
“ALL RACES ARE MIXED RACES:” OF ANGLO-INDIANS AND
BRITISH ARYANS

Debojoy Chanda

ABSTRACT

In this article, I situate Anglo-Indian anti-racism activist Cedric Dover’s thoughts against the backdrop of travelling discourses of Aryanism as manifested from the nineteenth century onward. Depicting the constructions of prejudices by British and German Orientalist philology against figures born of intermixture, I show how British appropriations of Aryanism disturbingly helped disenfranchise Anglo-Indians in colonial India, as Dover suggests in his work.

Discussing how Dover uses his anti-racist oeuvre to problematize philology and, by extension, eugenics, I delineate Dover’s arrival at the realization that race as a category needs to be abjured. The repudiation of race, states Dover, is necessary because all bodies—including those of British and Anglo-Indian alike—are born of indeterminate intermixture. I show how Dover uses this conclusion to conceptualize a transnational coming community of the intermixed—a community in which Anglo-Indians may participate to write back against their disenfranchisement in colonial India.

INTRODUCTION

According to Dolores Chew (2018), Anglo-Indian Studies, as a minority-studies project, engages with established power constructs to disassemble them and concurrently build emancipatory knowledge. In keeping with Chew’s description, I use this article to tease out a few strands of Anglo-Indian anti-racism activist Cedric Dover’s liberative thought. This helps me interrogate some power constructs that had been instrumental in discursively producing Anglo-Indians in colonial India.

So that their right to colonize India remained unchallenged after it had been shaken up by the First War of Indian Independence (1857-58), the British officially disowned Anglo-Indians in 1858, shearing them of their racial and political affiliations with their white forefathers.¹ Cedric Dover (1904-1961) tacitly compared this process of producing Anglo-Indians for disownment with that of the Nazi production of Jews, the connecting factor in both cases being that unlike their white supremacist dominators, the disowned groups were constituted of intermixed bodies deemed ‘degenerate.’² Challenging this forging of ‘degenerate’ Anglo-Indian bodies, Dover suggested that *all* bodies—including biologically ‘good’/white ones—were born of indeterminate intermixture.

By inserting Nazism and, therefore, Aryanism into the picture, Dover gestured to the fact that nineteenth-century British and German Orientalist philology had been deployed to mold Anglo-Indians under the aegis of ‘degeneracy.’ Unravelling the philological ramifications inherent to this gesture, I explicate the ways the British, like the Germans, had used language to produce themselves as ‘good’ Aryan bodies, as opposed to ‘bad’/intermixed Anglo-Indian ones.³ Examining the interactions between British and German Orientalist philology as eugenic prisms, I show how Dover’s subversion of notions of white supremacy manifested itself in his problematization of language.

Eventually abjuring his initial subscription to eugenics, Dover’s work, as I demonstrate, questioned the concept of a ‘pure’ race. This act of interrogation allowed Dover to view Anglo-Indians as potential participants in what he conceptualized as an emergent transnational community of the intermixed—a community of “mongrels,” to use Dover’s term. Such a community could expose the production of ‘degenerate’ bodies as a discursive fiction that facilitated the oppression of some for the gain of others. Within this community, Anglo-Indians, instead of viewing language as a eugenic lens, would find in English a means of self-expression that would allow them to speak out against their colonial ostracization.

ANGLO-INDIANS AS “VARIABLE POPULATIONS:” CEDRIC DOVER AND THE VACUITY OF RACE

Best known today as part of a transnational anti-racism colored collective that included African American Civil Rights activists such as W. E. B. DuBois (1868-1963), Langston Hughes (1901-1967), and Paul Robeson (1898-1976), Cedric Dover was born of an English father and an Indian mother in 1904 in Calcutta. As part of his political activism, Dover produced a spate of treatises against racism. These treatises were part of his fight against transnational variations of miscegenation discourse and the disenfranchisement of communities of color (Slate, 2014, p. 17-21). One of these treatises, *Hell in the Sunshine* (1943), was set against the backdrop of the Second World War. The treatise was part of Dover’s effort to conceptualize a transnational collective of mixed races that could join the Allied effort in the War against the Nazis (Wright, 2010, p. 245). Speaking of “Nazi racialists” and their location of “coloured races” at different levels below the Third Reich’s “Aryan family tree,” Dover (1943), in *Hell in the Sunshine*, found Indians “relegated to the bottom” of this tree (p. 12). His interest in this location was commensurate with and, indeed, probably stemmed from his situation as an Anglo-Indian who, as with all Anglo-Indians after 1858, had his body perceived to be ‘less’ than a good white/‘unmixed’ British one, born as it was of racial mixture (Dover, 1929, p. 14).

Drawing a parallel between Jews and Anglo-Indians, Dover (1939) explicated the “Aryan family tree” by stating that Nazism founded itself on the stratification of bodies perceived to be physically and/or mentally ‘degenerate.’ The ‘degeneracy’ of these bodies was causally traced to the fact that they were born not of endogamous sexual intercourse practiced among ‘unmixed’/supreme white bodies, but of varying degrees of interracial mixture (p. 31). Hence the Nazi belief in the ‘fallenness’ of the Semitic body, with its supremacy corporeally diluted. This belief found one of its most unsettling discursive expressions in *Mein Kampf* [*My Struggle*] (1925), the autobiography of Adolf Hitler, Chancellor of Germany from 1933 to 1945 and contemporaneously the leader of the Nazi Party. According to Hitler (1925) who nationalistically justified the large-scale annihilation of Jews in Nazi Germany, the order of the day was an originalist reification of the racially ‘supreme’ German Aryans for the salvaging of the lost cultural productions of this “former master people” (“Nation and Race,” para. 31). In other words, the reinstatement of Aryan cultural

productions paradigmatically demanded the reification of belief in the ostensible bodily superiority of Aryans. Such a reification could, according to Hitler (1925), only be binaristically advanced by the extermination of Jews, the supremacy of the Jewish peoples having apparently been lost by the interracial mixture determining their bodies, and through their reproduction of non-Aryans:

No more than Nature desires the mating of weaker with stronger individuals, even less does she desire the blending of a higher with a lower race, since, if she did, her whole work of higher breeding, over perhaps hundreds of thousands of years, might be ruined...[I]n every mingling of Aryan blood with that of lower peoples the result was the end of the cultured people. (Hitler, 1925, “Nation and Race,” para. 9)

This “end” of the Aryans as “the cultured people,” according to Hitler (1925), resulted in the “lowering of the level of the higher race,” that is, of the Aryans, thus seemingly causing the “[p]hysical and intellectual regression” of the peaks they had attained. This “slowly but surely progressing sickness” that, Hitler (1925) claimed, had ensued among the Aryans, had to be halted through the marginalization of the Jews as a ‘degenerate’/‘lesser’/mixed canker within (“Nation and Race,” para. 10). After all, “[b]lood mixture and the resultant drop in the racial level is the sole cause for the dying out of old [supreme] cultures; for men...perish...by the loss of the force of resistance which is contained only in pure blood. All who are not of good race in this world are chaff” (Hitler, 1925). Unmixed white Aryan bodies, in what Dover (1943) termed Hitler’s “Nordic Utopia,” signified a ‘good’ race, while mixed bodies constituted the ‘fall’ of this race (p. 12).⁴

In response to Hitler’s assertions about a “drop in the racial level” through acts of bodily intermixture, Dover (1943) stated in *Hell in the Sunshine* that a ‘pure’ race defined by unmixed blood, was an impossibility. Critiquing Nazi eugenics’ production of an ‘unmixed’ white Aryan race, Dover (1937), himself speaking in an ironically eugenic vein, asserted that some monolithic ‘full caste’ or “good race” defined by “pure blood” sans “mixture” was a chimera in a world inhabited by “variable populations”—populations in which “innumerable original features remain as heritable units, which may reappear in later generations, or be fortuitously recombined to produce new types” (p. 20).

