Deciphering Race
Callanan, Laura

Published by The Ohio State University Press

Callanan, Laura.
Deciphering Race: White Anxiety, Racial Conflict, and the Turn to Fiction in Mid-Victorian English Prose.
The Ohio State University Press, 2005.
Project MUSE. muse.jhu.edu/book/28262.

For additional information about this book
https://muse.jhu.edu/book/28262

For content related to this chapter
https://muse.jhu.edu/related_content?type=book&id=1149486
Notes to Introduction

1. See footnote 4 on page 33 of Scott’s edition of the Journal.
2. As Gillian Beer suggests, it is not surprising that Eliot would address racial conflicts directly: “Descent, development, and race are central to Daniel Deronda” (Beer, 182).

Notes to Chapter 1

1. See “Past and Present State of Hayti,” Quarterly Review 21 (1819): 430–60. Note that this citation information differs from that found in the Appendix to the novel. The titles are the same, however, and there are no similar articles at the location Martineau cites.

2. Her topic also suggests an affinity with Victorian writings about the French Revolution, such as Thomas Carlyle’s History of the French Revolution (1837), Karl Marx’s The Communist Manifesto (1847), and Charles Dickens’s A Tale of Two Cities (1859). The influence of Carlyle is especially important considering Martineau’s close personal relationship with both the author and his wife, Jane. But Martineau’s treatment of racial revolution has far less of the Romantic passion so powerfully conveyed in Carlyle’s language and avoids the scapegoating of former slaves in which both Carlyle and Dickens engage when arguing for a more sympathetic attitude towards suffering white workers in England.

3. Parliamentary debaters tended to assume that the words of the government could produce rebellions. Diane Roberts argues, in her discussion of the American anti-abolitionist writer Louisa McCord, that opponents of Emancipation used “the anti-abolitionists’ favorite example, Haiti, to describe the murder and rapine that would be visited on whites by outraged and vengeful black ‘barbarians’” (66). As with Edwards’s argument in 1797, the words produced by the home country—whether in pamphlets, tracts, or parliamentary debates—had the power to incite slaves in the colonial context to rebel. Slave uprisings, this argument suggests, were discursively fueled events.

4. See Ott’s discussion of the specifics of the military campaign in his chapter “Toussaint and the British Invasion, 1793–1798” and C. L. R. James’s analysis throughout The Black Jacobins.
5. See Ott’s chapter, “The French Invasion, 1801–1802” for a historical description of these events in addition to C. L. R. James’s detailed account.

6. Toussaint’s Catholicism very likely impeded the conventional English reader’s sympathy with his brand of Christianity, however.

7. An example of a text that takes the opposite position is Frances Trollope’s *The Life and Adventures of Jonathan Jefferson Whitlaw: or Scenes on the Mississippi* (1836), a novel about a Louisiana slave plantation that connects the lack of education with an ignorance of Christian morality, rather than with the importance of, or need for, freedom (see 1:172).

8. In *The Problem of Freedom*, Thomas C. Holt suggests that the freedom into which the slaves moved was more of a transition in labor practices than true freedom from institutional restraint fueled by the intersection of abolitionism and the industrial revolution: “In this way slavery helped locate the outer boundaries of freedom; it was the antithesis of freedom. If slavery meant subordination to the physical coercion and personal dominion of an arbitrary master, then freedom meant submission only to the impersonal forces of the marketplace and to the rational and uniform constraints of the law” (Holt, 26). Holt is, of course, modifying Eric Williams’s more economically deterministic argument in *Capitalism and Slavery*. In that work, Williams argues the following: “In 1833, therefore, the alternatives were clear: emancipation from above, or emancipation from below. But EMANCIPATION. Economic change, the decline of the monopolists, the development of capitalism, the humanitarian agitation in British churches, contending perorations in the halls of Parliament, had now reached their completion in the determination of the slaves themselves to be free. The Negroes had been stimulated to freedom by the development of the very wealth which their labor had created” (Williams, 208). Martineau speaks to the complex social and emotional situation of sudden freedom by having Toussaint’s wife in the novel experience a sense of confusion and disorientation after realizing that they were free of the slave system (1:94–118).

