

Introduction

Myanmar's Multitudes

Imperialism was an interspecies affair. Humans did not make, maintain, or contest empires alone. The ranks of the colonizers and the colonized were populated by a variety of animals. Yet despite their near ubiquitous presence, histories of empire have devoted little space to species other than *Homo sapiens*. Few have interrogated either the impact of imperialism on non-human creatures or explored how non-human creatures influenced imperialism. This lacuna is beginning to be addressed.¹ In this new research, critical animal studies' approaches inspired by post-humanist concerns have been deployed alongside insights from imperial historiography informed by postcolonial theoretical rigour.² However, the two have not always sat comfortably alongside one another. Animal studies and postcolonialism have not often been brought into a direct, mutually critical dialogue.³ Concepts still need to be adapted and refined. Methodologies need to be honed. In this book I am attempting to do some of this critical work. But, while in the course of the following chapters I do propose some new concepts and suggest some methodological innovations, the purpose of the study is not primarily to make a contribution to critical theory. Instead I am reconstructing a history that is brought to light through the combination of an animal

¹ Aaron Skabelund, *Empire of Dogs: Canines, Japan, and the Making of the Modern Imperial World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011); Rohan Deb Roy, 'Nonhuman Empires', *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 35, no. 1 (2015): 66–75; Timothy P. Barnard, *Imperial Creatures: Humans and Other Animals in Colonial Singapore, 1819–1942* (Singapore: National University of Singapore Press, 2019).

² Aaron Skabelund, 'Animals and Imperialism: Recent Historiographical Trends', *History Compass* 11, no. 10 (2013): 801–7.

³ Philip Armstrong, 'The Postcolonial Animal', *Society & Animals* 10, no. 4 (2002): 413–19; Zakiyyah Iman Jackson, 'Animal: New Directions in the Theorization of Race and Posthumanism', *Feminist Studies* 39, no. 3 (2013): 669–85; Deb Roy, 'Nonhuman Empires'; Fayaz Chagani, 'Can the Postcolonial Animal Speak?' *Society & Animals* 24, no. 6 (2016): 619–37; Alice J. Hovorka, 'Animal Geographies I: Globalizing and Decolonizing', *Progress in Human Geography* 41, no. 3 (2017): 382–94.

2 Introduction

and a postcolonial lens. This is a history lost to us when either an anthropocentric or a Eurocentric perspective prevails. It is the history of how British colonialism transformed ecologies and fostered new relationships with animals in Myanmar, even while it was itself embedded in ecologies and forged through relationships with animals.

In writing this history, I found that there were two challenges that had to be addressed. They both stemmed from the incommensurability of animal studies and postcolonialism. The first was the methodological challenge of keeping both animals and colonized humans in the same analytical lens while still attending to their particular experiences of domination. To elaborate a little, both animal historians and postcolonial historians have attempted to recover the lives of marginalized subjects from archives that were indifferent or hostile to them. However, in spite of this shared concern, animal historians have largely failed to integrate and centre the experiences of colonized peoples in their narratives.⁴ The second was a conceptual challenge, one that underpinned the first. As well as recuperating subordinated histories, both animal historians and postcolonial historians have deconstructed the discourses that reduced their historical subjects to mere cyphers representing what humanity should not be – either beastly or barbarous.⁵ But the historic dehumanization of colonized people through comparisons to animals has made aligning the deconstruction of speciesism with the deconstruction of colonial racism a problematic mode of critique.⁶ I argue in this introduction that both these challenges can be overcome through a focus on the relationships between animals and colonized people: a framing that I give the shorthand ‘interspecies empire’.

The interspecies relations forged through British imperialism in Myanmar were multifarious. Among the drawings in *The Illustrated London News* documenting the annexation of Myanmar and the dissolution of the Konbaung Dynasty in 1885, as well as the subsequent British counter-insurgency campaign to quell the ensuing rebellion, is a striking image showing an elephant dragging a British steam-powered tugboat mounted with artillery down a river. The Burmese driver flails his arms around. His powerful stead, however, wades determinedly forward

⁴ Both fields have sought to return both agency and autonomy to their subjects, but as I show later in the chapter in animal history the recovery of the animal has obscured colonized peoples. Ranajit Guha, ‘On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India’, in *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society*, ed. Ranajit Guha (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1982), 1–8; Brett L. Walker, ‘Animals and the Intimacy of History’, *History and Theory* 52, no. 4 (2013): 45–67.