Dover’s claim about “variable populations” (Dover, 1937, p. 17) allows one to use his thought to critique British discursive constructions of ‘lesser’ groups inhabiting colonial India—‘lesser’ because born of intermixture. The quintessential of these groups surfacing in Dover’s work is, unsurprisingly, that of the Anglo-Indians, as I will discuss later (1929, p. 9). What piques my interest is Dover’s suggestion that both “German and English imperialists” in conjunction “taught the world to condemn [Anglo-Indians] above all others” (1939, p. 31). This assertion seems to hark back to the notion of Aryan racial supremacy in Germany. The location of the British production of Anglo-Indians under the ostensibly Nazi aegis of Aryanism accordingly needs some unraveling.

OF LANGUAGE AND EUGENICS: GERMAN ORIENTALISTS, BRITISH ARYANS, AND INTERMIXTURE

To understand what discursively connects Dover’s German and English imperialists vis-à-vis Anglo-Indians, an anonymously written imperialist article published in the *Calcutta Review* in 1858, serves as a useful starting point. The year of the article’s publication is significant, 1858 having been the *annus miserabilis* that saw the British officially disown Anglo-Indians and disaffiliate them from claims to white European stock. In keeping with this turn of events, almost recalling Hitler’s belief that “Nature [does not] desire the...blending of a higher with a lower race” because “every mingling of Aryan blood with that of lower peoples” causes “the end of the cultured [Aryan] people” (1925), the article in the *Calcutta Review* (1858) says of Anglo-Indians that

[t]he unmistakable hand of nature having separated and dissociated the black race from the white, terrible and portentous effects might be expected to flow from their unnatural union. It is feared that in the fatal *mélange* which would thus be produced, the European stock would shortly lose all its virtue and pre-eminence. (as cited in Mizutani, 2011, p. 31)

When examined in conjunction with the passage from *Mein Kampf*, ‘European’ in this quote equates itself with Dover’s “English imperialists” (1939) and tautologically with white supremacy in colonial India. The parallels between the passages are unmistakable, white British supremacy in India having, as with German conceptions of Aryanism, carved its unquestionability by dissociating itself from the ‘degenerate’/‘lesser’/mixed figures laying claim to European racial kinship. Indeed,

‘Aryan’ as a transcendental signifier of white supremacy was drawn upon by both the British and the Germans along parallel lines, bound by a mutual discursive exchange of Orientalist philology in the nineteenth century. This is a matter that the reader is, of course, familiar with, but a recapitulation might prove helpful.

The philological project in question was based on a colonial study of the Sanskrit language. This was a project set in motion by several British figures, including English typographer Charles Wilkins (1749-1836), the first to translate the *Bhagavad Gita* in English in 1785; English philologist Nathaniel Brassey Halhed (1751-1830) who translated *A Code of Gentoo Laws* in 1776 from a Persian translation of a Sanskrit digest of Hindu law compiled by the British East India Company; and most significantly, British philologist and supreme court judge in colonial India, William Jones (1746-1794) who classified Sanskrit as the mother language showing affinities with and between Greek, Latin, Gothic, Celtic, and Old Persian (Trautmann, 1997, p. 38). According to Jones in 1807, these affinities proved the languages to be co-descendants of an originalist Proto-Indo-European language, and the speakers of this lost language to be racial kin to each other (Trautmann, 1997, p. 35-38). Through Jones and his fellow philologists’ study of Sanskrit texts as a means to ‘know’ Hindu law, religion, and historiography, philology became a discursive lens facilitating the British exercise of power/knowledge over the default Hindu Indian colonized subject. This exercise was assisted by the British use of Sanskrit texts to ‘traditionalize’ the colonized Hindu subject into ‘backwardness’ (Pollock, 1993, p. 97). In this sense, Jones and his epistemological kin used language to make India a center for consolidating self-perceptions of British superiority (Trautmann, 1997, p. 26).

In this context, it is important to note that German romanticist Friedrich von Schlegel (1772-1829) and his brother, August Wilhelm (1767-1845) came under the sway of this branch of British philology in 1803-04 (Pollock, 1993, p. 80-81). This contact of the Germans with Sanskrit fueled a German romantic search for an originalist self-definition that, by proving Sanskrit as temporally prior to Latin or Christian Europe, bolstered Germany with a sense of nationalism in the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries (Pollock, 1993, p. 82). Philology infused this nationalism with a veneer of scholarship—a veneer aligning language and eugenics.

Retracing the historiography of groups of peoples via Sanskrit as a signifier of linguistic commonality, Germans, in the nineteenth century, propounded the theory that the Aryans as the originalist Caucasian speakers of the Proto-Indo-European language, had divided themselves into two groups. One group was said to have inhabited Northwestern Europe, while another group apparently travelled to settle near the Indus River circa the second millennium BCE (Sugirtharajah, 2003, p. 52). This dissociation of a group that previously spoke a common language, eventually assumed a eugenic twist, particularly in the work of German Indologist and Sanskrit scholar Max Muller (1823-1900). According to Muller’s brand of German philology, judging by factors of linguistic commonality, the Aryans who had headed in the direction of the Indus had evidently vanquished the original inhabitants of the Northern part of the Indian subcontinent (Trautmann, 1997, p. 175). Effecting this defeat, writes Muller (1947), was not too difficult for the Aryans—the original inhabitants, unlike their Aryan conquerors, apparently resembled the “Negro” in physical and intellectual type and were consequently ‘degenerate.’ “We generally find that it is the fate of the negro race, when brought into hostile contact with the [Aryan] race, to be either destroyed and annihilated, or to fall into a state of slavery and degradation” (as cited in Trautmann, 1997, p. 175). In Muller’s philological position, we thus find a pseudo-scientific alignment of language and eugenics—an alliance that found its most pronounced expression in Muller’s 1859 treatise *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature So Far as It Illustrates the Primitive Religion of the Ancient Brahmans*. In this *History*, Muller suggests that language renders questions of supremacy and ‘degeneracy’ beyond question; ergo, the Proto-Indo-European language can retrospectively locate Aryans as the group that, thanks to its superiority, “civilised the whole of Europe” (1859, p. 12). This belief in Aryan supremacy, of which Muller’s texts are transcendently symptomatic, is essentially what made German philology Orientalist in character, nationalistically locating German Aryans as a ‘greater’ people and ‘others’ as ‘lesser’ groups. If, nevertheless, the Aryans who settled in the Indian subcontinent proved ‘less’ than the Aryans who remained in Northwestern Europe, that was because when turning southward in the subcontinent to conquer “the uncivilised inhabitants” there, India’s Aryan settlers “turn[ed] away from the realities of life,” nullifying any possibilities for the construction of a sense of nation and thus facing a “national degradation” (Muller, 1859, p. 17).

This “degradation,” argued Muller (1859), expressed itself through, among other manifestations, the absence of a poet who could generate a sense of nation, nationality, and nationalism among the Aryan settlers (p. 30). Muller’s anachronistic Orientalist implication is obvious: Sanskrit literature—and therefore the Sanskrit language—was ‘less’ than German literature and the German language (Pollock, 1993, p. 92). Given the alignment of language and eugenics in Muller’s texts, this conclusion was commensurate with the bodily ‘degradation’ of the Aryans in the Indian subcontinent—a degradation which could only have been caused if the Aryans turned ‘Negro’ themselves. In other words, Muller (1859) indicates that during their sojourns in the subcontinent, the Aryans had indulged in intercourse with the original inhabitants and produced groups that were defined by biological “degradation” (p. 17). If the German Aryans had avoided this trap, it was because they had stayed back in Europe and remained endogamous (1859, p. 17).

With the production of ‘lesser’ and ‘greater’ races through language, Muller’s conception of Aryan supremacy coded an intermixed population as ‘fallen’ and, by extension, as a threat. Magnifying this perception of threat in the twentieth century, Hitler (1925) and his nationalist ilk constructed Jews as their internal others—a position they justified by drawing upon claims of intermixture, as the passage from *Mein Kampf* corroborates. The German language thus proved central to Nazi politics—a politics dependent on eugenic claims of intermixture and ‘degeneracy.’

