

**Rethinking inclusion and exclusion: the question of mixed-race presence in late colonial  
India**

**Satoshi Mizutani**

This article examines the ambivalent meanings of mixed-race presence in late colonial India (from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries). In doing so it contributes insights for pursuing the theme of inclusion and exclusion in the historiography of imperialism and colonialism.

Studies on the imperial politics of inclusion and exclusion have not fully explicated the complex intersections between colonial exclusion and the metropolitan bourgeois hierarchy. We still tend, rather habitually, to mould our analytic categories, according to the coloniser / colonised dichotomy. This is *not* at all to imply that the analytic and empirical weight of this dichotomy should be downplayed: rather, it means that the coloniser / colonised axis itself stands in need of being re-considered.

The post-Independent historiography of colonial India has attended to the internal ordering of the colonised society, so as to evaluate the correlation between colonialist exclusion and nationalist inclusion, and to research the multiplicities of racial, class, gender and caste subordination under imperialism.<sup>1</sup> In contrast, less attention has been paid to the internal configuration of the coloniser's society. As Ann Stoler has pointed out, studies of colonial societies have long tended to assume white communities and colonisers as an abstract force, comprising a seamless homogeneity of bureaucratic and commercial agents.<sup>2</sup> But it is possible, as this paper

will show, to challenge this conventional view in ways that address the important imbrications of 'racial', class and gender identities.

This paper assesses the imperial significance of mixed-race identity in order to show that the imperial formation of 'whiteness' was predicated on the metropolitan order of class as well as the bipolar conceptualisation of racial difference. It will seek to demonstrate how the heterogeneous subjects of British society (men, women, middle or working classes, children, as well as 'mixed bloods') were *differentially* included in, or excluded from, the imperial body politic.

Pointing to this internal differentiation, however, should not be taken as an end in itself. Rather, it should be done as a step to show how the internal hierarchies of British society had repercussions on external relations with the colonised. In other words, the analysis of the internal composition of the coloniser's society in this paper will not be intended as a way of replacing the coloniser / colonised dichotomy, but, on the contrary, will be meant as a means precisely to re-consider it from another vantage point.

## **Exclusion**

### *The construction of 'whiteness'*

Before discussing the inclusion and exclusion of mixed-race people, we need to clarify, in a precise way, what 'being white' meant in late colonial India. The extreme elitism of the British in India was characteristic of colonial rule from the times of the East India Company, but the Sepoy

Rebellion in 1857 and the subsequent transition to Crown rule marked a crucial rupture in the colonial definition of 'whiteness'. The bitter memories of the bloody Rebellion deeply inscribed a racial hatred and fear on the British mind. This mental framework was soon solidified by the rising discourse of scientific racism.<sup>3</sup> These new developments forced the British to re-think 'what they ought to be' and to re-formulate the direction of their colonial settlement.

The appointment of the Select Committee for Colonisation and Settlement (SCCS) in 1857 explicitly shows the extent to which the imperial authorities were preoccupied with how to define 'whiteness'. The SCCS concluded that the opportunity for colonial settlement should be given only to 'a class of superior settlers; who may, by their enterprise, capital and science, set in motion the labour, and develop the resources, of India'.<sup>4</sup> To be a 'coloniser' meant belonging to the official, capitalist, or professional class, and nothing short of it would suffice. To govern a vast colonised population, each 'coloniser' had to be a flawless embodiment of imperial racial prestige, which would achieve the 'dominion of the mind'.<sup>5</sup>

In the sharply racialised context of colonial society, the white middle-class of late colonial India lived in a version of social apartheid, confining themselves tightly to 'Clubs', or retreating into British hill-stations in the northern mountains. Their racial attitude to the colonised subjects was maintained through an exaggerated sense of aristocratic snobbery, which they freely lavished in the absence of their upper-class rivals in the colony.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, this magnified class consciousness of

the coloniser tempts us to follow the SCCS in imagining the British in India to have been a homogeneous collective of imperial agents.

