

Society for Comparative Studies in Society and History

Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule

Author(s): Ann Laura Stoler

Source: *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (Jan., 1989), pp. 134-161

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/178797>

Accessed: 17-06-2016 20:37 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press, *Society for Comparative Studies in Society and History* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Comparative Studies in Society and History*

Rethinking Colonial Categories: European Communities and the Boundaries of Rule

ANN LAURA STOLER

University of Wisconsin, Madison

In 1945, Bronislaw Malinowski urged anthropology to abandon what he called its “one-column entries” on African societies and to study instead the “no-man’s land of change,” to attend to the “aggressive and conquering” European communities as well as native ones, and to be aware that “European interests and intentions” were rarely unified but more often “at war” (1945:14–15). Four decades later, few of us have heeded his prompting or really examined his claim.¹

The anthropology of colonialism has been a prolific yet selective project, challenging some of the boundaries of the discipline but remaining surprisingly respectful of others. As part of the more general political enterprise in the early 1970s, we re-examined how colonial politics affected both the theory and method of ethnography and the histories of our subjects.² Influenced by the work of Andre Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein, we investigated how the structural constraints of colonial capitalism not only shaped indigenous changes in community and class, but by turns destroyed, preserved, and froze traditional relations of power and production, and as frequently reinvented

This study was originally prepared for the American Ethnological Society Annual Meetings, Symposium on the Categories of Colonialism, May 1 1987, San Antonio, Texas. Research funds were provided by the Graduate School of the University of Wisconsin. I thank Talal Asad, Frederic Cooper, Murray Edelman, Linda Gordon, Lawrence Hirschfeld, Gerda Lerner, and Nancy Lutkehaus, and Aram Yengoyan for their thoughtful readings and useful criticisms of an earlier text. Steve Stern and Steve Feierman helped me ground comparative issues. I also wish to thank members of my graduate seminar on colonial cultures for allowing me to think out and clarify in that context many of the issues presented here.

¹ Malinowski was certainly not alone in noting the conflicts of interest and distinctions among Europeans. On the contrary, Margaret Mead, for example, commented on the social tensions among officials, missionaries, and various planters and was acutely sensitive to the appropriate dress codes when encountering different sorts of whites in the colonies (1977:62–63); also see Powdermaker 1966:102–7). For the most part, however, such observations were anecdotal or personal asides and not considered relevant to the subject of ethnography. Malinowski’s student, Hortense Powdermaker, is one of the few American anthropologists who, in her work in both Northern Rhodesia and Mississippi, attended specifically (if somewhat briefly, as she notes) to Europeans and white society, respectively (Powdermaker 1966:183–98, 272–79).

² See, for example, Kathleen Gough (1968) and the important contributions in Dell Hymes (1969); Talal Asad (1975); *Anthropological Forum* (1977); and Gerald Berreman (1981).

0010-4175/89/1696-1144 \$5.00 © 1989 Society for Comparative Study of Society and History

and conjured them up (Asad 1975b; Foster-Carter 1978; Scott 1976; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983).

Initially this work looked to the impact of colonialism on various domains of indigenous agrarian structure, household economy, kinship organization, and community life (Steward 1956; Wolf 1959; Geertz 1968; Mintz 1974; Etienne and Leacock 1980). A second wave, turning away from the determinism that some of that approach applied, sought to identify the active agency of colonized populations as they engaged and resisted colonial impositions, thereby transforming the terms of that encounter. The contours of these communities and the cultural practice of their inhabitants (exemplified in the preservation of “little traditions,” “reconstituted peasantries,” and “moral economies”) have appeared double-edged—explainable neither solely by their functional utility to colonialism nor by their defiance of it, but as the product of an historically layered colonial encounter. (Rosaldo 1980; Wasserstrom 1980; Taussig 1980; Stoler 1985a; Comaroff 1985; Roseberry 1986).

In attending to both global processes and local practices, the units of analysis have also shifted to the extra village, regional, national, and global ties that bind seemingly discrete peasant populations to the world economy (Nash 1981; Vincent 1982; Roseberry 1983), and to a rejection of the notion that categories such as nation, tribe, and culture are, as Eric Wolf puts it, “internally homogenous and externally distinctive and bounded objects” (1982:6). Curiously, in spite of this innovation, the objects of our study, if not the units of our analysis, have remained much the same. Where we have attended to world market forces and examined European images of the Other, we have done so better to explain the impact of perceptions and policy on people, on a particular subject community, on our ethnographic subject—the colonized (Alatas 1977; Asad 1975b; Clammer 1975; Sahlins 1981; Sider 1987). And even where we have probed the nature of colonial discourse and the politics of its language, the texts are often assumed to express a shared European mentality, the sentiments of a unified, conquering elite (Alatas 1977; Todorov 1985).

With few exceptions, even when we have attended to concrete capitalist relations of production and exchange, we have taken colonialism and its European agents as an abstract force, as a *structure* imposed on local *practice*. The terms *colonial state*, *colonial policy*, *foreign capital*, and *the white enclave* are often used interchangeably, as if they captured one and the same thing. While such a treatment encourages certain lines of novel enquiry, it closes off others. The makers of metropole policy become conflated with its local practitioners. Company executives and their clerks appear as a seamless community of class and colonial interests whose internal discrepancies are seen as relatively inconsequential, whose divisions are blurred.³ In South

³ French students of colonial history, confronted with colonial territories in which *pièdes noirs*

Africa, and in white settler communities more generally, where conflicts between imperial design and local European interests are overt, such glosses are less frequent, but these communities are rarely the objects of our ethnographies.⁴

More sensitized to the class, ethnic, and gender distinctions among the colonized, anthropologists have taken the politically constructed dichotomy of colonizer and colonized as a given, rather than as an historically shifting pair of social categories that needs to be explained. Certainly this is not to suggest that anthropologists have not attended to the ambiguity and manipulation of racial classification (Harris 1963, 1964, 1970; Mintz 1971; Dominguez 1986). But this interest has rarely been coupled with a focus on European communities, or the powerful cultural idioms of domination in which they invest (see, for example, Tanner 1964).⁵ As a result, colonizers and their communities are frequently treated as diverse but unproblematic, viewed as unified in a fashion that would disturb our ethnographic sensibilities if applied to ruling elites of the colonized. Finally, the assumption that colonial political agendas are self-evident precludes our examination of the cultural politics of the communities in which colonizers lived.

Colonial cultures were never direct translations of European society planted in the colonies, but unique cultural configurations, homespun creations in which European food, dress, housing, and morality were given new political

(French born in the colonies) and *petits blancs* (lower-class whites) were a sizable political force, have tended to examine these divisions more thoroughly (Delavignette 1946; Nora 1961; Mercier, 1965). Few French anthropologists have taken the lead suggested by George Balandier in 1951: to explore the internal structure of European communities and the construction of racial categories (1965:47–9, 53). Other anthropological efforts to examine specific agents of colonialism (and sometimes the tensions among them) are found, for example, in Thomas Beidelman (1982), Bernard Cohn (1983), Jean and John Comaroff (1985, 1986), Sidney Mintz (1985), Robert Gordon and Mervyn Meggitt (1985), and Jan Breman (1987).

⁴ Vincent Crapanzano's study of whites in South Africa is a notable exception (1985).

⁵ Historians have been far more attentive to these issues, although nuanced studies of colonial Europeans are generally a genre distinct from those that deal with the social classifications of race and class. For example, a profusion of "community studies" of the British in India attend to the social rankings of colonial life, but not to the internal political tensions among the British themselves (see, e.g., Dodwell 1926; Kincaid 1971; Spear 1963; Edwards 1969). The numerous accounts of British and French interaction with the colonized and their philosophies of rule analyze the political priorities informing colonial policy, but rarely treat the everyday practice of colonial domination (for French imperialism, see Murphy 1968; Cohen 1980; and on the British in Africa, see Gann and Duignan 1978). Efforts to go beyond the official debates and examine the distinct class interests within the colonial state include studies by Frederic Cooper (1980) and by John Lonsdale and Bruce Berman (1979). Since this article was written, several new works have appeared that provide rich case studies of European communities in colonial Africa, elaborating many of the themes addressed here (Callaway 1987; Kennedy 1987; Prochaska, n.d.).

Literature on the social construction of race in Latin America provides some insights into differentiation among European colonials (Degler 1971; Martinez-Alier 1974; Chance and Taylor 1977; Seed 1982), but focuses primarily on intermediary racial categories. Historical work on South African apartheid and Afrikaner nationalism raises the most salient and unresolved questions concerning class interests, racist discourse and political affiliations among Europeans (O'Meara 1983; Thompson 1985; Marks and Trapido 1986).

meanings in the particular social order of colonial rule.⁶ Formal dress codes, sumptuary laws, and military display did more than reiterate middle-class European visions and values. They were reactive to class tensions in the metropole, and created what Benedict Anderson calls a “tropical gothic,” a “middle-class aristocracy” that cultivated the colonials’ differences from the colonized, while maintaining social distinctions among themselves (1983:137). The point is that colonial projects and the European populations to which they gave rise were based on new constructions of European-ness; they were artificial groupings—demographically, occupationally, and politically distinct. Not only white settlers but the more transient European residents in the colonies were occupied with social and political concerns that often pitted them against policy makers in the metropole as much as against the colonized (Emmanuel 1972:89; Hughes 1987).⁷ Colonizers themselves, however, were neither by nature unified nor did they inevitably share common interests and fears; their boundaries—always marked by whom those in power considered legitimate progeny and whom they did not—were never clear. On the contrary, I argue that colonizers live in what has elsewhere been called “imagined communities” (Anderson 1983:15—ones that are consciously created and fashioned to overcome the economic and social disparities that would in other contexts separate and often set their members in conflict.