⁵ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979); Erica Fudge, ‘A Left-Handed Blow: Writing the History of Animals’, in *Representing Animals*, ed. Nigel Rothfels (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003), 3–18.

⁶ Armstrong, ‘The Postcolonial Animal’.

(Figure I.1).⁷ The image shows Victorian British and Burmese military techniques in combination. It is a steam-era assemblage of human, animal, and machine. The driver and elephant were in concert, their labours a mode of collaboration, both with each other and with the new colonizers. Indeed, their histories are inseparable. The military capacity of the elephant, namely the creature's unparalleled ability to traverse Myanmar's diverse topography, was realized by the driver's skill. The driver in turn was reliant on their relationship with the elephant for their livelihood.⁸ In this particular episode, British rule was furthered by the mobilization of this particular interspecies relationship. As we shall see, it was a relationship expanded and exploited by imperial timber firms across the colony.⁹ Empire was reliant on both the power of animals and the human labour that attended them.



Figure I.1 *The Illustrated London News*, 13 March 1886, 258

⁷ *The Illustrated London News*, 13 March 1886, 258.

⁸ Jacob Shell, 'Elephant Convoys beyond the State: Animal-Based Transport as Subversive Logistics', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 37, no. 5 (2019): 905–23.

⁹ Jonathan Saha, 'Colonizing Elephants: Animal Agency, Undead Capital and Imperial Science in British Burma', *BjHS Themes* 2 (2017): 169–89; Jonathan Saha, 'Do Elephants Have Souls? Animal Subjectivities and Colonial Governmentality', in *South Asian Governmentalities*, eds. Stephen Legg and Deana Heath (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 159–77.

4 *Introduction*

Animals were also participants on the other side of the conflict. One of war correspondent Willoughby Wallace Hooper's notorious photographs of the confrontation captured the death and destruction suffered by Burmese human and animal combatants alike (Figure I.2). His picture of the aftermath of British victory at Mindhla shows destroyed cannon and the strewn bodies of Burmese fighters. At the centre of the picture are the remains of a white pony with the corpse of their former rider draped over their back.¹⁰ The loss was symbolic and material. The horse represented an elite instrument of warfare. They were a sign of status as well as being militarily useful.¹¹ Their death was an episode in the



Figure I.2 British Library, India Office Records, hereafter IOR: Photo 312/(10): Willoughby Wallace Hooper, 'Mindhla after Its Capture' (1885)

¹⁰ British Library, India Office Records, hereafter IOR: Photo 312/(10): Willoughby Wallace Hooper, 'Mindhla after Its Capture' (1885).

¹¹ Michael W. Charney, *Southeast Asian Warfare, 1300–1900*, Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section Three: South-East Asia, v.16 (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004), 164–89.

abrupt dissolution of Konbaung dynastic rule and its associated inter-species relationships, some of which the new rulers inherited. On occupying the palace of the last king of Myanmar, Thibaw, the British army found themselves responsible for the royal elephants. Included among them was a white elephant calf.¹² Initially, they were unsure of what to do with the auspicious beast, a symbol of the material and moral authority of Burmese monarchs.¹³ They considered giving them to the king of Siam as a gift, but it was thought that the gesture might be taken to be insulting. The elephant could not be sold in the country, as it was feared that they would be acquired by a pretender to the throne and used to bolster their claim. Eventually it was decided that they should be sent to the colonial capital of Rangoon, where they would live in the recently opened park.¹⁴ In moving from Mandalay to Rangoon, the white elephant's journey metonymically performed the geographic shift of sovereignty from the central 'dry zone' to the coast and from the Burmese monarchy to British imperial rule.¹⁵ A white elephant captured in the 1920s continued this symbolic work, touring the world representing the colony, notably at the Wembley exhibition of 1924.¹⁶

The end of British imperialism in Myanmar was also an interspecies event. Working elephants driven by their Burmese and Indian handlers famously carried refugees fleeing the Japanese occupation in 1942 over mountains to the relative safety of India.¹⁷ The fall of Rangoon, once the jewel of British dominion in Southeast Asia, was played out through the actions of non-human urbanites. Rumours spread that wild animals had escaped the zoo. It was believed that an orang-utan had left their enclosure to take up residence in the city and was attacking any soldiers that approached them. A panther was reported to be stalking the streets.¹⁸ The populace displaced by Japanese bombing, and now living in

¹² National Archives of Myanmar, Yangon, hereafter NAM: 1/1(A) 1890, 1886 File No. 141, 'White Elephant and List of State Elephants'.