However, this description would represent only a partial picture of the reality of the white population in India. Military and commercial needs ensured that many sections of British society were represented in the colony. Since the suppression of the Rebellion, a stable figure of approximately 60,000 British soldiers was maintained in India. Many were discharged in India with hardly any means to sustain themselves. For instance, during 1858-62 alone, the Indian Navy and its departments discharged 2,703 subordinate white soldiers.<sup>7</sup> In addition to soldiers, more working-class people came, as artisans, railway workers or sailors. The increasing amount of imperial investments, both in businesses and public works, typified by the extensive construction of railways, had required a considerable number of British mechanics and artisans. Additionally, the intensified degree of navigation traffic between Britain and India brought a number of seamen, many of whom tended to stay on, instead of sailing 'Home'.<sup>8</sup>

In fact, the SCCS had defined 'whiteness' not only by identifying it with a handful of middle-class men but also by negatively circumscribing it against the subordinate classes. '[T]he inducements to a settlement of the working classes of the British Isles are not generally found in India'.<sup>9</sup> But such official coding of 'whiteness' stood on rather precarious ground, as the presence of subordinate white classes actually increased in contradiction to the ideological construction of

'whiteness'.

Out of the reproduction of 'whiteness', subordinate white persons would be excluded. In contrast to their middle-class counterpart, they quickly found themselves declining in socio-economic scale, simply because British colonialism did not want their presence in any positive way. British capitalism arrived in India in search of cheap native labour, which turned out to be abundant. Naturally, there was no room for the British working-class, who were not only unaccustomed to the Indian environment but claimed more pay than native 'coolies'. A white working-class presence was also politically undesirable. Around the time of the SCCS, a journal article graphically articulated the shared sentiment against the working-class in India:

The European cannot be a hewer of wood, and a drawer of water, in the same field with the Asiatic. Here his function is to govern and to war, to instruct, direct and educate, to root out the baneful superstitions and noxious errors of the native mind... He may not descent into the rough field of common labour, by the side of the black man, nor earn his daily bread with the daily sweat of his brow, in the same field of emulative toil with his coloured brother.<sup>10</sup>

As an unwanted presence in colonial society, the subordinate white class fell into destitution all too readily. In fact, the presence of 'white loafers' soon became a visible fixture of the colonial scene, especially in big cities.<sup>11</sup>

### *Miscegenation*

The question of colonial sexuality has acquired much significance in recent historiography of colonial society.<sup>12</sup> The question of inclusion / exclusion in the colonial context unavoidably involves the relation between the ideological invention of racial homogeneity and the contradictory

reality of sexual contact. The “problem” of miscegenation has become an important object of investigation for exploring the complex relations between race, sexuality and gender. For example, Ronald Hyam<sup>13</sup> has identified colonial miscegenation as a site for sexual and economic opportunities. Robert Young,<sup>14</sup> in contrast, has brought miscegenation to the fore as an analytical reference point to deconstruct colonialism into its psycho-sexual and discursive paradoxes.

In their different ways, Hyam and Young have tried to address the issue of inclusion / exclusion in imperial society. Hyam contends that colonial sexual exchanges took place in an equilibrium of demand and supply, which satisfied both the sexual needs of the colonising male and the economic advancement of the colonised female. Seeing the colonial context as an opportunity for sexual and economic inclusion, he has condemned the racist ban on miscegenation as a cause of exclusion. Young, on the other hand, regards the colonial context as a site contradictorily ridden with both desire (inclusion) and a necessity to differentiate (exclusion). Thus he reads miscegenation into the psyche and discourse of the coloniser to unveil their inherent ambivalence about inclusion / exclusion. My own approach to miscegenation differs from both of these views. Although there is no room in this paper to explore these influential and frequently debated accounts of colonial miscegenation,<sup>15</sup> it needs to be pointed out that they relate to the focus of this paper through their omission of a consideration of the *class dimension* of colonial sexuality. It is precisely this aspect that stands in need of elaboration to broaden our insight into the inclusion / exclusion

problematic.

In late colonial India, miscegenation emerged as a “problem” of ‘poor whites’, and not just as a “problem” of bourgeois sexuality and its repression (whether psychic or moralistic). Whilst miscegenation had been widely practiced by middle-class men,<sup>16</sup> a sufficient number of middle-class women began arriving from Britain in the mid-nineteenth century, enabling white middle-class men to subscribe quite closely to the imperial norm of same-race marriage. White women thus served the dual purpose of controlling the British domestic sphere in the colony, and preventing colonial men from forming inter-racial relations with native women.<sup>17</sup> Miscegenation was frequently articulated as an intolerable act of transgression, and to practice it threatened the position of middle-class men.<sup>18</sup> As a newspaper article expressed in 1871, it was an ‘unholy connection’, inflicting an injury on the racial morality of a new imperial age.<sup>19</sup> Yet, the middle-class withdrawal from miscegenation was only a partial solution. The control of sexuality had to take quite different directions in relation to the subordinate white classes.

