Anglo-Saxonist Implications of Rudyard Kipling's Unequal Portrayal of Two Conquered Peoples in "Gunga Din" and "Norman and Saxon"

Goran Petrović, University of Belgrade

Abstract

This paper deals with the portrayal of two different conquered peoples in two of Rudyard Kipling's poems – namely, "Gunga Din" and "Norman and Saxon". It argues that Kipling portrays the 19th-century Indians, as represented by Gunga Din, and the 11th-century Saxons, as collectively represented by themselves in "Norman and Saxon", unequally in the sense that he portrays the latter more positively than the former. The work explores how this unequal portrayal, which includes a combined, historical and contemporary, perspective rather than just a contemporary one, is related to the late 19th-century myth of Anglo-Saxonism and to Kipling's imperialist worldview.

Keywords: *Kipling, imperialism, racism, Anglo-Saxonism, poetry, historical and contemporary perspective.*

1 Introduction

Rudyard Kipling, England's first winner of the Nobel prize in literature, was at the peak of his popularity in the late 1890s and early 1900s, at a time when, according to Orwell, it was still possible to be both an imperialist and a gentleman (Varley 1953: 124; McGrath 2019: para. 1; Ferreira 2017: 62). As the world went through the processes of decolonisation and deracialisation over the course of the twentieth century, Kipling's popularity waned and his oeuvre became ever less palatable to wide audiences across the globe. Today, in the twenty-first century, Kipling is held in very low regard, especially in schools, where, according to Charles McGrath (2019: para. 1), his views are seen as "politically toxic".

As for Kipling's political views, their core element was the belief in the cultural and racial superiority of the English people over all other peoples on earth, especially non-Caucasian peoples which, as Kipling believed, the English were destined to govern and civilise. In scholarship, history's youngest Nobel laureate in literature has been referred to as "a [...] morally insensitive and aesthetically disgusting [...] jingo imperialist", as "an outright racist", and as "England's self-aware literary spokesperson for Anglo-Saxonism and empire" (Orwell 2023: para. 1; Islam 2002: 40; Swift n.d.: sec. 3). Although some scholars have pointed out that Kipling's works are actually two-sided, it is nevertheless entirely reasonable to argue that this Anglo-Indian[1] author genuinely believed in the global imperialist mission of the Anglo-Saxon race (Ferreira 2017: 65; McGrath 2019: para. 1).

Kipling conveyed his Anglo-Saxonist ideas mostly in those fictional and poetic works of his that dealt with the contemporary, 19th-century milieu of British imperialism or, more accurately, that of the late 19th-century British India. However, it is not only the 19th-century overseas empire of the British Crown that Kipling used as a setting to convey his imperialist views. He actually had a broad interest in intraimperial relations over the course of history – namely, relations between the conquering, colonising nations and the conquered, colonised ones – and it is specifically British history that particularly interested him in that respect, which

is quite expected of a writer as ethnocentrically minded as Kipling. Apart from dealing with the interethnic relations within the contemporary British Empire, Kipling also wrote about Roman Britain (that is, about the relations between the Romans and their subject British peoples, such as the Picts, for example) and about Norman England (that is, about the relations between the conquering Normans and the conquered Anglo-Saxons). Even though Kipling's imperialist and Anglo-Saxonist views are less noticeable in these works of his than in his works that touch upon the contemporary British Empire, it is, of course, not impossible to bring those historical works into connection with the ones that are concerned with the matters of the late 19th century. This will be exactly the topic of this paper, which is to establish a connection between two of Kipling's poems that deal with two different historical periods.

The paper will deal with the poems "Gunga Din" and "Norman and Saxon", or, more precisely, it will aim to examine the poet's portrayal of the subjugated peoples depicted in them – 19th-century Indians, subjects of the British Empire, as represented by the water-carrier Gunga Din, and 11th-century Saxons, subjects of the medieval Norman state, as represented collectively by themselves. The paper will shed light on the unequal treatment of the Indians and Saxons in these two poems, and it will argue that this unequal treatment ultimately reveals Kipling's imperialist, Anglo-Saxonist racist leanings. As the paper will not deal only with Kipling's works on contemporary topics, but rather with one work set in the contemporary epoch (i.e., in the 19th century) and another set in the Middle Ages, it would be possible to find some originality in its very approach. The referred to originality is contained in the fact that this paper is to provide a combined, historical and contemporary, perspective on the representation of conquered peoples in Kipling's opus, rather than just a contemporary one, as is often the case in Kipling scholarship.

On the whole, the paper will not drift away from today's standard, postcolonial view of Kipling as an imperialist and a believer in Anglo-Saxon supremacy, but it will strive to provide a fresh perspective on Kipling's imperialism-related poetry. The analysis that follows will be a sui generis imagological venture into the ethnically and racially diverse world of Kipling's poetic imagination.

2 The Indian Gunga Din as a Natural Slave

"Gunga Din" (1890), one of the pieces from Kipling's first book of poetry *Barrack-Room Ballads* (1892), is one of the best-known poems by this author. This ballad is entirely narrated by an unnamed, average British soldier, who tells, in Cockney dialect, the story of his regiment's bhisti (water-carrier) in India, Gunga Din. Gunga Din, as the reader learns from the narrator, was, after long service as a water-bearer in a British regiment in India, killed in action while saving none other than the narrator himself. The narrator, who, as would be reasonable to suggest, reflects Kipling's own views, uses racist language in describing Gunga Din and how he was abused by the British soldiers, including himself. However, this veteran of war, who recollects his military experiences in "Injia's sunny clime", ends his story with a frank admission that Gunga Din was a better man than him – "Though I've belted you and flayed you, / By the livin' Gawd that made you, / You're a better man than I am, Gunga Din!" (Kipling 2023a: vv. 7, 83–85). It is an admission that obviously defies the entire, heavily racialised, discourse preceding it, but how much it actually alters the overall description of Gunga Din is a matter of debate.

When it comes to the historical inspiration for Kipling's character of Gunga Din, it is worth mentioning that, according to Milton Horowitz (2004: 52), Kipling based his Gunga Din on a real water-carrier called Juma, who served British Indian soldiers at the recapture of Delhi in 1857. However, the real water-carrier who excelled in bravery in battle and earned the respect of the soldiers he served was a member of a regiment that was wholly made up of Indian fighters, with only the officers being British, whereas Kipling's bhisti is obviously a servant of British troopers (McGivering 2017: sec. 3). It is interesting to note, in relation to the historical foundation of this text, that, in scholarship, Gunga Din has been recognised as a Muslim (Islam 2012: 10), an assumption that can be substantiated by the fact that best-known water-carriers (bhisties) in British India were members of the Bhisti ethnicity in northern India and Pakistan, a people of entirely Muslim faith, to whom water-carrying had been a national profession for centuries (Chitnis et al. n.d.). However, considering the fact that Indian bhisties were not only of Muslim faith, it would be also possible to regard Gunga Din as a Hindu Indian, especially because the latter part of his name "Din" (pronounced as Deen) is a Hindu name or nickname with the meaning of "poor, miserable, humble" (Chitnis et al. n.d.; Anon. 1; Anon. 2), which is exactly how Kipling's bhisti is portrayed in the poem – namely, as a man who, due to his poor and scarce garment, his limping manner of walking, and his somewhat older age, looks pitiable, and as a man who humbly endures all the maltreatment that those he serves rain down on him.