¹³ Thant Myint-U, *The Making of Modern Burma* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 50.

¹⁴ National Archives of India, New Delhi, hereafter INA: Foreign Department, Secret E Proceedings, January 1887, Nos. 5–9, and March 1887, Nos. 20–21, 'Disposal of the "White" Elephant Captured at Mandalay'.

¹⁵ Michael Aung-Thwin, 'A Tale of Two Kingdoms: Ava and Pegu in the Fifteenth Century', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 42, no. 1 (2011): 1–16.

¹⁶ San C. Po, *Burma and the Karens* (London: Elliot Stock, 1928), 41, 46–49.

¹⁷ James H. Williams, *Elephant Bill* (London: Hart-Davis, 1950).

¹⁸ Bryan Perrett, *Tank Tracks to Rangoon: The Story of British Armour in Burma* (London: Hale, 1978), 30; Alfred Draper, *Dawns Like Thunder: The Retreat from Burma* (Barnsley, UK: Pen and Sword, 1987), 139; Alan Warren, *Burma 1942: The Road from Rangoon to Mandalay* (London; New York: Continuum, 2011), 144–5.

6 *Introduction*

makeshift camps around the city's royal lakes that neighboured the zoo, feared that recently liberated crocodiles were lying in wait in the waters.¹⁹ As the British retreated and the city burned, the streets were taken over by rats, dogs, and vultures that fed on the remains of the unfortunate humans who had not survived the chaos.²⁰ The uncanny and unsettling presence of these animals were signs of imperial collapse. The city's human poor became prey to the newly ascendent animal residents.

Animals were also anti-colonial symbols. While World War II engulfed Europe and loomed in the Pacific, nationalist poet Thakhin Kodaw Hmaing wrote of a dream in which he approached the body of the recently deceased veteran anti-colonial Buddhist monk, U Ottama. U Ottama's body was shrouded in the national flag, with the image of a peacock at the centre. Protecting his remains was a *nagani*, red dragon.²¹ The mythical creature represented the rising spirit of the Burmese nation. Kodaw Hmaing was building on well-established nationalist symbolism that drew upon an older repertoire of non-human images and meanings. In the rebellions that shook the colony during the Great Depression, the peasant rebels represented their struggle as analogous to that of the fabulous *galon* bird who overcame the dreaded serpent the *naga*. The British were the rapacious *naga*. They were the *galon*, fated to defeat their enemy. Hsaya San, the nominal leader of the uprising, was known as the *galon* king.²² The comparatively more mundane peacock was also a repeated nationalist motif. The image of a male bird either fanning his tail or in fighting pose adorned patriotic flags and was used ubiquitously in the branding of Burmese-made goods. Anti-colonial nationalists sought to establish new interspecies associations in their struggle against British imperialism.

These examples, lifted from the beginnings and ends of Myanmar's colonial history and explored in the following pages of this book, are indicative of the rich ecology of empire's entwinement with interspecies relationships. A diverse array of sentient life-forms were bound up with British imperialism in Myanmar, from elephants to peacocks, from

¹⁹ *Report on the Victoria Memorial Park and Zoological Gardens, Rangoon, for the Period 1st April 1941 to 30th September 1947* (Rangoon: Government of Burma Press, 1948), 3–4.

²⁰ Christopher A. Bayly, *Rangoon (Yangon) 1939–49: The Death of a Colonial Metropolis*, occasional paper, University of Cambridge, Centre for South Asian Studies (Cambridge: Centre of South Asian Studies, University of Cambridge, 2003).

²¹ Phoeblaing, 'Thakhin Kodaw Hmaing's Grand Congratulatory Laycho for the Saturday Nagani Journal Inaugural Issue', *Journal of Burma Studies* 19, no. 1 (2015): 249–57.