The shift from the metropolitan to the colonising context did not effect a change to the male, middle-class prejudice against the sexualities of women and the poor. If the supposedly more promiscuous nature of these sexualities was to be prevented from engaging in miscegenation, it had to be done by social and institutional control. The sexuality of the subordinate white soldiers, who constituted the bulk of the white working-class in India, had to be controlled by keeping them

away from the natives. A substantial element of opinion advocated the creation of a segregated colony in the northern hills where the soldiers would marry and live with working-class white women.<sup>20</sup> The colonial middle-class feared that in the plain regions of India, soldiers and ex-soldiers would relate with native women and stay on in the country with their native wives and mixed-race offspring. For instance, when asked by the SCCS whether soldiers lived well with native wives, James Martin, who was an influential ex-surgeon in the Bengal Army, said:

They do, but it spoils the soldier; he becomes domesticated in Indian habits; he volunteers to remain in India when his regiment comes home; he becomes an old Indian; in fact, an indolent man, and too much domesticated in India.<sup>21</sup>

Yet, even same-race marriage between working-class men and women was not thought sufficient to prevent miscegenation. After all, the middle-class was deeply prejudiced not just against the working-class but equally against women.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, India offered little prospect for the British working-class. Their inevitable economic decline led them to interact with the natives, sexually or otherwise. The creation of a colony for the subordinate soldiery might itself add to the “problem” of miscegenation instead of tackling it: as a newspaper article stated:

The wild schemes for colonising the Hills with poor Europeans, are not worth two minutes’ attention. [...] There is not one of the Hill colony schemes that would not prove a source of very heavy expenditure, while increasing the evil in almost geometrical progression, by leading the class to propagate itself in the country.<sup>23</sup>

In the end, the military authorities invented a regulated prostitution as an institutional mechanism for control: it would channel the desire of subordinate white soldiers’ desire into a restricted and supervised economy of sexual exchange, thus effectively eliminating possibilities of



miscegenation.<sup>24</sup>

*The 'domiciled'*

The class dimension of miscegenation indicates that the problem of racial inclusion and exclusion in late colonial India was intricately linked with the issue of 'poor whites' and middle-class control over their lives. From the mid-nineteenth century, the colonial perception of people of mixed-race origin came to be recast within this perspective of inclusion and exclusion.

By the 1890's, there was a dramatic underclass formation in a large section of the mixed-race population. This was to a great extent due to the 'Indianisation' of colonial public services, which was rigorously carried out in the late nineteenth century. Under the policy of 'Indianisation' the colonial state increasingly preferred to employ native rather than mixed-race subjects, in order to pursue both administrative cost-efficiency (native labour was available at a cheaper rate than the mixed-race counterpart), and the ramification of political control through conciliation (rather than confrontation). Reflecting the effect of 'Indianisation', the proportion of mixed-race clerkship declined on an acute scale, from 99% to 18%, during the period between 1840 and 1890.<sup>25</sup> Because the mixed-race community was traditionally dependent on civil employment, unemployment hit the population at a phenomenal rate. This acute impoverishment of the mixed-race population concurred with the increase of the British population in India and its subsequent pauperisation of its subordinate ranks. The two groups, 'poor whites' and 'mixed

bloods' were categorically amalgamated and referred to as the 'domiciled class'. Its relative numerical insignificance notwithstanding (approximately 200,000), the presence of the domiciled class continuously demanded the solicitous attention of the colonial authorities. The so-called 'Eurasian Question', which became a regular preoccupation among the British middle-class from the late nineteenth century, referred to social issues concerning both the poor-white and mixed-race populations.

