

OXFORD

Racial Crossings

Race, Intermarriage, and the
Victorian British Empire



Damon Ieremia Salesa

RACIAL CROSSINGS

OXFORD HISTORICAL MONOGRAPHS

Editors

P. CLAVIN R. J. W. EVANS

L. GOLDMAN J. ROBERTSON R. SERVICE

P. A. SLACK B. WARD-PERKINS

J. L. WATTS

Racial Crossings

*Race, Intermarriage, and the Victorian
British Empire*

DAMON IEREMIA SALESA

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Damon Ieremia Salesa 2011

The moral rights of the author have been asserted
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2011

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Typeset by SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India
Printed in Great Britain
on acid-free paper by
MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn

ISBN 978-0-19-960415-9

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

Acknowledgements

The past should always humble us. Certainly writing this book, and studying these pasts, has humbled me. Knowing the lives that came before and speaking of them is a great burden and a great responsibility: it has also been a great privilege. Kia māhaki: I know this, and I have tried to conduct myself properly. For my failings I ask forbearance.

The present has humbled me no less. The generosity and knowledge of others has been given more freely and generously than I deserve, and the payment for this now seems meager. But it is all I have, and so I give it.

This book began as a thesis at Oxford University, and those debts remain large. Megan Vaughan kindly picked up a stray student and saw me through to the end. Other faculty were equally generous: William Beinart, Judith Brown, John Darwin, and especially Nancy Leys Stepan, who provided much needed early guidance. But Oxford was a fortunate place for me because of the company of other wonderful students of empire: Jo Duffy, Andrew Fairweather-Tall, Anselm Hagedorn, Merata Kawharu, Melanie Newton, Jeremy Osborn, Simon Potter, Paul Tapsell, Oloya Tebere, and Ruth Watson. I know I have heavy intellectual and personal debts to Mark Hickford, Zoë Laidlaw, Helen Tilley, and Damen Ward: it is written here, and I hope that they can see it in this book.

I was my good fortune to have landed at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, a haven for innovative and critical scholarship of empires, race and history. My thanks to everyone—faculty and students—who has shared knowledge and time with me. Special thanks to Paulina Alberto, Matt Briones, Kathleen Canning, Rita Chin, Josh Cole, Jay Cook, Matt Countryman, Phil Deloria, Greg Dowd, Geoff Eley, Julie Ellison, Dena Goodman, Jesse Hoffnung-Garskoff, Kali Israel, Sue Juster, Mary Kelley, Val Kivelson, Matt Lassiter, Barbara Metcalfe, Farina Mir, Ian Moyer, Leslie Pincus, Sonya Rose, Ann Stoler, Tom Trautmann, and Penny Von Eschen. I owe much to my Michigan Asian/Pacific Islander American Studies colleagues: Tina Delisle, Scott Kurashige, Emily Lawsin, Susan Najita, Sarita See, Amy Ku'uleialoha Stillman and, especially, Vince Diaz. The Great Ocean is a way away, but we still see it.

At other institutions Tony Ballantyne, Antoinette Burton, Catherine Hall, Chris Hilliard, Maya Jasanoff, Miranda Johnson, Paul Kramer, Philippa Levine, Alan Ward, and especially Nick Thomas all gave much needed assistance and time. In New Zealand, friends, mentors, and teachers

continue to give of their knowledge, time and support: especially Dame Judith Binney, David Colquhoun, and the staff of the Alexander Turnbull Library, Raewyn Dalziel, Derek Dow, Linda Bryder, Huni Fifita, Brett Graham, Hugh Laracy, Malama Meleisea, Matt Melvin, Hazel Petrie, Barry Rigby, I'uogafa Tuagalu, Charlie Tu'u, and Al Wendt.

This book argues for the grounded and family natures of politics and ideas in the 1800s, but it has taught me no less about these things in my own life and work. To my parents, Tusanilefaia'ao Ieremia and Yvonne Joy, to my wife Jenny, my daughters Mahalia and Esmae, and my siblings Shane Akerei, Situfu Jordan, Fialogo Toaiva, and Leilani Esmae Sieni, I owe more than everything. Fa'afetai tele lava! Malo 'aupito! My debts to all of my family—Aiolupo, Aoina, Bratton, Latu, Salesa, and Toalepaiali'i—are marked on, and between, each line. Ralf Bratton, Toalepai Si'ueva, Rev. Salesa Eteuati, Lilomaiaava Pau, Sala Aoina, Iko Toalepaiali'i, Jeanette Skippy Patuwai, all saw this begin, but not end. You are remembered.

The histories presented here do not belong to me, even as I belong to them. Stumbling in the 'smoke of events', I have struggled to honour these ancestors, to treat them each with respect and dignity, to see them clearly, and to see them critically. In this I see my own failings, but I hope they are of ability, not aroha/alofa, or commitment. I have tried to be tika. Our ancestors did not always agree, and neither will we. I find encouragement in these words of Tawhiao:

Ko tahi te kohao o te ngira e kuhuna e au te miro ma, te miro pango, te miro whero.

Ia manuia!

Contents

<i>Key Māori Terms and Concepts</i>	ix
Introduction: The Problem of Racial Crossing	1
1. Amalgamating Races: The 'New System' of Colonization and Racial Management	27
2. 'Pandemonium on Earth'? Intimacy and Encounter in Pre-Colonial New Zealand	54
3. The Experiment of Racial Amalgamation	90
4. Racial Crossing and the Empire: Scholarship, Science, Politics, and Place	133
5. A Tender Way in Race War	171
Conclusion: Dwelling in Unity	231
<i>Bibliography</i>	251
<i>Index</i>	287

This page intentionally left blank

Key Māori Terms and Concepts

Long vowels are not marked in quotations unless indicated in the original text.

<i>Aroha</i>	Love, compassion
<i>Hapū</i>	Clan
<i>Hāwhe kāehe</i>	‘Half-caste(s)’: a transliteration of the English, if not a direct equivalent
<i>Iwi</i>	Largest scale descent group, ‘tribe’
<i>Kāinga</i>	Community, village, settlement, residence
<i>Kāwanatanga</i>	‘Governorship’, a critical term in the <i>te Reo</i> text of the Treaty of Waitangi
<i>Kīngitanga</i>	The King Movement, centred on the Waikato and with beginnings in the 1850s (see Chapter 5)
<i>Mana</i>	Power, prestige, authority, control, ‘psychic force’, spiritual power, charisma. For a fuller discussion of the divine dimensions at work, see Māori Marsden, ‘God, Man and Universe: a Maori View’, in Michael King, (ed.), <i>Te Ao Hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga</i> (Auckland, 1992)
<i>Māori/Tangata Māori</i>	Ordinary person, indigenous person to New Zealand (see Introduction)
<i>Pā</i>	A fortified settlement, fortress, typically with earth-works and palisades
<i>Pākehā</i>	Foreigner, stranger, white person (see Introduction)
<i>Pākehā Māori</i>	Foreigner, stranger, or white person living as a part of indigenous families and communities
<i>Rangatira</i>	‘Chief’, a leader, a person of <i>mana</i>
<i>Rangatiratanga</i>	‘Chieftainship’: a critical term in the <i>te Reo</i> text of the Treaty of Waitangi
<i>Takawaenga</i>	Mediator, go-between, intermediary (see Conclusion)
<i>Tangata Whenua</i>	People/person of the Land, used here interchangeably with ‘indigenous person’ (see Introduction)
<i>te Reo</i>	The Language: the Maori language, the shared language of Tangata Whenua which has several dialects
<i>Tiriti o Waitangi</i>	The text of the Treaty of Waitangi in <i>te Reo</i> /Maori language (1840)
<i>Whakapapa</i>	Genealogy, lineage, ‘the principle of descent’ (see Chapter 3)