²² Patricia M. Herbert, *The Hsaya San Rebellion, 1930–1932, Reappraised* (Melbourne, Australia: Monash University Publishing, 1982); Maitrii Aung-Thwin, *The Return of the Galon King: History, Law, and Rebellion in Colonial Burma* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2011).

crocodiles to mosquitos. The presence of animals in Myanmar's colonial past is as obvious from the archival record as it is overlooked by historians, whose anthropocentric concerns have filtered them out.²³ Perhaps being everywhere, animals have been considered a mundane constant – part of the scenery of history but not the plot. However, their ubiquity should not imply either a banality or a lack of historicity to their presence. The interspecies history of the colony is dynamic and animated by contests, conflict, and tension. Nor should the embeddedness of humans within bio-diverse ecological webs suggest that the social cleavages of race, gender, and class were any less powerful in shaping everyday life. Bringing human relationships with other animals into history should further elucidate social divisions between humans, rather than obscure them.²⁴ In these ways, an interspecies focus does not per se constitute a methodological or conceptual 'turn' in colonial history.²⁵ It shares the concerns and methods of social, economic, and cultural approaches to the past. But, by challenging the assumption that humans were distinct and discrete actors authoring historical processes in splendid isolation from other creatures,²⁶ interspecies history does provide new insights into the transformations engendered by imperialism in Myanmar. Far from being

²³ Some exceptions to this that bring environmental and ecological factors into the history of Myanmar include Michael W. Charney, 'Demographic Growth, Agricultural Expansion, and Livestock in the Lower Chindwin in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries', in *A History of Natural Resources in Asia: The Wealth of Nature*, eds. Greg Bankoff and Peter Boomgaard (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 227–44; Victor Lieberman and Brendan Buckley, 'The Impact of Climate on Southeast Asia, circa 950–1820: New Findings', *Modern Asian Studies* 46, no. 5 (2012): 1049–96; Michael Adas, 'Continuity and Transformation: Colonial Rice Frontiers and Their Environmental Impact on the Great River Deltas of Mainland Southeast Asia', in *The Environment and World History*, eds. Edmund Burke and Kenneth Pomeranz (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 191–208; Jonathan Saha, 'Among the Beasts of Burma: Animals and the Politics of Colonial Sensibilities, c.1840–1950', *Journal of Social History* 48, no. 4 (2015): 933–55; Jonathan Saha, 'Milk to Mandalay: Dairy Consumption, Animal History, and the Political Geography of Colonial Burma', *Journal of Historical Geography* 54 (2016): 1–12; Saha, 'Colonizing Elephants'; Peter A. Coclanis, 'Metamorphosis: The Rice Boom, Environmental Transformation, and the Problem of Truncation in Colonial Lower Burma, 1850–1940', *Agricultural History* 93, no. 1 (2019): 35–67.

²⁴ Joanna Bourke, *What It Means to Be Human: Reflections from 1791 to the Present* (London: Virago, 2011); Jackson, 'Animal'.

²⁵ The varying degrees of 'turn' in imperial history, and the insufficiency of a turn towards environmental and biological factors in the discipline more generally, have been discussed in the following interventions, part of a special section of the *American Historical Review* devoted to 'turns' in historical practice. Durba Ghosh, 'Another Set of Imperial Turns?' *The American Historical Review* 117, no. 3 (2012): 772–93; Julia Adeney Thomas, 'Comment: Not Yet Far Enough', *The American Historical Review* 117, no. 3 (2012): 794–803.

²⁶ Fudge, 'A Left-Handed Blow'; Harriet Ritvo, 'On the Animal Turn', *Daedalus* 136, no. 4 (2007): 118–22; Walker, 'Animals and the Intimacy of History'.

8 *Introduction*

an esoteric or niche topic, relationships with animals are a historical subject within which disparate studies of colonial Myanmar can be brought together.

Although it was an integral and sizable part of Britain's Indian Empire – an imperial formation well served by a vast and sophisticated historiography – Myanmar itself has not been meaningfully integrated into either imperial history or the history of colonialism on the subcontinent.²⁷ Nevertheless, recent decades have seen a flurry of new historical studies of the colony. These have taken different approaches but can be crudely divided into two areas: those examining the changes in material relations brought about or facilitated by colonial rule; and those concerned with shifts in Burmese cultural politics and political cultures in the context of colonial modernity. As these examples indicate, non-human creatures were bound up with both these areas of historical change. As such, an interspecies focus entails drawing on the arguments and approaches deployed by historians across both of these broadly defined areas of research.