German philology helped consolidate the Orientalism inherent to British colonial philology, with British historian and administrator Thomas Babington Macaulay’s (1800-1859) 1835 proclamation about the superiority of English over Sanskrit recalling the German alignment of language and race (Anderson, 1983, p. 91). Indeed, Muller proclaimed the British to be Aryans because they were, like the German Aryans, originalist inhabitants of Northwestern Europe. Unlike the Germans, though, the British proved reluctant Aryans (Trautmann, 1997, p. 185). After all, if both Indians and the British were of Aryan descent, the eugenic implication was that “the same blood was running in [the English soldier’s] veins and in the veins of the dark Bengalese,” as Muller argued in his *History* (1859, p. 13). This argument proved an embarrassment and, indeed, a political danger to the British colonial dispensation in India: if, given their supposed common descent, the colonized subject perceived

himself at par with and not ‘less’ than his ‘great’ white colonizer, the discursive foundations of colonial India could totter, founded as they considerably were on racial difference (Sinha, 1995, p. 20; Figueira, 2002, p. 141). Little wonder that it was only as late as 1875 that British jurist and historian Sir Henry Sumner Maine helped Britain formally appropriate the notion of Aryan supremacy for itself, claiming in his Rede Lecture delivered at the University of Cambridge that language, as a eugenic category, had significant implications for the British as a race (Trautmann, 1997, p. 2).

British reluctance notwithstanding, the fundamentals of Aryanism, that is, language, eugenics, and beliefs in a ‘degeneracy’ inherent to intermixed bodies, had crossed paths in colonial India prior to 1875. The casting of Anglo-Indian bodies as intermixed played a central role in this crossing. This centrality is hardly surprising— if the British perceived the possibility of the same blood running in white English and dark Bengali bodies as a danger to their colonialist project in India, Anglo-Indian bodies, defined largely by Indo-European intermixture, effectively epitomized this danger.

THE INTERMIXED OFFSPRING OF BRITISH ARYANS BEFORE AND AFTER 1858

The British East India Company, after its victory in the Battle of Plassey in 1757, had encouraged marriages between Indian women and its white European soldiers (Hawes, 1996, p. 1-20). The administrators of the Company had hoped that marriage, as an ostensibly disciplinary institution, would keep the European soldiers from ‘wickedness’ and concomitantly enhance their masculinity and the physical strength of their bodies by satiating their sexual hunger (Mizutani, 2011, p. 118-21). However, contrary to the Company’s estimates, most of the unions that the soldiers contracted with Indian women were out of wedlock, the legal registration of marriages having been an expensive affair. The Company’s administrators had, more importantly, not counted on the explosion of the Anglo-Indian population that would result from these interracial unions. Indeed, the administrators were politically unsettled by this explosion because it was unclear whether the Anglo-Indians’ allegiances lay with the Company or the native inhabitants of India (Hawes, 1996, p. 1-20).

Possibly as part of an effort to control this state of affairs, a military officer of the East India Company stated in 1818 that the non-marital unions of which most Anglo-Indians were born, by constituting a “system of concubinage,” put “the health, the morals, and the discipline of the [English] men” in jeopardy (as cited in Hawes, 1996, p. 13). ‘Concubinage,’ in this imperialist setting, was significantly linked to British military officers visiting Indian prostitutes in brothels attached to the colonial cantonments in nineteenth-century India (Hawes, 1996, p. 9). The officers’ visits to the brothels were adjudged a detriment to what Macaulay described as the “manly spirit” of the body of the British colonizer (1840, p. 41), many of the prostitutes in the brothels having been bearers of syphilis (Ballhatchet, 1980, p. 10-12). Through the imperialist equation of non-marital unions with syphilis and Macaulay’s contrasting of the “manly spirit” of the British with a determinist ‘effeminacy’ said to mark the colonized Indian subject (1840, p. 73), Anglo-Indians born of the “system of concubinage” were eugenically adjudged ‘fallen,’ bearing the ‘un-British’/‘un-manly’ specter of sexual disease, ‘immorality,’ and—perhaps most importantly—Indian blood (Ballhatchet, 1980, p. 120). This helped the East India Company determine Anglo-Indians as paradigmatically ‘degenerate’ (“The East-Indians,” 1831, p. 14-16).

In his 1939 treatise *Know This of Race*, Dover criticizes the British construction of Anglo-Indians as intermixed and tautologically “degenerate bastards, born of blackguardly fathers” in the British militia and “whoring mothers” inhabiting the cantonment brothels (p. 31). In another treatise about mixed races, *Half-Caste* (1937), he fleshes out why this paradigm might have been produced: according to him, “English imperialists” categorized Anglo-Indians as ‘degenerate’ in response to Anglo-Indian philanthropist John William Ricketts’ (1791-1835) Petition of December 1829 (p. 132-33). Ricketts had addressed this Petition to the British Parliament to prevent the possible administrative disownment and consequent disenfranchisement of Anglo-Indians in colonial India (D’Cruz, 2006, p. 48). The classification of Anglo-Indians as eugenically ‘degenerate’ because born of intermixture was thus, by Dover’s assessment, a notion propounded to prevent Anglo-Indians from having a voice in the British Parliament and/or receiving guaranteed employment in the East India Company’s covenanted civil service (Dover, 1937, 132-33). If, against this backdrop, Dover (1937) mocked Aryans in *Half-Caste* by claiming that “anyone who

is ostensibly white” was officially recognized as ‘white,’ it was to provocatively indicate that the British Aryans could well be born of indeterminate intermixture, much like their Anglo-Indian kin whom they had disowned (p. 271).

The construction of Anglo-Indian bodies as ‘bad’ culminated in colonial India after the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, otherwise known as the First War of Indian Independence. The War saw several Indian soldiers in the employ of the East India Company rebel against their employers, killing many British men, women, and children. Matters were not helped by the fact that one of the most pronounced defeats of the British during the Mutiny was at Lucknow: the British soldiers in the city were easily defeated because they were, for the greater part, stricken down by the outbreak of syphilis in the local cantonment brothel (Ballhatchet, 1980, p. 36-38). Accordingly, once the British had quelled the War, what mattered for the Company was that its Indian subjects should feel awe and fear toward their ‘white’ colonizers (Sinha, 1995, p. 59). White skin and its equation with imperialist supremacy became more central than before as a discursive generator of this awe and fear (Callanan, 2006, p. 145). To transcendentalize whiteness in this fashion, though, the ‘degeneracy’ of solvent white bodies had to be outlawed within a British nationalist paradigm played out in the colony. In order to implement this process of outlawing, immediately after the Mutiny had been suppressed, the British, in 1858, officially disowned intermixed figures born of Indo-European unions. This disownment culminated in the official formation of Anglo-Indians as a separate community in the same year (Mizutani, 2011, p. 19). The colonial definition of Anglo-Indians in terms of intermixture and concomitant sexual ‘immorality’ and bodily ‘degeneracy’ thus played no small role in this act of disownment (Ballhatchet, 1980, p. 34-35; Mallampalli, 2011, p. 190-94; Hawes, 1996, p. 8).

It is important to note that Muller (1859), in his *History*, wrote about Aryans in India ‘degrading’ through intermixture a year after the British had disowned the Anglo-Indians. Given this temporal intersection, it can be conjectured that British Orientalism, after having helped produce German Orientalist philology in the early-nineteenth century, consolidated it by disenfranchising those of racial mixture in the Indian subcontinent; in the process, then, what proleptically took shape were not merely the origins of a German brand of Aryan nationalism opposed to bodily

“degradation” (Muller, 1859, p. 30), but also a white British nationalism that later morphed into British Aryanism. Both British and German Aryanisms, then, assisted the shaping of intermixed bodies as ‘degenerate.’ Ergo, there was no irony in the fact that the British owned Aryanism sans reluctance via Maine in 1875 (Trautmann, 1997, p. 1). After all, if Maine (1875) championed the cause of British Aryans by claiming that “peoples not necessarily understanding one another’s tongue should be grouped together politically on the ground of linguistic affinities” (as cited in Trautmann, 1997, p. 1), he silently avowed the possibility that language could politically translate into race, and that race as a political category could not only unite but also divide peoples into ‘greater’ and ‘lesser’ groups, as it did in 1858 in India.