9. Martineau’s use of literacy as a narrative tool to gain the respect of the reader makes a great deal of sense, in terms of the ways in which the acts of reading and writing signify within the Western and European mindset. As Gates argues, “Writing, many Europeans argued, stood alone among the fine arts as the most salient repository of ‘genius,’ the visible sign of reason itself. In this subordinate role, however, writing, although secondary to reason, is nevertheless the medium of reason’s expression. We know reason by its writing, by its representations. Such representations could assume spoken or written form. And while several superb scholars give priority to the spoken as the privileged of the pair, most Europeans privileged writing—in their writings about Africans, at least—as the principal measure of the Africans’ humanity, their capacity for progress, their very place in the great chain of being” (“Introduction,” 9, original italics).

The issue of literacy in light of work such as Edward Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* (1993), and Gauri Viswanathan’s “Currying Favor: The Politics of British Educational and Cultural Policy in India, 1813–1854” (1988) and *Masks of Conquest* (1998), cannot be left to exist as a kind of liberal idealization, however. Said’s and Viswanathan’s works illustrate vividly the power of the project of cultural literacy to intersect directly with physical and social brutality. Thus considering the way that Martineau’s novel develops, a critique of the power of education as an imposition of social control over a population becomes significant.
C. L. R. James identifies Charles Bellair as Toussaint’s nephew, and James argues that Toussaint “destined Belair to be his successor” (257).

Notes to Chapter 2

1. Rae discusses two incidents specific to Knox’s work on the intersections of science and art: first, Knox’s time in the British Museum studying the Elgin Marbles in 1848, and second, his visit at that time to the Jardin des Plantes where he viewed what I believe was the Venus Génitrix. This image of Venus is reproduced by Knox in a sketch in *Races of Men* on p. 401 of that work. Knox thus collapses particular Greek statues into an essential ideal racial type.

2. One of the controversies surrounding Knox was how he got hold of these black African bodies upon which he performed his work. As his biographer and contemporary, Henry Lonsdale, argues, “Of the many wicked stories told by his enemies, one had reference to his possessing so many Caffre skulls in his museum. It was alleged that when one of his students inquired of the Doctor how he got them, he replied: ‘Why, sir, there was no difficulty in Caffraria; I had but to walk out of my tent and shoot as many Caffres as I wanted for scientific and ethnological purposes.’ This monstrous accusation had its believers. Knox was tender to a degree, wherever humanity was concerned; he never approved of the Caffre war, and always extolled the Caffre man for his courageous conduct” (Lonsdale, 149, f. 1).

Both Lonsdale and Knox biographer Isobel Rae argue quite openly for a renewed appreciation for their subject, who, they suggest, was unfairly judged by both his contemporaries and history alike. However, Knox’s paradoxical and erratic attitudes toward darker-skinned races suggest that the blind coldness evident in the above vignette was somewhat out of character for what we will see as the anti-imperialist racialist.

3. Lonsdale suggests that from the beginning of his interest in race, even before the lecture tour in the late 1840s that took his work to a broader audience, Knox worked to convince those around him of its central importance: “From an early period in his career as an anatomical lecturer, he had pointed out the import of the study of Race, and, after 1834, had indoctrinated the majority of his friends with his more advanced views; it was in the year 1846 that he ventured to appear on a public platform to address a non-medical audience. In the language of the day, these lectures caused a sensation by their novelty, and led to much talk out of doors, and no small amount of controversy in the press” (Lonsdale, 295).

Knox’s professional identity as one of the foremost comparative anatomists and medical professionals positioned him to take his place at the center of the controversies surrounding race. The goal for these individuals became creating a connection between biology and racial characteristics. Douglas Lorimer argues, “Pride of place as men of science went to the medical practitioners with an interest in comparative anatomy. The purpose of their studies was to establish a correlation between anatomical features and mental traits and social behavior. In this task, the comparative anatomists were dependent upon the context of the common culture. They presumed that the psychological traits and social behavior of various races, as encapsulated in commonplace stereotypes, were known” (Lorimer, “Science and the Secularization,” 213).