Whether of mixed-race origin or not, people of the category 'domiciled' were regarded as essentially different from 'whites'. They were recognised as a 'race apart', and this recognition led some critics of the 'Eurasian Question' to insist that they should no longer be regarded as an integral part of the British body politic, and be deprived of all privileges therewith. For instance, an article in *The Calcutta Review* declared in 1879 that:

The ['domiciled'] race, it seem to me, must ultimately merge into the general population of the country. [...] let him throw off the feeling which prompts this isolation [from Indian society], let him declare himself a fellow countryman to the rest of the people of India, and it will be seen that the Indianisation which must necessarily be the moulding force of his character, will become [...] the means of great and good results.<sup>26</sup>

The exclusion of the 'domiciled' in the language of race ran parallel with a form of legal exclusion. At the beginning of the 1870's, members of the domiciled class were given the legal status of 'Statutory Natives of India'. The official logic of this legal arrangement was that it would enable the 'domiciled' to benefit from the policy of the 'Indianisation' of local governmental services. However, the exclusion of the 'domiciled' from the white middle-class had derived from an

equivocally negative definition of the domiciled class as 'not quite white', rather than their positive identification with the 'natives'. *In reality*, the 'domiciled' were never counted amongst the colonised subjects and were virtually excluded from the policy of Indianisation.

### Inclusion

#### *The colonial state*

The mixed-race population was excluded from 'whiteness' not solely because of their 'impure' racial origins but also because of their class position which they shared with 'poor whites'. However, the white middle-class in India were at the same time keenly conscious of the political meaning of the presence of these impoverished populations. In 1860, Lord Canning, who was the first head of the colonial state ('Viceroy') since imperial Britain established sovereign rule in India in 1858, proclaimed:

If measures for educating these ['domiciled'] children are not promptly and vigorously encouraged and aided by the Government, we shall soon find ourselves embarrassed in all large towns and stations with a floating population of Indianised English, loosely brought up, and exhibiting most of the worst qualities of both races; whilst the Eurasian population, already so numerous that the means of education offered to it are quite inadequate, will increase more rapidly than ever. I can hardly imagine a more profitless, unmanageable community than the one so composed. It might be long before it would grow to what would be called a class dangerous to the State; but very few years will make it, if neglected, a glaring reproach to the Government, and to the faith which it will, however ignorant and vicious, nominally profess.<sup>27</sup>

In this widely influential and often quoted remark, Lord Canning articulated a shared anxiety of the colonial authorities. They thought that the visible decline of a population of European origin in the midst of the colonised subjects would be a 'calamity' and would surely be 'ascribed to

the inactivity of a Christian Church and Civilised State',<sup>28</sup> or more generally, a 'damaging blow to British prestige'.<sup>29</sup> The 'domiciled' therefore, should be kept at bay within the control of British society. 'Inclusion' was also necessary to maintain imperial racial prestige.

From around the mid-1870's, British philanthropic activities for the 'domiciled' became increasingly centralised by the colonial state. As Canning's remark implied, the colonial state was expected to take a positive role in extending and implementing social control over the 'domiciled'. With the 'Eurasian Question' becoming increasingly serious, efforts at charitable aid, educational provision and employment promotion would have to be done with more organisational unity and precision. The state would provide functional and financial means, and orchestrate private efforts. By the mid-1880's, a centralised schooling system was created especially for the children of the domiciled class. As an object of state intervention, the domiciled class would emerge as a population whose conditions, with their many interconnected aspects, would be subjected to close public scrutiny.

The above pattern of inclusion and control was epitomised in the two public enquiries, the Pauperism Committee (PC) (1891) and the Calcutta Domiciled Community Enquiry Committee (CDCEC) (1918-19).<sup>30</sup> Various aspects of the domiciled population, such as labour, education, charity, housing and health would be surveyed through statistics, interviewing and ethnographical observation. On the basis of these findings, measures to solve the 'Eurasian Question' were

proposed to the Government and the British public at large.

*'Psychological pathology'*

Within the scheme of inclusion and control the alleged difference, or 'inferiority', of the 'domiciled' was represented as resulting from a kind of psychological abnormality. It was commonly considered that whilst, on the one hand, the 'domiciled' mimicked the lifestyle of the white middle-class in neglect of their class position, on the other hand they enjoyed a false sense of superiority over the natives. This psychological inclination became their intrinsic character, born out of their long immersion in the in-between social situation experienced in crowded slum quarters. The alleged false-psyche of the 'domiciled' would cause them to commit unbecoming cultural practices, making them helplessly poor and dependent. Their 'false' identification with British middle-class culture would make them love luxury and display. Their 'false' economic consciousness and despise of the natives would cause them to avoid manual labour. Their 'false' sense of kinship with the British would induce them into becoming dependent on the philanthropists and their relief aid.<sup>31</sup> These 'false' misrecognitions would also lead them to employ poor natives as domestic servants, making the children helplessly dependent and spoiled.<sup>32</sup>

This discourse on 'false consciousness' implied that the supposed characteristics of the 'domiciled' were a *cause* of their pauperisation as much as it was an effect of the latter.

