ and destroy the wild habitat that leads

to decrease in the wild animals destroying the earth's biodiversity.

If we see the philosophical trend, human have been seen as the rational and reflective centre of creation while in the religious trend the relationship of human with nature is dominating one. The earth and its myriad species are secondary to the significance of human being. The anthropocentric view suggests that human have greater intrinsic value than other species. As a result to this attitude, any species that are of potential use to human can be resources to be exploited. This use occurs often to the point of extinction as far as concerned to the animals. The view that human has greater intrinsic value than other species also influence ethical judgment about interconnection with other organism. These ethics are often used to legitimize treating other species in ways that should be considered morally unacceptable if human were similarly treated.

Among several concepts of Ecocriticism, there is the concept of anthropomorphism which originally was applied to the false attribution of human shape and qualities to God. Greg Garrard sees the concept of anthropomorphism as biasness to animals which makes the description of animal and its behavior is twisted and almost impossible. Providing human attributes and qualities to the animals depict a negative representation of animals. Midley explains that, for example, 'mahouts' or elephant handler have many beliefs about the elephants which sometimes turn out to be false because they are anthropomorphic as they "misinterpret some outlying aspects of elephant behavior by relying on a human pattern which is inappropriate" (Garrard 115).

Some evidences in the novel *Tiger for Breakfast*, turn out to be anthropomorphic. As stated in the book, governmental officials also create discourses about animals which are truly a human perspectives laden upon the poor creature. As

for illustration – the Indian officials rename the animal “blue bull” (nilgai in Hindi) to “nil gora” giving a complete different meaning ‘a blue horse’ which make it popular among the poachers and hunters to kill it legally. Before, naming it as nilgora, it belonged to a cow family, a sacred animal thus, are not shot by villagers also. But as the number of it grew, officials name it as of horse family and thus, a subject of hunting. The enormous damage on crops caused by the animal will get controlled.

Likewise, in Nepal too, governmental officials also follow the same path of describing an animal named ‘yak’ in their own perspective. It was the time of 1856, the officials categorize and describe yak belonging to a deer family. Before, yak was of a cow family. Peissel writes, “In similar fashion, in Nepal, yaks, which are of the cow family were declared in 1856 to be of the deer family, and thus could serve as food for the Nepalese army invading Tibet” (152). It is crystal clear behind the objective that yaks can be used as food supply for humans. Officials also compromise to do the wrong things or create a perspective among the Nepalese people. This reveals the true example of anthropomorphism.

Today we are rallying for the preservation of the endangered species whether it is an animal or a bird. It is sure; it is neither Boris nor the narrator Peissel of the book *Tiger for Breakfast* join in this view. There are several state leaders in the book who in one way or the other completely discard this agenda of preservation. Such activities seem to happen in the coronation ceremony of King Mahendra of Nepal. To decorate the elaborate crown, it needs some rare feathers of endangered species of birds found in America. It is considered an appropriate present for the United States to send the paradise feathers and the rare plumes from the storeroom of New York Museum of National History – ‘a strange but welcome gift’, though since 1924 the sale had been banned for the preservation of the species. But United States did it.

The view that replaces anthropocentrism is a biocentrism notion which considers human to be no more than a particular species of animal with less intrinsic value than any of the other species or organism on earth. Biocentrism takes human as one of the concept of earth's ecosystem and that human have an absolute and undeniable requirement of the products and services of ecosystem in order to sustain them. Paul Taylor in his *Respect for Nature* equates human with that of animals – “human and animals share the earth and should live equal and harmoniously” (75). Thus, people or humans should not harm any part of nature that has inherent value and try to control or charge the ecosystem. Human must value and respect all other living and non-living entities and expect human being to exist in harmony with nature.

The concept of biocentrism shares some equal ideas with a new and distinct view of earth called ‘Gaia Hypothesis’ developed by the novelist William Golding for suggesting his friend James Lovelock for the inflection of the earth. Gaia hypothesis states that Earth could be described as a self- regulating system, analogous to a living organism. Lovelock claims that “the planet has been so thoroughly altered physically and chemically by living things that the earth itself has to been as kind of super organism. Rather than merely being a rock in space with life clinging to it, the non-living parts of the planet are as much a part of the whole as the non-living heartwood of a living tree” (qtd. in Garrard 173). Gaia is dynamic and unpredictable and it tends towards “a geophysical balance of energy and chemical elements analogous to the physiological balance of organism.” A hypothesis to understand earth to be a living organism, there are several factors to make it alive and regulate and there remains the greater importance of human, animals and living organisms to make it alive for the millennia. Thus, today world of growing wealth based on the destruction and consumption of forests and wildlife so astonishingly voracious that, in

places, it amounts to be an 'ecocidal' campaign to exhaust and redo the new ways of habits.