4. “Unsettled from 1842 to 1846, and moving to and from on both sides of the
Tweed; now living with an old pupil, now searching for employment in London, he was at length induced to give a few lectures on the ‘Races of Men,’ in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Manchester, &c. This peripatetic philosophizing made him known to the general public, and helped his finances; but it was not exactly the position for a man of Knox’s calibre to occupy in England, that had its ‘Royal Institution’ and many chartered corporations under whose wing he should have played a part equal to the best-cultured minds of the day. His letters at this period express disappointment, and no wonder. Possessing the highest gifts of intellect, he obtained to acknowledgment in the ranks of his own profession; the greatest teacher of anatomy could find no chair and no lectureship in the mighty metropolis; and the Government, not knowing the meaning of the word science, could not possibly see the merits of a man of genius” (Lonsdale, 284).

5. H. L. Malchow notes that Ralph Waldo Emerson’s view of hybrid individuals was influenced for the worse by his reading of Knox (Malchow, 184), thus suggesting a wide influence and reading of Knox’s work in the nineteenth century.

6. Early in the text, Knox addresses the common argument at the time that darker-skinned races must have smaller brains. When evidence emerged that some darker-skinned races have larger brains, Knox sought to explain the findings. Lonsdale reports that “Knox thought there must be a physical, and consequently a psychological inferiority in the dark races, not depending altogether on deficiency in the size of the brain en masse, but rather perhaps on specific characters in the quality of the brain itself” (308). Knox portrays Chinese people in a similarly contemptuous manner. Arguing against those who praise the scientific achievements of the race, Knox says, “A love for science implies a love of truth: now truth they despise and abhor. I do not believe there is an individual Chinaman who could be made to comprehend a single fact in physical geography” (283). Knox goes on to argue that “it is admitted on all hands that they are devoid of all principle, and essentially a nation of liars” (285). And he asserts that the Gypsy is “without a redeeming quality” (159).

Knox asserts that Jewish people should be classed among the dark-skinned races, and thus they deserve the most derogatory of descriptions. They have “no ear for music as a race, no love of science or literature; that he invents nothing, pursues no inquiry” (194), and they seek “callings where cunning of the mind surpasses the gifts of science, the profound knowledge of the arts, and the skill of the hands” (196). He argues that the “Slavonians” are the most intellectual race (356). The Saxon race he generally calls the most superior (46) because it comprises hard and determined workers without any artistic ability (54).

7. A mixed-race child is a “monstrosity of nature”; “there is no place for . . . a family” that could produce such a child (88). In general, “man can create nothing” that is not already produced in nature. All types and varieties are fixed: “Nature produces no mules; no hybrids, neither in man nor animals” (65). The mixed-race individual “cannot extend his race, for he is of no race” (111).

8. Stocking argues that the “roots of the APS in turn are to be found in the crusade led by Evangelical and Quaker philanthropists against the African slave trade and slavery in the British colonies” (“What’s in a Name?” 369).

9. As Stocking argues, the young scientists felt that women inhibited their ability to speak freely on all subjects: “the presence of women made it impossible to discuss freely matters of human anatomy and physiology, or such questions as phallic worship and male and female circumcision” (Victorian Anthropology, 253).
10. Far from dominating contemporary racial discourse, the attitude of the Anthropological Society was primarily reactive. The organization waged war on the still powerful ideology of monogenesis, attempted to destroy the remains of the abolitionist humanitarian stance towards the races, and sought to retain control over racial discourse by excluding women and by belittling the work of those of the Ethnological Society. According to Stocking, the growth and popularity of the ASL were phenomenal, “despite the fact that its internal life was marred by disension and frequent resignations. Within two years there were over five hundred members, and in 1866 constitutional provisions were made for local branches” (“What’s in a Name?” 377). Darwinians, interestingly, remained members of the Ethnological Society. Many credible scientists stayed away from the ASL because they were perceived as a renegade group of scientific radicals who, as Stocking describes, “violated the canons of behaviour appropriate to a respectable scientific group.” Calling “themselves ‘The Cannibal Club’” and calling their meetings to order by gaveling “a mace in the form of a Negro head” (“What’s in a Name?” 380) exemplified this perception.

11. This argument perhaps suggests an ideological precursor to what Deirdre David calls the “trope of invasion by the colonizer and counterinvasion by the colonized” (204).