*Reforming the 'domiciled subject'*

Both the PC and the CDCED internalised the view of the 'domiciled' as psychologically misfit. However, they represented the 'domiciled' in such a way as to not stereotype (exclude) but rather to control (include) them. The identification of undesirable attributes was justified as a necessary step for indicating certain traits that should be subsequently eliminated. The cure of pauperism would depend upon how the poor could free themselves from their own problematic inclinations and acquire the 'proper' mode of self-recognition and cultural practice. The role of the colonial state and the British philanthropic class would be to enforce various measures for this reformation and re-invention of the 'domiciled subject'.

It was proposed that relief aid would be restricted as much as possible in order to avoid 'parasitic' dependency. The institutional confinement of the poor was to be done primarily to prevent the 'work shy' from begging, but also to force them into learning the art of labour. Labour itself would be used to discipline the 'domiciled'. For instance, there were strong proposals for creating a special military regiment, solely composed of domiciled-class youth, and a training-ship scheme whereby to instruct them into marine pilots.<sup>33</sup> These schemes would isolate the domiciled youth both from the hazards of chronic unemployment and the slum quarters of big cities in which they supposedly nurtured their false self-consciousness and deplorable cultural practices. At the same time, these schemes would institute a strict working ethic. As the PC said of the proposed

military regiment:

Military training is one of the best remedies that could be devised for curing the want of discipline, of which all employers of labour now complain. Service with a regiment will check, if not entirely put a stop to, the improvident marriages which young men are now only too ready to contract.<sup>34</sup>

Similarly, attempts were widely made at internal migration for agricultural re-settlement and permanent emigration abroad (i.e., British 'settler' colonies such as Australia). These two schemes were not formerly recommended by the PC, but their importance was duly recognised. In the late 1870's, Richard Temple, the then Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, acknowledged the effort at internal migration as 'one of the most important measures' that could possibly solve 'a difficulty which has been puzzling the brains of the most astute of Her Majesty's representatives in this country'.<sup>35</sup> Charles Elliot, who was in office as the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal at the time of the PC, expressed his view of emigration as the only solution for the 'Eurasian Question': India was simply too densely populated to make room for the 'domiciled'.<sup>36</sup>

These schemes of migration aimed at the realisation of a homogenous, self-sufficient commune for the 'domiciled'. Removed from the slums and the coloniser / colonised relation altogether, the 'domiciled' would transform themselves from the 'psychological unfit' to the 'honest labourer'.

The dual methods of isolation and discipline would be assisted by educational means as well. An orphanage scheme, founded and run by the Scottish missionary John Graham, encouraged its poor-white and mixed-descent inmates to become soldiers, sailors, farmers and

emigrants.<sup>37</sup> This much praised orphanage system itself realised a total institutionalisation of the youngest members of the 'domiciled' in a remote mountain area in the north of India. Through thoroughly disciplining them from a very early age, this institution aimed at totally eradicating the 'intrinsic characteristics' of the 'domiciled'. It forced the children to do all the domestic work thereby saving them 'from the overbearing spirit generated by the sense of "bossing" native servants'.<sup>38</sup>

None of the aforementioned schemes were, in fact, enough for solving the pauperism of the domiciled class, but the orientation of these schemes is an important referential point for our understanding the 'Eurasian Question' and its imperial significance. Labour and education (in its broadest sense) complemented each other as a means to transform the 'domiciled'. This disciplinary transformation was itself conditioned by the possibility of social and geographical relocation. The removal of the 'domiciled' was thought to be the simplest but also the most radical way to solve the 'Eurasian Question'. These combined measures of isolation and discipline purported to control and undermine the expansion of the mixed-race and poor-white presence in colonial society. 'Inclusion' was advocated not as a means to integrate the 'domiciled' with the 'coloniser' but rather to exclude them from the coloniser / colonised relation itself.