<i>Whānau</i>	Family, in a way that accords with the Pākehā and anthropological sense of ‘extended family’
<i>Whanaunga</i>	Relative, kin, relation
<i>Whanaungatanga</i>	Family relationships, kinship, sense of family connection

Introduction: The Problem of Racial Crossing

It is surprising how often, after closer investigation, the Victorians seem not as 'Victorian' as we imagine. As good an example of this as any is the 'crossing' of races—different races associating, liaising, reproducing, marrying or consorting. Almost intuitively we might expect that in this most imperial of ages, its most imperial of people, the British, would be set against such things. Despite expectations that everywhere there would be efforts to punish race crossing, to condemn it, to exorcise and legislate against it, this was rarely the case. After the abolition of slavery (1834), one will find few laws that do this in the British Empire. With the exception of a few, largely unsuccessful, attempts to regulate concubinage amongst colonial officials, there were few attempts to outlaw interracial marriages between the abolition of slavery and the rise of apartheid in South Africa (which was by that time a self-governing dominion). And most of these efforts, such as those in South Australia, were specific, local and often temporary.

This is not to say that the British and their colonies were unconcerned with racial crossing. On the contrary, throughout the nineteenth century race crossing was considered a serious and recurrent problem—it was just not a simple one. In various parts of the Empire these years were filled with black and yellow 'perils', all kinds of fears and controversies, as well as a kaleidoscope of fixations, books, studies and discussions that were driven by one or another kind of racial crossing. These were not matters that could be easily banished by blunt laws, simple declarations, or spuriously engineered ideas, nor could they be controlled or ordered by policy or official fiat. Interest in racial crossing did not always manifest blatantly, and was as often chronic as it was acute, insinuated into policy and other techniques of governmental and social management. The complexity of all that came to overlay and underpin the practices, discourses and experiences of race crossing is richly revealing of British, imperial and colonial histories.

Though capable of being described or classified, the relevance, forms and meanings of race crossing differed from one locale to another. In many colonies, and in Britain, many people understood that race crossing, in some sense, had a centrality to important developments—even if what that centrality was, or meant, was contested. Yet racial crossings were not intrinsically troublesome to colonialism. To be sure, it was common for racial crossings to be seen as challenges, threats or difficulties. But in many instances racial crossings were seen as solutions or benefits, strategies of colonialism not challenges *to* it, improvements rather than difficulties or quandaries. At different moments in different places, racial crossing meant widely variant, even contradictory things.

As a result there was not a singular or universal predicament of race crossing, no reiterating history of development, no unified terminology, nor a common set of circumstances. Though many scholars wrote as if there was such a singularity (some historians still do), and sought to construct some equivalencies between different situations of racial crossings, or define some theoretical constant, any specific historical investigation seems only to put this to rest. The differences are too important or too large, the political, social and cultural landscapes—and, of course, the individuals—too different. Even the vocabulary of these situations was nuanced and particular. Mixed marriages in the nineteenth-century Cape Colony, for instance, were not simply John Smith and Pocahontas moved, revisited, updated and multiplied. Intimacy between different people of different races was always, in some way, idiosyncratic. This makes it even more important to understand why these disparate matters were lumped together, seen as comparable, and understood in relation to each other. Why would it be expected that a ‘half-caste Maori’ was in some sense similar or comparable to a Canadian Metis? How, and why, were these variant practices and histories of racial crossing in the Empire fashioned as a coherent problem?

The problem of racial crossing was never restricted to any one easily bounded location, colony or nation, nor one set of actors, events or developments. It was multitudinous and distributed: racial crossing was evidently a problem not only in the colonies, but in domestic British discourses. Metropolitan discourses commonly arrived at the topic on very different trajectories to those produced from colonial encounters. Whether attempting to explain human variety, interrogating questions of species difference, or pursuing projects as different as Reform and Salvation, for much of the nineteenth century race crossing was a surprisingly common domestic theme. It was a mainstay of writing about the colonies and Empire, as well as in the circles of ethnologists, anthropologists, theologians, physicians and natural historians. But concern with racial crossings drew

attention not only from intellectuals and scholars explicitly concerned with themes of race, nor just imperial officials, but different kinds of observers, writers and 'participants'. Economists, historians, geologists, classicists—as we might call them now—all had their investments in questions of race and what happened when these races met. At any rate the interest of very different people in the subject, with such different reasons and reasoning, points to a compelling and recurrent concern: an interest in racial crossing with resonance and consequence that invites further study.

By the 1830s, racial crossing was becoming established as a widely evident concern. However, in the decades following, a conjuncture of discursive changes, colonial practices and colonial experiences helped fashion this loosely related set of concerns into a more bundled problem. This was in part precipitated by earlier developments, not least (though certainly not only) those in 'scientific' discourses beginning around the turn of the nineteenth century. In these domains various definitions of race had begun to push at the boundaries of central understandings, in particular challenging notions of 'species'. At the time, hybrid animals—those produced through crosses of different species—were generally thought to be uniformly sterile. A range of influential scholars, from John Ray to Comte de Buffon had long seized upon this infertility to prove the distinction between species.¹ The typical example of this was the crossing of the horse and donkey, which resulted in the mule or hinny, neither of which could usually produce offspring. This was generally interpreted as a special endowment to maintain the order of nature, and by the first part of the nineteenth century the hybrid creature was established as a way of identifying and defining species difference. The natural order was invested with political, religious and other significances, so the difference was, as we will see, never solely about the subject at hand.

For much of the eighteenth century the crossing of human races and the mixing of species were not then seen as analogous or similar, and 'hybridity' was not a term directly applied to people. This shift was a slow one, led in large part by writers such as Henry Home, Lord Kames, and the Jamaican planter Edward Long, who began in the 1770s publicly to argue that the human species was not single in origin and character, but multiple.² Though not the first or only ones to make this suggestion, they

¹ John Ray, *The Wisdom of God Manifested in the Works of the Creation* (London, 1691), p. 219; Comte de Buffon, *Barr's Buffon: Buffon's Natural History*, (ed.) James Smith Barr, 10 vols., (London, 1810).