12. See also Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* (1983) for a discussion of the transition from language to race as a definitive component of national identity.

13. Stocking argues that “within Europe itself, the ‘racial’ nationalism of the revolutionary epoch of 1848”—commonly called the Springtime of Nations—“gave the idea of race a greatly heightened saliency, even for men of unquestioned humanitarian commitment” (*Victorian Anthropology*, 63).

14. Lonsdale also notes this change in public opinion: “Those who felt disposed to laugh in 1846 at Knox’s theories of Race, were surprised at the historical endorsement they obtained in 1860” (Lonsdale, 317).

15. One element of the late-1840s revolutionary environment in Europe that perhaps contributed to a climate in which Knox’s ideas could receive a more sympathetic reception was the influx of refugees into England, fleeing a number of the 1848 European national conflicts. Referring to this phenomenon as “one factor that has not been sufficiently explored” (17), Wetzel argues that three issues contributed to an environment within English culture that could nurture incipient racism. First, “in 1850 half the population of England was under twenty-six, a decrease of six and a half years over the average age ten years before” (17). This change combined with the “unprecedented movement from the countryside to the cities” (17) of rural citizens over the previous fifty years. However, when these rural citizens arrived in the city, they found life “risky and uncertain” and “competition over jobs, food, and clothing” was fierce (17). Add to this situation the final factor of “the presence of aliens” brought about by the revolutionary climate, and you have all the ingredients for creating a sense of racial “xenophobia” (17). And although Wetzel argues that it is necessary not to overemphasize the significance of this situation, it becomes important as another contributing element in a cultural environment moving away from humanitarianism.

16. England exemplifies this dynamic. Knox has special contempt for the government of England, arguing that the feudal Norman government—in what he describes as “semi-Saxon England”—imposes itself on the people, resulting in the oppression of much of the population (*Races*, 371). He suggests that “the military force at the disposal of the
government for the crushing down and intimidating the freemen of England is more effective, more insulated from the people, than in the most despotic European state” (372). So the nation becomes the vehicle in Knox’s work for a government’s oppression of its own people in the direction of the race that has the preeminent natural strength within the population. Government becomes the way in which the oppression of one race by another is masked by the mirage of national destiny.

17. Although racial conflict is inevitable, and one race will always try to dominate another, Knox labels the races that yearn for freedom and liberty as superior. As with Martineau’s *The Hour and the Man*, the concept of liberty becomes crucially important in Knox’s text, most pointedly in his dramatic presentation of Saxon superiority. For Knox, “all men love liberty, in one sense or another; but all do not attach to the term the same ideas. Each race interprets the expression differently” (*Races*, 373). Liberty, for Knox, comes to be yet another slippery term, however, introducing a linguistic relativism in the relationship between the races. “Each race has its own ideas of liberty,” Knox argues, but the Saxon race is the only one whose “ideas on this point are sound.” And the Saxon perspective is sound, because the political system that he most desires is democratic, and it is only the Saxon “who combines obedience to the law with liberty. But the law must be made by himself, and not forced on him by another” (374). Therefore, the Saxon resists being the object of colonial oppression because as a race, he cannot live with the imposition of external laws not natural to his racial makeup. And this reverence for liberty perhaps ties in with Knox’s declaration of admiration for rebellious slaves. The desire to be free is a mark of racial superiority.

18. Knox argues that his experience studying race had shown him that avoiding the subject served the interests of dominating colonial powers who justify their subjection of races by not acknowledging the distinctions that exist: “More than thirty years ago, observation taught me that the great question of race—the most important, unquestionably, to man—had been for the most part scrupulously, shall we say purposely, avoided—by the statesman, the historian, the theologian; by journalists of nearly all countries. Unpalatable doctrines, no doubt, to dynasties lording it over nations composed of different races” (*Races*, 4).