### **Complexities of inclusion and exclusion**

The relations between the two categories, 'white' and 'domiciled', were inevitably complex, making the interplay of inclusion and exclusion ambivalent. To dismantle this ambivalence we need



to re-think the meaning of 'domicile'. The paper has thus far argued that the colonial meaning of mixed-race identity should be understood within its irreducible relation to 'class'. In the colonising context, 'class' was not simply replaced by 'race' as an index of inclusion / exclusion, but was revised in ways that produced subtle but definite complexities. 'Domicile' was a key idiom, invented to re-define and domesticate a 'class' problem that, as the SCCS had made clear, should not have come into being in the first place.

The legal labelling of the 'domiciled' as 'non-European' had an implicit function of transferring what was essentially a problem of class gap to an issue of place of residence, as though 'domicile' was a matter of arbitrary choice, and not a socio-economic effect. In fact the 'domiciled' had little room to deliberate on the question of residence. They became rooted in India, and often mixed with the natives, simply because there were no economic means for returning 'Home' to re-establish their lives there. What divided 'domicile' from 'non-domicile' was the social and economic hierarchies that structured British society; the creation of the colonial category 'domiciled' was *already* an effect of 'exclusion'. Conversely, then, 'whiteness' was guaranteed only by an 'inclusion' *prior to* colonial settlement.

To 'remain white' was to remain connected to the imperial metropole. India would exist only as a temporary passage for a 'career' or for economic surplus value to be taken back 'Home'. The colonial ruling classes, both bureaucrats and capitalists, were reproduced exclusively through

this very narrow circuit of middle-class social network that traversed the metropole and colony. From such a network the 'domiciled' had been structurally excluded.

This paper has laid bare the complexities of inclusion and exclusion in colonial society by exploring the ambivalent implications of the mixed-race question. Through examining the key issues on which this question hinged, especially 'race', sexuality and class, the paper indicates the importance of re-considering the relevance of 'class' and 'metropole' to the historiography of colonial society. The origins of colonial ambivalence to the mixed-race question can be traced to the imperial reproduction of class order *and* the colonial necessity for maintaining racial prestige in the colonial periphery. This paper emphasised these complex intersections of 'race' / class and metropole / colony. The elaboration of which may open up further prospects for researching the issue of inclusion and exclusion.

The problem of the mutual imbrications of racism and classism which this paper has problematised may well be considered further to address other related issues. For instance, we can analyse, as Catherine Hall, Ann McClintock and others have done, how the emergent discourse of racial difference in the age of empire related to the hierarchies of class and gender identities in the British nation-state. The imperial nation-state was not simply a centrifugal force of 'civilisation'. White middle-class men used an imperial discourse of racial difference to mark out the female, the poor, or the so-called 'unfit' populations in the metropolis. The imperial centre itself

came under the *centripetal* influences of its colonial peripheries. In this sense, the discourse of 'civilisation' came back to influence the hegemonic representation of the metropolitan social order.<sup>39</sup>

The terms of inclusion / exclusion in the imperial nation-state were conditioned, to some extent at least, by colonial social encounters. Given this assumption, we may argue that the white middle-class arrived in colonial India to discover not just the non-European 'other' but also the class 'other', whose 'degeneration' they were already familiar with in British society. Missionaries, such as John Graham, travelled to India with an imperial enthusiasm for the 'civilising mission', only to witness a problem of a different nature, which was equally significant as a 'racial' or 'imperial' concern.

The notion of 'degeneration' which constituted the exclusionary discourse against the 'domiciled' may be elaborated upon within the metropole / periphery axis of empire. Anna Davin and Bernard Semmel have demonstrated that the discourses of social evolutionism and eugenics sought to theorise class difference in a crude language of 'degeneration'. These theories emerged in the late nineteenth century, when intellectuals tried to rescue the declining strength of the 'British race' as a centrifugal force of imperialism. In this context, it was not colonial racial difference as such but the 'health of the population' that mattered. The boundary of the 'ruling race', and inclusion and exclusion in relation to it, would be drawn in class terms, in order to compete with

other imperial powers.<sup>40</sup>

This conceptualisation of race as a matter of public hygiene indicates an interesting analogy with the colonial Indian context, where the white middle-class were already paranoid about 'degeneration'. To be 'white', in fact, was not always perceived as a permanent attribute of Europeans but was thought to require continuous care and material investment. In late colonial India, they carefully subscribed to the cultural and pseudo-medical norms that were widely circulated within their social circuit. It was partly because of this 'medical' concern that the offspring of the colonials were sent back to Britain.<sup>41</sup>

By introducing the particular case of the mixed-race "problem" in late colonial India, this article contributes a fresh perspective for re-thinking the inclusion / exclusion problematic in the historiography of modern imperial society. Through a close examination of the internal hierarchies of British society and their colonial consequences, this paper indicates several points from which to re-consider the coloniser / colonised relation.