² Henry Home, Lord Kames, *Sketches of the History of Man*, 4 vols., enlarged edn., (London, 1779); Edward Long, *The History of Jamaica*, 3 vols., (London, 1774).

were amongst the most important proponents of a view that appeared to challenge the fundamentals of the biblical account of human origin and early human history.³ By the middle of the nineteenth century this new belief, 'polygenism' as it was called, was still controversial but was in much wider circulation and many elements were being entertained, often in unlikely places. There was little doubt that in Britain the biblical orthodoxy, or 'monogenism', continued as the majority and orthodox view; one 1848 work weighed over one hundred and fifty 'learned and eminent men' against seventeen polygenists.⁴ Yet the significance of polygenist thought had become clear: not only had it posed new questions, and offered very different, unorthodox answers, it had reinvigorated the study of human origins and differences. If, as polygenists argued, human races were as different as species, racial intermixture paralleled the crossing of animal species—it was unnatural, degenerate and unsustainable. This new challenge focused attention on racial crossings, which were now a proving ground for debates about humans, species, races and the natural and divine. The outcome and success of racial crossings could clarify the character of differences between races: were these differences graduated and essentially minor—within the family of man? Or were these racial differences fundamental and enduring—differences of origin, and of species? Though formal polygenists remained relatively scarce, and it was a position that remained in many respects disreputable, there was no doubt that the debate reoriented and intensified scrutiny of racial crossings.

The contours of these elite intellectual and scholarly racial discourses were critical, but they were only one, comparatively orderly, set of a congeries of discourses. This elite story was once unfamiliar, but the rejuvenation of the historiography of race has made it less so. The works of Nancy Stepan, Stephen Jay Gould and George Stocking Jr guided much of this renewed interest in these questions.⁵ This narrative now pervades the recent historiography of empire, although the work of these scholars was directed towards intellectual and disciplinary history, not that of empire. As a result the focus was, unsurprisingly, mostly on metropolitan locations and developments, and by and large on metropolitan elites. Even in Stocking's work, which engaged the contemporary rise of anthropology and British Empire, the Empire figures mostly as a field of

³ Genesis 9: 19. See George W. Stocking, Jr, *Race, Culture and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (New York, 1968).

⁴ Thomas Smyth, *The Unity of the Human Races proved to be the Doctrine of Scripture, Reason and Science* (Edinburgh, 1851), pp. 58–64.

⁵ George W. Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology* (London, 1987); id., *Race Culture and Evolution*; Nancy Stepan, *The Idea of Race in Science: Great Britain 1800–1960* (London, 1982); Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York, 1981).

collection, while processing this 'data' takes place centrally amongst a small group of experts. This is an approach that can be broadened to include the workings and discourses of government, the networks of discourse and people that spread across the Empire, even those that these discourses increasingly claimed. Moreover, as historians such as Roger Cooter and Adrian Desmond have shown, there were critical sites and agents of discourses that were outside these elites, as amongst the 'masses' were vibrant intellectual, scientific and publishing markets.⁶ So although the 'experts' undoubtedly had important roles to play in the shaping of racial discourses, as well as in shaping the Empire and its categories of rule, these processes involved far broader constituencies, which included and crossed different classes, and involved multiple places across the Empire, at times even incorporating those who were colonized.

To better comprehend the variegated and distributed qualities of racial and colonial discourses, it is useful to be open to the diversity of those concerned with it. The recent surge in works concerned with race and its history, and the continuing influence of some early works of historiography, has had the effect of producing what might informally be called a 'canon' of nineteenth century racial texts. This accords prominence to marginal works (such as Robert Knox's *Races of Man*) and has sidelined or overlooked vitally important works (like those by Thomas Arnold, Herman Merivale, or those by key geologists or political radicals).⁷ It has also privileged published and non-official texts, to the great detriment of private correspondence and other writings, especially the writings of officials. Race, and more specifically the problem of racial crossing, was promiscuous, and could be found in more diverse locations than such a 'canon' acknowledges. John Morgan, a missionary and schoolteacher; Wiremu Patara Te Tuhi, editor of the Māori King's newspaper; Alexander Walker, a British radical writer and medical doctor; Montague Hawtrey, an English vicar; Maria Aminta Maning, a 'half-caste' woman; Thomas Arnold, historian and schoolteacher; George Grey, colonial governor—

⁶ Roger Cooter, *The Cultural Meaning of Popular Science Phrenology and the Organization of Consent in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge, 1984); Adrian Desmond, *The Politics of Evolution* (Chicago, 1989).

⁷ Robert Knox, *The Races of Man* (London, 1850); Thomas Arnold, *The Effects of Distant Colonization on the Parent State; a Prize Essay Recited in the Theatre at Oxford, June 7, 1815* (Oxford, 1815); id., *An Inaugural Lecture on the Study of Modern History* (Oxford, 1841); Herman Merivale, *Introduction to a Course of Lectures on Colonization and Colonies* (London, 1839); Charles Lyell, *Principles of Geology: or, the Modern Changes of the Earth and its Inhabitants, Considered as Illustrative of Geology*, 3 vols., 6th edn., (London, 1840); Alexander Walker, *Intermarriage; or the Mode in which, and the Causes why, Beauty, Health and Intellect Result from Certain Unions, and Deformity, Disease and Insanity, from Others*, 2nd edn., (London, 1841); Patrick Matthew, *Emigration Fields* (Edinburgh, 1839).

these are just a few of those who took seriously the problem of racial crossing. Their impact was uneven, often localized or particular, but it was also frequently important and sometimes pivotal. Historians now generally take seriously the lower classes and the colonized as historical actors, but (for variant reasons) often consider them less seriously as thinkers and makers of discourse. Much as Chris Hilliard has revealed a 'literary history from below' and Adrian Desmond a 'radical science', there is a history of race 'from below', and from different sides, and inside out.⁸ Such histories are certainly uneven, and may not always be visible, relevant or strong; but they at least trouble assumptions about elites as makers and others as receptacles of discourse—a belief that maps suspiciously close to the thoughts and assumptions of Victorian governing elites themselves.

The complexity of the problem of racial crossing makes even the choice of terminology difficult. Here the attempt is to encompass the problem through the use of the term racial 'crossing', which was an inclusive 'umbrella' term. Commonly used at the time, it is preferred for a couple of reasons: first, it was never associated with one or other 'schools' of thought or particular arguments or assertions (such as terms like 'hybridity' or 'mongrelization'); and second, and perhaps most importantly, because it was often used at the time, much as it is used here, as a kind of general descriptor—synonymous with 'mixture' and 'intermixture' which were also often used at the time. 'Crossing' encompasses a larger field of understanding than some similar terms, such as 'intermarriage', which implies a particular kind of institutionalized conjugal relationship, even though it was commonly used in situations where 'marriage' as such had not occurred or was seemingly not possible—as between plants.

Differences in the vocabulary of race crossing indexed how the problem connected various locations. Many terms were born of foreign or colonial roots. 'Eurasian' was a word of choice in India, and this is also where the ubiquitous 'half-caste' seems to have originated. 'Mulatto' derived from the Spanish word for mule; 'quadroon' and 'octoroon' came from Spanish America via the Caribbean; Métis and Métissage from French. These words had been inherited or trafficked into the British colonies, which in addition produced its own varieties, from Euronesian to Anglo-Indian or Eurasian, from 'Coloured-Persons', 'Half breeds' to 'Mixed race' and even 'European' or 'local European', some of which were in local usage, others of which circulated more widely.⁹ Newer technical vocabularies

⁸ Desmond, *The Politics of Evolution*; Chris Hilliard, *To Exercise Our Talents: The Democratization of Writing in Britain* (Cambridge, 2006).