Unsurprisingly, in the same year in which Maine officially propagated the idea of British Aryanism, British physician and medical writer Edward John Tilt (1815-1893) wrote at length of eugenic experiments he had conducted to observe the propagation of ‘good’ Aryan blood—or its lack—among Anglo-Indians (1875, p. 108). Tilt (1875) claims he expected the offspring of first-generation male Anglo-Indians born within holy wedlock, to have “had children better or as good as themselves” (p. 108) This was, of course, provided the Anglo-Indian men in question married women who belonged to the caste of Brahmans—the highest caste of Hindus correspondingly claimed to bear the greatest traces of “ante-historical” Aryan blood in India (Figueira, 2012, p. 87). Tilt (1875) wrote that his expectations held good for “the first offshoot of the two mighty races,” but that subsequent generations of “half-castes” “show[ed] early signs of degeneration of both body and mind” (p. 109). This outcome, according to Tilt’s colleague Bartle Frere (1815-1884), emanated from the fact that Brahmans, despite their Aryan inheritance, were “an inferior race” (cited in Tilt, 1875, p. 108-09) when compared with the British. Such a conclusion is redolent of Muller’s Aryans producing ‘lesser’ bodies when invading the Indian subcontinent (1859, p. 17). To sum up, Tilt and Frere’s Anglo-Indians “inherited the vices of both parents [white and non-white] and the virtues of neither,” to quote Dover’s sarcastic reference to this disturbing act of colonial racializing (1939, p. 31). For the nationalist exaltation of British Aryans in the colony, Tilt thus justified the disownment of Anglo-Indians on eugenic grounds. Indeed, then, the “German and English imperialists” had together “taught the world to condemn” Anglo-Indians’ intermixed bodies on charges of degeneracy in very similar ways, as Dover (1939) had stated in *Know*

This of Race (p. 31). It must be admitted, though, that the Germans took the British instance to a more alarming level in the twentieth century vis-à-vis Jews as their enemies within.

ELASTICIZING RACE: THE TRAJECTORY OF DOVER’S THOUGHT ON EUGENICS AND LANGUAGE

Interestingly, Macaulay’s 1835 Minute on Indian Education had a formative part to play in the construction of British Aryans before the fact. The Minute, as the reader will know, was an attempt to create a class of colonized Indian subjects who, indoctrinated into the supposed supremacy of English literary production, would be “Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect” (as cited in Anderson, 1983, p. 91). This class would accordingly inhabit a double consciousness that would help the British use them for administrative purposes as native informants (Anderson, 1983, p. 91). Macaulay’s initial formulation of the Minute in 1828, however, stated that the East India Company would ensure “stability and security to landed property in...British India” by employing “natives of unmixed blood *and half-caste*” [emphasis added] (Stokes, 1959, p. 147). In other words, Anglo-Indians were also to have functioned as privileged informants for the British administration, given their racial affiliation with the British and their familiarity with the English language—a language whose literary production was, to quote Macaulay, “worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia” (as cited in Anderson, 1983, p. 91). After the backlash against Ricketts’ Petition in 1831, Macaulay evidently recast the projected intent of his Minute. Of note in this context is Dover’s observation in *Half-Caste* (1937) about the imperialist declensions marking the English language: the word ‘native’ which Macaulay uses in the Minute is, as per Dover, “not [only] a scientific term but [also] an instrument of action: [it is] an a priori justification for a plan of campaign” against figures of Indo-European provenance (p. 75). Thus, if “German imperialists” used language as a eugenic lens, the changes in Macaulay’s Minute cast English literature—and, by extension, the English language—as prisms wielding a proto-biopolitical power/knowledge. This was a power/knowledge founded on and concurrently facilitating the disownment of intermixed figures, as the invisibility of Anglo-Indians in the final version of the Minute testified. Colonial India thus became a territory on which white British supremacy

was molded through literature and language’s assumption of a stance redolent of eugenics, recalling the linguistic excesses of German Orientalist philology.

Against the backdrop of German and British Aryanisms that I have discussed so far, Dover, as an anti-racism activist of Indo-European provenance, initially maintained a political stance both fascinated by and suspicious of eugenics. To more thoroughly grasp the nuances of this stance, we need to turn to his earliest significant text, *Cimmerii, or Eurasians and Their Future* (1929). *Cimmerii* sees Dover as a somewhat blind votary of eugenics—a position that he attempted to abjure after 1935, as I will discuss later (Slate, 2014, p. 15). What makes *Cimmerii* noteworthy is its use of a eugenically inflected position to arrive at powerfully incisive conclusions that would inform Dover’s entire published oeuvre.

Dover (1929) begins *Cimmerii* by quoting from a 1913 novel, *The Eurasian*, penned by British writer Henry Bruce. In a passage from Bruce’s novel that Dover (1929) quotes, one British Corporal Dekker says of Anglo-Indians—or ‘Eurasians,’ as they were officially called before 1911—that eugenically speaking, “an Yewrasian is...the half part of a nigger; but not the twentieth part of a man” (as cited in *Cimmerii*, 1929, p. 9). If Muller’s 1859 exploration of Aryans copulating with India’s “Negroes” had led him to conclude that the resultant offspring would be ‘degenerate,’ as the instance of the Anglo-Indians had ostensibly proved, it comes as no surprise that an English text should produce Anglo-Indians in similar terms mere decades after the British had officially owned Aryanism.⁵ The passage Dover quotes, also recalls Macaulay’s tacit claim about Anglo-Indians lacking in the “manly spirit” of the unmixed white European (1840, p. 73). Of such acts of representation as Bruce’s, Dover (1929) asks, “Is it fair? Is it right? Three hundred thousand Eurasians [Anglo-Indians] in the British Empire are constantly asking themselves these questions” (p. 10). In other words, depictions such as Bruce’s forced Anglo-Indians into questioning whether they were in fact ‘men,’ given the sociopolitical dehumanization they experienced after their disownment by their white forefathers. Putting such questions to rest, Dover (1929) says that regardless of whether a “Yewrasian” body was indeed “the half part of a nigger,” a (perhaps fictitious) British eugenicist named Lord Oliver had correctly claimed that “so far as there survives in a mixed race the racial body of each of its parents, so far it is a superior human being, or rather...potentially a more

competent vehicle of humanity” (p. 10-11). In short, according to Dover (1929), if the “illegitimate sons of a prostitute by a British officer of the Indian Civil Service” (p. 13), born of the nineteenth-century “system of concubinage,” would bear the slightest bodily traces of both white European father *and* Indian mother, intermixture made his body immune to ‘degeneracy’ rather than susceptible to it.

Against this backdrop of eugenics—and, by extension, Aryanism—Dover (1929) claims that if Sanskrit shows linguistic affinities with Greek, then perhaps the greater number of Indians are descendants “of [Macedonian king] Alexander’s own Asiatic wives and (who can say how many?) mistresses” (p. 14). Referring to Alexander’s invasion of the Indian subcontinent circa 326 BCE, Dover thus proposes that a sizable part of Indians in the present day—“who can say how many?”—can be hypothesized as being the bearers of both ‘Indian’ and ‘European’ blood. To separate the white European colonizer from the colonized Indian subject in order to code some ‘bad’ monolithic ‘Indian’ body against which ‘good’ white bodies can be defined, is therefore an exercise in futility. Hence, says Dover (1929), “barriers of language and [consequent] prejudice” need to be broken down (p. 14). To put Dover’s point succinctly, language—in this case English—as an Orientalist eugenic lens can in fact not help determine the bodily supremacy of British Aryans vis-à-vis their colonized subjects in India: after all, by functioning in a colonial situation, English, instead of remaining watertight, starts bearing colonial declensions until it becomes indigenized through intermixture, as its expanded vocabulary evinces (Dover, 1937, p. 86). In the index to *Half-Caste* where he makes this insightful assertion, Dover (1937) describes the expansion of the English lexicon in a British colony as the “enlargement of [language] through *miscegenation*” [emphasis added] (p. 317). Far from being a lens to produce bodily ‘degeneracy,’ then, the English language, through its own intermixture, prevents itself from ‘degenerating’ into the nothingness of a lost Proto-Indo-European, just as ‘bad’ Anglo-Indian bodies remain immune to ‘degeneracy’ because they are born of miscegenation (Dover, 1929, p. 10-11). English can therefore not express some originalist desire for a ‘pure’ language to prove claims about an unmixed race, given its own indeterminate intermixture with the languages of the ‘lesser’ peoples inhabiting British colonies.