Racism is the classic foil invoked to mitigate such divisions and is thus a critical feature in the casting of colonial cultures, so much so that it is often seen as a virtually built-in and natural product of that encounter, essential to the social construction of an otherwise illegitimate and privileged access to property and power (Memmi 1973; Sartre 1976; Takaki 1983). But this view accords poorly with the fact that the *quality* and *intensity* of racism vary enormously in different colonial contexts and at different historical moments in any particular colonial encounter. In colonial situations as diverse as India, New Guinea, the Netherlands Indies, Cuba, Mexico, and South Africa, increasing knowledge, contact, and familiarity lead not to a diminution of racial discrimination but to an intensification of it over time, and to a rigidifying of boundaries. Understanding those sharpened racial pressures has entailed, among other things, identifying heightened forms of anticolonial resistance and increased demands by those given limited access to certain privileges but categorically denied others.

But colonial racism is more than an aspect of how people classify each other, how they fix and naturalize the differences between We and They. It is

⁶ I owe the term *homespun* to Scott Christensen, a participant in my seminar on colonial cultures. See also Malinowski’s observation that the white settler “community is by no means a direct replica of its mother community at home” (1966:14).

⁷ See, for example, B.J. Moore-Gilbert’s (1986) excellent study, based on literary sources, of the conflicts and distinct social visions that divided British resident in India (Anglo-Indians) from British in the metropole.

also, less clearly perhaps, part of how people identify the affinities that they share and how they define themselves in contexts where discrepant interests, ethnic differences, and class might otherwise weaken consensus (Lévi-Strauss 1983). In other words, it provides a way of creating the sense of (colonial) community and context that allows for colonial authority and for a particular set of relations of production and power. What I suggest here is that racist ideology, fear of the Other, preoccupation with white prestige, and obsession with protecting European women from sexual assault by Asian and black males were not simply justifications for continued European rule and white supremacy. They were part of a critical class-based logic, statements not only about indigenous subversives, but directives aimed at dissenting European underlings in the colonies—and part of the apparatus that kept potentially subversive white colonials in line.

This is not to say that in the absence of white ruling-class manipulations, subordinate white colonials would necessarily have joined social forces and become politically allied with the colonized; nor is it to suggest that these subordinates were unwitting practitioners of racist policy.⁸ Rather, it is to argue that these internal divisions augmented the intensity of racist practice, affected the terrains of contest, and intervened significantly in shaping social policies toward those rules. It is significant that racist rationales permeated the political strategies of *both* the corporate elite and their less-privileged European class opposition. In this article I draw on the case of a European community in North Sumatra in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and use it to set out some of the issues that I think the anthropology of colonialism has not sufficiently addressed—how competing colonial agendas, based on distinct class and gender interests, shaped the politics of race and tensions of rule. In what follows I outline some of the social differences and antagonisms that divided the Deli community of East Sumatra and describe the material provisions and cultural conventions that were invoked to secure its unity. Within this context, the sexual and domestic arrangements of European staff were central issues, not private matters, but political and economic affairs that acted to sharpen or mute the categories of ruler and ruled. In the Sumatran case below, the rights to marry and form families were a focal point of indigenous and European labor protest and of the strategies of corporate control.

Within the ranks of the European communities, I examine two disparate

⁸ There is, however, strong evidence that such forms of cooperation between European employees and indigenous workers did exist and were actively opposed by some colonial states and foreign companies. For example, during the rise of the Javanese labor movement in the 1920s, multiracial trade unions were promoted that, in the case of railway workers, included lower-level Europeans and Indonesian workers (Ingelson 1981:55). In South Africa, where working-class whites and blacks socialized at home and at work, urban planning in Johannesburg was designed precisely to eradicate “inter-racial ‘slum-yards’” and “increase the growing social distance between white and black miners” (van Onselen 1982:39).

social groups closely linked to the European self-image of privilege and rule. First was the category of poor or impoverished whites. The efforts displayed to prevent their emergence in the colony, forbid their entry, and expedite their repatriation reveal a wider set of colonial concerns and policies. The second category, white women, represented a threat of a different order. The overwhelming uniformity with which white women were barred from early colonial enterprises, and the heightened racism that usually accompanied their entry is cited for a wide range of colonial situations. As we shall see, attitudes toward poor whites and white women were intimately tied: Both were categories that defined and threatened the boundaries of European (white male) prestige and control. The reasons these categories had such political saliency will be clearer if we look first at some of the more general divisions and commonalities that characterized the community of colonizers on Sumatra's East Coast.

THE MAKING OF COLONIAL COMMUNITY IN DELI

The case of Sumatra's plantation belt—or Deli, as it was known during the first half of the twentieth century—is particularly interesting on several counts. Deli was, first of all, pioneered on a scale unparalleled elsewhere in the Indies. Opened by the Dutch in the late nineteenth century, it rapidly emerged as one of the most lucrative investment sites in Southeast Asia. Covering a fertile lowland plain of some thirty thousand square kilometers, the plantation belt (*cultuurgebied*) included nearly one million hectares of jungle and swiddens converted within several decades into tobacco, rubber, tea, and oil-palm estates leased to foreign companies. Unlike the case in Java, where sugar and tobacco were interposed between rice fields, in North Sumatra, estate holdings were laid out with contiguous borders, the complexes ranging anywhere from one thousand to several thousand hectares.

Distant and largely autonomous from the Dutch colonial heartland in Java, the foreign community of the plantation belt developed a specific character during its late nineteenth-century expansion: a multinational European membership (rather than a predominantly Dutch one as on Java), an extensive system of concubinage well into the twentieth century, a high level of labor violence, and what has been described as the most marked degree of social discrimination in the Netherlands Indies (Bagley 1973:44). This emphasis on rigid social markings and strict class lines has been attributed in part to Deli's proximity to the more socially rigid British Straits colonies and to the large number of British planters in East Sumatra (Bagley 1973; Marinus 1929). Deli was frequently contrasted with the more lax, and less discriminatory, largely Dutch-colonial culture in Java, whose members were said to have mixed more willingly and adapted more easily to local custom.

But British influence aside, there were other features of plantation expansion in Sumatra that rendered Deli and the Deliaan (the Deli planter) unique.

Unlike Java, where Dutch hegemony was established in the seventeenth century, most of the Sumatran plantation belt came under the political and economic control of the Dutch only in the 1870s. It did so at a time when the colonial state administration had neither sufficient funds nor personnel to carry out the task. Thus pacification of East Sumatra was made an international affair with investors from France, Belgium, Germany, Britain, and the United States at the forefront of the plantation effort. These early Deli planters were able to initiate and maintain a level of autonomy from state control over labor conditions and labor relations well into the twentieth century (Stoler 1985a). Given license to procure land and labor under an open-door policy, they were also granted the right to protect those assets as they saw fit through, among other things, an indentured-labor system endorsed and formalized by the Dutch colonial state. Dependent more on Europe and the Straits settlements than on the Indies administration in Java for personnel and financial support, the early Deli planters were in sustained conflict with the colonial administration, demanding its protection while protesting its interference in labor affairs (Martinus 1929). But because the planters could claim prior and privileged knowledge of Deli's conditions, they easily circumvented or simply ignored the directives of the younger and less experienced government agents who were on relatively short-term assignments in this Indies outpost.⁹

What stands out in memoirs, the contemporary press, period novels, and government archives is the disjuncture between a dominant rhetoric of unity and a subjacent concern with the reality of sharp social and political division among the Europeans themselves. The proffered image of a rough and rugged cohort of men transforming the primeval forest into a civilized and profitable plantation belt captured the imagination not only of Deli's European population, but of colonials elsewhere in the Indies and in Southeast Asia. The notions that Deli was an "entirely different idea" (Nieuwenhuys 1978:346–47) and that the Deliaan was a unique type appealed to a pioneering Protestant ethic in which success resulted from perseverance and hard work. Descriptions of this planter prototype emphasize and concur on several distinct features: diverse social background, uncompromising courage, and a disregard for class origin (Szekely 1979: 37; Brandt 1948:186).¹⁰

While descriptions of such pioneering personalities are commonplace in many colonial situations, our interest here is how this image played on the Deliaans themselves, contributing to a sense that privilege and profit were

⁹ See Ann Stoler (1985b) for a detailed discussion of how conflicts between local planters and the Dutch Indies administration affected labor policy, and in turn how responses to labor resistance changed from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century.