⁹ For a contemporary discussion see Thomas Hodgkin's critique of these terms and the problems of terminology, Wellcome Institute Library, London, Hodgkin Papers, WMS/

(such as 'racial hybrids' and 'racial hybridity') were consequently circulating in a complex, changing and spatially variegated lexicon. There were so many terms available, and they could quickly change. The famous ethnologist James Cowles Prichard was certain that people could not be hybrids and refused to label them as such; yet only two years after his death in 1848 his closest follower Robert Gordon Latham had begun using the term 'hybridism'.¹⁰ These terms, concepts and languages were variable and relatively unstable, and could change dramatically, and relatively quickly, whether from place to place, or over the years.

Particular locations where race crossing was of obvious importance attracted special attention. By the 1860s many of these populations in the British Empire had become fixtures in narratives on racial crossing, whether the 'Cape Coloureds', the Métis of Canada, the Eurasians of India, the half-castes in New Zealand, or the smallest and perhaps most fetishized population, the descendants of the *Bounty* mutineers discovered on Pitcairn Island. These fixations often proved very durable, and most histories of racial crossing have stemmed from precisely such local contexts where a well-marked local population of racially mixed people has been historically prominent.¹¹ These kinds of works have usually picked one particular location, and written of it within traditions of national or regional historiography. The best of these works provide subtle, nuanced and informed analysis, rich in detail and instructive in the humbling extent of the British Empire. But the tendency of such works to approach their subjects more or less as isolates means imperial, transnational or transcolonial developments are often ignored, minimized or packaged in ways that make them uniform and stagnant rather than as integrated in networks of exchange or connection.

These 'local' histories of racial crossing (though the 'local' is often expansive) have increasingly converged with the work of a variety of postcolonial and feminist scholars. In the past two decades postcolonial critics, theorists and historians have been particularly drawn to 'hybridity' and other forms of racial, cultural and social mixing, for a variety of reasons, and perhaps not least due to a present they understand as hybrid. This has led to a new life, and a new salience for all kinds of concern in

PP/HO/D/D232, Thomas Hodgkin, 'On the Progress of Ethnology', fos. 51–2; for a later, ironic turn, see Cedric Dover, *Half-Caste* (London, 1937).

¹⁰ Though to describe only what he called 'extreme intermixture'; Robert Gordon Latham, *The Natural History of the Varieties of Man* (London, 1850), pp. 555–7.

¹¹ For example D.N. Sprague, *Canada and the Métis, 1869–1885* (Waterloo, 1988); Robert Ross, *Adam Kok's Griquas: A Study in the Development of Stratification in South Africa* (Cambridge, 1976); Gad J. Heuman, *Between Black and White: Race, Politics, and the Free Coloureds in Jamaica, 1792–1865* (Westport, 1981).

racial crossing, and in particular for the language of racial and cultural hybridity. Race mixing, racial crossing, interracialism, interracial intimacy have all joined hybridity as subjects, not only in the nineteenth century, but in the twentieth and twenty-first. The best of this work has proven trenchant, and has changed many of the questions central to their subjects. However, as Robert J.C. Young has shown, there are some serious problems with this project, not least in its re-employment of much of the nineteenth-century racist vocabulary.¹² The intersections between feminist and postcolonial historians has proven particularly fruitful, where rigorous historical and archival research has been married with new questions and analyses of power, ones that have not only been interested in how racial crossing can unmask the production and operations of colonialism and race, but in domestic spaces and formations—the intimate relations of households and families where racial crossings were lived and experienced.¹³ These works successfully manage different dimensions: holding local and imperial, transnational and transcolonial simultaneously in view.

Evidently, the myriad connections and mobilities that constituted the British Empire ensured the problem of racial crossing was never simply a local problem. Recent conceptions of the British Empire, drawing on a complicated and contradictory genealogy, have evolved to pay these mobilities greater attention. Catherine Hall, in tandem with the work of others such as Ann Stoler and Fred Cooper, has led the questioning of prevalent understandings of centre/periphery, calling for their ‘demolition’.¹⁴ The recent work of Hall, as well as those of historians such as Tony Ballantyne, Antoinette Burton, Philippa Levine, Thomas Holt,

¹² Robert J.C. Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (London, 1995); also Avtar Brah and Annie Coombes, (eds.), *Hybridity and its Discontents* (London, 2000).

¹³ Katherine Ellinghaus, *Taking Assimilation to Heart: Marriages of White Women and Indigenous Men in the United States and Australia, 1887–1937* (Lincoln, 2006); Sylvia Van Kirk, *Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur-Trade Society in Western Canada, 1670–1870* (Winnipeg, 1981); Adele Perry, *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia 1849–1871* (Toronto, 2001); Henry Reynolds, *Nowhere People: How Imperial Race Thinking Shaped Australia's Identity* (Camberwell, 2005); C.J. Hawes, *Poor Relations: The Making of a Eurasian Community in British India 1773–1833* (Richmond, 1996); Kuntala Lahiri Dutt, *In Search of a Homeland: Anglo-Indians and McClutkiegunge* (Calcutta, 1990), pp. 27–35; Kenneth Ballhatchet, *Race, Sex and Class Under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and their Critics, 1793–1905* (London, 1980); Indrani Chatterjee, ‘Colouring Subalternity: Slaves, Concubines and Social Orphans in Early Colonial India’, *Subaltern Studies*, X (1999), pp. 49–97.

¹⁴ Catherine Hall, *White, Male, and Middle Class: Explorations in Feminism and History* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 25. Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, ‘Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda’, in Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler, (eds.), *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley, 1997), p. 15.

Alan Lester and Zoë Laidlaw, have refined this, and demonstrated the ways in which it is useful for understanding the nineteenth-century British Empire as a collection of networks or circuits or webs.¹⁵ These studies elucidate how the government and comprehension of empire was networked, not only with official circuits of personnel, policy, law and correspondence, but also with extra-official ones that were commercial and religious, scholarly and professional, personal and familial. This is an understanding that this book shares and draws upon. These networks were cultural artefacts, historically situated and spatially and socially variegated. They did not indiscriminately connect: in Britain, for instance, what was drawn into these imperial circuits is what John Darwin has suggested were 'domestic bridgeheads'—colonies, you might say, of imperial interest in Britain.¹⁶ 'Imperial networks', as Laidlaw reminds us, 'connected people first, and places second.'¹⁷ But if networks connected people, what activated these networks and invested them with meaning was discourse.

Nineteenth-century imperial networks changed dramatically, but fundamentally differ from those of the present. They were anchored in their own specific geographies, technologies and temporalities. It may be true that today, as Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt observe, 'we see networks everywhere we look', and that the 'network has become a common form that tends to define our ways of understanding the world and acting in it.'¹⁸ 'Network' is best used carefully, particularly as a critical metaphor, but what Negri and Hardt missed is that in the context of empire is no simple anachronism. It is worth noting that the rise of the use of the word 'network' in its 'social network' sense was entangled with empire: the *Oxford English Dictionary's* first recorded use in this way (1884) is in a biography of Charles Gordon.¹⁹ Equally, the centrality of networks

Also, Nicholas Dirks, 'Introduction', in his, (ed.), *Colonialism and Culture* (Ann Arbor, 1992), pp. 1–25.