Regardless of the inability of language to bolster eugenics, Dover, in his early work, could not recognize his own folly in perhaps innocently subscribing to race as a category that was apparently marked by some ‘pure’/white-European body. Little wonder that in *Cimmerii*, he drew copiously upon Indian statistician and anthropometrist Prasanta Chandra Mahalanobis’ (1893-1972) 1928 paper “Analysis of Race-Mixture in Bengal” to prove that Anglo-Indians were “a more competent vehicle of humanity” (1929, p. 34), being “superior in stature to other natives of Bengal” so that “there [was] little to choose between them and [white] Europeans” (Dover, 1929, p. 34). This reading of Mahalanobis’ paper bore out Dover’s belief in race as a concept that found its highest expression in white Eurocentric bodies, leading Dover to calculatedly misrepresent Mahalanobis’ findings: “Analysis of Race-Mixture in Bengal” merely indicated in modest terms that Anglo-Indians living in Bengal were more frequently the offspring of Brahman mothers (Mahalanobis, 1927, p. 322).

Interestingly, even in his role as the writer of *Cimmerii*, Dover seemed a figure cleft in twain: the same *Cimmerii* that saw him subscribe to the possibility of a ‘pure’ race, took on a contradictory inflection when Dover claimed in it that the stereotyped Anglo-Indian “illegitimate son” (1929, p. 20), as a “thoroughly degenerate bastard” (Dover, 1939, p. 31), was an “outcast,” and that the “outcast” “exists in all countries” (Dover, 1929, p. 20). The Anglo-Indian “outcast” of *Cimmerii* was, in other words, homophonically the ‘out-caste’ as a universal figure—like all peoples inhabiting the world, the out-caste was not of ‘full caste’ qua ‘pure’ race. This suggestion helped Dover (1939) to later arrive at the anti-eugenic conclusion that “there are no half-castes because there are no full castes” (p. 31).

The evolution of Dover’s thought beyond eugenics began six years after he wrote *Cimmerii*, with the 1935 publication of British evolutionary biologist Julian Huxley (1887-1975) and British anthropologist and ethnologist Alfred Cort Haddon’s (1855-1940) *We Europeans: A Survey of “Racial” Problems* (Slate, 2014, p. 15). Dover’s perusal of Huxley and Haddon’s book made him realize how problematically eugenics via Mendelian genetics contributed to perceptions of racially associated traits as “dominant” vs. “recessive” (Huxley and Haddon, 1935, p. 65) or, to put it differently, ‘supreme’ vs. ‘degenerate.’ Huxley and Haddon’s exposition brought

home to Dover how much the anthropometry he swore by in fact helped consolidate prejudices against intermixed bodies, and how disturbingly seamless the commensuration of ‘greater’ and ‘lesser’ racial types was with the excesses of segregation as practiced at the time in the United States of America (Huxley and Haddon, 1935, p. 70-71). Most significantly, *We Europeans* helped Dover grasp how racial traits as “national types” had reached a dangerous limit that allowed eugenics to forge “the German ideal” of the ‘good’ Aryan body vis-à-vis ‘lesser’ counterparts for the benefit of Nazism (Huxley and Haddon, 1935, p. 26). To distance himself from this last position, Dover (1936) borrowed Huxley and Haddon’s assertion that given *Mein Kampf*’s dangerous ““racial” differentiations...of Jews” based on the “biological concept of physical descent” (Huxley and Haddon, 1935, p. 28), it was necessary to stop categorizing “racial stocks” into separate nationalities (Huxley and Haddon, 1935, p. 27). After all, as Huxley and Haddon (1935) put it,

[if] nationalities are more strictly examined, it will usually be found that there is very little in them that has any close relation to the physical characters by which “race” in the biological sense can be distinguished. It is more probable that, so far as the European populations are concerned, nothing in the nature of “pure race” in the biological sense has any real existence. (p. 27).

Accordingly, if the Dover of *Cimmerii* showed an interest in classifying Anglo-Indians as a ‘race’ (1929, p. 57), by 1937, in *Half-Caste*, he was asserting that Anglo-Indians were, as I have cited before, one of countless “variable populations” inhabiting the earth, “in which innumerable original features remain as heritable units, which may reappear in later generations, or be fortuitously recombined to produce new types” (Dover, 1937, p. 20). Ergo, the “genetic segregation” of the ‘Aryan’ kind in no way ensured that a ‘purebred’ Aryan need not have curly hair like an African American, or that an African American could not have a child who ‘looked’ white (Dover, 1937, p. 20). This rendered race a category in a state of perennial flux. Dover (1937) thus indicated that observable physical characteristics such as whiteness, said to be indicative of a ‘pure’ race, were not commensurate with an individual’s genetic makeup (p. 20-21). Pushing this position in a more radical direction, Dover wrote in *Know This of Race* (1939) that because “all races are mixed races,” “you cannot draw the line where a race begins or ends.” This rendered “all men...mongrels” (p. 17).⁶ Dover’s “mongrel” was a variation on the ‘out-caste’ as a universal figure shorn of the shadow of some ‘pure’ race. There was, in this universalist conception, merely

one point of difference between, among others, Jews and Anglo-Indians qua “newer mongrels,” and their temporally older counterparts such as Muller’s German Aryans and Maine’s British Aryans: the older mongrels had discursively produced the newer ones in “the gilded age of western colonisation” for stigmatization and subjugation (Dover, 1939, p. 31). It was in this “gilded age of western colonisation” that the British Aryans had used the concept of a ‘pure’ race to reduce Anglo-Indians to “thoroughly degenerate bastards, born of blackguardly fathers and whoring mothers” (Dover, 1939, p. 31). Therefore, indicates Dover (1939), the Aryan production of intermixed bodies as ‘fallen’ needed to be questioned as much in the instance of Anglo-Indians as of Jews (p. 31).⁷

With the coming of the Second World War and the German Aryan marginalization and extermination of Jews as ‘lesser’ bodies, Dover took his thought a step further in *Hell in the Sunshine* (1943). In this book, written at the height of the War, Dover (1943) conceptualized all mankind as an ethical totality that he termed “mongrelism” (p. 136)—a totality bound into oneness by the fact that “all races are mixed races” or “mongrels” (1939, p. 17). Mongrelism, indicated Dover (1943), could be viewed as a gesture liberating mankind from the specter of some ‘pure’ race—or, indeed, race as such—because “[t]wo thousand million people create the spectacle and the drama, the unity and diversity, of human life... Three quarters of them are not white [in color]. They are the browns, blacks, yellows and middlings” (p. 11). This fact of indeterminate “middlings” needed to be recognized if Aryan notions of ‘pure’ whiteness were to be opposed. Dover (1943) therefore abjured the notion of race in *Hell in the Sunshine* altogether: he stated that “[r]ace and mongrelism [we]re irreconcilable terms,”⁸ so that “[a]t a time when leading [British] statesmen [in India] [we]re nauseatingly reiterating the inherited virtues of the ‘British race,’” they would do well to remember that there was no ‘pure’ race against which an intermixed group—like the Anglo-Indians—could be deemed lacking (p. 136). Dover’s evident suggestion was that to take a stand against Aryanism in the context of the Second World War, communities across the world would have to recognize each other as consisting of peoples kindred in body—peoples clubbed into homogeneity by their uniformly heterogeneous corporeality.