The narrator's description of Gunga Din's service of the British soldiers is full of scenes of humiliation, both physical and verbal, of the humble water-carrier. The bhisti is shown in three separate pictures – first, while giving water to intensely thirsty soldiers, who return his favour by insulting him and hitting him because, due to his limp, he cannot serve all of them quickly enough; second, as he courageously follows his regiment everywhere on the battlefield, tending the wounded under fire; and third, as he saves the wounded narrator of this story in verse (the man has a bullet wound close to his spleen) by first plugging his wound, then giving him some water to drink, and finally carrying him to where there are litters to take him away from the battlefield for nursing, the latter act being fatal for Gunga Din, who is shot the very moment his task of saving the narrator has been accomplished.

Over the course of his story, the narrator uses an array of very derogatory phrases for Gunga Din, referring to him as "blackfaced", a "limpin[g] lump o[f] brick-dust", a "squidgy-nosed old idol", a "[h]eathen", a man with a "dirty [h]ide", and a "beggar" (Kipling 2023a: vv. 10, 14, 17, 31, 44). At one point, the native bhisti is also put in the same rank with ammunition mules and is referred to as grunting at the moment of lifting the head of the wounded narrator, both of which descriptions, together with the above-mentioned epithet "squidgy-nosed" seem to compare the South Asian water-carrier to an animal. Especially denigrating in that respect seems to be the ascription of grunting, and perhaps even of a squidgy nose, to Gunga Din, because these characteristics are typical of hogs.

The phrases "blackfaced", "lump of brick-dust", and "dirty hide" more or less obviously point to the racial othering of Gunga Din (the colour of brick-dust can be brown), and in this respect, the phrase "dirty 'ide" is clearly the most denigrating one because it brings the dark colour of the bhisti's skin into connection with dirtiness). The words "heathen" and "idol" point to the religious othering of Gunga Din (the name "idol" is immediately preceded in the poem by the attribute "squidgy-nosed"), and both of these could actually point in the direction of Gunga Din being a Hindu – first, because it was probably the Hindus, rather than Muslims, that 19th-century Victorians would have referred to with the noun "heathen", and, second, because the word "idol" could be understood as referring to the artistic representations of the numerous

Hindu deities that British Indian Muslims did not worship. Of course, it would be also possible to imagine the British soldiers simply not caring about the real religious identity of their regimental bhisti and thus arrogantly and ignorantly attaching a connection to polytheist idols and deities to even those natives of South Asia who do not worship them. The latter assumption would be quite in tune with their arrogant treatment of Gunga Din who, from beginning to end, has been a loyal and hard-working servant to them in spite of his probably somewhat older age and a limp.

It is true that the images of Gunga Din being beaten and insulted by his ungrateful, arrogant regiment is not the whole story. It is true that this plethora of derogatory references is not all that there is to this poem. Apart from all these negative, racist descriptions which, according to Goonetilleke (1975: 15), reveal a relationship that is "worse than a feudal relationship between a European lord and a European serf", there is also in "Gunga Din" a sense of admiration for the bhisti's courage on the field of battle in helping the thirsty and wounded British soldiers. However, even this admiration has an unmistakeable aura of racism as the narrator says that, because of his gallantry and self-sacrifice on the field of battle for the cause of the British Crown, Gunga Din was "white, clear white inside" despite his "dirty [h]ide" (Kipling 2023a: vv. 44–45). This description, obviously, reveals a rather unfair, racist stance that a good South Asian is only one who serves Britain, who is ready to help the usurpers of his country's independence in their struggle against those who would restore it (as was the case in the 1857 Sepoy Mutiny), and who is willing to die for his white masters although there is nothing for him to gain from his service, apart from verbal denigration and physical abuse, which is not a gain at all.

Another instance of the narrator's positive reference to Gunga Din, albeit an unusual, oblique one, would be his calling the Indian bhisti a "Lazarushian-leather" (v. 82), which might be understood as an allusion to the biblical story of Jesus' resurrection of Lazarus, that is, as a comparison between Gunga Din's saving of the narrating soldier and Christ's restoration of Lazarus to life (Gunga Din's mussick, or his goat-skin water-bag, is probably the life-restoring, hence Lazarushian, leather that Kipling's narrator is referring to).

Finally, there is also the narrator's final admission that Gunga Din is a better man than him, which has led some scholars, such as C. J. Driver (1989: 34), to argue that this statement, these final words from "Gunga Din", are one of the clearest proofs refuting the thesis that Kipling was a racist. However, in spite of what Driver argues, it still seems safer to assume that this admission from an English soldier of his own moral inferiority to a native Indian water-bearer simply attenuates the racist tone of this poem, rather than reverting it altogether. In addition to the already mentioned large number of highly offensive descriptions of Gunga Din, there is one more detail that opposes the defence of Kipling against charges of racism, a detail which, as it seems, crucially defeats the idea that "Gunga Din" is not a racist poem.

The detail in question is the fact that Kipling, that is, Kipling's soldier-narrator, places Gunga Din in hell after his death on the battlefield. After serving zealously for a long time, without ever uttering a word of complaint or rebelling against the bullying soldiers, Gunga Din, according to Kipling's narrating veteran, does not manage to evade going to the place of eternal damnation in the afterlife. Not even the fact that, shortly before expiring, Gunga Din's last words are clearly ones of submissiveness (being mortally wounded, he says to the non-mortally wounded narrator – "I 'ope you liked your drink") (Kipling 2023a: v. 74) can save Kipling's South Asian protagonist from the foulest fate imaginable in the hereafter. The Indian, one could reasonably argue, deserves a better fate in the afterlife – if any kind of afterlife is to be had at all – because he has spent a lifetime of service, altruism, self-sacrifice, and humility. If he was

not allowed to go to Christian heavens, a place of no sorrow or servitude – which would have been entirely justifiable in all matters except for the formal act of baptism – he would at least deserve to end up in some kind of a polytheist paradise, such as one of his own Hindu paradises[2] or, perhaps, some place similar to the Norse Valhalla, where one could imagine him being a Valkyrie-like cup-bearer to some proven heroes (cup-bearer being a similar vocation to water-bearer),[3] instead of being again a water-carrier to all those same anti-heroic British soldier-bullies, including the narrator, who will also one day go to hell, as the latter is aware himself:

> So I'll meet 'im later on
> At the place where 'e is gone
> Where it's always double drill and no canteen.
> 'E 'll be squattin' on the coals
> Givin' drink to poor damned souls,
> An' I'll take a swig in hell from Gunga Din!
>
> (Kipling 2023a: vv. 75–80)

The image of Gunga Din squatting on the coals, that is, amid the burning embers of fiery hell and giving swigs of water to fatigued soldiers, tormented by the flames of hell, is very unsettling and, ultimately, as it seems, denies full humanity to Gunga Din. In other words, although the narrator eventually does express remorse for not treating the regimental bhisti like a real human being, which, after four stanzas of Gunga Din's intense dehumanisation, does restore a certain degree of humanity to him, the last stanza fails to restore all of the bhisti's humanity because he is eventually deprived of the right to be judged in the afterlife in accordance with his real merits. Kipling's veteran, like some kind of an omniscient theologian, puts Gunga Din in (Christian) hell, probably based on the Indian's non-Christian religious background, and entirely neglects his impeccably moral life on earth. As it turns out, Gunga Din does not have the right to speak for himself or to be represented from the perspective of someone from his own cultural background. He exists only as a native seen through the lens of his white British masters. He does not have the freedom of choice on earth, nor is he given a chance to portray his own existence in the hereafter. Everything is already decided and determined for him by the Christian British possessors of India. Gunga Din is an object, not a subject; his picture is one painted by his white masters, not one painted by himself or by a like-minded fellow Indian. Such a portrayal of a South Asian native is by all means imperialist and patronising.

In the context of Gunga Din's being placed in hell in the end, it becomes possible to argue that the narrator's sentence – "You're a better man than I am, Gunga Din" – is not to be understood quite literally, but only as a tool for the mitigation of the poem's overall racist tone. Gunga Din is better than the narrator and the other British soldiers who bullied him only in moral terms, but that still does not mean, as one might infer, that he is better than them as a whole human being. He is, after all, according to Kipling, a member of an "inferior" dark-skinned race and, as such, his humanity goes only so far as to enable him to be the reason of the narrator's going to hell in the hereafter (the actual reason is the narrator's harassment of Gunga Din, a fellow human being), but it is not great enough to enable him to earn a place in paradise for himself, because, as the reader might suggest, there can be no paradise for 'heathens' or 'people of colour', who are, by late 19th-century standards, subhuman (Chaudhuri 1994: 549, 558). In Kipling's eyes, race and religion seem to be stronger determinants of one's humanity than practical morality, and so Gunga Din appears to be not a better man, but a better half-man or sub-man than the narrator, who is a full-fledged man. The South Asian water-

carrier is, for all his goodness and for all his moral superiority to British soldiers, not good enough to be any better than the worst whites in the hereafter, not even good enough to be their equal in the wretched department of the afterlife. He is a natural slave, preordained by nature to serve the English as natural masters, and morality, no matter how important for white Britons when assessing the human quality of their own people in their own society, plays no significant role here, because Nature favours race over morality, and in racial terms, Gunga Din is disqualified instantly. The paradoxicality of Gunga Din's purported "superiority" over the white narrator was aptly explained by Riaz Hassan, although Hassan (2006: 50) does not go beyond earthly affairs in his discussion of Gunga Din's relationship with the whites:

> British Europeans, it is suggested, be they never so lazy and irresponsible, are natural rulers, while Indians, be they never so committed and efficient, are natural slaves. Gunga Din might be the better man, but he is the one who is kicked and cursed by British soldiers. And (this is important) he accepts their abuse cheerfully, as in the due order of things. Kipling highlights the anomaly. Don't ask for reasons, he seems to tell us; and he is right because there are no reasons. This is how it is in Nature's (with a capital 'n') mysterious ways, he also seems to tell us [...].

As it turns out, the image of Gunga Din is, for all the attenuating elements added to it, a racist image of a native Indian in the late 19th century. The admission of Kipling's soldier-narrator that Gunga Din is a better man than him is only a minor voice of compassion which, perhaps, stems from the fact that Kipling grew up in a mixed, English-Indian environment, with even his first language being Hindu (Watts 2009: 9), and that, as a result, he may have had, at least in the beginning, until he fully identified himself with his English heritage as a young adult, to seek for his identity, instead of having it as a given already at his birth, as would have been the case with all the British children of that time back home in Britain. It is a voice that, according to Hassan (2006: 50), goes back to Kipling's psychological base and attempts to "champion the underdog in a guarded, oblique manner", but it does not aspire to change the general attitude of the 19th-century British authorities to their South Asian subjects. Nowhere in the poem is there an explicit call for improving the status of the Indian people within the empire. Hence, the elements in "Gunga Din" which mitigate its racist mood seem to go no further than supporting the view of Kipling as a bit milder, somewhat compassionate or sentimental racist. To refer to him as being entirely against racism seems like a rather exaggerated view in relation to not only "Gunga Din" but also all other writings of his authorship.

When it comes to the image of the Indian Gunga Din as a servile, docile servant who does his slavish duties cheerfully and accepts beatings and curses without ever rebelling or complaining, it is important to mention that such a portrayal fits well into both the scientific and popular view of Indians in the late 19th century. In a time dominated by social Darwinism and unilineal sociocultural evolutionism, the image of Indians and non-Caucasian peoples in general as backward, both culturally and mentally, and as similar to children in need of guidance or tutelage, was omnipresent on both sides of the Atlantic, and not only in Victorian England (Chaudhuri 1994: 549–562; Sidky 2004: 114). Kipling drew on that image for his voluminous imperialist oeuvre and also helped perpetuate it. The first English Nobel laureate in literature is known to have opposed the idea of India's self-rule, believing instead that the South Asians should be governed by the British, primarily for the good of the South Asians themselves (Wurgaft 1983: 117–8, 143, 149, 150), and "Gunga Din" appears to be in line with

this patronising attitude of Kipling's, in spite of its legendary sentence – "You're a better man than I am, Gunga Din".

In relation to the fact that Gunga Din is portrayed as a "natural slave" in the service of a "natural British ruler", this poem can be said to contain a typically Orientalist depiction of an Indian character. Gunga Din, as a silent slave who is humiliated in his life, and is then also humiliated in the afterlife by being placed in hell for no apparent reason, is an example of Said's "Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient" (Said 1979: 3), of an artificially constructed imagological concept aimed at depriving easterners of their own voices and giving them a voice that the West wants them to have, a voice of effeminate submissiveness, obedience, and helplessness in the absence of foreign leadership. This is, of course, an entirely false and unjust image, created with exploitative intentions, an image that Kipling is and will forever remain to be guilty of, in spite of his undoubtedly great craftsmanship as both a verse-maker and a story-teller, and in spite of his tendency as a writer to show a certain degree of respect to Indian peoples and cultures (though only in cases when one finds his South Asians willingly serving the cause of British imperialism).