Social and economic histories of the colony have flourished of late, building on an older research agenda exploring the expansion of the rice industry in southern Myanmar – one of the largest rice-producing regions in the world by the turn of the twentieth century. Ian Brown's work on the impact of the 1930 world depression on the rice industry, and particularly on Myanmar's peasant-cultivators, has reanimated these longer-standing discussions about the economic transformations engendered by empire and the vulnerabilities of those changes. The timber industry and mining have also both been studied as contested sites of multi-national, colonial, and local exploitation. Raymond Bryant's work on the political ecology of Myanmar's forests was pioneering in broadening the ambit of studies of the economic impacts of colonial rule. In addition, labour history and histories of illicit trading and opium production have attracted studies that similarly interrogate the material impacts of British rule.²⁸ Aligned to

²⁷ Jonathan Saha, 'Is It in India? Colonial Burma as a "Problem" in South Asian History', *South Asian History and Culture* 7, no. 1 (2016): 23–9. For some exceptions where Myanmar has been kept in the frame of the study, see Anand A. Yang, 'Indian Convict Workers in Southeast Asia in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries', *Journal of World History* 14, no. 2 (June 2003): 179–208; Thomas R. Metcalf, *Imperial Connections: India in the Indian Ocean Arena, 1860–1920*, The California World History Library 4 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007); Clare Anderson, *Subaltern Lives: Biographies of Colonialism in the Indian Ocean World, 1790–1920*, Critical Perspectives on Empire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

²⁸ Ian Brown, *A Colonial Economy in Crisis: Burma's Rice Delta and the World Depression of the 1930s*, RoutledgeCurzon Studies in the Modern History of Asia 28 (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005); Ian Brown, 'Tracing Burma's Economic Failure to Its

these studies, environmental history has also emerged as a topic, pioneered by historians who started out with an interest in the rice industry.²⁹

Methodologically distinct from these more materialist studies, research into the cultural history of colonial Myanmar has simultaneously taken off. This too has been a multi-faceted research agenda but one that can be broadly thought of as being primarily concerned with exploring the changes in mentalities wrought by the imposition of British rule. Most notable among these studies are Chie Ikeya's research into gender relations and Alicia Turner's book on Burmese Buddhism, both of which track how local cultural and social mores were adapted, threatened, altered, and contested in the context of colonial modernity. Relatedly, although published prior to these studies, Penny Edwards' research into colonial knowledge and institutions in Myanmar broke ground in introducing postcolonial methods of cultural critique to the field.³⁰ Mandy Sadan's monumental study of the emergence of Kachin identity makes a kindred contribution to Ikeya's and Turner's studies but for Myanmar's borderlands, although she takes a longer time frame and is also informed by ethnographic methods. More widely, and somewhat more unevenly, the formation of the colony's ethnic and religious diversity has recently

Colonial Inheritance', *Business History Review* 85, no. 4 (2011): 725–47; Raymond L. Bryant, *The Political Ecology of Forestry in Burma, 1824–1994* (London: Hurst, 1997); Raymond L. Bryant, 'Branding Natural Resources: Science, Violence, and Marketing in the Making of Teak', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 38, no. 4 (2013): 517–30; Magnus Fiskesjö, 'Mining, History, and the Anti-State Wa: The Politics of Autonomy between Burma and China', *Journal of Global History* 5, no. 2 (2010): 241–64; David Baillargeon, '"A Burmese Wonderland": British World Mining and the Making of Colonial Burma' (UC Santa Barbara, 2018), <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2109j3rs>; Amarjit Kaur, 'Indian Labour, Labour Standards, and Workers' Health in Burma and Malaya, 1900–1940', *Modern Asian Studies* 40, no. 2 (2006): 425–75; M. Satish Kumar, 'The Census and Women's Work in Rangoon, 1872–1931', *Journal of Historical Geography* 32, no. 2 (2006): 377–97; Eric Tagliacozzo, *Secret Trades, Porous Borders: Smuggling and States along a Southeast Asian Frontier, 1865–1915* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005); Robert Maule, 'British Policy Discussions on the Opium Question in the Federated Shan States, 1937–1948', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 33, no. 2 (2002): 203–24; Ashley Wright, *Opium and Empire in Southeast Asia: Regulating Consumption in British Burma* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

²⁹ Adas, 'Continuity and Transformation'; Coclanis, 'Metamorphosis'.