¹⁵ Tony Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race: Aryanism in the British Empire* (Houndmills, 2002); Antoinette Burton, *At the Heart of the Empire: Indians and the Colonial Empire in Late-Victorian Britain* (Berkeley, 1998); Philippa Levine, *Prostitution, Race, and Politics* (London, 2003); Thomas Holt, *The Problem of Freedom: Race, Labor, and Politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832–1938* (Baltimore, 1992); Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-Century South Africa and Britain* (London, 2001); Zoë Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections, 1815–45: Patronage, the Information Revolution and Colonial Government* (Manchester, 2005).

¹⁶ John Darwin, 'Imperialism and the Victorians: the Dynamics of Territorial Expansion', *English Historical Review*, 112 (1997), pp. 614–42.

¹⁷ Laidlaw, *Colonial Connections*, p. 35.

¹⁸ Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York, 2004), p. 142.

¹⁹ Archibald Forbes, *Chinese Gordon: A Succinct Record of His Life* (London, 1884), p. 140.

reiterates the ancestry of the British Empire to our own world, as well as the enduring relevance and efficacy of networks as a 'form of organization' of material, people and knowledge. Moreover, though these historical actors came to use the word 'network' only later, they shared similar understandings about 'connections' (as Laidlaw highlights), 'circles', 'ties' and 'relations', both spoken and unspoken. This should not overstate the ubiquity and eminence of networks, which for all the connectivity they inscribed, were defined as much by their disconnections and unevenness, their ruptures, absences and limitations. The problem of racial crossing dramatizes these discursive movements, so connections can be plumbed, and disconnections appreciated. At times racial crossings, intersections and disconnections also illuminate other, even competing—often indigenous or subjugated—forms. These forms sometimes opposed colonial and imperial networks, sometimes were juxtaposed with them, other times intersected them.

It is worth stressing the materiality of these discourses, which were physically located, occurring in actual places and not divorced from social practices. Discourses were not ethereal or disembodied, but occurred in actual places, whether in parliaments, the Colonial Office, missions and scientific societies, or in newspapers, journals, to the readerships that publishing and writing constructed. As James Epstein has reminded us, 'the production of meaning is never independent of the pragmatics of social space.'²⁰ Such a caution can be found in the fate of a multi-volume set of *Milner's Church History* that early missionaries took to New Zealand. Missionaries brought the volumes as spiritual sustenance, but the pages ended up in the hands of a local indigenous leader who used the pages to prime his people's firearms.²¹ Evidently books were not intangible vessels for transferring discourse, but were subject to the usual strictures of life, within the rhythms of ordinary existence. Indeed, these discursive encounters can be likened to the meeting of people, and regarded as—to use the phrase of Greg Dening and D.J. Mulvaney—'encounters in place'.²² Appreciating the 'encounters in place' which animated particular discourses reveals how they were contestable, sensitive to locality and time, creative and specific. Discourses were connected by and circulated through networks, but these networks did not do so freely and promiscuously, but constrained and arranged them, circulating them in certain

²⁰ James Epstein, *In Practice: Studies in the Language and Culture of Popular Politics in Modern Britain* (Stanford, 2003), p. 109.

²¹ Marianne Williams, journal, 12 January 1824: Caroline Fitzgerald (ed.), *Letters from the Bay of Islands: The Story of Marianne Williams* (Phoenix Mill, 2004), pp. 79–80.

²² D.J. Mulvaney, *Encounters in Place: Outsiders and Aboriginal Australians 1606–1985* (St Lucia, 1989); Greg Dening, *Performances* (Chicago, Chicago).

ways, and depositing them into certain places. Nor did they work evenly upon people, whose differences informed the ways in which these discursive encounters played out.

Appreciating these 'encounters in place' emphasizes the powerful importance of the many locations, both colonial and metropolitan, where discourse was articulated. Explicitly political places, such as Parliament, councils and courts, are instructive in the kinds of class, gender and racial differences that organized not only the consumption of, but participation and access to, particular discourses. This was as apparent in colonial societies as in metropolitan ones. Schools, newspapers, missions, bureaucracies, and the many other critical sites for colonial discourse, reflected a similar discipline. But spaces of articulation were also ones of contest and challenge. The excluded jostled for entry into these spaces, or co-opted their forms; they argued, ignored and refused. Women demanded to hear, and then be heard, at the Ethnological Society of London. In New Zealand, indigenous people petitioned government, occupied the pulpit, wrote letters to newspapers, even travelled to England for audiences with Victoria. But colonial circuits and discourses were never the only ones extant; there were many other discursive sites and networks. Rarely were they entirely separate. Those who sought to disrupt or enter places of colonial discourse met with varying degrees of success and efficacy. Colonial agents persistently strategized to dissemble or control indigenous networks, discourses and places of assembly, with similarly mixed results.

Colonial and imperial archives epitomize the struggles over discourse, place and power that structured the problem of racial crossing. The official archives, for instance, were places profoundly closed to those they sought to colonize. The appearance of such people in the archive was heavily controlled and regulated, was encoded in colonial taxonomies, and circulated through official networks and discourses. As both bodies of discourse and physical entities, colonial archives exerted enormous control over who might be archived and how: the illiterate, women, the lower classes, the 'unconnected' and the colonized, in particular, found themselves put into discourse, and they could not enter on their own terms. Others, too, even amongst metropolitan and colonial elites, were also subject to the careful regulation of archives: most requests for information and knowledge were denied, and access was strategically distributed as a means of power, patronage or privilege. Correspondence had to work its way through narrowly prescribed archival channels (all correspondence from the colonies had to be 'officially received' through colonial governors, for instance). These exclusions concentrated rather than circumscribed the power that the colonial archive exerted. The archives were conduits that guided and framed policy, organized and directed action, defined and

disciplined space and people, authorized, legitimated and made illicit. 'Colonial conquest', as Nicholas Dirks has written, 'was about the production of an archive of (and for) colonial rule.'²³ Archives were not inert, mere records or remains of the past, but active in conditioning the present—as well as the histories that followed. These colonial archives held race as a fundamental principle, whether in organizing correspondence, framing statistics or apportioning jurisdiction.

Race added a dimension that allowed the specific and peculiar experiences of certain people and groups of people to transcend their immediate realms. Race was an archival principle, but it was more than that: a comparative dimension that made the Empire easier to archive, signify, consume, integrate and administer. In one telling example, a parliamentary committee folded the peoples of Southern Africa, North America, New Zealand, Australia and the Islands of the Pacific into the racial category of 'aborigine'.²⁴ This, as with other racial categorizations, produced commensurabilities that made certain administrative techniques and forms of knowledge transferable and mobile—in this case asserting the uniform fragility of these 'aborigines', and their need for 'protection', which had the prerequisite of colonial rule.²⁵ From otherwise disparate, complex, messy and peculiar situations one could now discover, or be directed towards, commensurabilities and common elements. These processes of commensurability enabled a quality of empire that Benedict Anderson and, following him, Cooper and Stoler have called 'modular'.²⁶

The modular qualities of empires are particularly evident in imperial 'problems'—cohesive preoccupations that were widely shared. Across the British Empire the 'protection' of certain races was obviously one of these 'problems'; 'freedom' was another. Thomas Holt has provided a powerful account of the imperial and colonial concern with slavery and its attempts to end it.²⁷ Rather than seeing freedom as a localized development of 'abolition' or free labour, or as an abstraction promulgated at the imperial scale, or even as a singular moment of crisis, Holt recognizes freedom as a

²³ Nicholas Dirks, *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India* (Princeton, 2001), p. 107.