3 The Saxons as Respectable Subjects

If in 'Gunga Din' Kipling portrayed an Indian subject of the English Crown as a "natural slave", in "Norman and Saxon" he portrayed the Anglo-Saxon subjects of the Norman Crown as servants who are worthy of respect and lenience. While in "Gunga Din" the dehumanising submissiveness of an Indian servant is just slightly attenuated by a guarded attempt at empathising with the dark-skinned "natural slaves", without any open call for improving the Indian status within the British Empire, in "Norman and Saxon" there is a very explicit statement that the Saxons are not to be regarded as rightless slaves, but rather as respectable servants who deserve fair treatment because one day, as Kipling would make the reader believe, the Saxons, having successfully fused with their Norman conquerors, will form the modern, 19th- and 20th-century English identity as the identity of the world's most superior race with a global civilising mission. Eventually, the Saxons will even form the main part of the modern English identity, given that the 19th century saw the apex of popularity for the myth of Anglo-Saxonism, particularly in Great Britain, but also in the United States.

The myth of Anglo-Saxonism, the roots of which may be traced as far back as Geoffrey Chaucer's 14th century, included the idea that England, despite the Norman invasion of 1066, which ended for good the independence of Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, maintained its prevalent Saxon character over the course of centuries (Boyce 2011: sec. 2). According to this idea, the contemporary England of the late 19th-century was an Anglo-Saxon nation and, since the medieval Anglo-Saxons who ruled over England from the 5th to the 11th century were mythically held as the most democratic and freedom-loving people of the Middle Ages, it was believed that the contemporary English, too, as their direct biological and cultural descendants were the first in the world in terms of egalitarianism, the love of liberty, and the sense of justice (Boyce 2011: sec. 2). This myth drew extensively on Edward Gibbon's appropriation of Tacitus' idealisation of the ancient Germanic tribes from which the Anglo-Saxons also originated, and was, by the late 19th century, put on a (pseudo-)scientific footing within the framework of Victorian racial "science" (Boyce 2011: sec. 2; Swift sec. 2).

Apart from Victorian scientists, the myth of Anglo-Saxonism was also developed (and even more so) by English and American scholars and artists, including literary artists, with this scholarly and artistic interest in Anglo-Saxonism being particularly intense from the 16th century (Boyce 2011: sec. 2). Kipling, as a literary figure and journalist, made his contribution to the popularisation of this concept at a time when it was gaining an unprecedented momentum, at a time of the Great Rapprochement (1895–1914), when especially British, but also some American, intellectuals called for a unification of these two English-speaking nations (Perkins 1968: 31–63).

There were, basically, two views of Anglo-Saxonism in Britain during the 19th century. Both of them favoured the Anglo-Saxon element over the Norman one in the formation of the contemporary English identity, but while some celebrated also the Norman factor, alongside the Anglo-Saxon one, others (such as Walter Scott, the famous author of *Ivanhoe*) entirely dismissed the Norman element, portraying it as tyrannical and effete due to an aristocratic lust for power, while extolling the democracy, physical sturdiness, and courageousness of the Saxons (Boyce 2011: sec. 2; Williams 2008: 108). Kipling belonged to the former camp. On the one hand, he praised the Normans as the conquerors and bringers of a rich artistic heritage and high organisational skills to England, but, at the same time, he "pursue[d] the [...] historical myth of Anglo-Saxon masculinity", and of Anglo-Saxon anti-aristocratic values (Williams 2008: 108). "The most influential writer of the late Victorian and Edwardian ages", as Boyce (2011: sec. 2), with a small degree of reservation, refers to Kipling, cherished both the Norman and the Saxon element in the contemporary English identity and believed that, mixed together, they formed a perfect blend of aristocracy and democracy, one that made the English the fittest of all the nations in the world to rule and civilise the uncivilised. Because the English were "both a colonised and a colonising nation", Kipling believed that they "were uniquely suited to govern other peoples on account of their capacity to see both sides of the imperial project" (Boyce 2011: sec. 2). Their combination of the Norman ability to rule and organise and the Saxon ability to stay "incorruptible and un-self-seeking" made the contemporary English, from Kipling's point of view, the most beneficent political force on earth (Eliot 1963: 29–30).

Kipling wrote several works on the topic of Norman-Saxon relations in 11th-century England, and perhaps his best-known one is "Young Men at the Manor", a story from *Puck of Pook's Hill* (1906), where he conveyed the idea of a successful, mutually respectful, fusion of the conquering Normans and conquered Saxons in England, through the friendship of two protagonists – one Saxon (Hugh) and another Norman (Sir Richard). The same spirit is also perceptible in "Norman and Saxon", one of the many poems that Kipling wrote for C. R. L. Fletcher's *School History of England* (1911).

In this poem, Kipling presents "a dramatic monologue" between two protagonists – a dying old Norman baron, apparently a veteran of the historic Battle of Hastings, and his own son and heir, who is to inherit his father as the head of a Norman county in England (Keating 2005: sec. 2). The poem wholly consists of the dying baron's instructions for his son on how to successfully rule the Saxons, the natives of England who irrevocably lost their independence back in 1066 to William of Normandy (the poem is set in 1100). The old baron advises his son to be just in his rule over his Saxon subjects, and so the poem obviously reflects the idea, advocated not only by Kipling but also by many other renowned figures of the Victorian and Edwardian periods, that Anglo-Saxons would form a significant portion of England's contemporary national identity, and that, for this reason, they must not be depicted negatively, as mere humiliated slaves, but rather as a dignified people that acts proudly even under the circumstances of national subjugation. As in "Gunga Din", so here too, the poem's narrator or

speaker is to be understood as reflecting Kipling's own stance, his stance on the Anglo-Saxons and England's medieval history. According to Peter Keating (2005: sec. 2):

> Kipling's sole purpose is to employ a simple dramatic situation to express his own point of view [...]. Kipling's baron has no individuality at all. He is simply a representative 'baron'. Nor does the son have any individuality. He is simply 'a son'. The advice offered by the baron – the wisdom to be delivered – consists entirely of statements about the nature of the Saxon people. They come from a conqueror about the conquered and they are assumed to be true.