What demanded mongrelism at the time of war or otherwise, Dover (1943) suggested, was that any production of difference based on racial categories, was ultimately a socioeconomic construct, facilitating the oppression of some for the gain of others: ‘degenerate’ bodies were fictions intended to “make another world within the world—an oppressed world of poverty, pestilence and misery” founded on colonialism, “surging with the impulse to burst its chains” (p. 11). This “oppressed world of poverty” harks back to the East India Company’s political disenfranchisement of Anglo-Indians from 1858—an act that prevented them from attaining employment in the Company’s covenanted civil service (Hawes, 1996, p. 8) by casting them as the “Eurasian problem” (Dover, 1930b, p. 115). This and later racializing acts led the greater number of Anglo-Indians into impoverishment, so that Dover (1937) said of them in *Half-Caste*:

Condemned to an urban life of dependence upon the crumbs that fall from the paternal table, devoid of agricultural or industrial traditions, conditioned in a degrading atmosphere of prejudice...and low cultural opportunity, they [Anglo-Indians] sail a perilous craft in the stormy seas of modern India. Indeed, many sail no more. For...a third of employable [Anglo-Indians]...are unemployed, thousands more are in acute distress, and the majority barely subsist above what would be called in Europe ‘the poverty line.’ (p. 141)

To extricate themselves from this situation and include themselves in the coming transnational community of mongrels, Anglo-Indians, said Dover (1947), needed a linguistic means for the expression of their selfhood (p. 213). After all, though they could speak the English language against a British Aryan grain, the fact remained that Anglo-Indians had not been “born to the English tongue,” as Dover stated in his 1947 essay “Notes on Coloured Writing,” written mere days before or after the formal decolonization of India (p. 213). This problem inherent to English mattered for Anglo-Indians because “a language is more than a means of expression and communication. In its development a way of interpretation is fostered that largely limits the things we see to the words with which we see them” (Dover, 1947, p. 213). Dover (1937) substantiated his point with an instance in *Half-Caste*: “Western colonisation [having given] so derogatory a meaning to the once-cherished word ‘native’,” it could never be used with its pre-colonial valences again (p. 74). In other words, the same intermixture of English that prevented its ‘degeneracy’ and eventual loss, added layers of meaning to it that prevented its appropriation sans self-alienation by Anglo-Indians (Dover, 1947, p. 213).

In the final reckoning, Anglo-Indians living in India, wrote Dover (1947) in “Notes on Coloured Writing,” were “not part of the scene which produced the [English] language, and the language [wa]s not part of the scene in which they have their being” (p. 214). Hence, unsurprisingly, “[t]he Eurasian [Anglo-Indian] contribution to Anglo-Indian [English] verse is...mostly poor stuff: cheaply imitative, florally romantic and sycophantic” in its failed attempt to indigenize a language that its writers felt estranged from (Dover, 1947, p. 215). This sense of alienation was enhanced by the likes of Bruce’s novel and its imperialist ilk’s use of the English language to reduce Anglo-Indians to a “problem” in metropole and colony alike (Dover, 1930a, 145). But when Anglo-Indian literary production in English arose from a sense of “social injustice” to combat its way against British Aryans into a sense of selfhood, “it equal[ed] its masters in technique and excel[led] them in feeling” (Dover, 1947, p. 215). If Anglo-Indians were to participate in an emergent mongrelism, says Dover (1947), they would have to start on this transnational trajectory by mastering the language of their Aryan forefathers to write back to them at a local level (p. 215). With this start, mongrelism could eventually take the proto-cosmopolitan shape of a pan-Eurasianist movement that Dover envisioned. This would be a movement in which Anglo-Indians would participate with other ‘newer mongrels’ produced and colonized by the West in Asia (Charlton-Stevens, 2018, p. 193). Eventually, hoped Dover, these colonized peoples would together form a single Eurasian nation, as Uther Charlton-Stevens (2018) points out (p. 193). The pan-Eurasian nation Dover envisaged would be predicated on the fact that Anglo-Indians had much in common, in terms of their bodies and the racializing ideologies enmeshing them, with Eurasians in other Asian colonies (Charlton-Stevens, 2018, p. 193).⁹

WE CAN NEVER BE POST-RACIAL: DEFERRING THE ABJURATION OF RACE

Part of Dover (1943) understood that his pan-Eurasianism was merely an ideal envisioned to justify a hoped-for cultivation of the colonizing British Aryan self as a mongrel,¹⁰ and that giving a pan-Eurasian nation material shape was effectively impossible (p. 136), as his critics were quick to point out (Glicksberg, 1951, p. 16).¹¹ However, Dover (1947) also contradictorily felt that were the Anglo-Indian act of locally writing back followed through to its intended emancipatory telos of a transnational mongrelism, “[a] great future...await[ed] the coloured writer” and his

readers at the telos (p. 224). The writer born of intermixture would have to be at the helm of this movement: after all, he alone sensed through the double consciousness determining his fraught relationship with English literature and the English language, that his place was “in the vanguard of the struggle to free coloured peoples” into a political firmament beyond repressive discourses of power/knowledge (Dover, 1947, p. 224). Dover began his role as part of this vanguard with the publication of *Cimmerii*, holding the “White World” of the British Aryans in India accountable for the “Eurasian problem:”

[y]ou have brought this great mixed race [of Anglo-Indians] into being. Yet you have treated it with indifference, usually with contempt, often with cruelty...You did this because you were afraid, afraid that your own progeny would usurp your supremacy...You can be sympathetic, encouraging, and just. You can take an active interest in [the Anglo-Indians’] uphill climb; you can give them a hand when they stumble by the way. But all this you can never do until you realise, as the true thinkers of the world, even your world, have realised, that there is no more evil thing than race prejudice. (Dover, 1929, p. 74-75)

Dover’s eloquent words against race prejudice, for all their power, had an incommensurable antinomy built into the figure of the Anglo-Indian writer on two counts, with “Notes on Coloured Writing” making this antinomy more pointed and poignant. I have stated before that the English language was an apparatus of power/knowledge that facilitated the disownment of mixed figures. It was this phantasm of power/knowledge from which the writer born of intermixture—Dover’s “colored writer”—would attempt to free his readers. Nevertheless, the phantasm would perennially haunt the Anglo-Indian Caliban’s mastering of English in his efforts to curse an Aryan Prospero: he would remain alienated from the language even after producing inspired literary texts that arose from a sense of “social injustice.” After all, as a colonized subject, he would be perpetually tormented by the belief that his *mastery* of English did not instate him as the *master* of English: he might “equal [the] masters in technique and excel them in feeling” (Dover, 1947, p. 215), but this success would be founded on an indigenization of English—an indigenization that a non-master alone needed to perform. Hence English’s ability to “limit the things [the Anglo-Indian] sees to the words with which [he] sees them” (Dover, 1947, p. 213). The Anglo-Indian writer would thus face the negating shadow of the British Aryan anew every time he tried to assert his authorial selfhood. Be he at the vanguard of the struggle to free coloured peoples, he would not be rid of the self-alienation that

the act of writing in English inflicted upon him. This held good even if he was monolingual because he was “born to the English tongue.”