²⁴ Most accessibly, Aborigines Protection Society, *Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee, on Aboriginal Tribes, (British Settlements); Reprinted with Comments* (London, 1837).

²⁵ On the complicated origins of this Committee and Report see Zoë Laidlaw, "'Aunt Anna's Report': The Buxton Women and the Aborigines Select Committee, 1835–37", *Journal of Commonwealth and Imperial History*, 32:2 (2004), pp. 1–28.

²⁶ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2nd edn., (London, 2001), e.g. p. 4; Cooper and Stoler, 'Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda', pp. 13–14.

²⁷ Holt, *The Problem of Freedom*.

problem that was widespread, enduring, multifarious, concrete and which worked out in multiple locations. The problem of freedom was, as he puts it, 'at once a problem in the social and economic reconstruction of the lives of freed people, a problem in British intellectual and political history, and a problem in race relations, colonialism and imperialism.'²⁸ Philippa Levine has shown, with similar cogency, how prostitution was a similarly imperial problem.²⁹ The problem of prostitution went far beyond sexual transactions: through the 'vector' of venereal disease, prostitution was to have profound and confounding effects, as women and other races were made targets of sexual and social regulation, not least through a series of Contagious Diseases Acts. These Acts proved highly contentious, and occasioned considerable social and political trouble, pushing 'the imperial government to the brink... on several occasions.'³⁰ Framing these concerns as problems appreciates their strong nodal qualities, their capacity to draw together or articulate (in Stuart Hall's sense) different discourses, people, networks and concerns.³¹ These imperial problems were 'lumps'.³²

Racial crossing remained an abiding problem through much of the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century. Part of this was due to the enduring conjuncture where racial crossing remained a cornerstone of the colonial management of races, a preoccupation of a number of discourses, and a lodestone in the thought and study of human variety. These convergent interests in racial crossing brought intellectual and scholarly concern into recurrent conversation with practice, power, and discourses of government. And although the students of racial crossings were inclined to overestimate its significance, there was no question that the problem was one of continuing importance that transected the different communities of interest. 'Are the causes which have overthrown the greatest of nations not to be resolved by the laws regulating the intermixture of the races of man', the anthropologist James Hunt asked in 1864. 'Does not the success of our colonisation depend on the deductions of our science?'³³

Recent attention given to the distribution and economy of colonial discourses, and not just their content, has reoriented received understandings of

²⁸ Holt, *The Problem of Freedom*, p. xxi.

²⁹ Levine, *Prostitution, Race and Politics*.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 328.

³¹ Stuart Hall, 'Race, Articulation, and Societies Structured in Dominance', in *Sociological Theories: Racism and Colonialism* (Paris, 1980), pp. 305–345.

³² Frederick Cooper, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley, 2005).

³³ James Hunt, 'The President's Address', *Journal of the Anthropological Society (JAS)*, 2 (1864), p. xciii.

empire and colonialism. A variety of historians have shown this by turning to locations where particular problems are unusually evident, intense or important. Holt and Catherine Hall turned to Jamaica to study the problems, respectively, of freedom and whiteness, Timothy Keegan analysed the development of a 'racial order' using South Africa, and Adele Perry used a focus on British Columbia to explore the problem of (amongst other things) frontier masculinity.³⁴ It is in this mode that this study turns to New Zealand. Most colonial locales had some engagement with the wider problem of racial crossing, but for New Zealand it was of particular importance. For one thing New Zealand was a privileged colony, a colony of settlement that was unusually well connected and well publicized. Not only was it the first major colony formally acquired during Queen Victoria's reign, but to many British politicians, businessmen, officials and settlers, New Zealand promised to be the 'Britain of the South', holding peculiar prospects for replicating the social and economic conditions of England. Certain features seemed to set it apart. It was a colony of settlement, but without convicts or a pre-existent settler population (such as the Boers or French-Canadians), initially partly driven by a joint-stock company, with a temperate climate, at the end of the longest emigration route in the world. The indigenous peoples already living in New Zealand were customarily seen as unusually advanced for 'aborigines', with great potential. Some asserted New Zealand as a chance for the redemption of empire and its ideals or practices, others as a place to make atonement, others still as a place for experimentation or great profit. Each of these understandings (as even this short list suggests) was referential—whether back to metropolitan Britain, or to other colonies on which New Zealand was supposed to improve or with which it could be contrasted. Discussions about, and policies of, racial crossing—evident in New Zealand from its very beginnings—were to prove durable and critical.

In New Zealand the problem of race crossing was to prove extraordinarily important to the wider practices of colonization, particularly through what became termed 'racial amalgamation'. This is a term familiar to students of New Zealand's nineteenth-century history, though it has been widely misunderstood. Its familiarity comes from Alan Ward's seminal work, *A Show of Justice: Racial 'Amalgamation' in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand*, which first posed the idea that certain forms of race crossing were central to New Zealand's nineteenth-century history. 'Racial amalgamation', as Ward established, was the central strategy of colonial government policy regarding

³⁴ Catherine Hall, *Civilizing Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830–1867* (Oxford, 2002); id., *White, Male, and Middle Class*; Holt, *The Problem of Freedom*; Timothy J. Keegan, *Colonial South Africa and the Origins of the Racial Order* (Charlottesville, 1996); Perry, *On the Edge of Empire*.

indigenous people and groups in the nineteenth century. His work (first published in 1973) seemed to set the scene for subsequent studies of race crossing and native policy more generally, but almost none followed.³⁵ Ward's primary focus was the political dimension of 'racial amalgamation', but he was well aware that it also connoted what might now be called a 'biological' amalgamation (something some historians misunderstood).³⁶ Racial amalgamation, as this book further explores, was not simply an earlier incarnation of 'assimilation'. Ward observed that racial amalgamation was not only informed government policy and practice, but was directed at interpersonal, affective and sexual relations, although he wrote of them only briefly. This insight was then largely neglected until new postcolonial and feminist historians began to turn towards domestic and intimate domains with new energy.³⁷ Although Ward's study of racial amalgamation preceded the recent upsurge in studies of colonialism, race, sexuality and gender, when read alongside these it seems remarkably prescient.

The scarcity of attention given to racial crossing was not due to such concerns lying outside the traditional interests of New Zealand historians. Colonialism, in one way or another, has remained a prevailing theme in the historiography, 'race' has been the subject of a number of monographs and articles, and women, marriage and the family all found considerable historical attention at various points, for a variety of reasons.³⁸ But, as with other specific national or colonial histories, one of the results of adopting too narrow a frame was to truncate or disconnect subjects that needed to be understood in articulation. Keith Sorrenson, a pioneer and doyen of the

³⁵ Alan Ward, *A Show of Justice: Racial 'Amalgamation' in Nineteenth Century New Zealand*, revised edn., (Auckland, 1995 [1973]). Ward began, but did not finish, an investigation into half-castes; Alan Ward, personal communication.

³⁶ For example, Keith Sinclair, 'The Aborigines Protection Society and New Zealand: A Study in Nineteenth Century Opinion', Masters thesis, University of New Zealand, 1946, p. 72; K.R. Howe, *Race Relations, Australia and New Zealand: A Comparative Survey* (Wellington, 1977), p. 22.