The things that Kipling's Norman baron tells his son, that is, the reader, about the Anglo-Saxons are entirely in agreement with the Anglo-Saxonist myth of the 19th and the early 20th century. The first thing that the dying baron turns his son's attention to is the fact that the Saxons, albeit a less cultivated people than the Normans themselves, have a very strong sense of justice, for which reason it would be very wrong to treat them unfairly, and what would be especially wrong is to subject them to corporal punishment:

> The Saxon is not like us Normans. His manners are not so polite.
> But he never means anything serious till he talks about justice and right.
> When he stands like an ox in the furrow – with his sullen set eyes on your own,
> And grumbles, "this isn't fair dealing", my son, leave the Saxon alone.
>
> You can horsewhip your Gascony archers, or torture your Picardy spears;
> But don't try that game on the Saxon; you'll have the whole brood round your ears.
> From the richest old Thane in the county to the poorest chained serf in the field,
> They'll be at you and on you like hornets, and, if you are wise, you will yield.
>
> (Kipling 2023b: 5–12)

What especially catches the reader's attention in these two stanzas is the image of a Saxon standing "like an ox in the furrow" while calling into question a decision of his Norman lord on the grounds of its being unfair. This image can be compared to the image of Gunga Din being put in the same rank with the mules carrying ammunitions for the British soldiers ("Hi! Ammunition-mules and Gunga Din", shout the British soldiers calling for help on the field of battle). While the Indian servant is mentioned side by side with those hybrid, man-made beasts of burden, with a noticeable implication that both the mules and Gunga Din are servile, the Saxon servant, on the other hand, is compared to a much bigger and, hence, more dangerous animal, an ox. Kipling's verses clearly emphasise the threatening dimension of this animal which, though also being a beast of burden like the mule, is, due to its greater size and greater strength, likely to cause greater trouble to its human owners in the event of turning disobedient or violent. So, the ox-like Saxon can become a threat if he is not treated fairly, while the mule-like South Asian accepts his abuse without contemplating the idea of disobeying, which creates the picture of medieval Saxon servants being more proud and, therefore, more human than dehumanised 19th-century Indian servants.

On the whole, the impression that the two above-quoted stanzas convey is that the Saxons, though having less sophisticated manners than the Normans, care a lot about justice and being treated fairly, and make respect for this sentiment a sine-qua-non condition for being peacefully ruled by a foreign power. This image of Saxon thanes and serfs feistily protesting against such an act of humiliation as corporal punishment, when contrasted to the image of

Norman servants from different parts of France (Gascony and Picardy), who do not protest against corporal punishment due to their less developed sense of dignity and justice, looks like a veracious application of the Anglo-Saxonist myth from the late 18th and the 19th century as it was elaborated by various English historians of the time. For instance, there was at the time a custom among various authors, such as Sharon Turner, to view the relationship between the civilised Romans and the nomadic Germans of the late antiquity as more or less equal, rather than one characterised by the superiority of the civilised state over the nomadic one (Turner 1820: 10–11). According to this view, while the civilised Romans were more "technologically accomplished and intellectually subtle", the nomadic Germanic tribes, and especially the Anglo-Saxons, were more democratic and egalitarian and knew better how to value their liberty and independence (Boyce 2011: sec. 2; Turner 1820: 10–11, 17–19). The civilised Romans were seen as more subject to both secular and sacral repression, while the Germanic character was deemed more independent and fonder of freedom and individuality (Turner 1820: 17–18). The contemporary, 19th-century British were believed to have been, both biologically and culturally (in terms of legal institutions and customs), descended from the "ruder" Germanic, Anglo-Saxon tribes, while the legal institutions of the civilised Romans, resting on the principle of political submission to imperial autocracy, were ascribed to the contemporary French, that is, to "the Kelt of France", in the words of another 19th-century scholar, Goldwin Smith, who contrasted the "English Saxons", not to the Romans, but to the "French" and "Irish" Kelts (Boyce 2011: sec. 2; Turner 1820: 10–11, 17–18; MacDougall 1982: 97–98). In the context of the 19th-century Anglo-Saxonist myth, Kipling's warriors of Picardy and Gascogne who are ready to embrace repression without complaint are clearly the embodiment of Smith's "Keltic race" which, in contrast to the egalitarian and freedom-loving Germanic English, is, for all its attempts to adopt constitutional government, always inclined to eventually revert to despotism, "whether it be that of a Bonaparte or that of a Robespierre" (MacDougall 1982: 97–98). From this point of view, it was possible to regard the Normans and their yoke on the backs of the conquered Saxons as representative of Roman cultural heritage because, by the time of their arrival in England in 1066, the Normans had become Latinised as a result of their earlier settlement in the land of the Franks, a people of Germanic descent like themselves who had adopted a form of the Latin language, as well as Roman laws and customs, centuries before them (Boyce 2011: sec. 2; Williams 2008: 108). So, the idea that the Anglo-Saxons were not entirely inferior to the civilised peoples of the Roman cultural realm, including the Normans, a people of Germanic descent and Latin culture, but instead superior to them in terms of democracy and liberty, is obviously present in Kipling's "Norman and Saxon". Kipling's dignified depiction of the Anglo-Saxons is one that exploits the myth of the Saxon noble savage, whom Turner (1820: 17), in his *History of the Anglo-Saxons* from the turn of the 19th century, described as living in a society in which "[n]either chief nor priest was suffered to have much power".

It is easy to draw a parallel between this romanticised image of the medieval Anglo-Saxons and the 18th- and 19th-century romanticised image of the Native Americans, which permeated the philosophical opus of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and the literary oeuvre of James Fenimore Cooper, among other intellectual figures of the time. Both of these noble savage myths were, of course, either more or less mythical, but, unlike the myth of the Native American noble savage which was, perhaps, more based in historical reality than its Anglo-Saxon counterpart and in which there was no underlying imperialist goal, the myth of the Anglo-Saxon noble savage was clearly a tool for the advocacy of imperialism, with its creators

and propagators obviously aiming to use it for the justification of British and American global domination.

Except for admiring the Saxon sense of justice, the old Norman baron – that is, Kipling himself – also extols the physical sturdiness and warrior skills of the Saxons. Of importance for this aspect of "Norman and Saxon" is its fifth, penultimate stanza, in which the dying baron describes the not so likeable custom of the Saxons to poach during the night, which, in a different situation, produces a far more likeable result, at least from the point of view of the Norman masters of England – namely, the high capabilities of the Saxons as warriors on the field of battle:

> They'll drink every hour of the daylight and poach every hour of the dark.
> It's the sport not the rabbits they're after (we've plenty of game in the park).
> Don't hang them or cut off their fingers. That's wasteful as well as unkind;
> For a hard-bitten, South-country poacher makes the best man-at-arms you can find.
>
> (Kipling 2023b: 17–20)