¹⁰ Witness the number of novels, sketches, and memoirs describing the attributes of the "Deli planter" (e.g., Gorter, *Delianen* (1941), Kleian, *Deli-planter* (1936), Brandt, *De Aarde van Deli* (1948), Manders, *Boedjang-Club* (1933), Petersen, *Tropical Adventure* (1948), Székely, *Tropic Fever* (1979); no counterpart exists for Java.

based on issues of *character*, not race or class.¹¹ But “character” itself was not derived directly from abstract and universal values, but was essentially constructed out of a cultural consensus on Europeaness, rooted in a bearing and material standard of living to which all whites had to subscribe and from which Asians were barred.¹²

Most accounts of Deli describe an early estate administration staffed with a motley assortment of inexperienced personnel drawn from the scions of failed business families, runaways from ill-fated love affairs, defunct aristocrats, and adventurers seeking to make their fortunes. This portrait was deeply romanticized, focusing more on the relatively few social marginals and fugitives than on the majority of lower-middle-class and middle-class men for whom the Indies offered the hope of financial improvement (Clerkx 1961:10–12; Nieuwenhuys 1982:154). While the early boom years of tobacco growing may have allowed some to strike it rich, a much larger number of planters-cum-speculators went bankrupt when the international market failed. Some with good reputations became administrators for the larger companies that bought them out (Breman 1987:63–7). For the most part, however, the dream of *haute-bourgeois* retirement was something realized by few Europeans employed on the estates. In the initial years when staff were trained on the spot, new recruits had some opportunity to work themselves up to high administrative positions. This became increasingly rare, however, as multinational companies took over the plantation belt after the turn of the century, and as greater technical and administrative skills were needed to fill higher-echelon posts. In reality, the Deli planters were for the most part not gentlemen planters at all but bureaucrats, office workers, specialists, and field foremen in a rapidly expanding corporate hierarchy.

The distinctions among Europeans were most commonly couched in terms of the differences between *singkeh* (greenhorns) and old hands, between the

¹¹ The relative importance of “character” vs. “class” in determining colonial status is something that apparently varied in different colonial contexts. References to character pervade the colonial literature but with often contradictory formulations. In New Guinea, “class distinctions disappeared and recognition of character took over” (Boutillier 1984:179), whereas in the administrative service of the Ivory Coast in the 1920s, character was a class-privilege defined by an Oxbridge arrogance if not education (Kuklick 1979:26). Whereas character and not class origin allegedly marked the making of a Deli planter in the early twentieth century, in India at the same time “class distinctions within the British community became more sharply defined” (Woodcock 1969:163). These differences may reflect historical variation or merely distinct rhetorical uses of the notion of “character.” In any case, it is clear both that character served as a replacement for class as a social marker, and that it was defined by privileges which were, by in large, race- and class-specific. Cf. Robert Hughes (1987:323), who states that in the colonization of Australia “the question of class was all pervasive and pathological.”

On the significance of an accepted standard of living in shaping the contour of a European colonial community (in this case the British in Malaya), see John Butcher (1979).

¹² Thus, Henrika Kuklick notes that an Oxbridge education was required “not so much to receive occupational training as to acquire the social polish considered intrinsic to a commanding personality” (1979:26).

assistenten (European field staff) and senior management, giving the latter legitimate claim to an authority and income based on earned seniority.¹³ Implicit within this emphasis on age-related status was the principle that one could and would move naturally up the corporate ranks. But the evidence suggests that economic mobility was limited, and for dissenting personnel virtually impossible (*De Planter*, 1 April 1909:19; Said 1976:51–52; cf. Breman 1987:65–6). The social and economic distance that divided estate directors, administrators, and higher personnel from those at the bottom was further accentuated in Deli by the virtual absence of Indo-Europeans, who on Java, in contrast, constituted much of the low-level office and field staff. Deli's planter elite prided itself on the maintenance of strict racial distinction, many companies even refusing to employ Indo-Europeans as clerks (Marinus 1929:47).

Despite a public façade to the contrary, discontent within the lower ranks of the estate hierarchy was evident early in Deli's history. By 1909 it had become formalized in a union of European plantation employees (Vak-vereëning voor Assistenten in Deli, or VvAiD), the formation of which government officials in Batavia, plantation owners in Sumatra, and directors in Europe commonly viewed as *chantage* (*Kroniek* 1917:39). Starting off with only two hundred members in 1909, the union grew to several thousand within ten years, reaching out from its primarily Dutch-speaking membership. Setting itself up in direct opposition to the powerful rubber- and tobacco-planters' associations and the press that represented those interests, the union founded an independent but widely read newspaper wherein members aired grievances, criticized government policies, and offered their own interpretations of labor legislation and the causes of labor violence in the plantation belt. While government reports and the planters' press attributed increased coolie assaults to the poor quality of European recruits, the employees' union was concerned with the strains that an indentured-labor system placed on labor relations in general. Where the planters' press blamed labor violence on inappropriate mishandling of coolies by assistants, the latter pointed to excessive production quotas and the pressure placed on assistants to meet them. Where company executives advocated a change in recruitment practices and requirements used to select low-level staff, subordinate whites demanded improved living conditions, job security, and pensions for those already employed (*De Planter*, 1 April 1909, 1 September 1909).

The union publication, ironically entitled *De Planter* although union members were by definition not planters at all, not only fought against policies which affected employees' private lives, but lent support to various indigenous protests, railway strikes, and nationalist organizations (Said 1976:51).

¹³ The transformation of a greenhorn into a seasoned planter is a central theme in a number of the memoirs and novels cited in note 10.

Formed at a time when the nationalist movement was making its presence felt throughout the Indies and locally among Deli's Javanese estate workers, the Assistants' Union was able to force concessions during this period that would later have been impossible. For example, the 1917 Assistants' Ruling established by the government bureau accorded European field supervisors some protection from "coolie assaults," more job security, and directly addressed the assistants' concern with their dependence on the personal whims of their employers. (Algemene Rijksarchief, Afdeeling II, Verbaal, 19 January, 1921, #71). Plantation executives vehemently protested, arguing that it gave Deli a bad name and tainted its image as a united front.

THE MARRIAGE RESTRICTION IN DELI

We can get a sense of the sorts of issues that arose and the sorts of solutions that were sought by looking at one policy which was contested for nearly fifteen years, namely, the marriage prohibition on all incoming European plantation employees. In the late nineteenth century, the major tobacco companies neither accepted married applicants nor allowed them to take wives while in service.¹⁴ Corporate authorities argued repeatedly that new European employees with families in tow would be unable to support them in a proper manner, risking the emergence of a "European proletariat in Deli" (*Kroneik* 1917:50; *Sumatra Post* 1913). Eventually the antimarriage sanction was relaxed to a stipulation that an assistant could marry only after his first five years of service and then only if he had attained some demonstrable solvency. Concubinary arrangements with Javanese women, in contrast, were considered preferable because they posed little financial burden to low-salaried staff, and had the advantage of allowing newcomers to acquire native language quickly and learn native customs. European marriages, on the other hand, threatened to take up too much time and too much salary. By refusing to employ married men, the estate industry virtually legislated a broad system of interracial concubinage into existence.

That system was not without its problems, however. Given the ratio of fewer than one Javanese woman for every ten Javanese and Chinese men, intense competition for sexual and domestic partners among the indigenous workers, and between them and their European supervisors, resulted in *vrouwen perkara* (disputes over women), barracks brawls, and assaults on white staff. In British Malaya during the same period, the advantages and disadvantages of setting up households with native women as opposed to importing European women were actively weighed. While the use of pros-

¹⁴ This policy was by no means specific to Deli; it was simply enforced to a much later date there than elsewhere in the Indies. The migration of European women to the Dutch East Indies was actively discouraged from the seventeenth to mid-nineteenth centuries, and until the late 1800s European marriages in the army were basically restricted to the officer corps (Taylor 1983:26; Ming 1983).

titutes and the proliferation of Indo-European children were viewed as a blight on the community, these alternatives were considered less distressing than the impoverishment of white men, which could result from attempts to maintain a middle-class life style with European wives (Butcher 1979:93). In both instances, colonial morality was relative: Interracial sexual activity was more easily tolerated than destitution. As Butcher notes, for Malaysia there was a “particular anathema with which the British regarded ‘poor whites’” (1979:26).

Nonetheless, the presence of white women was seen as exerting a civilizing, cultured, and restraining check on the rowdy, crude, and hard-drinking life style for which Deli’s European staff were infamous. Jacob Nienhuis, one of the pioneer planters, argued that marriages to European women would create more sociability (*gezelligheid*), provide better returns on labor, and encourage more applicants—this last because *het moederhart* (a mothers’ heart) in Europe would suffer less *angst* at permitting her child to depart for a place where “refined” society reigned (*De Planter*, 1 May 1909).¹⁵

Throughout the first ten years of *De Planter’s* publication, the assistants openly and vigorously protested the marriage restriction and the infringement on their civil rights that it represented. In fact, the marriage issue was a strategic focus for a wider set of demands. If estate directors feared that European marriages would impoverish their assistants, the assistants could then argue that improved wages, bonuses, job security, and pensions would ward off such an eventuality. Whether European men actually preferred European over Asian women is a moot point. Employing a language that appealed to the fears of the colonial elite, the assistants argued for a better standard of living, security from assault, and thus the protection of white prestige.