Despite the hunter's dominion over the animals, there are many evidences that connect the humans with animals. Elephant is circulated as the holy animal as the Hindu God Ganesh has the head that of an elephant. So, elephants are used in several great functions like King's coronation ceremony and even for someone's respect like that of Queen Elizabeth II's visit to Nepal where 376 elephants are lined to pay her a great respect. The wild animals like elephants are used to serve humans. This tendency is very popular in the Indian sub-continent areas especially Nepal and India. It was of a great pride of every state and the state maharajas to tame the elephants and ride on it.

The thinkers most associated with the animal liberation or animal rights views are Peter Singer and Tom Regan. Peter Singer is a philosopher associated with the birth of the animal rights movement through his epoch-making book *Animal Liberation: Towards an End to Man's Inhumanity to Animals*. Following the British philosopher Jeremy Bentham, Singer advances a utilitarian defense of animal liberation. He, like his predecessor, argues that the fact that animals feel pain and pleasure means that we should desist from inflicting unnecessary pain upon them and instead should aim to maximize pleasure for all, humans or animals. Singer mentions about the animal suffering that:

If a being suffers there can be no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into consideration. No matter what the nature of the being, the principle of equality requires that its suffering be counted equally with the like suffering – in so far as rough comparisons can be made – of any other being. If a being is not capable of suffering, or of

experiencing enjoyment or happiness, there is nothing to be taken into account. [...]. So the limit of sentience [...] is the only defensible boundary of concern for the interests of others. (9)

Animals are part of the physical environment or nature and the fact that many species have become extinct while others are at the brink of extinction, makes it imperative that we undertake studies towards understanding our attitudes to animals that emerge through forms of cultural production, in this case literature.

Today ecology is defined as the way in which plants, animals and people are related to each other and their environment. In this relationship they are so much interdependent on each other that any disturbance in one disturbs the other. History has proved this every now and then that with every change in the civilization the relationship of animals and human beings have also changed and the effect on civilization of the changes in environment has been so acute that sometimes it has wiped the whole civilization from the face of the earth.

We should consider human as one of the members of the earth where there is complex web of interconnected elements in the universe. If human reject the entitlement of 'dominion' on them, there is no point in justifying of exploiting other species as the humans are doing day by day. There is thus, no point to our mental superiority to put ourselves in a superior class among others and making a solid distinction between us and say, animals and other organisms. If nature thinks of revenge for our cruelties towards her the whole humanity which boasts so much of their brain will be washed away from the face of the earth. It is not to claim the same rights for animals that human enjoy but when arguing in the ethical ground that all sentient are equal, it is sure to grant animals the far more rights than they at this point have.

The book *Tiger for Breakfast* shows that the relationship of humans and animals to be hierarchical and at the same time in the tensed mood. The hunting adventures throughout the book with which the central character named Boris is involved seems exclusively anthropocentric. Animals are like little dummies of Boris and the high state officials where the vested human interests get fulfilled. No one in the book is aware of the animal welfare and preservation including the narrator. Rather, the narrator Peissel is fascinated by Boris hunting adventures and time and again meets Boris to know about his shooting activities. The discourses which the humanly characters in the book create are for their own welfare and thus, they dominate the animals and altogether the planet. The poor animals have served the humans but humans are always dominating by creating a distance among the two. This book treats tigers like the cups of tea served in the morning breakfast with a little value. The tensed relation between the animals and human is revealed in the title too. The title gives a lot of glimpse about the tensed relation of the animals with the humans without mentioning the hunting activities.

III. Ecology and Inseparability between Human and Animals

This study analyzes animal representation in the autobiographical novel *Tiger for Breakfast* and discusses various modes of animal representation and the ideological influences on the narrator's manner of representing animals. It also examines the manner in which the environmental crisis is seeping into contemporary South Asian narratives. Further, this reveals among us to the extent to which the values expressed in the novel are consistent with or different from current ecological orthodoxies and the ways in which the views generated in relation to animals influence the way we treat them. This research also investigates the writers' attitudes to animals and the relationship in which such attitudes produce disharmony between humans and nature.

However, this study reveals the failure of the narrator to appreciate the inseparability and interconnectedness of human, animal and earth. The novel focuses in varying degrees on animal suffering and abuse, thereby, depicting the connection between human and animal/nature exploitation. Many social and ecological problems stem from animal exploitation. As such efforts to save animals are inseparably entangled with questions of democratization of society, equitable distribution of resources, social justice, equality, and human rights. In the same vein, efforts to end human oppression, exploitation, and injustice are also interwoven with questions of resource distribution and utilization, and animal welfare and liberation. What entails regarding my study is that, although interesting, texts like *Tiger for Breakfast* and the narrator Peissel fails to appreciate and explore the inseparability and interconnectedness of human, animal, and earth.