The impasse that the Anglo-Indian writer found himself in saw the re-turn of the specter of the Aryanism in more ways than one: despite the professed irreconcilability of race and mongrelism, the figure of the “coloured writer” resuscitated race, contradicting Dover’s abnegation of the category in *Hell in the Sunshine* (Dover, 1943, p. 136). An insight from Trinidadian writer C. L. R. James might help clarify my point: if whiteness be the marker of some ‘pure’ race, James (1963) argues that the fundamental discursive unit shoring up race prejudice among a white populace is the chromatic distinction between a white man and a man of color (p. 34). This distinction keeps the colonized subject in a consensual state of subjection by associating inferiority and degradation with the distinguishing marks of color (James, 1963, p. 39)—the marks of “browns, blacks, yellows and middlings.” In this way, with color reifying racialization, whiteness pries open the Pandora’s Box of race to transcendentalize itself into supremacy a second time, reducing Dover’s conclusion about all bodies being uniformly intermixed to yet another deferred ideal. The body of Dover’s colored writer accordingly finds itself determined by lack, estranged from itself even before it can set pen to paper to grapple with the demons of Aryanism plaguing the language its hand scripts. With the Anglo-Indian writer’s attempts to write back frozen, a pan-Eurasianist movement seems far-removed from his vision, receding into the horizon the more he tries to envisage its possibilities. “Notes on Coloured Writing” thus sees Dover confessing his failure to abnegate race and conceptualize the engendering of a mongrelist movement, contrary to the telos he had set himself.

Despite Dover’s failure, the reinstatement of race was, I would argue, necessary for the redress of certain wrongs. Racial atrocities, based on physical or epistemic violence, can often be understood solely at local levels; the erasing of the mark of racial difference in favor of claims for a transnational uniformity may render a nuanced understanding of these atrocities incomprehensible. If Marcus Garvey, George Padmore, and C. L. R. James’ envisioned Pan-Africanist movement attained materiality in the present day, it would, in all probability, fail to capture the finer local points of the Black Lives Matter movement (James, 1963, p. 396-98), just as an All

Lives Matter hashtag, by erasing racial difference, makes it impossible to subtly perceive the atrocities that many African Americans in the United States face (Lopez, 2016). Similarly, if an Anglo-Indian writer were to seek restitution for the post-1857 disownment of Anglo-Indians and their reduction to impoverishment, he could produce a refined argument only if he grasped how the Eurasian Question was related to the production of race as a category in India.

In no way, though, should the reader be left with the perception that the antinomy in “Notes on Colored Writing” diminishes the power of Dover’s call to recognize that “all races are mixed races.” Aryanism, transcendentalizing an oxymoronic ‘unmixed’ whiteness, morphs and resurfaces across space and time in unexpected ways, needing to be problematized accordingly. This rings true even today as we witness the rise of a neo-Nazism in the United States of America under the singular presidential regime of Donald Trump. Self-professed neo-Nazis such as Milo Yiannopoulos, Richard Spencer, and Andrew Anglin use Trump’s political rhetoric as “the engine that fuels white supremacy,” helping them further their racist agendas (Lusher, 2018). Anglo-Indians having, as Dover points out, been shaped through their ‘condemnation’ by German and British Aryans, the Anglo-Indian writer occupies a peculiarly privileged critical vantage point from which to write against chimerical visions of ‘purebred’ Aryans. Whether this act of writing paves the way for mongrelist futurities or not, it certainly testifies to the importance of the treasure trove of texts that Dover left behind. Evidently, the world could do worse than to brush aside Dover’s thoughts on intermixture at this crucial political juncture on which, to lesser or greater extents, the fate of the world hinges.

Dr. Debojoy Chanda is a Visiting Assistant Professor of Communication at the Indian Institute of Management, Sirmour. He submitted his doctoral dissertation, “Racializing White Residues: Seditious Anglo-Indians and Others,” in 2018 at the English Department of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He has published in *South Asian Review* and on the University of Illinois’ *Modern American Poetry Site*. His areas of interest include colonial and postcolonial Indian Anglophone and Bangla literatures, critical race theory, gender and women’s studies, and the digital humanities. He is also interested in Hindustani and Western classical music. He can be contacted at debojoy@gmail.com.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Deb Stauffer and Gail Trent of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign for selflessly furnishing me with scans of Cedric Dover’s books from the University library.

¹ Figures officially recognized to be of Indo-European provenance in nineteenth-century India—born in or out of wedlock—were termed ‘Eurasians’ or ‘East Indians’ (Mallampalli, 2011, p. 7). At that point of time, the British in India referred to themselves as ‘Anglo-Indians.’ Through the second half of the nineteenth century, Eurasians demanded to be legally identified as ‘Anglo-Indian’ in an effort to reclaim their European racial affiliations (Mizutani, 2011, p. 204). It was only in 1911 that the Census of India extended the term ‘Anglo-Indian’ to Eurasians, with the official recognition of this change coming about as late as 1935 (Anthony, 1969, p. 5).

² I try, as far as possible, to use the term “intermixed” rather than “racially intermixed” all through the article because race as a category, by my understanding, problematically transcendentalizes whiteness. This is, indeed, the very argument that Dover attempts to articulate in his post-1935 oeuvre by preferring to abnegate the category—which he, much like I, cannot always do (1943, p. 136).

The ethical aptness of Dover’s post-1935 position proved itself in the backlash it faced from the likes of American academic and literary critic, Charles I. Glicksberg (1900-1998). Dover’s call to rise above race, according to Glicksberg (1951), perversely instantiated a reverse racism in which Dover, as an Anglo-Indian writer, invested as if race were “something special” (p. 16). Through his reverse racism, asserted Glicksberg (1951), Dover manifested a cultural insularity, unlike the “white” intellectual who did not view color or race as components cut out for “segregation,” thus “betray[ing] a healthier attitude.” This expansive attitude ostensibly evidenced itself in the average white intellectual’s attempts to “reach out to a study of Chinese, Russian, Japanese, Greek, Roman, Indian, and other “alien” literatures” (p. 16-17). The white writer was thus the supreme intellectual, shunning the parochiality of writers of color like Dover. Glicksberg’s accusation of reverse racism against Dover thus bolstered discourses of white supremacy amongst a transnational intelligentsia by unwittingly or otherwise recuperating the category of race. The irony, judging by Dover’s strain of thought, is that if discourses of Aryan supremacy delineated both Anglo-Indians and Jews as not white enough, Glicksberg, as a Jew, was essentially disabled from laying claim to the supposedly unquestionable superiority of the ‘white’ intellectual (Dover, 1939, p. 31). Indeed, part of Dover’s later and more radical thought takes this point a step further, arguing that no one can claim the racial appellation ‘white’ because everyone is born of indeterminate intermixture between “white[s],...browns, blacks, yellows and middlings” (Dover, 1943, p. 11).

³ I focus in this article solely on Anglo-Indians born of Indo-European unions and not on poor whites who, juridically speaking, also counted as Anglo-Indian in colonial India (“The East-Indians,” 1831, p. 14-16). My decision is largely determined by the overall character of Dover’s output, more invested as it is in matters of race and not class.

⁴ I am reminded in this context of an interesting passage from Frank Anthony’s 1969 historiography of Anglo-Indians, *Britain’s Betrayal in India: The Story of the Anglo-Indian Community*. The passage runs,

The greatest exponents of spurious doctrines of race superiority...were obviously polygenetics. I have always been intrigued by photographs of both Hitler and [Rudyard] Kipling: the former was the antithesis of the so-called Nordic type: Hitler’s pogroms were probably motivated by a subconscious guilt complex of possessing an admixture of Jewish blood. Both in features and pigmentation, Kipling suggested ethnic admixtures with a tan not accounted for merely by the Indian sun. (Anthony, 1969, p. 371)

⁵ Dover had been criticized for indicating that Bruce’s novel was apparently representative of English literary depictions of Anglo-Indians. However, according to Anglo-Indian writer Kenneth Wallace’s 1930 critique of the “Eurasian problem,” the passage from Bruce’s novel that Dover quoted in *Cimmerii* “puts the attitude of most European writers towards Eurasians [Anglo-Indians] in a nutshell, though they [other European writers] may express their opinions more euphemistically” (1930, p. 8). To substantiate the European attitude he speaks of, Wallace (1930) quotes another passage from Bruce’s novel (p. 8). In the passage, one British character tells another that an Anglo-Indian is a “mixture” (as cited in Wallace, 1930 p. 8). He placidly states that this would not have been a problem if the mixture had been “good.” However, the fact remained that the Anglo-Indian was “a tarnation bad mixture” (as cited in Wallace, 1930, p. 8). Redolent of the Aryan differentiation between unmixed bodies as ‘good’ and mixed bodies as ‘bad,’ the passage recalls Nazism’s “Nordic Utopia” that Dover (1943) writes against in *Hell in the Sunshine* (p. 12).