In 1920, after nearly a decade of steady protest, the marriage restriction was rescinded by the major companies, and large numbers of white women arrived in the East Coast Residency. Although the companies held that the change was now possible because Deli was sufficiently prosperous and the industry sufficiently secure to support European families in a proper manner, it is clear that this concession came at a crucial moment—when labor relations among Europeans had reached a new stage of tension, threatening European unity on the Deli estates. *De Planter’s* editor-in-chief, C. E. W. Krediet, having expressed open sympathy for indigenous strike actions and labor demands, was ousted from his post in 1920 and repatriated to Holland. Krediet was replaced by J. van den Brand, who in 1903 had written a scathing critique of Deli’s indentured-labor system (leading to the establishment of a labor inspectorate to monitor working conditions on the Deli estates). But he, too, was relieved of his post by the governor general in less than a year and died a few months later (Said 1976:51–52).

¹⁵ See also Roger Nieuwenhuys (1982:144) on the importance of maintaining a moral colonial society to assuage the fears of mothers in the Netherlands.

Corporate response to staff dissent, both indigenous and European, was strikingly similar. The recruitment of single male coolies from Java and a bachelor staff from Europe was replaced by a policy that encouraged married couples and promoted conditions that would allow for “family formation” by both European management and the Javanese rank and file. These parallel policies sharpened the divisions and accentuated racial distinctions more than ever. Thus, European recruits during the 1920s were upgraded with higher bonuses, better housing, more fringe benefits—an added share in the profits and thus a stronger stake in the companies’ cause.¹⁶ For Javanese estate workers, single-family dwellings replaced barracks, and labor colonies included small subsistence plots that would allow for the semblance of village life and the reproduction of a local labor reserve.¹⁷ In turn, the explanations of violence shifted their focus from the poor quality of low-level staff to the spread of dangerous communist and nationalist elements among the Javanese and Chinese recruits.

As indigenous resistance to Dutch rule heightened, the divisions within the European enclave were muted by additional reforms. European staff were thus advised to avoid confrontation by maintaining increased physical and social distance from their workers. For example, pre-dawn roll calls, often the site of assaults on Europeans, had already been abolished (*Kroniek* 1917:36). Throughout the 1920s increasing emphasis was placed on a mediated chain of command: Managers and their white staff were instructed to relay their orders through Javanese and Chinese foremen and through specific *tussenpersonen* (go-betweens) delegated to the task, such that no European would have to risk the consequences of reprimanding a worker face to face. Low-level Europeans increasingly sought security in protection by the companies rather than in resistance to them.

Accompanying these changes in the material conditions of the lower management, the supposed commonalities of the European colonial experience in Deli were actively reinforced and affirmed. Although differences in income, housing, and social standing still set the lower echelon of the estate hierarchy off from those at top, the myth of a Deliaan prototype highlighted their common interests. The evocation and re-enactment of Deli’s opening was celebrated in commemorative volumes issued by the various planters’ associations and large companies every five, ten, and twenty-five years. These capsule corporate and personal histories produced a continual affirmation of economic success and heroic achievement. The East Coast of Sumatra In-

¹⁶ J.H. Marinus, for example, in describing the fact that distinctions between assistants and administrators were more striking thirty years earlier writes: “The historical facts that the assistant might not ride in a four-wheeled carriage, nor wear a grey helmet, as did the administrator are long forgotten and something about which most of the young assistants today know nothing” (1929:12, 112).

¹⁷ For a detailed discussion of the shift in corporate strategy to “family formation,” or “*gezinvorming*”, see Stoler (1985a:31–46).

stitute annually chronicled the expansion of the cultural infrastructure (tennis courts, theater troupes, social clubs, hill stations, and charities), assuring itself as well as its metropole investors that the European enclave was stable and strong.

The official discourse of colonial rule was laden with military metaphor, bolstered by uniforms, roll calls, and forms of deference and address that seem designed as much to deter any break in the ranks as to impress the native population. A particularly strong iconographic expression of this created common history was the 1925 plan to build “a tomb of the unknown planter” in remembrance of those Europeans who had died by coolie assault or otherwise in the service of the industry (*Kroniek* 1925:72). The idea that any European murdered (regardless of cause) was a hero emphasized the common enemy and shared threat. And homogenizing the past effectively blurred the vivid distinctions in the working conditions and experiences of the European community. As significant, it reiterated and enforced the differences that divided Asian workers from Europeans; it was after all in opposition to the archetypal plantation coolie that this unknown planter/soldier had pitted himself and died.

CUSTODIANS OF MORALITY: FEMALE HONOR AND WHITE PRESTIGE

From the outset, Deli’s colonial community was defined in terms of cultural criteria that set it off from the colonized. Housing, dress codes, transport, food, clubs, conversation, recreation, and leaves marked a distinct social space in which Europeans were internally stratified but from which Asians were circumstantially and/or formally barred. However, when the colonial industry saw its position threatened, new measures were usually sought to identify its members, their affinities and common interests, along racial lines.

It is frequently argued that social and political differentiation of the colonized and colonizer intensified following the entry of European women. Some accounts claim that the increasing number of women in colonial settlements resulted in increased racism not only because of the native desire they excited and the chivalrous protection they therefore required, but because women were more avid racists in their own right. Thus Percival Spear, writing on the social life of the English in eighteenth-century India, asserts that women “widened the racial gulf” by holding to “their insular whims and prejudices” (1963:140). Similarly, the Indian intellectual Ashis Nandy argues that “white women in India were generally more racist [than their men] because they unconsciously saw themselves as the sexual competitors of Indian men” (1983:9–10).¹⁸ Thomas Beidelman for colonial Tanganyika writes that “Eu-

¹⁸ Also see Woodcock George (1969:163), who argues that with the arrival of Englishwomen “racial distinctions . . . became more sharply defined,” and Hank Nelson (1982:47), who asserts that new racial barriers were created when *kiaps* (patrol officers) were accompanied by European wives.

ropean wives and children created a new and less flexible domestic colonialism exhibiting overconcern with the sexual accessibility or vulnerability of wives, with corresponding notions about the need for spatial and social segregation (1982:13). L. H. Gann and Peter Duignan baldly state that “it was the cheap steamship ticket for women that put an end to racial integration” in British Africa (1978:242; also see O’Brien 1972:59). In short, sources in which colonial women receive little or no mention accord to these otherwise marginal actors the primary responsibility for racial segregation.¹⁹

What stands out in many accounts is the fact that the arrival of women usually occurred in conjunction with some immediately prior or planned stabilization of colonial rule. The term *stabilization* is ambiguous; it may express either a securing of empire or a response to imperial vulnerability. In India, after the Sepoy Mutiny in 1857, the colonial community was stabilized and further segregated from indigeneous contacts (Arnold 1983:154). In New Guinea, large numbers of white women arrived in the 1920s when the colonial order was considered stable although nonetheless under attack by an increasing number of “acculturated” Papuans making their discontent with colonial policy more rigorously felt (Inglis 1975:11). The white women’s protection ordinance of 1926 rigidified racial divisions, but, more important, it represented a culmination of political tensions and was advocated not by women but by men (Inglis 1975:vii).

Thus the presence of European women did not inadvertently produce stronger racial divisions: rather, it was in some cases intended precisely to enforce the separation between Asians and whites. Colonial elite concern for the entry of white women was related, as James Boutillier argues, to “the real or imagined threat to superiority and status that miscegenation implied” (1984:196). The arrival (and protection) of women was part of a wider response to problems of colonial control which often antedated the objections raised by European women to miscegenation. It was not sexual relations between European men and Asian women per se that were condemned, but this form of domestic arrangement and the social tensions to which it gave rise. The concubines and their Eurasian progeny came to be seen as a danger to the European community at large.²⁰

¹⁹ More convincing accounts suggest rather that expatriate women were not only symbols of white male power but that they “served to define men in relationship to one another” (Elaine Silverman, quoted in Boutillier 1984:196; Inglis 1975; Barr 1976). Boutillier argues further that the racist inclinations these women imported from Europe were not of their making, but derived from prejudices previously brought to the metropole by colonial men (Boutillier 1984).