³⁰ Chie Ikeya, *Refiguring Women, Colonialism, and Modernity in Burma* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2011); Chie Ikeya, 'Colonial Intimacies in Comparative Perspective: Intermarriage, Law, and Cultural Difference in British Burma', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 14, no. 1 (2013); Alicia Turner, 'Narratives of Nation, Questions of Community: Examining Burmese Sources without the Lens of Nation', *Journal of Burma Studies* 15, no. 2 (2011): 263–82; Alicia Turner, *Saving Buddhism: The Impermanence of Religion in Colonial Burma* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2014); Penny Edwards, 'Half-Cast: Staging Race in British Burma', *Postcolonial Studies* 5, no. 3 (2002): 279–95; Penny Edwards, 'Relocating the Interlocutor: Taw Sein Ko (1864–1930) and the Itinerancy of Knowledge in British Burma', *South East Asia Research* 12, no. 3 (2004): 277–335.

10 *Introduction*

attracted scholars.³¹ Aligned to all of these studies have been a slew of publications into the structures of colonial governance, its legal resources, and its coercive institutions.³² Broadly synthesizing this tranche of historiography, these historians have unpacked the shifts in colonial governance and traced the concomitant effects within colonized populations' cultures and politics.

These two strands of research – socio-economic and politico-cultural – unavoidably meet in the study of interspecies empire in Myanmar. Animals, such as buffalo, oxen, and elephants, were essential to economic activity as beasts of burden and as livestock.³³ Other critters, from beetles that attacked paddy to tigers who hunted plough cattle, threatened agriculture and added to the insecurity of peasant-cultivators.³⁴ At the same time the sweeping economic and ecological changes engendered by the colony's rapid integration into the world market during the second half of the nineteenth century had a dramatic impact on Myanmar's animals. The populations of some species, such as the two-horned rhinoceros, collapsed through widespread deforestation and hunting.³⁵ Animals were also central to contests over Burmese culture and were intrinsic to the structures of colonial rule. British imperial scholar-officials condemned what they portrayed to be the overly sympathetic and superstitious attitude of Burmese-Buddhists towards animals.³⁶ Meanwhile, anti-colonial activists and Buddhist reformers encouraged kindness towards animals and abstinence from meat as part of protecting the *sānasa* (the teachings

³¹ Mandy Sadan, *Being and Becoming Kachin: Histories beyond the State in the Borderworlds of Burma* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013); Nile Green, 'Buddhism, Islam, and the Religious Economy of Colonial Burma', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 46, no. 2 (2015): 175–204; Yi Li, *Chinese in Colonial Burma: A Migrant Community in a Multiethnic State* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017); Rajashree Mazumder, 'Illegal Border Crossers and Unruly Citizens: Burma-Pakistan-Indian Borderlands from the Nineteenth to the Mid-Twentieth Centuries', *Modern Asian Studies* 53, no. 4 (2019): 1144–82.

³² James Warren, 'The Rangoon Jail Riot of 1930 and the Prison Administration of British Burma', *South East Asia Research* 10, no. 1 (2002): 5–29; Ian Brown, 'A Commissioner Calls: Alexander Paterson and Colonial Burma's Prisons', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 38, no. 2 (2007): 293–308; Aung-Thwin, *The Return of the Galon King*; Jonathan Saha, *Law, Disorder, and the Colonial State: Corruption in Burma c.1900* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

³³ Charney, 'Livestock in the Lower Chindwin'; Saha, 'Colonizing Elephants'.

³⁴ Arthur E. Shipley, 'Beetles Destructive to Rice-Crops in Burma', *Bulletin of Miscellaneous Information (Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew)* no. 25 (1889): 13–15. More than 4,000 heads of cattle were reported as killed by tigers in 1902 alone; Henry Park Cochrane, *Among the Burmans: A Record of Fifteen Years of Work and Its Fruitage* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1904), 257.

³⁵ William F. H. Ansell, 'A Note on the Position of Rhinoceros in Burma', *The Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society* 47 (1947): 249–76.

³⁶ Saha, 'Among the Beasts of Burma'.