Again, the father advises his son against using severe corporal punishment on his Saxon subjects, and this time not only because physical mutilation can offend the Saxon keen sense of justice and thus stir rebellion, but also because that would lead to not harnessing the huge potential for warfare that the Saxons are possessed of. Here the "hard-bitten" masculinity of the Anglo-Saxons is emphasised, the masculinity that first stood up bravely to Norman conquerors in the Battle of Hastings of 1066 and in a series of local anti-Norman uprisings that followed soon afterwards, but which is thenceforth to be used for the purposes of further Norman, or more accurately, Anglo-Norman expansionism, most notably under the Plantagenet royal dynasty. For example, there was in Kipling's time a belief that in some of the best-known English victories in the Hundred Years' War between the Norman successors of William the Conqueror on the throne of England and the French kings, such as the Battle of Crecy (1346) and the Battle of Poitiers (1359), "the poacher's qualities had helped win the day" (Ridgwell 2018: 33), and, according to Stephen Ridgwell (2018: 33), "Norman and Saxon" provides "a lyrical testament" to exactly that belief. Moreover, that masculinity which Kipling celebrates in "Norman and Saxon" was, alongside egalitarianism and the love of liberty, an integral part of that version of the Anglo-Saxonist myth which was produced by Sharon Turner (1820: 10, 18), who contrasted the personal dignity and "the martial temper" of the nomadic, primarily Germanic, races of the late antiquity and early Middle Ages to the polished but effeminate habits of the ancient civilised peoples, such as the Romans, who, according to him, were prone to becoming ever more decadent with the passage of time due to their settled and luxurious life-style.

Apropos of the old baron's advice to his son against hanging the Saxons or cutting off their fingers as a form of punishment for disobedience, it is worthwhile to compare it to the obviously approving way in which Kipling describes English brutality in suppressing Indian rebelliousness in works such as "The Head of the District". Although this paper, in its part on Kipling's representation of Gunga Din, concentrates on the image of 19th-century Indians as incapable of rebelliousness and on, as one might say, less brutal forms of British violence such as beatings and verbal insults, it is interesting to draw attention to the images of merciless executions and even beheadings of rebellious Indians on the part of the British and their native servants in "The Head of the District" because these provide an insightful contrast between the different treatments Kipling suggests for Saxons as his own nation's ancestors and the Indians

of his time as England's servants at the height of British colonial power. This contrast ultimately proves Kipling's Anglo-Saxonist leanings which essentially boil down to the idea that the English, whether in the past or in the present, whether slaves or masters, are worthy of admiration and humane treatment, whereas the Indians, in the very present time, deserve nothing but perpetual subjugation, with brutal punishments included, whenever they dare to question the superior position of their subjugators.

Going back to Kipling's admiration for Saxon physical capabilities, it would also be possible to connect it with the mythical view of the pre-revolutionary white settlers of English colonies in North America as nearly all of them being not only honest, intelligent and pious, but also physically strong, which is a characteristic that eventually enabled them to tame the inhospitable natural environment of the New World and thus lay the foundations of the American nation (Detweiler 1938: 188). This myth, which disregarded the fact that many of the first English colonists in North America "belonged to the pauper and criminal classes" (Detweiler 1938: 188), also drew heavily on the myth of Anglo-Saxonism, that is, on the belief that the first English settlers in North America were worthy heirs of their Anglo-Saxon forebears from medieval England and, as such, specially gifted in liberalism and democracy, values that would eventually lead to the rise of American republicanism (Detweiler 1938: 189).

Finally, worthy of mention are also the lines in which Kipling's dying Norman baron tells his son that he should get well acquainted with the language and culture of his Saxon subjects and that he should treat them as by no means separate from himself and from the Norman lordly class, at least when addressing them in public. For instance, in the first two lines of the fourth stanza, the old baron says – "But first you must master their language, their dialect, proverbs and songs. / Don't trust any clerk to interpret when they come with the tale of their wrongs" (Kipling 2023b: 13–14) – while in the last two lines of the last, sixth stanza, he recommends the following – "Say 'we', 'us' and 'ours' when you're talking, instead of 'you fellows' and 'I' / Don't ride over seeds; keep your temper; and never you tell 'em a lie!" (Kipling 2023b: 23–24).

Clearly, these verses call for and anticipate a closer connection and eventual assimilation of the Normans and Saxons into a single, modern English nation. Thus, this poem, with all of its recommendations pointing in the direction of tolerance to the conquered Saxons, in the direction of treating them with respect and not causing them any unnecessary aggravation, and in the direction of turning a blind eye to some of their rather innocuous criminal activities, such as limited poaching, so that maximal services would be obtained from them in the end, turns out to be a sui generis celebration of not only genuine Anglo-Saxon values as they were ascribed to the Saxons in the Anglo-Saxonist myth, but also of the fusion between the Saxon and Norman elements in England which would eventually create, in Kipling's view, the most advanced nation in the world with a mission to civilise and rule vast portions of the globe and even, perhaps, the whole world (Montefiore 2018: 6). "Norman and Saxon", therefore, is a rendering of the Anglo-Saxonist myth, of the view of the 19th- and early 20th-century English that, as descendants of the medieval Anglo-Saxons, they are the world's most progressive nation, one that is fitter than any other Caucasian nation to carry "the white man's burden" by dominating humanity for the benefit of humanity itself. Thus, this skilfully crafted poem, with Kipling's recognisable perfect rhythmicality (i.e., his perfectly regular metre and rhyming scheme), turns out to be valid for not only the last year of the 11th century in which it is set, but also for Kipling's own day and age.

4 Conclusion

This paper has worked within the framework of the existing Kipling scholarship, not departing from the postcolonial stance on Kipling as a believer in British imperialism and Anglo-Saxon supremacy. Within this framework of research, it has provided a novel, fresh perspective on how Kipling's political views are manifested in his poetry. Instead of dealing with only those poems that openly advocate British imperialism and Anglo-Saxonist racism in Kipling's contemporary, late 19th or early 20th-century setting, the paper dealt with two poems set in different periods of history and describing colonial relations in two different colonialist states – the 19th-century British Empire and the 11th-century Anglo-Norman kingdom. So, the novel approach of this work is reflected in its combined, historical and contemporary, perspective on colonialism, that is, in its effort to compare and contrast Kipling's unequal treatment of two different subjugated peoples from different historical periods – the British Empire's Indians or South Asians of the 19th century and the Anglo-Saxons from the Norman kingdom straddling the English Channel in the late 11th century.