---

**Endnotes**

<sup>1</sup> For instance, Indian femininity was 'nationalised' as a symbol of Indian purity to which the coloniser would have no access: the female body became interlocked with the male-nationalist desire to control their women and the eugenicist idea of linking motherhood to effective population control. Among the many examples, see, for instance, Tanika Sarkar, 'Rhetoric against Age of Consent: Resisting Colonial Reason and Death of a Child-Wife', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 28 (1993), pp.1869-1878

<sup>2</sup> Ann Stoler, 'Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 13 (1989), pp.134-161

<sup>3</sup> As Thomas Metcalf notes, 'The ideas forged in the crucible of 1857 were hammered into shape on the anvil of racial and political theory'. Thomas Metcalf, *The Aftermath of Revolt: India, 1857-1870* (Oxford, 1965), p.310

<sup>4</sup> *Parliamentary Papers, the Select Committee on Colonisation and Settlement in India, Report, 1860, V*, p.iii

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*, p.xxxi

<sup>6</sup> For a general discussion about the link between class consciousness and colonial racism, see, *Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities, Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (Verso, 1991), Chapter 8. For the case of British India in particular, useful observations are found in Kenneth Ballhatchet, *Race, Sex and Class under the Raj, Imperial Attitudes and Policies and their Critics, 1973-1905* (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980); and in Michael Edwards, *Bound to Exile: The Victorians in India* (Sidgwick & Jackson, 1969). For a good analysis of the ideological romanticising of the 'hills' and the simultaneous stereotyping of the 'planes', see, Thomas Metcalf, *Ideologies of the Raj* (Cambridge, 1995)

<sup>7</sup> See, 'Light on the Loafers', *The Friend of India [Weekly]*, 7 Feb. (1867), p.151

<sup>8</sup> 'The Great "Loafer" Difficulty', *The Friend of India [Weekly]*, 6 Aug. (1868), p.907

<sup>9</sup> The SCCE, *op.cit.*, p.iii

<sup>10</sup> Anonymous, 'Colonisation in India', *The Calcutta Review*, 30 (1858), pp. 163-188, pp.178-179

<sup>11</sup> See the pioneering work by David Arnold; David Arnold, 'European Orphans and Vagrants in India in the Nineteenth Century', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 7 (1979), pp.104-127

<sup>12</sup> For a concise historiographical overview, see Linda Bryder, 'Sex, Race and Colonialism: An Historiographical Review', in *The International History Review*, 20 (1998), pp.806-822

<sup>13</sup> Ronald Hyam, *Empire and Sexuality: The British Experience* (Manchester UP, 1992)

<sup>14</sup> Robert J. C. Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (Routledge, 1995)

<sup>15</sup> Hyam's view has been subjected to severe criticisms: it has been accused of being both male chauvinist and imperialist. See, for instance, Mark Berger, 1988, 'Imperialism and Sexual Exploitation: A Response to Ronald Hyam's 'Empire and Sexual Opportunity'', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 17(1988), pp.83-89

<sup>16</sup> Indrani Chatterjee, 'Colouring Subalternity: Slaves, Concubines and Social Orphans in Early Colonial India', in Gautam Bhadra, Gyan Prakash & Susie Tharu (eds.), *Subaltern Studies X: Writings on South Asian History and Society* (Oxford, 1999), pp.49-97; see also, C. J. Hawes, *Poor Relations: the Making of a Eurasian Community in British India, 1773-1883* (Curzon Press, 1996)

<sup>17</sup> For a vivid expression of this white femininity, see J. E. Dawson, 'Women in India: Her Influence and Position', *The Calcutta Review*, 83 (1886), pp.347-370

<sup>18</sup> Anthony Frank, *Britain's Betrayal in India* (Allied Publishers, 1969), p.356