Human centered tendency is well practiced from the ancient time thinking it as ethical as it is because human well-being and interest have been protected and

promoted at the expense of non-humans. This human centric mentality proceeding over the world has its legacy in the autobiographical narratives like *Tiger for Breakfast*. Boris is involved in several hunting programs and events managed by the royal families of Nepal and Nepal. The hunting activities in the South Asian states are normal and at best a pride to the high dignitaries to identify as a sport – the finest sport among the sports. Defining and leading the hunting to the level of sports is a worst anthropocentric attitude completely neglecting the animal conservation and promoting environmental exploitation. Thus, here comes the real role of the writer to explore the inseparability and interconnectivity of human, animal and earth but writers like Michel Peissel on *Tiger for Breakfast* completely ignore and focus on the human hypocrisy of superiority and created the character like Boris who completely enjoyed hunting at best.

Here, Peissel exposes the complex ways in which humans relate to other animals. The novel explores relational selfhood with respect to the ways in which humans interact with nonhuman animals, sometimes the relation of extreme tension and sometimes of the relational existence. The hunting activity proves the relation of tensed environment among human and animals. The novel covers almost the hunting stories of different characters either involving Boris or without him abundantly. Thus, it bears the title “Tiger for Breakfast”. The title itself proves the existing critical relationship and tension existing between human and animals especially tigers. Tigers should serve and fulfill the thirst of breakfast of humans like the tea in the cups, the game of triviality – having fun in cups and enjoying. In the novel, we see tigers turn out to be men eater in the late stage of their life, it is sure, the human activities and the tiger’s life-long experience of tolerating the human dominance make them men eater. It is the human over dominance on animals that make tigers take revenge turning into

a man eater and be violent upon humans.

Peissel seems to have his mind shaped by the fact that the entire world's organisms are hunters in one way or the other; for survival hunting is a best way - hunting is living one's own life and also it is the bond of interconnection of the world's organisms. But, this mind-set leads the story to deal hunting as the most advanced and adventurous game and neglecting the animal rights and ecological beliefs. Human relation with the animals is treated always as the trivial matter and dominating. Sure, the role of hunter is dominant however, the role of other animals – elephants used in hunting, ceremonial activities where animals have an important role gives the glimpse that the role of animals cannot be undermined. This is perhaps the unconscious acceptance of interdependence among human and animals that Peissel had in his mind.

This research depicts the anthropocentric eco-judgment on Peissel and his leading characters in the novel *Tiger for Breakfast* that reveals the exploitation of nature and especially dominance on animals by humans is itself an indirect self-destructive of human and the earth. Thus, this research exposes human anarchy on the animal world which can lead to the destruction of ecosystem and the bad impacts on the human world.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. New York: Thomson Wadsworth, 8th Ed., 2005.
- Basnyat, Arati. "Tiger of Man". *Nepali Times*. 17-23 Feb. 2006. 8.
- Bertens, Hans. *The Basics*. London and New York: Routledge, 2nd Ed., 2008.
- Devonshire-Ellis, Chris. "Boris Lissanevitch-Asian Expat Extraordinaire". China Expat. 30 Sep.2011. Web.21Feb.2013.<<http://www.chinaexpat.com>>
- Elliot, Robert. *Environmental Ethics*. London: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Garrard, Gred. *Ecocriticism*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Gautam, Roman. "Waiting for Dead Moroz in Kathmandu". *Himal South Asian*, 18Sep. 2010. 15.
- Glotfelty, Cheryll. "Introduction". *The Ecocriticism Reader: Landmarks in Literary Ecology*. Ed. Cheryll Glotfelty and Harold Fromm. London: Georgia UP, 1996. xv-xxxvii.
- K. Armbruster and K.R. and Wallere. Ed. *Beyond Nature Writing: Expanding the Boundaries of Ecocriticism*. London: Virginia University Press, 2001.
- Maehle, Andreas-Holger. "Cruelty and Kindness to the 'Brute Creation': Stability and Change in the Ethics of the Man-Animal Relationship, 1600 – 1850." *Animals and Human Society: Changing Perspectives*. Eds. Aubrey Manning and James Serpell. London and New York: Routledge, 1994. 81-105.
- Peissel, Michel. *Tiger for Breakfast*. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1966. Reprint. New Delhi. TBI, 1990.
- Sellmyer, Amy. "Life and Times of Boris Lissanevitch". *The Kathmandu Post*, 18 Sep.2010. 7.
- Wylie, Dan. "Elephants and Compassion: Ecological Criticism and Southern African Hunting Literature". *English in Africa*. Rhodes University, Vol. 28, No. 2 (Oct., 2001). 79-100.