Rae argues that “[a]lready, in 1820, Robert Knox held sufficiently advanced opinions to make him a supporter of equality and fraternity—an early and unfashionable anticolonialist” (16). In addition to his criticism of aggression masking as administrative paperwork and posturing, Knox is particularly hard on the use of the cloak of Christianity. But the “inevitable” as always blended with the “constructed” in Knox’s observations: “A profitable war is a pleasant thing for a Saxon nation” he notes, and he then maintains that “a crusade against the heathen has always been declared praiseworthy” (*Races*, 4). But Christianity, which he calls “the everlasting truth,” has no ability to “alter race” (367). For Knox, however, Christianity certainly does not ensure a civilized manner and agenda: “Civilization and Christianity are identical, it is true; but then it must be real, and not sham Christianity—the actual, not the shadow” (399). Here again, we see this issue of the actual and the shadow, the real and the fictional, the biologically determined versus the obscuring construct. Rather than being a vehement anticolonialist, Knox advocates for a directly aggressive manner against those a group wants to dominate: “I prefer the manly robber to this sneaking, canting hypocrisy, peculiar to modern civilization and to Christian Europe” (*Races*, 43). What he seems to find offensive is the dishonest “justification” used for aggressive colonial policy, not the reality of the actions.
19. This discussion begs the relationship between Darwinian evolutionary thought at this time and this idea of biological determinism as rooted in the development of the embryo. And although Knox delimits the role of progressive change or adaptation, certainly the development and mutations of the embryo suggests some kind of historical component. Beer’s discussion of the role of evolution and the evolutionary metaphor (18) becomes important here, in that one can see Knox struggle with how to fold in the temporal nature of human biology and to configure the role of human beings in relation to the rest of the living world. Beer argues that one of the most challenging aspects of evolutionary theory was the placing of human beings in the realm of the rest of the animals (19). Darwin remained a believer in monogenesis all his life, although his theories were often seen as a way to unite the impulses of both strands of racial thinking. However, as connected as the living world became in evolutionary theory, there was still an implied hierarchy at work along a new evolutionary scale (Stepan, 55).

20. “By the latter half of the nineteenth century, the analogy between race and gender degeneration came to serve a specifically modern form of social domination, as an intricate dialectic emerged—between the domestication of the colonies and the racializing of the metropolis. In the metropolis, the idea of racial deviance was evoked to police the ‘degenerate’ classes—the militant working class, the Irish, Jews, feminists, gays and lesbians, prostitutes, criminals, alcoholics and the insane—who were collectively figured as racial deviants, atavistic throwbacks to a primitive moment in human prehistory, surviving ominously in the heart of the modern, imperial metropolis” (McClintock, 43).

21. See footnote 1 for this chapter.
22. Knox died December 20, 1862.

Notes to Chapter 3


2. There are many accounts of this event. See, for example, Lillian Nayder’s description in “Class Consciousness and the Indian Mutiny in Dickens’s ‘The Perils of Certain English Prisoners,’” (1992), 693.


4. Oddie suggests that this characterization of the servant is made to bear the weight of a growing and virulent British xenophobia: “The character of Christian George King, clearly enough, is an expression of the pathological hatred of ‘natives’ that swept over England during the mutiny. Dickens was not, in any case, very well disposed towards dark-skinned races, and King is a kind of all-purpose ‘wog’, half negro and half Indian, on to whom he can fasten his loathing” (7).

5. According to H. L. Malchow, “the multicultural nature of ships’ crews became analogous in the nineteenth century to a kind of miscegenation, and the white sailor, by association (and perhaps sexual liaison) with racial aliens both on ship and in exotic ports of call, absorbed some element of their strange, deviant ways” (Malchow, 103).

6. Like the pirates of “Perils,” the crew of Marryat’s The Pirate has representatives from many different nations: “The crew consisted in all of one hundred and sixty-five
men, of almost every nation; but it was to be remarked that all those in authority were either Englishmen or from the northern countries; the others were chiefly Spaniards and Maltese. Still there were Portuguese, Brazilians, negroes, and others, who made up the complement, which at the time we now speak of was increased by twenty-five additional hands” (435).


9. For example, Charles Bernheimer gives a particularly lucid description of the phallocentric limitations of Freud’s theory of the fetish: “Even after it is revealed to be a false front, this construct continues to determine a central truth of psychoanalysis, the truth of castration. But this truth is of course a phallocentric deceit: woman cannot be deprived of an organ that was never hers in the first place. In terms of the criterion of factual reality that Freud himself introduces in this context, the unmasking of sexual difference reveals that woman is uncastratable, not that she is castrated” (65).