While the Indian water-carrier Gunga Din from Kipling's eponymous 1890 poem is portrayed as a "natural slave", one that, in the natural order of things, is supposed to serve his white British masters unprotestingly both in this life and the next, and in spite of his moral superiority to those he serves on a daily basis, Kipling's Saxons from his 1911 poem "Norman and Saxon" are depicted as respectable servants, with a well-developed sense of justice and national dignity, who, therefore, must not be treated unfairly by the conquering Normans. Such a contrast in portraying the Indians and Anglo-Saxons as servants is, perhaps, more indicative of Kipling's imperialism and Anglo-Saxonism than any of his openly pro-imperialist poems with a contemporary setting when viewed on their own (e.g., "The Galley Slave", "A Servant When He Reigneth", and "Gunga Din" as well). What the said contrast ultimately shows is that, according to Kipling, the English are a special nation, one that is preordained by nature to dominate the world for the benefit of the world itself, whereas the Indians, as well as all the other ethnicities (white or non-white) within the British Empire, occupy the position of an inferior race, one that is supposed to be perpetually led and taught by the superior and benevolent Britons. Gunga Din, as it turns out, is a loyal servant and endures his difficult and humiliating service to the English cheerfully, with the perspective of continuing to do the same, in the same cheerful spirit, in the afterlife as well, while Kipling's Saxons are a possible menace to their Norman colonisers if they are not treated justly. From a broad historical perspective, this analysis has shown that even the slave status can be used for propagandist purposes, in this case for Kipling's justification of Britain's dominion over India, because that part of English history when the English were slaves turns out to be, in Kipling's eyes, only a transitory epoch which taught the English to be "just" rulers and colonisers one day when they become mighty, whereas the Indian (19th-century) present, characterised by the slavery of the Indians, is, from his point of view, meant to go on in perpetuity.

To sum up, according to Kipling, the Indian servants are inborn slaves and they do not have to be treated with full justice, although their moral values are acknowledged, while the Saxons are given a far more dignified depiction, and not only because they are white Europeans, but primarily because, in spite of their decisive defeat to the Normans in the Battle of Hastings of 1066, they form the basis of the early 20th-century English identity as the English themselves saw it at the time of their greatest political and military power. So, the two analysed poems convey an Anglo-Saxonist, imperialist and racist, message from a combined, historical and contemporary, point of view by dealing with the English at the dawn of their history as a

unified European nation in the 11th century, and at the time of their greatest territorial extent at the turn of the 20th century.

The two works are a clear testimony about the Kiplingian Anglo-Saxonist utopia from the turn of the 20th century which included the idea of a global British-American hegemony in the interest of the whole human race. They are a testimony about a racist utopia which, in fact, would have been utopian solely for the British and Americans, and which, because of its blatantly anti-egalitarian character, did not have the potential to satisfy the numerous subjugated non-European races and peoples of the vast British and the fledgling American overseas empires. Such explanations that the British Empire was good for the conquered peoples because of the import of the industrial civilisation and because of the uniquely refined ability of the English to sentimentally acknowledge the contribution of their loyal indigenous subjects (as in "Gunga Din") and open-mindedly pay respect to the indigenous religions (as in *Kim*) can hardly compensate for the hardship inflicted upon the native peoples of South Asia by the exploitative colonial rule over the course of centuries. It is precisely for this reason that the British dominion eventually had to give way to the forces of India's independence movement after the Second World War. Speaking of the idea that Anglo-Saxon world domination should be striven for as something entirely beneficent for the whole of humanity, it is worth mentioning that, in Britain, it was not advocated only by Kipling, but also by many other notable intellectual figures of the late Victorian and Edwardian ages, including Kipling's personal friends – Arthur Conan Doyle and Cecil Rhodes (Montefiore 2018: 6).

When it comes to Anglo-Saxonism as a key concept in this article, it is important to say that, despite the fact that it is no longer alive in the 21st century as a racial concept, it still survives as a politico-cultural notion, and in the form of American exceptionalism. In other words, although in the present day and age, western scientists and scholars no longer speak of the innate supremacy of the "white Anglo-Saxon race", there is a perceptible belief in today's leading superpower, and formerly one of the chief two champions of Anglo-Saxonism, the United States, that it is an exceptional nation and that it has the right to export its liberal democracy to the rest of the world, whether peacefully or through military aggression,[4] purportedly for the benefit of mankind (Ceaser 2012). Such an ideology, which is seconded, first and foremost, by Great Britain, and then also by many other countries in Europe, North America, Asia, and Australia, is little else but a transformed ideology of Anglo-Saxonism, now clad in cultural rather than racial attire. This state of affairs shows that Kipling is still relevant for readers all over the world, simply because the world he lived in and described (the *Pax Britannica*) is a direct progenitor of the present world (the *Pax Americana*).

Kipling gave the world probably the richest and the most colourful picture of the colonialist practices and relations within the British Empire, and so it would be absolutely justifiable to regard this writer as an enduring symbol of Anglo-Saxon self-righteousness, a symbol that has outlived his own time. Kipling has the power to vividly acquaint the modern, 21st-century reader with the narcissism of the Anglo-Saxon civilisation, but, ultimately, it is time and history as the supreme judges of all human deeds and ideas that are to decide the fate of American exceptionalism as the new Anglo-Saxonism, just as they decided the fate of the old Anglo-Saxonism in the previous century. Whether the 21st century will see another fall of Anglo-Saxon hubris, or whether this time Kiplingian political dreams will come true in their full bloom, remains to be decided by the time to come and to be judged by history, that eternal "teacher of life".

Endnotes

1. The term "Anglo-Indian" is used here in its 19th-century meaning, as referring to white British people residing in British India.
2. In Hinduism, there is a temporary paradise called Svarga, which is in heaven, and there is also an eternal paradise which is attained through moksha (liberation from reincarnation, that is, the cycle of death and rebirth) and is often imagined as the union of a soul with the divine in some kind of an immaterial abode (Anon. 3).
3. Valkyries or Valkyrs were Norse mythical beings, beautiful maidens, clad in armour, who brought chosen fallen heroes from among mankind to Valhalla, the heavenly paradise, and there gave them "horns full of delicious mead" to enjoy in the afterlife (Guerber 1992: 19). The horns used for drinking can be considered cups, and hence comes the reference to the Valkyries as cup-bearers.
4. Following the end of the Cold War, many of Western attempts to introduce liberal democracy and the neoliberal market as its integral part to countries that had previously been outside of the politico-cultural sphere of the United States went peacefully, but some, however, did not. Worthy of mention in that respect are NATO's military assaults on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1999) and Iraq (2003), where the introduction of the neoliberal market and liberal democracy did not go peacefully, but rather violently, through either partial (FRY) or complete (Iraq) territorial occupation, in the old, violent ways of European imperialism from Kipling's day and age, and in breach of the UN Charter. In fact, the two decades or so that have elapsed since the military occupation of these two countries have shown that their occupiers have actually done very little to implement liberal democracy there, concentrating instead mostly on the implementation of the neoliberal market and adopting policies which bear more resemblance to a neo-colonialist approach than to a truly democratising one.

References

Anon. 1. n.d. "Dina, Dīna, Dinā, Dīnā, Dīna: 30 definitions". *Wisdomlib*. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.wisdomlib.org/definition/dina.

Anon. 2. 1997–2023. "Din Family History: Din Name Meaning". *Ancestry*. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.ancestry.com/name-origin?surname=din.