²⁰ Company and government authorities were concerned with interracial sexual contact but primarily as it related to prostitution. In the Netherlands Indies, for example, venereal disease had become endemic among subordinate white men. In 1930 it was estimated that more than 47,000 European men, mostly soldiers, were hospitalized with syphilis (De Braconier 1933:923). New restrictions imposed on army barrack-concubinage apparently led to increased use of prostitutes and increased incidence of venereal disease. Concubinage and prostitution thus created different

White women arrived in large numbers in Deli in the 1920s, during the most profitable years of plantation economy, but also at a time of mounting resistance to estate labor conditions in particular and to colonial rule generally.²¹ Their presence excused sharper racial divisions, but, more important, it also justified policies already in motion to tighten the European community, and to control those European men who blurred the naturalized categories of ruler and ruled. Entering this context, European women as the caretakers of male physical well-being and guardians of morality found their activities and the social space in which they could operate rigidly controlled (*De Planter*, 9 April 1910:52; Groupe d'études coloniales 1910:7).

Novels from Deli in the 1920s—the most famous a set written by the Dutch wife of a Hungarian estate manager—describe bored, inactive, and desperately lonely women, trapped on the estates and in the confines of their homes (Szekely-Lulofs 1932, 1946). The books by women, however, also provide important insight into the highly stratified pecking order of European males—and their siege mentality vis-à-vis native labor. Unlike the male novelists of this period, who emphasize white comradeship (despite the difficult, but temporary adjustments to becoming colonial managers), female authors highlight sustained social tensions deriving from relations of work, pressures for promotion, conflicts over sexual affairs, and hierarchies of class and race in the home.²²

Whether or not white women exacerbated racial tensions, they certainly did not create them, as is sometimes implied.²³ On the other hand, we should not dismiss the fact that colonial women were committed to racial segregation for their own reasons and in their own right. In a context in which women's roles were severely limited and defined even more narrowly through their men than in Europe, it is not surprising that in the domain of sexual and domestic affairs these white women should have demanded exclusive rights and some modicum of control.

The coming of white women was part of a more general realignment of labor relations in the cultural politics of labor control. Such methods of stabilization invariably added new arenas of vulnerability, creating more

sorts of problems: While the latter was seen as a major source of European pauperism (by creating a large class of underprivileged barrack-children), prostitution was condemned as a medical problem and social evil (Ming 1983:74).

²¹ The number of European women in the Dutch East Indies rose from 18.7 to 40.6 percent of the total European population between 1905 and 1915 (Nieuwenhuys 1982:166).

²² Compare, for example, the fiction of Madelon Székely-Lulofs (1932) with that of her husband Ladislao Székely (1979). Also see Jo Manders (1933), whose account of planter excesses in *De Boedjang-club* (*The Stag Club*) won her much disfavor from those who deemed her portrait damaging to "colonial prestige at home and abroad" (Nieuwenhuys 1982:173). On the hierarchy within African colonial communities and the constraints it imposed on European women's lives, see Yvonne Knibiehler and Regine Goutalier (1985:133–136).

²³ Also see Lucas (1986) and Kuklick (1979).

points of possible infringement, more places that could not be invaded, new demands for deference, thus legitimizing the coercive measures needed for control. On the other hand, as white women were made custodians of a distinct cultural and moral community, the protection of their honor became an issue with which all European men could agree and affirm their unity rather than their differences. In such a context, sexuality was politicized and charged. As in the post-Reconstruction American South, where white men lynched blacks in the name of chivalry (Dowd Hall 1984), any attempted or perceived infringement of white female honor came to be seen as an assault on white supremacy and European rule (Barr 1976:170; Ballhatchet 1980:7). For example, in 1929, at a time when murders of European staff by indigenous workers occurred nearly every year, the killing of the wife of a European assistant by a Javanese coolie was politicized in unprecedented fashion. The event was tied to “communist agitation,” and explicitly interpreted as a threat to Dutch authority in the Indies at large (*Kroniek* 1929:43–48).²⁴ As a direct consequence, army troops were reinforced in Deli, intelligence operations on the estates were expanded, and the fascist-linked *Vaderlandsche Club* increased its constituency, receiving added support for its repressive conservative political agenda in the following years.

THE STRUCTURING OF EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES AND THE PROBLEM OF POOR WHITES

What strikes us at first blush as artificial in the European colonial settlements is the inappropriate dress, food, and other markers of European culture that Anthony Burgess and George Orwell caricatured in their novels: the jungle planter sweating through a five-course dinner in formal attire. These cultural artifices were less important than the fact that these communities were constructed to sustain a particular structure and form. They were demographically and therefore socially skewed in several respects, the most obvious resulting from the absence of European women and children from the early colonial settlements and the enclosed social space that was delimited for them once they came.

Children were thought to be particularly susceptible to the dangers of tropical lethargy and disease, deemed a threat to all Europeans in the tropics (Price 1939:6–8; Spencer and Thomas 1948:637). By extension, they were also considered vulnerable to social contamination as they played with the children of native servants and easily not only acquired the local language but deftly mimicked non-European gestures and social custom. While native nursemaids often reared the small children of European families, older chil-

²⁴ For a more detailed account of this event and the political issues that surrounded it, see Stoler (1985a:82–86) and also Stoler (1985b), which contrasts this 1929 reaction to the murder of an estate manager’s wife sixty years earlier.

dren were invariably sent back to boarding schools in Europe, packed off to schools and vacation colonies in temperate hill-stations or, as in nineteenth-century Hawaii, confined with their mothers to walled courtyards in the latter's charge (Arnold 1983:141; Grimshaw 1983:508; *Kroniek* 1923:78). Deli, like other colonial communities, often lacked a representation of young people in their impressionable years, namely, older children and adolescents (Mercier 1965:287).

Among the men, there were also profound omissions. When possible, the European colonial elite restricted the presence of nonproductive men and of those individuals generally who might undermine the image of a healthy, empowered, and "vigorous" race (Groupe d'Etudes Coloniales 1910:10). In Deli, the infirm, the aged, and the insane were quickly sent home. Insurgents were repatriated and the impoverished were zealously sheltered and supported until they, too, could be shipped out of the colony. In nineteenth-century India, the colonial state made every effort to institutionalize "unseemly" whites (in orphanages, workhouses, lunatic asylums, and old-age homes) for much of their lives, discreetly keeping them invisible from both Indians and Europeans alike (Arnold 1979:113). Similarly, while various plans were devised in India and in the Netherlands Indies to establish agricultural settlements for poor Scottish and young Dutch farmers, successful opposition stressed the "loss of racial prestige and authority which . . . an 'influx' of poor whites would bring" (Arnold 1983:139). In Sumatra, efforts to settle young Dutch farmers in the Batak highlands during the Great Depression were actively opposed by the local colonial elite as a "chimera" that would lead to "wretched [European] pauperism" (*Kroniek* 1933:181).

The potential and actual presence of impoverished and "unfit" whites informed social policies in many colonial contexts. British, Dutch, and French colonial capitalists and state policy makers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries designed pay scales, housing, medical facilities, marriage restrictions, and labor contracts such that the colonial venture remained a middle-class phenomenon. Some semblance of the middle-class ethic was made possible by the fact that wages were extremely low for native house servants and others who might provide services to European employees. Still, the amenities of a bourgeois existence were not within the reach of many Europeans who occupied the lowest-level supervisory posts. While in some colonies, and in many parts of the Netherlands Indies, these positions were reserved for Indo-Europeans, on the Deli estates, as noted earlier, Indos were barred from low-level jobs in administrative service.

The presence of poor whites in the colonies was far more widespread than most colonial histories lead us to imagine. In nineteenth-century India "nearly half the European population could be called poor whites;" nearly 6,000 of them were placed in workhouses by 1900 (Arnold 1979:104,122). In the Netherlands Indies, European pauperism was already a concern of the Dutch

East Indies Company in the mid-eighteenth-century. By the early 1900s, a profusion of government reports had identified tens of thousands of Eurasians (“Indos”) and “full-blooded” Europeans, as dangerously improvised (Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indie 1919:366–8). On Barbados, in the mid-nineteenth century, poor whites (called “red legs”) made up more than three quarters of the European population (Sheppard 1977:43; Beckles 1986:7). In French colonial communities in Northern Africa, a vast population of “petits blancs,” (a perjorative term for lower class Europeans) included many poor whites of non-French European origin, whose political interests diverged from both the French colonial elite and from the skilled black Africans with whom they were in competition for jobs (Mercier 1965:292–3; O’Brien 1972:66–91; Leconte 1980:71–83).

South Africa’s poor-white population, conservatively estimated at 300,000 in the 1920s, was admittedly of a different order, but may serve as an instructive comparison (Albertyn 1932:vii). In a comprehensive investigation carried out during 1929–30, the Carnegie Commission attended specifically to the effects of increasing numbers of European paupers on the internal labor market, and on white prestige and rule. The commission concluded that wider class distinctions among Europeans were giving rise to more mixing between poor whites and “colored” groups: blacks were no longer calling poor white farmers “boss” but by their familiar Christian names, and poor whites and “colored” were eating and drinking together, in short, displaying “no consciousness of the need for a segregation policy” (Albertyn 1932:33–38). While South Africa is certainly at the extreme of enforced separation, it is not an exception. British India and the Netherlands Indies were able to maintain less formalized apartheids because in these colonies the profusion of “unfit whites,” the creation of settler communities, and, most important, the composition of the resident colonial population could all be controlled. The dangerous or destitute, unlike the case in South Africa, could simply be sent home. Although India and Sumatra experienced a poor-white problem of a different magnitude from that in South Africa, the desire to contain it was motivated by similar priorities.