10. See also the following from Hayden White: “From the Renaissance to the end of the eighteenth century, Europeans tended to fetishize the native peoples with whom they came into contact by viewing them simultaneously as monstrous forms of humanity and as quintessential objects of desire. Whence the alternative impulses to exterminate and to redeem the native peoples. But even more basic in the European consciousness of this time was the tendency to fetishize the European type of humanity as the sole possible form that humanity in general could take. This race fetishism was soon transformed, however, into another, and more virulent form: the fetishism of class, which has provided the bases of most of the social conflicts of Europe since the French Revolution” (Tropics, 194–95).

11. “His costume was elegant, and well adapted to his form: linen trousers, and untanned yellow leather boots, such as are made at the Western Isles; a broad-striped cotton shirt; a red Cashmere shawl around his waist as a sash; a vest embroidered in gold tissue, with a jacket of dark velvet, and pendant gold buttons, hanging over his left shoulder, after the fashion of the Mediterranean seamen; a round Turkish skull-cap, handsomely embroidered; a pair of pistols, and a long knife in his sash, completed his attire” (Marryat, 434–35).

12. “Cleveland himself was gallantly attired in a blue coat, lined with crimson silk, and laced with gold very richly, crimson damask waistcoat and breeches, a velvet cap, richly embroidered, with a white feather, white silk stockings, and red-heeled shoes, which were the extremity of finery among the gallants of the day. He had a gold chain several times folded round his neck, which sustained a whistle of the same metal, the ensign of his authority. Above all, he wore a decoration peculiar to those daring depredators, who, besides one, or perhaps two brace of pistols at their belt, had usually two additional brace, of the finest mounting and workmanship, suspended over their
shoulders in a sort of sling, or scarf of crimson ribbon” (Scott, 532–33).

13. Interestingly, Peter Fryer’s description of the appearance of slave-ship captains has much in common with the pirate captain, perhaps suggesting an allegorical connection between the characterization of Mendez and the slave trading system, which would have been in full flower in 1744: “These slave-ship captains were the elite of their calling, identifiable not only by their ‘privelege Negroes’ but also by their gaudy laced coats with big silver or gold buttons, their cocked hats, the silver or gold buckles on their shoes. Most of them, whatever they had been like when they entered the trade, turned into brutal tyrants. But it was a trade that tended to attract sadists” (Fryer, 55).


15. Of course, Mendez’s popularity with audiences would seem to suggest that this goal was not achieved.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. From the statement of George Lake in the papers submitted by Governor Eyre describing the oath Paul Bogle, a central rebel leader, asked his followers to take in meetings previous to the Morant Bay riot.


4. Information about the reception of accounts of the rebellion in England is from Bernard Semmel, *The Governor Eyre Controversy* (1962). Heuman also provides information about English reception of the news of the rebellion, but his source is primarily Semmel.

5. H. L. Malchow argues that “the fascination in the press with the grisly anatomical details of Jamaican mutilation resonated strongly with similar preoccupations with the dissection theater and the cannibal feast” (Malchow, 211), thus suggesting a link between the discourses surrounding both the Burke and Hare scandal and the stream of colonial uprisings in the first half of the nineteenth century.

6. “News of the rebellion reached London ahead of Governor Eyre’s report of the events of Morant Bay, Jamaican newspapers as well as passengers on an earlier ship had already publicized the rebellion, and the British press had reprinted some of the stories emanating from Jamaica. When Eyre’s dispatch arrived on 16 November, the reaction in the Colonial Office was one of relief that the insurrection had been suppressed. However, there was also concern about the manner in which the rebellion had been put down” (Heuman, *Killing*, 164).

7. The following is from a footnote to the *Autobiography*: “Among the most active members of the Committee were Mr. P. A. Taylor, M.P., always faithful and energetic in every assertion of the principles of liberty; Mr. Goldwin Smith, Mr. Frederic Harrison, Mr. Slack, Mr. Chamerovzow, Mr. Shaen, and Mr. Chesson, the Honorary Secretary of the Association” (Mill, 209n).

8. 7167. You saw him shot, what became of you?—I was hiding, as I was in the
house. I was compelled to hide from the soldiers.