<sup>19</sup> 'Marriages and Other Matters', *The Friend of India [weekly]*, 11 May (1871), pp.538-539, p.538

<sup>20</sup> On the arguments for military colonisation, see, for instance, 'Military Colonization', *The Friend of India [Weekly]*, 17 June (1858), pp.556-557; 'Military Colonisation in India', *The Friend of India [Weekly]*, 18 July (1861), pp.786-787; 'Hill Sanitaria and Our Railway System', *The Friend of India [Weekly]*, 3 Oct. (1861), pp.1096-1097; H. M. Knollys, 'Military Colonization in India', *The Calcutta Review*, 36 (1861), pp.220-235

<sup>21</sup> *Parliamentary Papers, the Select Committee on Colonisation and Settlement in India, First Report, 1857-58, VII, Pt.I*, p.25

<sup>22</sup> For male, middle-class prejudice against white women in India, see, Indrani Sen, 'Between power and "purdah": The white women in British India, 1858 - 1900', *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 34 (1997), pp.355-376;

<sup>23</sup> *The Friend of India [Weekly]*, 2 September (1876), p.795; see also, *The Friend of India*, 21 October (1876), p.946

<sup>24</sup> See, Ballhatchet, *op.cit.*

<sup>25</sup> *Report of the Pauperism Committee* (Calcutta, 1892), p.6

- 
- <sup>26</sup> Anonymous, 'The Anglo-Indian Question', *The Calcutta Review*, 69 (1879), pp382-391, p.390
- <sup>27</sup> Quoted in *Review of Education in India in 1886*, p.294
- <sup>28</sup> Joseph Baly, *The Employment of Europeans in India: A Paper Read Before the Bengal Social Science Association on Thursday, May 1<sup>st</sup> 1879* (Calcutta, 1879), p.36
- <sup>29</sup> W. H. Arden Wood, 'The Domiciled Community in India and the Simla Education Conference', *The Calcutta Review*, 1 (1913), p.109-132, p.111
- <sup>30</sup> *Report of the Pauperism Committee*, op.cit., and *Report of the Calcutta Domiciled Community Enquiry Committee, 1918-19* (Calcutta)
- <sup>31</sup> John MacRae, 'Social Conditions in Calcutta – 1 & 2: The Problem for Charity among the Anglo-Indian Community', *The Calcutta Review*, 1 (1913), pp. 84-94 and pp. 351-371
- <sup>32</sup> See for instance, Julius Smith 'Correct Education for Anglo-Indians and Eurasians in India', *St. Andrew's Colonial Home's Magazine*, Jan. (1902), pp. 45-46, p.46
- <sup>33</sup> For a summary of the proposed training-ship sheme, see, Luke James Luke, 'A Training-Ship Institution', *The Calcutta Review*, 146 (1903), pp.329-333
- <sup>34</sup> Report of the Pauperism Committee, op.cit., p.14
- <sup>35</sup> 'Sir Richard Temple and Hill Colonization', *The Friend of India [Weekly]*, 22 Jan. (1876), p.76
- <sup>36</sup> 'Eurasian and Anglo-Indian Association', *The Statesman & Friend of India [Weekly]*, 28 Mar. (1891), pp.4-5.
- <sup>37</sup> See, J. A. Graham, 'The Education of the Anglo-Indian Child', *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, vol.83, 1934, pp.22-46
- <sup>38</sup> 'Appeal to Mr. Andrew Carnegie', *St. Andrew's Colonial Home's Magazine* (Oct. 1901), p.26
- <sup>39</sup> Catherine Hall, *White, Male and Middle Class: Explorations in Feminism and History* (Polity Press, 1992); Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context*, (Routledge, 1995); see also, Susan Thorne, "'The Conversion of Englishmen and the Conversion of the World Inseparable": Missionary Imperialism and the Language of Class in Early Industrial Britain', in Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler (eds.), *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (University of California Press, 1997f), pp.238-262
- <sup>40</sup> Anna Davin, 'Motherhood and Imperialism', *History Workshop Journal*, 5 (1978), pp.9-65; Bernard Semmel, *Imperialism and social reform : English social-imperial thought, 1895-1914*, (London, 1960)
- <sup>41</sup> See, Mark Harrison, *Climates and Constitutions: Health, Race, Environment and British Imperialism in India, 1600-1850* (Oxford, 1999)