As early as 1891 a relief fund for “needy Europeans” was established in Deli to support bankrupt planters and their staff who were casualties of the crisis triggered by the halving of tobacco prices on the world market (*Kroniek* 1917:51). At the end of World War I the issue of white pauperism again loomed large. With the supply of goods from Europe severely diminished and the prices precipitously increased, many companies were forced to grant a temporary cost-of-living allowance to their lower-salaried European personnel. Despite such efforts, “scores of Europeans without work and without means of support were at large and roaming around the administrative center of Medan” (*Kroniek* 1917:49). Living on credit from Japanese hotels or on the hospitality of the native population, their inappropriate bearing and dimin-

ished standard of living were vigorously criticized as a direct threat to colonial prestige. Programs were devised to provide funds for the European poor, but the amounts were insufficient to support the number who fell below the *acceptable* European standard of living. During the malaise of 1921, relief funds were again collected to support the increasing number of European paupers (*armlostingen*) and vagrants (*landloopers*) until they could be sent home (*Kroniek* 1922:50). Some, nonetheless, ended up in native villages when they had exhausted the largess of their European friends (Clerkx 1961:13).

The white pauperism of the 1930s, however, like the Depression itself, was of crisis proportions (Kantoor van Arberd 1935:1–94). For the first time, repatriation was not an option as the metropole economies staggered in straits as serious as those in the colonies. The projected cost of re-engaging personnel from Europe when the crisis should be passed was considered exorbitant, and many of these Europeans in fact had nowhere to go. In 1931, of the 240,000 Europeans in the Indies, 2,400 were unemployed (*Kroniek* 1930:22). Other accounts estimated more than 5,500 unemployed Europeans in 1932 of which 3,238 were listed as “in straitened circumstances” (Furnivall 1944:444). In Deli, the situation was worse. Of nearly 1,700 Europeans employed on the estates, one half were dismissed within the first few years of the Depression; more than 400 of them were low-level staff (*Kroniek* 1931:79).

The threat posed by large numbers of European paupers gave rise to a profusion of relief agencies and community efforts to feed, board, and maintain the unemployed at some semblance of a European standard. European hotel owners housed the unemployed for nominal rent, and hill-stations were converted into centers where courses were made available in modern languages and bookkeeping (*Kroniek* 1932:82). Children of the unemployed received free schooling and free lunches. The Salvation Army boarded scores of families in abandoned hill-station villas and the Support Committee for European “Crisis-Victims,” as they were called, provided funds to more than a thousand European adults and children. Remedies that were used in the United States and Europe to deal with the crisis—the “make-a-job” and “odd-job” campaigns to keep the working classes occupied at typically menial tasks, scavenging work, and public-utilities maintenance—were considered unsuitable for a middle-class colonial elite (Piven and Cloward 1971:49–60). Nevertheless, some of the unemployed tried to help themselves, setting up spontaneous colonies on forestry reserves for small-scale agriculture and husbandry, but this was confined to a very small number (*Kroniek* 1932:82). Impoverished Indo-Europeans fell between the cracks of both the indigenous support system and those of the Europeans. It is ironic that those who attempted to sustain themselves on subsistence farming were barred from doing so “owing to the traditional policy of excluding from agriculture all who ranked as Europeans” (Furnivall 1944:444).

The handling of the world-wide crisis as it affected Deli served to accentu-

ate certain local social distinctions and political alliances while downplaying others. First, and most important, it wiped out the dissident voice of subordinate whites in the estate hierarchy. In 1931 the assistants' union (VvAiD) was merged with the *Sumatra Cultuur Bond* that represented the companies' interests (*Kroniek* 1931:80). Two years later, the 1917 Assistants' Ruling was abolished and absorbed into a Planters' Ruling that encompassed lower- and higher-level staff alike. Both moves severely undermined whatever was left of an independent politics for low-level staff. Affirming what planters called the "community of interest" in which all Europeans shared, company directors argued that "economic class struggle" was not in the interests of the unemployed assistants, the owners of industry, or the colonial state (*Kroniek* 1933:85). Second, the Depression produced a wave of reaction against the increasing number of non-Dutch Europeans employed as staff on the estates, and their recruitment was curtailed. Third, it created a more solid alliance between the plantation elite and the colonial administration. As the economy recovered in the mid 1930s, a more rationalized estate industry, devoid of indigenous "dangerous elements" and having an air of "military discipline," resumed full-scale operation (De Waard 1934:272). Unemployment, however, did not disappear with the crisis. In 1935 nearly 20,000 Europeans who could no longer be classed as crisis-victims remained out of work in the Netherlands Indies (*Kroniek* 1935:94–6).

EXCLUSION AND ENCLOSURE OF COLONIAL CATEGORIES

The discussion above points to a major problem with accounts that speak of *the* British in Malaya or *the* Dutch in the East Indies. It forces our attention to internal differences peculiar to each of these European colonial communities and to their idiosyncratic membership requirements. Something as apparently basic as who could legally be deemed a European differed across the colonial context, revealing discrepant and *changing* criteria by which racial superiority and attendant European privilege were assigned. For example, in the Netherlands Indies during the early twentieth century, the legal category of "European" paralleled only loosely the idea of ethnic European origin. Included within it were Japanese, Jews, Arabs, Armenians, Filipinos, naturalized Javanese, the Sundanese wives of Dutch-born bureaucrats, the recognized children of mixed marriages, and Christian Africans, among others (van Marle 1952:108). To acquire European legal equivalence (*gelijkgestelde*) in 1884, one had to (1) be Christian, (2) speak and write Dutch, (3) have a European upbringing and education, and (4) demonstrate a suitability for European society—criteria that forty years earlier were far less specified (Van Marle 1952:98,109). Or one could acquire European status simply in virtue of marriage to or adoption by a European.

The distinctions which set the colonized apart from colonizer are further complicated when we look at the movement of "Europeans" from one colo-

nial context to another. In British-ruled Malaya in the 1930s, for instance, those designating themselves European outnumbered those who were considered part of the colonizing community proper. The sons and daughters of mixed marriages in Indochina and the Netherlands Indies—persons often regarded as part of the native population in their home countries—listed themselves as French, Dutch, or Portuguese when resident outside the colonies from which they came (Butcher 1979:25). Such shifting and arbitrary definitions should make us wary of taking “Europeans” and “colonizers” as synonymous categories.²⁵

What is striking when we look to identify the contours and composition of any particular colonial community is the extent to which control over sexuality and reproduction were at the core of defining colonial privilege and its boundaries. Whether incoming European colonials married, lived, or bedded with native women, early colonial communities commonly produced a quotidian world in which the dominant cultural influence in the household was native (Taylor 1983:16). The fact that prohibitions against interracial marriage were commonly late rather than early colonial inventions (in such diverse contexts as Mexico, Cuba, India, Indonesia, and the American South) suggests that it was not interracial sexual contact that was seen as dangerous, but its public legitimization in marriage. Similarly, it was not the progeny of such unions who were problematic but the possibility that they might be recognized as heirs to a European inheritance. The point is obvious: Colonial control and profits were secured by constantly readjusting the parameters of the colonial elite to delimit those who had access to property and privilege and those who did not.

Given such disparate origins and circumstances, it is clear that not all who were classed as European were colonial practitioners or colonialism’s local agents; thousands were drawn from the middle ranks of the colonized and were neither “cultural brokers” nor natural “intermediaries.” The populations that fell within what I would call these contradictory colonial locations were subject to a frequently shifting set of criteria that allowed them privilege at certain historical moments and pointedly excluded them at others. The point here is not to deny the indisputable fact that sharp distinctions divided

²⁵ The alternating fluidity and rigidity with which these divisions were drawn is illustrated in June Nash’s work on interracial marriage in sixteenth-century Mexico. Mixed marriages between Spanish men and Christianized Indian women were condoned by the colonial state until “the rising numbers of . . . mestizo progeny threatened the preogatives of a narrowing elite sector” (Nash 1980:141). By redefining the colonial categories to exclude mestizos from tribute rights and thus restrict their control over Indian labor (*ibid*:140–41), this segment of the population was forcibly marked off from the privileges that their parentage in other colonial contexts might have allowed. Also see Virginia Dominguez (1986) for an excellent historical analysis of social classification and its changing legal specification in creole Louisiana. For a comparative, and more extensive treatment, of the relationship of European sexual prohibitions to racial boundaries and the politics of colonial control, see Stoler (n.d.).

those who were ruled and those who did the ruling, but to highlight the fact that these divisions were not as easily (or permanently) drawn as one might imagine.