³⁷ M.P.K. Sorrenson, 'Maori and Pakeha', in Geoffrey W. Rice, (ed.), *The Oxford History of New Zealand*, 2nd edn., (Auckland, 1992), pp. 152, 154, 162–5; M.P.K. Sorrenson, 'How to Civilize Savages: Some "Answers" From Nineteenth-Century New Zealand', *NZJH*, 9 (1975), pp. 97–110; Malcolm Nicolson, 'Medicine and racial politics: changing images of the New Zealand Maori in the nineteenth century', in David Arnold, (ed.), *Imperial Medicine and Indigenous Societies* (Manchester, 1988), pp. 66–104.

³⁸ Ian Wards, *The Shadow of the Land: a Study of British Policy and Racial Conflict in New Zealand 1832–1852* (Wellington, 1968); A.H. McIntock, *Crown Colony Government in New Zealand* (Wellington, 1958); John Stenhouse, "A Disappearing Race Before We Came Here": Dr Alfred Kingcome Newman, the Dying Maori and Victorian Scientific Racism', *NZJH*, 30 (1996), pp. 123–140; Angela Ballara, *Proud to be White? A Survey of Pakeha Prejudice in New Zealand* (Auckland, 1986); David Pearson, *A Dream Deferred: the Origins of Ethnic Conflict in New Zealand* (Wellington, 1990).

historical study of race in this period, is an interesting example of this. Sorrenson made the most significant contributions in the later half of the twentieth century, writing several important articles and producing two monographs that establish the basic contours of racial ideas and scholarship amongst New Zealand-based intellectuals. These, however, focus on the twentieth and late-nineteenth centuries and isolate local developments from other transcolonial, transnational and international ones.³⁹ In his subsequent work Tony Ballantyne showed how this isolation was not one that characterized these racial scholars, and their own thinking about race—not least through ‘Aryanism’—was ordinarily keyed into imperial and transcolonial dimensions. Even when New Zealand-based scholars appeared to be working most in local registers, larger webs of discourse shaped their understanding.⁴⁰ This meant that even in the apparently distant and remote colony of New Zealand, colonials found not just another native race, nor just ‘Māori’, but ‘Aryan Māori’. New Zealand history was never as disconnected, nor as provincial, as it has sometimes been taken to be.

To be sure, most of the literature that has taken up questions of racial intermarriage and other kinds of interracial intimacy have tended to stress the uniqueness or exceptionality of New Zealand. In these works New Zealand has been figured as a place of unusual beneficence and toleration for interracial relationships. The literature itself, however, is not large. Disproportionately the historiography is concentrated in biographical studies and in regional histories, something that seems to have been long true in Canada and South Africa, as well as other places. The apparently transgressive nature of these interracial relations—though, as is argued here, they were not as transgressive as has been assumed—means that the subject is also amenable to certain sensational or titillating modes of historiography.⁴¹ In more traditional genres of history the New Zealand field has also seen small studies of intermarriage by Graham Butterworth and, more importantly, by Atholl Anderson.⁴² Yet, in the past few decades of historiography, in which New Zealand has claimed the attention of a large number of historians, there have been very few

³⁹ Sorrenson, ‘How to Civilize Savages’; M.P.K. Sorrenson, *Maori Origins and Migrations: the Genesis of some Pakeha Myths and Legends* (Auckland, 1979); M.P.K. Sorrenson, *Manifest Duty: the Polynesian Society over 100 Years* (Auckland, 1982).

⁴⁰ Ballantyne, *Orientalism and Race*, chs. 1, 3, 5.

⁴¹ See, for instance, Trevor Bentley, *Captured by Maori: White Female Captives, Sex and Racism on the Nineteenth-century Frontier* (Auckland, 2004); Richard Wolfe, *Hell-Hole of the Pacific* (Auckland, 2005).

⁴² Atholl Anderson, *Race Against Time: the Early Maori-Pakeha Families and the Development of the Mixed-Race Population in Southern New Zealand* (Dunedin, 1991); id., *The Welcome of Strangers: an Ethnohistory of Southern Maori A.D. 1650–1850* (Dunedin, 1998).

attempts to seriously grapple with racial crossings in a larger, more inclusive, and critical frame.⁴³

The most ambitious attempt to frame race crossing within the context of a national or colonial history has been by James Belich. His brief address on the subject of racial intermarriage in New Zealand is one of the most intriguing passages in his recent, innovative, general history.⁴⁴ Belich has consistently tried to engage critically with race, and his work has been consistently provocative, although his approach differs fundamentally with that adopted here. In his most important work Belich argued that race was a 'bias', and that texts in which race is present can at times be sifted through and that race can be 'subtracted out'.⁴⁵ This view, which sees race not as constitutive, but as a kind of distortion, does not interrogate the fundamental racial and colonial categories nor seek to explain how they work instrumentally through colonialism. Though the larger arguments laid out here are, for the most part, compatible with Belich's work, this book makes a fundamentally different argument and adopts a different approach—that race was elemental: that New Zealand was a 'racialized state', one associated with a nineteenth-century British Empire increasingly organized and ruled through discourses and practices of race. The elemental and productive characteristics of race were what invested racial amalgamation, and other aspects of the problem of racial crossing, with both centrality and significance in New Zealand and beyond.

New Zealand has come to claim a kind of racial exceptionality that is still current, and which has its roots in the period with which this book is concerned. This unusual historiographical valuation of race relations in New Zealand is worth emphasizing. Historians, and not only partisan New Zealand ones, have long been convinced that 'race relations' in New Zealand were superior to elsewhere. As New Zealand's most famous historian, Keith Sinclair, put it, New Zealand's race relations were 'better' than in South Dakota, South Africa or South Australia.⁴⁶ Imperial historians, such as Victor Kiernan and Robin Winks, have followed a similar line. Winks, for instance, argues that of all the colonies of settlement, 'the harshest race relations developed in Australia, the least harsh in New Zealand'.⁴⁷ It is

⁴³ Most notably, Kate Riddell, 'A "Marriage" of the Races? Aspects of Intermarriage, Ideology and Reproduction on the New Zealand Frontier', M.A. thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 1996.

⁴⁴ Belich, *Making Peoples*, pp. 251–7.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁴⁶ Keith Sinclair, 'Why are Race Relations in New Zealand Better than in South Africa, South Australia or South Dakota?', *NZJH*, 2 (1971), pp. 121–7.