Anon. 3. 2023. "Svarga". *Yogapedia*. Accessed 27 April 2024. https://www.yogapedia.com/definition/7776/svarga.

Boyce, Robert. 2011. "The Persistence of Anglo-Saxonism in Britain and the Origins of Britain's Appeasement Policy Towards Germany". *Histoire@Politique*, no. 2011/3 (nº 15). 110–129. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.cairn.info/revue-histoire-politique-2011-3-page-110.htm.

Ceaser, James. 2012. "The Origins and Character of American Exceptionalism". *American Political Thought*, vol. 1, no. 1. 3–28. Accessed 13 April 2024. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/664595.

Chaudhuri, Nupur. 1994. "Memsahibs and Their Servants in Nineteenth-Century India". *Women's History Review*, vol. 3, no. 4. 549–562. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09612029400200071.

Chitnis, Komal, Ahire, Diksha, and Saiyad, Aslam. n.d. "Memories of the Water-Bearer: A Short Story of India's Bhishties". Online exhibition. *SARMAYA*. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://sarmaya.in/exhibition/short-history-of-indias-bhistis/.

Detweiler, Frederick German. 1938. "The Anglo-Saxon Myth in the United States". In *American Sociological Review*, vol. 3, no. 2. 183–189. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2084250.

Driver, C. J. 1989. “On ‘Recessional’”. In *The Kipling Journal*, vol. 63, no. 249. 33–34. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/pdf/KJ249.pdf.

Eliot, Thomas Stearns. 1963. “Rudyard Kipling”. In Eliot, T. S. (ed.). *A Choice of Kipling’s Verse*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd. 5–36. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.503906/page/n5/mode/2up.

Ferreira, Julio Carlos Viana. 2017. “Orwell on Kipling: An Imperialist, a Gentleman and a Great Artist”. *Anglo Saxonica*, vol. III, no. 13. 59–71. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://repositorio.ul.pt/bitstream/10451/29059/1/JCViana_Ferreira.pdf.

Goonetilleke, D. C. R. A. 1975. “Kipling’s Indian Poetry”. *The Kipling Journal*, vol. 42, no. 193. 14–17. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/pdf/KJ193.pdf.

Guerber, Helene Adeline. 1992 (1909). *Myths of the Norsemen from the Eddas and Sagas*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://archive.org/details/mythsofnorsemenf0000guer/page/n13/mode/2up?view=theater.

Hassan, Riaz. 2006. “Neither Civil nor Military”. *The Kipling Journal*, vol. 80, no. 320. 47–53. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/pdf/KJ320.pdf.

Horowitz, Milton. 2004. “Tommy this an’ Tommy that: Kipling’s Soldier Poems – *Barrack-Room Ballads*”. *The Kipling Journal*, vol. 78, no. 311. 51–57. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/pdf/KJ311.pdf.

Islam, Shamsul. 2002. “Imperialism, Racism & ‘the God of Small Things’”. *The Kipling Journal*, vol. 76, no. 302. 40–47. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/pdf/KJ302.pdf

Islam, Shamsul. 2012. “Kipling and Islam and Other World Religions”. *The Kipling Journal*, vol. 86, no. 348. 8–15. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/pdf/KJ348.pdf.

Keating, Peter. 2005. “Norman and Saxon”. *The Kipling Society*, 2005. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/readers-guide/rg_normansaxon1.htm.

Kipling, Rudyard. 2023a (1890). “Gunga Din”. *The Kipling Society*. 2023. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/poem/poems_gunga.htm.

Kipling, Rudyard. 2023b (1911). “Norman and Saxon” [1911]. *The Kipling Society*. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/poem/poems_normansaxon.htm.

MacDougall, Hugh A. 1982. *Racial Myth in English History: Trojans, Teutons, and Anglo-Saxons*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://archive.org/details/racialmythinengl0000macd/page/n7/mode/2up.

McGivering, John. 2017. ‘Gunga Din’. *The Kipling Society*. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/readers-guide/rg_gungadin1.htm.

McGrath, Charles. 2019. “Rudyard Kipling in America”. *The New Yorker*. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2019/07/08/rudyard-kipling-in-america.

Montefiore, Janet. 2018. “Editorial and News”. *The Kipling Journal*, vol. 92, no. 376. 6–7. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/pdf/KJ376.pdf.

Orwell, George. 2023 (1941). “Rudyard Kipling”. *The Orwell Foundation*. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/essays-and-other-works/rudyard-kipling/.

Perkins, Bradford. 1968. *The Great Rapprochement: England and the United States, 1895–1914*. New York: Atheneum. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://archive.org/details/greatrapprocheme0000perk/page/n5/mode/2up?view=theater.

Ridgwell, Stephen. 2018. “‘Nothing except All England’: Kipling and the Idea of the Poacher”. *The Kipling Journal*, vol. 92, no. 375. 27–40. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/pdf/KJ375.pdf.

Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://pages.pomona.edu/~vis04747/h124/readings/Said_Orientalism.pdf.
Sidky, Homayun. 2004. *Perspectives on Culture: A Critical Introduction to Theory in Cultural Anthropology*. Upper Saddle River NJ: Pearson Education. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://archive.org/details/perspectivesoncu0000sidk/page/n7/mode/2up.
Swift, John N. n.d. "Anglo-Saxonism". *American History Through Literature 1870–1920*. *Encyclopedia.com*. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://www.encyclopedia.com/history/culture-magazines/anglo-saxonism.
Turner, Sharon. 1820 (1799–1805). *The History of the Anglo-Saxons*, Vol. I. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://archive.org/details/historyofanglosa01turn/page/n5/mode/2up?ref=ol&view=theater.
Varley, H. L. 1953. "Imperialism and Rudyard Kipling". *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 14, no. 1: 124–135, *JSTOR*. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://doi.org/10.2307/2707499.
Watts, Cedrick. 2009. "Introduction". In *Kim*. Rudyard Kipling. Ware (Hertfordshire): Wordsworth Editions Limited. 5–25.
Williams, Deanne. 2008. "Rudyard Kipling and the Norman Conquest". *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature*, vol., 39, no. 3. 107–123. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://web.archive.org/web/20101221100857id_/http://ariel.synergiesprairies.ca:80/ariel/index.php/ariel/article/viewFile/241/238.
Wurgaft, Lewis. D. 1983. *The Imperial Imagination: Magic and Myth in Kipling's India*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press. Accessed 13 October 2023. https://archive.org/details/imperialimaginat0000wurg/mode/2up?view=theater

Goran Petrović
Faculty of Philology
University of Belgrade
E-mail: gphwchamp@gmail.com

In SKASE Journal of Literary and Cultural Studies [online]. 2024, vol. 6, no. 1 [cit. 2024-06-30]. Available on web page http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JLCS12/01.pdf. ISSN 2644-5506