⁶ Dover (1943) borrowed the term “mongrel” in this sense from Julian Huxley’s brother Aldous’ (1894-1963) essay “The Olive Tree” (1936), published a year after *We Europeans* (p. 136). Against the backdrop of language as a eugenic prism in an Aryan worldview, it is no coincidence that Dover uses “mongrel” to denote the indeterminate intermixture defining all bodies: Aldous Huxley (1936), in “The Olive Tree,” uses the term to delineate the infinite linguistic intermixture that defines English.

⁷ Dover was not alone in viewing Anglo-Indians as being haunted by the shadows of Aryanism and eugenics. Twentieth-century Anglo-Indian writer Millicent Wilson took the same view in a book on the future of Anglo-Indians that she published in Bangalore in 1928, a year before the publication of *Cimmerii*. However, contrary to Dover’s theorization of indeterminately intermixed bodies, Wilson, manifesting a blind faith in eugenics, propagated the belief that white genes dominated in the bodies of Anglo-Indians (Charlton-Stevens, 2018, p. 194-95). In keeping with this belief, Wilson wrote that “there is a general tendency for the coloured element in the population to work back to its original white” (as cited in Charlton-Stevens, 2018, p. 194-95). In other words, Anglo-Indians would eventually have ‘unmixed’ blood and would therefore assume unadulteratedly white bodies (Charlton-Stevens, 2018, p. 195).

⁸ Recall my point in endnote 2 that race as a category transcendentalizes whiteness.

⁹ The category ‘Eurasian’ was not limited in its application to pre-1911 Anglo-Indians—it was also used for mixed peoples in other colonies that had been forged by Dover’s ‘older mongrels,’ including the Dutch East Indies and French Vietnam (Charlton-Stevens, 2018, p. 193; Stoler, 1991, p. 10; Stoler, 1995, p. 52).

¹⁰ To bring home the ethical necessity for the cultivation of the colonizing self along these lines, Dover (1943) quotes the following passage from Aldous Huxley’s “The Olive Tree” (1936) in *Hell in the Sunshine*: “We are essentially mongrels: that is the whole point of us. To be mongrels is our mission. If we would fulfil this mission adequately we must take pains to cultivate our mongrelism” (as cited in p. 136). Dover (1943) says of this passage that “Mr. Huxley was writing of his own countrymen,” telling them that they, like Eurasians in all Asian colonies, were defined by indefinite mixture and not an unadulterated ‘whiteness’ (p. 136).

¹¹ Indeed, the inconsistency of a transnationalism desiring the material form of a single nation is inescapable.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Benedict. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anthony, Frank. (1969). *Britain’s Betrayal in India: The Story of the Anglo-Indian Community*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers.
- Ballhatchet, Kenneth. (1980). *Race, Sex and Class under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and Policies and their Critics, 1793-1905*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Callanan, Laura. (2006). *Deciphering Race: White Anxiety, Racial Conflict, and the Turn to Fiction in Mid-Victorian Prose*. Ohio: The Ohio State University.
- Charlton-Stevens, Uther. (2018). *Anglo-Indians and Minority Politics in South Asia: Race, Boundary Making, and Communal Nationalism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chew, Dolores. (2018). Khicchries, Kedgerees and Bespoke Methodologies—Problematizing and Coherence in Anglo-Indian Studies. Keynote speech presented at the Second International Conference on Anglo-Indian Studies, Chennai, India.
- Dover, Cedric. (1929). *Cimmerii or Eurasians and Their Future*. Calcutta: Modern Arts Press.
- Dover, Cedric. (1937). *Half-Caste*. London: Martin Secker and Warburg Ltd.
- Dover, Cedric. (1943). *Hell in the Sunshine*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Dover, Cedric. (1939). *Know This of Race*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Dover, Cedric. (1947). Notes on Coloured Writing. *Phylon* (1940-1956), 8(3), 213-224.

- Dover, Cedric. (1930a). 'Foreign' Elements in the Community. In *The Eurasian Problem Constructively Approached by Kenneth Wallace* (pp. 143-155). Calcutta and Simla: Thacker, Spink & Co.
- Dover, Cedric. (1930b). The Need for a Comparative Statistical Survey of the Community. In *The Eurasian Problem Constructively Approached by Kenneth Wallace* (pp. 115-127). Calcutta and Simla: Thacker, Spink & Co.
- D'Cruz, Glenn. (2006). *Midnight's Orphans: Anglo-Indians in Post/colonial Literature*. Peter Lang Publishing Group: Bern et al.
- The East-Indians. (1831). *The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British and Foreign India, China, and Australia*, Vol. 5, 14-15.
- Figueira, Dorothy M. (2002). *Aryans, Jews, Brahmins: Theorizing Authority through Myths of Identity*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Glicksberg, Charles I. (1951). Eurasian Racialism. *Phylon* (1940-1956), 12(1), 13-19.
- Hawes, Christopher. (1996). *Poor Relations: The Making of a Eurasian Community in British India, 1773-1833*. New York: Routledge.
- Hitler, Adolf. (1925). *Mein Kampf*. Retrieved from <http://www.ou.edu/englhale/meinkampf.html>
- Huxley, Aldous. (1936). "The Olive Tree." *Collected Essays*. Retrieved from https://www.e-reading.club/chapter.php/72425/8/Huxley_-_Collected_Essays.html
- Huxley, Julian S., Haddon, A. C. (1935). *We Europeans: A Survey of "Racial" Problems*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
- James, C. L. R. (1963). *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Lopez, German (2016). Why you should stop saying "all lives matter," explained in 9 different ways. Vox. Retrieved from <https://www.vox.com/2016/7/11/12136140/black-all-lives-matter>
- Lusher, Adam (2018). Neo-Nazis say Donald Trump's 'sh**hole countries' comments show he thinks like them. Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/donald-trump-shithole-countries-neo-nazis-white-supremacists-celebrate-more-or-less-same-page-racist-a8157796.html>

- Pollock, Sheldon. (1993). Deep Orientalism? Notes on Sanskrit and Power Beyond the Raj. In Carol Appadurai Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer (Eds.), *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia* (pp. 76-133).
- Mahalanobis, P. C. (1927). Analysis of Race-Mixture in Bengal. *Journal and Proceedings: Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. 23* (pp. 301-32).
- Mizutani, Satoshi. (2011). *The Meaning of White: Race, Class, and the “Domiciled Community” in British India, 1858-1930*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Muller, Max. (1859). *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature So Far as It Illustrates the Primitive Religion of the Brahmans*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Sinha, Mrinalini. (1995). *Colonial Masculinity: The ‘Manly’ Englishman and the ‘Effeminate Bengali’ in the Late Nineteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Slate, Nico. (2014) *The Prism of Race: W. E. B. DuBois, Langston Hughes, Paul Robeson, and the Coloured World of Cedric Dover*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stokes, Eric. (1959). *The English Utilitarians and India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. (1995). *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault’s History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. (1991). *Sexual Affronts and Racial Frontiers: National Identity, ‘Mixed Bloods’ and the Cultural Genealogy of Europeans in Colonial Southeast Asia*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Sugirtharajah, Sharada. (2003). *Imagining Hinduism: A Postcolonial Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Tilt, Edward John. (1875). *Health in India for British Women, and on the Prevention of Disease in Tropical Climates*. London: J. & A. Churchill.
- Trautmann, Thomas R. (1997). *Aryans and British India*. California: University of California Press.
- Wallace, Kenneth E. (1930). *The Eurasian Problem Constructively Approached by Kenneth Wallace*. Calcutta and Simla: Thacker, Spink and Co.

Wright, Patrick. (2010) *Passport to Peking: A Very British Mission to Mao's China*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press.