While Beidelman's contention that "anthropological curiosity [has] stopped at the color bar" (1982:2) may be an exaggeration, much evidence supports his claim. For the most part, it has not been radical social scientists who have probed colonial mentalities nor political apologists who have cast the colonizer as victim, but colonized intellectuals who have attempted to broach the psychology and political economy of rulers and ruled. Franz Fanon (1963), Albert Memmi (1973), Aimé Césaire (1972), and Ashis Nandy (1983) have sought to identify a colonial consciousness that entraps the defenders of empire as well the more passive middling participants. The colonial everyman they paint is often a politically conservative composite of middle-class moralism, what V.S. Naipaul calls B-rate mediocrity (1978:65), hyper-masculinity, guilt, alienation, and a passive acceptance of a system supporting violence.

Such caricatures effectively capture certain features of colonials but are analytically limiting. Some colonial administrations selected for mediocrity; others produced it. Middle-class moralism, as we have seen, is made up of a wide range of substitutable prohibitions and standards, and is meaningful only if we examine the changing political agenda to which it was applied. White women appear as racist accomplices, defined by proxy to their men. But what their combined sensibilities offer is a political project for which an understanding of racism, class tensions, sexual subordination, and the everyday cultural idioms of domination is essential to a goal of liberation. For anthropology, it suggests that we take seriously Memmi's insistence that colonialism creates both the colonizer and the colonized. We need to reexamine the internal structures of colonial authority, and to explore the salient features of European class cultures that were selectively refashioned to create and maintain the social distinctions of imperial control.

REFERENCES

- Alatas, Syed Hussein. 1977. *The Myth of the Lazy Native*. London: Frank Cass.
- Albertyn, J. R. 1932. *Die Armblanke ein Die Maatskappy. Verslag van die Carnegie-Kommissie*. Stellenbosch: Pro-ecclesia-drukkery.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Anthropological Forum* 4:2. 1977. "Anthropological Research in British Colonies," 1–112.
- Arnold, David. 1979. "European Orphans and Vagrants in India in the Nineteenth Century." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 7:2, 104–127.
- . 1983. "White Colonization and Labour in Nineteenth-Century India." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 10:2, 133–58.
- Asad, Talal. 1975a. "Two European Images of Non-European Rule," in *An-*

- thropology and the Colonial Encounter*, T. Asad, ed. London: Ithaca Press, 103–20.
- _____. 1975b. *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.
- Bagley, Christopher. 1973. *The Dutch Plural Society: A Comparative Study in Race Relations*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Balandier, George. 1965 [1951]. "The Colonial Situation: A Theoretical Approach," in *Africa: Social Problems of Change and Conflict*. Pierre L. van den Berghe, ed. San Francisco: Chandler, 34–61.
- Ballhatchet, Kenneth. 1980. *Race, Sex, and Class under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and Policies and Their Critics, 1793–1905*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Barr, Pat. 1976. *The Memsahibs: The Women of Victorian India*. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Beckles, Hilary. 1986. "'Black Men in White Skins': The Formation of a White Proletariat in West Indian Slave Society." *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 15:1, 5–21.
- Beidelman, T. O. 1982. *Colonial Evangelism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Berremán, Gerald. 1981. *The Politics of Truth: Essays in Critical Anthropology*. New Delhi: South Asian Publishers.
- Boutilier, James. 1984. "European Women in the Solomon Islands, 1900–1942: Accommodation and Change on the Pacific Frontier," in *Rethinking Women's Roles: Perspectives from the Pacific*, Denise O'Brien and Sharon Tiffany, eds. Berkeley: University of California, 173–99.
- Braconier, A. de. 1933. "Het Prostitutie-Vraagstuk in Nederlandsch-Indië," *Indische Gids* 55:2, 906–28.
- Brandt, Willem. 1948. *De Aarde van Deli*. The Hague: van Hoeve.
- Breman, Jan. 1987. *Koelies, Planters en Koloniale Politiek*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Butcher, John G. 1979. *The British in Malaya, 1880–1941: The Social History of a European Community in Colonial Southeast Asia*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Callaway, Helen. 1987. *Gender, Culture and Empire: European Women in Colonial Nigeria*. Oxford: Macmillan Press.
- Césaire, Aime. 1972. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Chance, John, and Taylor, William. 1977. "Estate and Class in a Colonial City: Oaxaca in 1792." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 19:4, 454–87.
- Clammer, John. 1975. "Colonialism and the Perception of Tradition," in *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, T. Asad, ed. London: Ithaca Press, 199–222.
- Clerkx, Lily. 1961. *Mensen in Deli*. Amsterdam: Sociologisch-Historisch Seminarium voor Zuidoost-Azië. Publicatie nr. 2.
- Cohen, William B. 1980. *The French Encounter with Africans: White Response to Blacks, 1530–1880*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Cohn, Bernard. 1983. "Representing Authority in Victorian India," in *The Invention of Tradition*. E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 165–210.
- Comaroff, Jean. 1985. *Body of Power, Spirit of Resistance*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Comaroff, Jean, and Comaroff, John. 1986. "Christianity and Colonialism in South Africa." *American Ethnologist*, 13:1, 1–22.
- Cooper, Frederic. 1980. *From Slaves to Squatters: Plantation Labor and Agriculture in Zanzibar and Coastal Kenya, 1890–1925*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Crapanzano, Vincent. 1985. *Waiting: The Whites of South Africa*. New York: Vintage.
- Degler, Carl. 1971. *Neither Black nor White: Slavery and Race Relations in Brazil and the United States*. New York: Macmillan.
- Delavignette, Robert. 1946. *Service Africain*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Dixon, C. J. 1913. *De Assistent in Deli*. Amsterdam: J. H. de Bussy.
- Dodwell, Henry. 1926. *The Nabobs of Madras*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Dominquez, Virginia. 1986. *White by Definition: Social Classification in Creole Louisiana*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Dowd Hall, Jacquelyn. 1984. "'The Mind that Burns in Each Body': Women, Rape and Racial Violence." *Southern Exposure*, 12:6 (Nov.–Dec.), 61–71.
- Edwards, Michael. 1969. *Bound to Exile: The Victorians in India*. London: Sidgwick and Jackson.
- Emmanuel, Arghiri. 1972. "White-Settler Colonialism and the Myth of Investment Imperialism." *New Left Review*, 73 (May–June), 35–57.
- Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indie*. 1919. 's-Gravenhage, Leiden: M. Nijhoff and E. J. Brill.
- Etienne, Mona, and Leacock, Eleanor. 1980. *Women and Colonization*. New York: Praeger.
- Fanon, Franz. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove.
- Foster-Carter, Aidan. 1978. "The Modes of Production Controversy." *New Left Review*, 107 (January–February), 47–78.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Vintage.
- Furnivall, J. S. 1944. *Netherlands India: A Study of Plural Economy*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gann, L. H. and Duignan, Peter. 1978. *The Rulers of British Africa, 1870–1914*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1968. *Agricultural Involution: The Processes of Ecological Change in Indonesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gordon, Robert, and Meggitt, Mervyn. 1985. "The Decline of the Kipas," in *Law and Order in the New Guinea Highlands: Encounters with Enga*, R. Gordon and M. Meggitt, eds. Hanover: University Press of New England, 39–70.
- Gorter, H. 1941. *Delianen: schetsen uit het plantersleven op Sumatra's Oostkust*. Amsterdam: L. J. Veen.
- Gough, Kathleen. 1968. "Anthropology and Imperialism." *Current Anthropology*, 9:5 (December), 403–7.
- Grimshaw, Patricia. 1983. "'Christian Woman, Pious Wife, Faithful Mother, Devoted Missionary': Conflicts in Roles of American Missionary Women in Nineteenth-Century Hawaii." *Feminist Studies*, 9:3, 489–521.
- Groupe d'études coloniales. 1910. "La femme blanche au Congo." *Bulletin de la société belge d'études coloniales*, 5 (May), 1–12.
- Gutierrez, Ramon. 1985. "Honor Ideology, Marriage Negotiation, and Class-Gender Domination in New Mexico, 1690–1846." *Latin American Perspectives*, 12:1, 81–104.
- Harris, Marvin. 1964. *Patterns of Race in the Americas*. New York: Norton.
- . 1970. "Referential Ambiguity in the Calculus of Brazilian Racial Identity." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 26:1, 1–14.
- Harris, Marvin, and Kotak, Conrad. 1963. "The Structural Significance of Brazilian Racial Categories." *Sociologia*, 25, 203–9.
- Hobsbawn, Eric, and Ranger, Terence, eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–14.
- Hughes, Robert. 1987. *The Fatal Shore*. New York: Knopf.

