2

Reading colonial masculinity through a marriage in Burma

Jonathan Saha

Revisiting Mrinalini Sinha's *Colonial Masculinity* over two decades after its publication, much of its historiographical critique still applies. The book is ubiquitously cited in the literature reviews of articles and books examining masculinities in Britain and its empire. However, when relating her central argument – that British manliness in colonial Bengal was co-constituted with the figure of the 'effeminate Bengali' – the wider methodological import of her approach has not always been fully engaged with. The generic point, that ideas of masculinity emerged entangled with the racialised divisions of colonial society, is one that is now almost axiomatic to the field;[1] but some of Sinha's essential contextualising caveats have often been left unaddressed. There are two principal points that have been less well heeded. The first is her warning about too easy an alignment between 'imperial' and 'national' frames in the history of masculinity, lest either be effectively submerged beneath the other. The second is her emphasis on analysing the ways that colonial gender ideologies were rooted in material and ideological shifts *within* communities, particularly through their changing class divisions. While histories of masculinity in colonial Asia emphasise heterogeneity and contingency, these more pointed insights have not been consistently attended to.[2]

Historians unpacking white masculinities in British India – often somewhat euphemistically referred to as 'imperial' – have now identified a range of typologies of masculinity,[3] with studies being more sensitive to class hierarchies within white populations.[4] Commonly missing from these studies is a consideration of how these specific ways of being a man in the empire inform, overlap with, or are in tension with masculinities 'at home' in Britain. Nor do they treat imperial representations of Asian masculinities as discursive figures contested and appropriated by colonised populations, something that Sinha details with regards to Bengali Hindu middle classes and the trope of effeminacy. For example, studies of imperial hunters show how this lethal sport entailed a particular performance of virile manliness and racial superiority. Though this, historians of the imperial hunt have

carefully uncovered its aristocratic precedents, its links to South Asian practices, and its reliance on South Asian labour.[5] But they have not traced how this manly archetype fed back into discussions of masculinity in Britain or within colonised communities.[6]

Studies tracing the colonial histories of Asian masculinities mirror those of white masculinities. Many have followed Sinha's lead in examining the construction of particular figures of masculinity; some valourised and lauded, such as 'martial races', others marginalised and policed, like *thuggee*s and *hijra*s.[7] In addition, some have shifted beyond deconstructions of the gendered gaze of imperial authors and the effects of the colonial state's disciplinary power, to uncovering the practices and writings of colonised actors.[8] Such studies have often examined the place of masculinity in animating different strands of anti-colonial nationalist thought and struggles.[9] It is a sign of the maturity of the historiography on colonial South Asia that these studies can dispense with a dialogue with work on masculinity in imperial Britain and white masculinity in the empire.[10] Nevertheless, this contributes to a growing cleavage between studies of white masculinities and studies of Asian masculinities in colonial contexts.

As a result of these trends, the framing devises of 'imperial' and 'national' are either treated as necessary heuristic divisions or left unexamined. In either case, the tensions between these two social imaginaries are elided. The use of the adjectives 'British' and 'imperial', either together or interchangeably to prefix 'masculinity' in secondary literature, masks myriad contradictions and fractures.[11] In addition, there is an implicit reification of the counterpart masculinity co-constructed across the divide between coloniser and colonised. In other words, research into white masculinities, while noting local agency, tends to leave Asian masculinities unexplored. Likewise, research into Asian masculinities, while contextualised alongside normative imperial discourses, often does not interrogate the heterogeneity of white masculinities. Without attending to these entanglements and complexities, the contention that the masculinities of coloniser and colonised were co-constituted is reduced to a superficial and abstract acknowledgement, one easily made but rarely meaningfully explored.

Not long after her book, Sinha reviewed the growing field for the journal *Gender & History*, exploring what histories of masculinity might contribute to the discipline. One of her critiques in this essay was of the 'easy equation of men and masculinity'. This critique still resonates. Most studies of masculinity implicitly frame themselves as studies of men. To counter this, she urges historians to denaturalise men and masculinity by tracing the processes of embodiment, rather than assuming a sexed male body to be the subject of histories of masculinity. Moreover, she argues that giving masculinity a history means uncovering how a broader range of

social relations produce masculinity, beyond the narrower set of practices entailed in manhood. For Sinha these wider social relations were the fraught material and ideological contests within and between British colonisers and Bengali Hindu middle classes. Masculinity provided her with a single analytical frame through which these social relations could be better understood.[12] But this critique also suggests the utility of more micro-historical approaches to masculinity focussed on uncovering bodily performances and performativity.