7168. Did you see it from your house then?—Yes.

7169. From your own house you saw him shot; were you in the house?—I was in the house when he was shot.

7170. And you could see it from your house, it was so near as that?—Yes, between my gate and the treehead cut off as a post.

7171. He was taken straight from your house and was shot?—Yes.

7172. Was he tied to the tree?—Tied to the tree.

7173. Who shot him?—The soldiers. (Report, II:148)

9. In the continued testimony, the first discrepancy surfaces about whether the brother was hit with a sword:

7183. Did not you say a short time ago that you did not see that?—Yes, I did say it.

7184. Which do you say now?—I say that he received three balls.

7185. Attend; you say he had a chop over the brow?—Yes.

7186. Did you see that chop given?—Yes.

7187. Do you mean to say that?—Yes. (Report, II:148)

10. 7195. And did you say before, when you told this story to this gentleman, that you did not see that sword blow given?—The soldier gave it to him.

7196. Did you say you did not see it given; do you understand the question?—I saw the whole of them in the crowd, and the soldier struck him over the head.

7197. Only one did that you say; only one drew the sword and delivered the blow?—Yes, delivered the blow.

7198. Have you not said this morning, when you told the story before, that you did not see this done?—Understand me, sir, I was hiding myself in the house, and saw the soldiers as they came; they tied him to the post, tied him to the tree, and after that they shot him. (Report, II:148)

11. 7285. When they got to your house at 7 o’clock what did they do?—They came for Ned Bryan, and said he was a rebel. He said no, and one of the soldiers came and held Ned Bryan and James Bryan.

7286. What did they do with them?—They took them out in the road.

7287. When they got out into the road what became of them?—As they got to the road the soldiers asked for a rope, and they took the rope, and Ned Bryan said, “I am just from Kingston last night, and I am going to dead this morning. What have I done?” And a white gentleman, with a black soldier, riding a horse, was there. The whole of the black soldiers were riding, and when they carry him out in the road he said, “I am just from Kingston last night.” The gentleman, who the soldier said was the doctor, had a pistol in his hand, and he took the pistol and knocked Ned Bryan on his hand, and said, “Go on; I want no chat from you.” They went a little in the road and they tied the two brothers, James Bryan and Ned Bryan together, and the doctor ordered three soldiers to come off and shoot those two men. They tied him to a tree by the side of the road, and cut off the head of the tree, and three soldiers came and shot the two of them.

7288. Shot both of them?—Yes.

7289. Were they close together?—Yes; and they shot them facing each other. The three soldiers shot the two, and when they shot the two Ned Bryan was tied to the post that way, and James the other to the front, and as they shot him James dropped down, and Ned stood up, and out the soldier drew a sword out of his sheath, and chopped Ned Bryan right down. (Report, II:149)
12. 7319. (Mr. Walcott) Where was George Bryan when the soldiers fired?—He hid behind the patch of bush at the time.

7320. At the time the soldiers were firing at James and Edward?—Yes.

7321. Then he was not in his house at the time?—No. I begged him to hide, for the soldiers would kill him.

7322. Then he was behind the bush when the soldiers fired at James and Edward?—Yes. (Report, II:150)

13. 10,907. Is it not true that you went into the bush?—The bush was before the house, and I ran through the bush. I was in my own house.

10,908. Is it true that at the time your brother was shot you were hid in the bush?—No, I was not hid in the bush; I was in the house.

10,909. You say you went through the bush?—Yes.

10,910. Where was the bush?—On the side of the road.

10,911. At the back of your house?—No.

10,912. In front of your house?—No.

10,913. Do you say there was no bush in front of your house?—On the other side of the road.

10,914. And you were not concealed in that bush?—No.

10,915. Do you know that your sister-in-law stated that you were concealed in that bush?—No; she states I was in the bush. She don’t know when I went in.

10,916. Was there anybody else shot at the same time as your brother was?—No, sir, because I did not see the other person shot, I really think.

10,917. You did not see any other person shot at the same time as your brother was?—No, I did not see the man when they were tied, but I saw the man that was on the back of him.

10,918. Was there any other person shot at the same time that your brother was?—Did I see any person shot at the same time?