- Hymes, Dell, ed. 1969. *Reinventing Anthropology*. New York: Vintage.
- Ingelson, John. 1981. "'Bound Hand and Foot': Railway Workers and the 1923 Strike in Java." *Indonesia*, 31 (April): 53–88.
- Inglis, Amirah. 1975. *The White Women's Protection Ordinance: Sexual Anxiety and Politics in Papua*. London: Sussex University Press.
- Kantoor van Arbeid. 1935. *Werkloosheid in Nederlandsch-Indie*. Batavia: Landsdrukkerij.
- Kennedy, Dane. 1987. *Islands of White: Settler Society and Culture in Kenya and Southern Rhodesia, 1890–1939*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kincaid, Dennis. 1971 [1938]. *British Social Life in India, 1608–1937*. New York: Kennikat Press.
- Kleian, J. 1936. *Deli-Planter*. The Hague: van Hoeve.
- Knibiehler, Yvonne, and Goutalier, Regine. 1985. *La femme au temps des colonies*. Paris: Stock.
- Kroniek [Chronicle]. 1916–39. Oostkust van Sumatra-Instituut. Amsterdam: J. H. de Bussy.
- Kuklick, Henrika. 1979. *The Imperial Bureaucrat: The Colonial Administrative Service in the Gold Coast, 1920–1939*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.
- Leconte, Daniel. 1980. *Les Pieds Noirs*. Paris: Seuil.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1983. *Le regard éloigné*. Paris: Plon.
- Lonsdale, John, and Berman, Bruce. 1979. "Coping with the Contradictions: The Development of the Colonial State in Kenya, 1895–1914." *Journal of African History*, 20: 487–505.
- Lucas, Nicole. 1986. "Trouwverbod, inlandse huishoudsters en Europese vrouwen. Het concubinaat in de planterswereld aan Sumatra's Oostkust," in *Vrouwen in de Nederlandse kolonien*, Jeske, Reijs, et. al., eds. Nijmegen: SUN, 78–97.
- Malinowski, B. 1966 [1945]. "Dynamics of Culture Change," in *Social Change: The Colonial Situation*, I. Wallerstein, ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 11–24.
- Manders, Jo. 1933. *De Boedjang-Club*. 's-Gravenhage: H. P. Leopold.
- Marks, Shula and Trapido, Stanley, eds. 1986. *The Politics of Race, Class, and Nationalism in Twentieth Century South Africa*. London: Longman.
- Marle, A. van. 1952. "De groep der Europeanen in Nederlands-Indie." *Indonesie*, 5:2, 77–121; 5:3, 314–41; 5:5, 481–507.
- Martinez-Alier, Verena. 1974. *Marriage, Class, and Colour in Nineteenth-Century Cuba*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marinus, J. H. 1929. *Veertig Jaren Ervaring in de Deli-Cultures*. Amsterdam: de Bussy.
- Mead, Margaret. 1977. *Letters from the Field, 1925–1975*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Memmi, Albert. 1973 [1957]. *Portrait du colonisé*. Paris: Payot.
- Mercier, Paul. 1965. "The European Community of Dakar," in *Africa: Social Problems of Change and Conflict*, Pierre van den Berghe, ed. San Francisco: Chandler, 283–304.
- Ming, Hanneke. 1983. "Barracks-Concubinage in the Indies, 1887–1920." *Indonesia*, 35 (April): 65–93.
- Mintz, Sidney. 1971. "Groups, Group Boundaries, and the Perception of 'Race'." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 13 (Fall): 437–50.
- . 1974. *Caribbean Transformations*. Chicago: Aldine.
- . 1985. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Penguin.
- Moore-Gilbert, B. J. 1986. *Kipling and "Orientalism"*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Murphy, Agnes. 1968. *The Ideology of French Imperialism, 1871–1881*. New York: Howard Fertig.
- Murray, Martin. 1980. *The Development of Capitalism in Colonial Indochina*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Naipaul, V. S. 1978 [1962]. *The Middle Passage*. London: Penguin.
- Nandy, Ashis. 1983. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Nash, June. 1980. "Aztec Women: The Transition from Status to Class in Empire and Colony," in *Women and Colonization: Anthropological Perspectives*, Mona Etienne and Eleanor Leacock, eds. New York: Praeger, 134–48.
- . 1981. "Ethnographic Aspects of the World Capitalist System." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 10: 393–423.
- Nelson, Hank. 1982. *Taim Bilong Masta: The Australian Involvement with Papua New Guinea*. Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Commission.
- Nieuwenhuys, Roger. 1978. *Oost-Indische Spiegel*. Amsterdam: Querido.
- . 1982. *Mirror of the Indies: A History of Dutch Colonial Literature*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts.
- Nora, Pierre. 1961. *Les Français d'Algérie*. Paris: Julliard.
- O'Brien, Rita Cruise. 1972. *White Society in Black Africa: The French in Senegal*. London: Faber and Faber.
- O'Meara, Dan. 1983. *Volkskapitalisme: Class, Capital, and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1934–1948*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Onselen, Charles van. 1982. *Studies in the Social and Economic History of the Witwatersrand 1886–1914*, Vol. I. New York: Longman.
- Petersen, Tscherning H. 1948. *Tropical Adventure*. London: J. Rolls.
- Piven, Frances, and Cloward, Richard. 1971. *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*. New York: Vintage.
- Post, Ken. 1978. *Arise Ye Starvelings: The Jamaican Labour Rebellion of 1938 and its Aftermath*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Powdermaker, Hortense. 1966. *Stranger and Friend*. New York: Norton.
- Price, A. Grenfell. 1939. *White Settlers in the Tropics*. New York: American Geographical Society.
- Prochaska, David n.d. (Forthcoming). *Making Algeria French: Colonialism in Bone, 1870–1920*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosaldo, Renato. 1980. *Ilongot Headhunting, 1883–1974*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Roseberry, William. 1983. *Coffee and Capitalism in the Venezuelan Andes*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- . 1986. "Images of the Peasant in the Consciousness of the Venezuelan Proletariat," in *Proletarians and Protest*, Michael Hanagan and Charles Stephenson, eds. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 149–169.
- Sahlins, Marshall. 1981. *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Said, H. Mohammad. 1976. *Sejarah Pers di Sumatera Utara*. Medan: Waspada.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1976 [1960]. *Critique of Dialectical Reason*. London: New Left Books.
- Scott, James C. 1976. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Seed, Patricia. 1982. "Social Dimensions of Race: Mexico City, 1753." *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 62:4, 590–606.

- Sheppard, Jill. 1977. *The "Redlegs" of Barbados*. New York: KTO Press.
- Sider, Gerald. 1987. "When Parrots Learn to Talk, and Why They Can't: Domination, Deception and Self-Deception in Indian White Relations." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 29:1 (January), 3–23.
- Spear, Percival. 1963. *The Nabobs: A Study of Social Life of the English in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Spencer, J. E., Thomas, W. L., 1948. "The Hill Stations and Summer Resorts of the Orient." *Geographical Review*, 38:4, 637–51.
- Steward, Julian. 1956. *The People of Puerto Rico*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Stoler, Ann. 1985a. *Capitalism and Confrontation in Sumatra's Plantation Belt, 1870–1979*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 1985b. "Perceptions of Protest: Defining the Dangerous in Colonial Sumatra." *American Ethnologist*, 12:4, 642–58.
- . 1986. "Plantation Politics and Protest on Sumatra's East Coast." *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 13:2, 642–58.
- . n.d. (Forthcoming). "Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Matrimony, Race and Morality in Colonial Asia," in *Towards an Anthropology of Gender*, Micaela di Leonardo, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sutherland, H. 1982. "Ethnicity and Access in Colonial Macassar," in *Papers of the Dutch-Indonesian Historical Conference*. Dutch and Indonesian Steering Committees of the Indonesian Studies Programme. Leiden: Bureau of Indonesian Studies, 250–77.
- Székely, Ladislao. 1979 [1937]. *Tropic Fever: The Adventures of a Planter in Sumatra*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford in Asia.
- Székely-Lulofs, Madelon. 1932. *Rubber*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- . 1946. *De Andere Wereld*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Takaki, Ronald. 1983. *Pau Hana: Plantation Life and Labor in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Tanner, R. E. S. 1964. "Conflict within Small European Communities in Tanganyika." *Human Organization*, 23:4, 319–27.
- Taussig, Michael. 1980. *The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Taylor, Jean Gelman. 1983. *The Social World of Batavia: European and Eurasian in Dutch Asia*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Thompson, Leonard. 1985. *The Political Mythology of Apartheid*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. 1985. *The Conquest of America*. New York: Harper.
- Vincent, Joan. 1982. *Teso in Transformation: The Political Economy of Peasant and Class in Eastern Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Waard, J. de. 1934. "De Oostkust van Sumatra." *Tijdschrift voor Economische Geographie*, 25: 213–21, 255–75, 282–301.
- Wasserstrom, Robert. 1980. "Ethnic Violence and Indigenous Protest: the Tzeltal (Maya) Rebellion of 1712." *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 12:1, 1–19.
- Wilkie, Mary. 1977. "Colonials, Marginals and Immigrants: Contributions to a Theory of Ethnic Stratification." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 19:1, 67–95.
- Wolf, Eric. 1959. *Sons of the Shaking Earth*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- . 1982. *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Woodcock, George. 1969. *The British in the Far East*. New York: Atheneum.

Newspapers

Deli Courant. Medan.

De Planter. 1909–22. Organ of the Vakvereniging voor Assistenten in Deli. Medan.

Sumatra Post. Medan.