⁴⁷ Robin Winks, 'A System of Commands: The Infrastructure of Race Contact', in Gordon Martel, (ed.), *Studies in British Imperial History: Essays in Honour of A.P. Thornton*

difficult to know, apart from the mathematics of body counting, how to measure 'race relations'; yet it is revealing that an important element in most of these histories is the focus given to intermarriage.⁴⁸ Interracial intermarriage is commonly used in these and other accounts as a kind of index of 'good' race relations, one on which New Zealand gets nearly full points. (This has a striking similarity with Brazil's twentieth-century reputation as a place where race relations were also preternaturally 'good'—and for which the putative place of racial crossing is equally fundamental.⁴⁹) These kinds of assessments of race relations were also always comparative claims, addressing other places and other histories. Most importantly, these kinds of interpretations had widespread and enduring public popularity, even after the surprisingly late retreat of academic historians from such positions (a retreat significantly enabled by Alan Ward's work, and the wider political efforts of Māori people in the 1960s and 1970s). Behind the approving assessments and even those of its critics, lay the same remarkably durable idea that a favourable disposition towards intermarriage was indicative of a softer, more humane colonial encounter. As is argued below, this was an idea already common in nineteenth-century Britain, where many argued that Britain (and Britons) emerged out of an intermarriage of the different races of England, Scotland and Wales, in a 'marriage' epitomized in Sir Walter Scott's historical novels: voluntary, racially and politically uplifting.⁵⁰ This assumption is not just questionable, but is in many respects an artefact of these histories. 'Racial amalgamation', as is argued below, like other attempts to advance certain kinds of interracial marriages and intimacies often marked not a 'good' colonialism but an unusually intensive, potent and ambitious species. Interracial affective ties and marriage, when effectively combined with law, policy and other forms of statecraft, could prove to be strikingly invasive, expansive and virulent colonial strategies.

Still, until very recently, racial intermarriage and other kinds of racial crossings in New Zealand had received little serious historical attention. In the light of recent and contemporary New Zealand experiences, where 'racial crossings' were, and are, commonplace, this seems difficult to

(Houndmills, 1986), p. 19. Also see Armitage, Andrew, *Comparing the Policy of Aboriginal Assimilation: Australia, Canada and New Zealand* (Vancouver, 1995).

⁴⁸ Victor Kiernan, *The Lords of Human Kind: European Attitudes to the Outside World in the Imperial Age* (London, 1969), pp. 262–4.

⁴⁹ See Thomas Skidmore, *Black Into White: Race and Nationality in Brazilian Thought* (New York, 1974) and Mark Alan Healey, 'Powers of Misrecognition: Bourdieu and Wacquant on Race in Brazil', *Nepantla: Views From the South*, 4 (2003), pp. 391–402.

⁵⁰ See Chapter 4.

reconcile.⁵¹ Yet historians have, if apparently belatedly, begun to turn increasingly towards these topics. It seems, however, that this interest owes almost as much to international and postcolonial scholarly developments as to local or national origins. Particularly important, again, has been the work of feminist and gender historians who have been closely attuned and responsive to the revaluation and exploration of marriage, family and children. By engaging the 'domestic' seriously, and investigating the private realms and 'intimate domains' of colonial New Zealand, these historians have recognized these as places of vital state and political activity, often with histories that are outside or contrary to received historical narratives.⁵² This has brought the work of gender or feminist historians especially close to racial crossings when the focus has been on particular individuals, where historians have described experiences patently incompatible with prevailing analyses that suggested stark, masculine, opposed and fixed colonial milieux. Patricia Grimshaw's work on Heni Pore, Jesse Munro's on Suzanne Aubert and, most notably, Judith Binney's biography of Te Kooti are key examples of this.⁵³ In each of these pieces the central individuals are shown to be living in complicated and variegated social, political and cultural surroundings—usually outside the main colonial settlements and townships—where the limitations of monolithic categories of race, gender or class are clear.

Angela Wanhalla has written an especially important study of the community of Maitapapa, on the Taieri plains in Otago, part of the deep south of New Zealand.⁵⁴ This small community had a much higher rate of intermarriage than most—whether those belonging to the same indigenous group (Kai Tahu), or others in the territory of New Zealand. By far the most important work of its kind, Wanhalla's study is richly local, with a command of the particulars of individuals and their kin relations that troubles simple understandings of New Zealand colonialism. Her history has clear ramifications for wider histories of Kai Tahu, as well as

⁵¹ Paul Callister, Robert Didham and Deborah Potter, 'Ethnic Intermarriage in New Zealand', Statistics New Zealand Working Paper, 2005.

⁵² A representative volume would be Barbara Brookes, Charlotte Macdonald and Margaret Tennant (eds.), *Women in History 2* (Wellington, 1992).

⁵³ Judith Binney, *Redemption Songs: A Life of Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki* (Auckland, 1995); Patricia Grimshaw, 'Interracial Marriages and Colonial Regimes in Victoria and Aotearoa/New Zealand', *Frontiers*, 23:3 (2002), pp. 12–28; Jesse Munro, *The Story of Suzanne Aubert* (Auckland, 1996).

⁵⁴ Angela C. Wanhalla, 'Transgressing Boundaries: A History of the Mixed Descent Families of Maitapapa, Taieri, 1830–1940', PhD thesis, University of Canterbury, 2004; id., 'Marrying "In": the Geography of Intermarriage on the Taieri, 1830s–1920s', in Tony Ballantyne and Judith A. Bennett, (eds.), *Landscape/Community: Perspectives from New Zealand History* (Dunedin, 2005), pp. 72–94.

for colonial and national histories, though with some specification. Due to patterns of recurrent intermarriage, as well as a number of regional and colonial developments, the people of Maitapapa eventually dispersed—‘a story of cultural disintegration and loss’, though they and their descendants retained an enduring sense of community and kinship. Wanhalla compellingly advances a central argument that the figure of the ‘half-caste’ was a dangerous one for the colonial state and many colonial institutions, a figure that threatened categories of people and property.

No less important than Wanhalla’s work is Judith Binney’s recent essay on some aspects of race crossing. One of New Zealand’s leading historians, Binney draws upon a career of research to highlight the complicated and often transgressive histories of certain racially mixed individuals. She demonstrates how they were problematic for indigenous and settler communities as well as colonial government. Binney’s expertise in the regional histories of the Bay of Islands and the east coast of the North Island enabled her to map some revealing connections of kinship, social circles and interests between a number of different mixed families. There was not, as Binney initially imagined, a mixed ‘subculture’, but these connections amounted to ‘an identifiable network of inter-connected families’, mixed families that were associated with the colonial establishment.⁵⁵ The work of both Wanhalla and Binney is especially instructive in their focus on the *whānau* (extended family) in its ‘mixed’ incarnations, detailing its centrality to lived experiences of racial crossing. This study hopes to work with these studies by further exploring the entanglement of *whānau* and other domestic and intimate formations with colonial practices and statecraft, as well as the many attempts to comprehend racial crossing and integrate it with various kinds of knowledge. It also tries to square the challenges that half-castes presented to colonialism with the challenges that colonialism presented to half-castes and others. The two, it is clear, were part of the same problem of racial crossing. The putative instability of racial crossings made many racially crossed people and relations troublesome for colonialism; yet this instability was produced or appropriated by the colonial state and its agents, and could prove potentially as dangerous for indigenous communities.

⁵⁵ Judith Binney, “‘In-Between’ Lives: Studies from Within a Colonial Society”, in Tony Ballantyne and Brian Moloughney, (eds.), *Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand’s Pasts* (Dunedin, 2006), pp. 93–117. Other relevant recent works include Manying Ip, *Being Māori-Chinese: Mixed Identities* (Auckland, 2008); Senka Bozic-Vrbancic, *Tarara: Croats and Māori in New Zealand* (Dunedin, 2008); Patricia Grimshaw, ‘Interracial Marriages and Colonial Regimes in Victoria and Aotearoa/New Zealand’, *Frontiers*, 23:3 (2002), pp. 12–28.