10,919. Yes; any other person shot at the same time your brother was shot?—No; I said that already. There was no other person shot, only farther on. (Report, II:217)

14. 10,937. Then it must have been very soon afterwards that the wife cut him down?—Soon, sir, very soon.

10,938. Did she not have to go and get a person from the town to come and take the body away?—Well, sir, it is me, the same one that took the body, and another man.

10,939. Who was the man?—Another man named Edward.

10,940. You and Edward took the body?—Yes, and buried it.


15. 10,980. (Suggested by Mr. Gorrie.) What was the name of your brother who was shot; that you have been describing as having been shot?—What is the name of my brother?

10,981. Yes; that brother you say was shot at this time?—Ned Bryan?


10,983. Do you know a person of the name of James Bryan, or did you know a person named James Bryan?—A person of the name James Bryan?

10,984. Do you know a person of the name of James Bryan?—Yes.

10,985. Who is he?—Not my brother.

10,986. Any relation of yours?—No.
10,987. No relation at all?—No.
10,988. Where is James Bryan now?—I heard this one James Bryan was dead, but I don’t know him.
10,989. Was he no relation of yours?—No.
10,990. None at all?—No.
10,991. You heard he was dead?—Yes.
10,992. Where did he live?—He was living down the river.
10,993. Have you any other brother?—Yes, I had one.
10,994. What name?—Name of James Bryan, too.
10,995. But I asked you whether James Bryan was your brother, and you said no?—I had one, the one that went to Kingston, of the name James Bryan.
10,996. He is your brother?—Yes.
10,997. Is he alive?—Yes.
10,998. Where is he?—At Long Bay now.
10,999. Have you any other brother?—No.
11,000. Had your brother-in-law any brother?—Yes.
11,001. What was his name?—He had a brother named Edward Bryan.
11,002. No; he was Edward Bryan?—No, there is two of them, Ned Bryan and Edward Bryan, and he had one of the name of William Bryan that I gave to you, who was at Manchioneal, and the soldiers shot him.
11,003. Where is Edward Bryan?—At Long Bay now.
11,004. Had he any other brother?—Another in Kingston named John Bryan.
11,005. Is he alive still?—Yes. (Report, II:218)

Notes to Chapter 5

1. In *Suggestions Towards the Future Government of India*, a work in which Martineau makes suggestions for dealing with the immediate aftermath of the 1857 Indian Rebellion, the author argues for continued rule by the East India Company rather than an assertion of control by the British government by making a comparison with what she feels is the British failure in the West Indies to deal fairly with Africans: “We have done what we could in reparation of our misdeeds to the negro race and our favouritism to the planters; but the alternating distresses of the two races are an evidence of such serious errors in colonial government as leave us no cause for confidence that we could succeed better in ruling a greater number of races under far more difficult circumstances” (*Suggestions*, 6).

2. Jenny Sharpe suggests that events such as the “Mutiny” triggered ideas propagated in scientific writings, thus further supporting the thesis that “scientific” ideas about race had a wide cultural impact: “I want to suggest that the Indian Mutiny, along with other rebellions in the colonies, activated scientific theories of race” (Sharpe, 5).

3. Penny Tinkler argues, in her introduction to the special issue of *Women’s Studies International Forum* (1998), the following: “As Catherine Hall pointed out in her WHN plenary address, it is a ‘blind eye’ through which we see the Empire. In other words, despite the attention that empire currently attracts, fundamental aspects of imperialism are obscured, including, importantly, the exploitative relations that underpinned it and the interconnectedness of ‘home;’ be it Britain or other Western nations, and empire”
(Tinker, 217). Also see Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850* (1987), for a fuller discussion of middle-class family structures and environments. However, this work has little discussion of the relation of metropolitan family arrangements and colonialism.

**Note to Conclusion**

1. Robyn Wiegman argues in *American Anatomies* that Cuvier’s work helped move the search for legitimizing evidence for oppressive racial distinction within the human body: “The move from the visible epidermal terrain to the articulation of the interior structure of human bodies thus extrapolated in both broader and more distinct terms the parameters of white supremacy, giving it a logic lodged fully in the body” (Wiegman, 31).