While new vistas in this field have emerged, the methodological approach that *Colonial Masculinity* outlined still has analytical purchase and interpretive power, especially for those attempting to disentangle precisely what might be *British* about the various masculine figures constituted throughout the empire. However, realising this approach is beset with challenges. There is a difficult subtlety required to treat masculinity as a single analytical frame while not artificially reducing the national to the imperial, or vice versa. Giving a balance of analysis to the material and ideological tensions within a particular colonised community *and* among the colonisers, while also tracing the contests and collaborations across this division, requires handling disparate archival materials. It is an aspiration made harder still by the more recent, and entirely justified, call for more attention to be paid to *inter*-Asian social relations.[13] Scale also poses a problem. Masculinity has been described as a 'world historical category of analysis', with global purchase.[14] Fitting awkwardly within this planetary view are the interconnected geographies covered by overviews of imperial histories, which are on occasion mapped beyond the British Empire.[15] Moreover, within these sweeping frameworks, there is the imperative to maintain the analytical precision to avoid equating the history of masculinity with that of men.

Numerous imperial historians have successfully overcome these challenges by limiting the scope of their research. Sinha did this through an unwavering focus on Bengal 'proper' and three greatly contested, high political conjectures. Others, such as Catherine Hall, have followed suit by identifying particular colonial sites and moments.[16] Biography has proved another effective approach.[17] A tight empirical focus is evidently beneficial for enabling studies of colonial masculinity to retain their analytical power without reducing the complexities at work. But within this necessary narrowing of topic, there is a need to be attentive to wider connections and comparisons that might be abstracted from the empirics of a study. To achieve this, a focus on sites and institutions replicated across imperial spaces enables studies to simultaneously explore what might be specific to certain colonial contexts and what might be generic to colonialism. There are many such framing devises that might be deployed; however, 'family' is one that has already been serving this role.[18]

There is now a significant body of literature exploring the history of family within the empire; although much of the focus has been on either white families or families whose members cut across colonial racial divides. Analysis of masculinity is inevitably present in much of this work. Building in part on the history of sexuality, families have been conceptualised as 'dense transfer points of power' in which the tensions between the uneven construction of discourses of bodily difference, such as race, and the curation of exclusive social imaginaries, such as nation, have played out.[19] In addition to this, a focus on family has enabled historians to trace the emergence of gendered subjectivities while attending to the history of emotions,[20] rooting studies of these otherwise abstract ideological constructs in lived experiences. Of course, family does not have a transhistorical, universal form. Families take many forms across time and place, and in this chapter, I am narrowing the ambit of my research further to look at the institution of marriage.[21] Or, more narrowly still, one marriage: that of controversial novelist Mabel Cosgrave and celebrated Arakanese barrister Chan-Toon, in *fin de siècle* Rangoon and London.

Mabel Cosgrave and Chan-Toon were married in St Mary of the Angels in Bayswater, London, on 27 July 1893. Their nuptials were reported in the press from Scotland to Singapore.[22] It was an unhappy marriage, at least for Mabel Cosgrave Chan-Toon. In 1905, she published a fictionalised, but apparently autobiographical, account of the relationship, *A Marriage in Burmah: A Novel*. Unusual in that it depicts a marriage between a white British woman and a colonised man of colour – a well-policed taboo of the high-imperial era[23] – her account exposes some of the fractures between Britishness and whiteness through an exploration of masculinity. Writing under the name 'Mrs Chan-Toon', in the course of the book she simultaneously deploys a critique of Burmese masculinity and of gender relations within British imperial society in Rangoon to plot her (or rather, her protagonist Mrs Moung Gyaw's) emergence as an independent woman. In the process, through her unfavourable rendering of her husband in the form of the character Moung Gyaw, also an Arakanese barrister, she argues that 'Oriental' men were imperfect mimics of British aristocratic norms of gentlemanly behaviour due to their innate flaws. As a result of these themes, it is a book that reveals how women could deploy critical renderings of colonial masculinity, and reproduce discourses of racial difference, to sustain feminine subjectivities with precarious, hard-won mobility.[24] It also provides a window onto the ambivalent discursive responses to colonised actors' attempts to embody British masculinity.[25]

The book follows Mrs Moung Gyaw's experiences of her doomed marriage to her Arakanese husband, whom she marries not out of love, but due to his promising legal career and the expectation of a large inheritance.

Almost as soon as she arrives in Rangoon, this veneer of good prospects is destroyed as her husband's dishonesty is revealed to her. He is instead exposed as being in a financially precarious position, heavily indebted to a Bengali moneylender and struggling to sustain a profitable legal practice. Marked as an outsider and a curiosity because of her racially transgressive marriage, she is ostracised from the close-knit, white Rangoon society, suffering from constant petty slights from vindictive, upper-class British wives. The either doddering or aloof white men provide no relief. The sociality of British married couples in Rangoon is portrayed as stilted, overly formal, and vapid; a litany of excruciating dinners and tedious race meetings. It is a poor simulacrum of London society. Cringingly seeking acceptance within white official circles, her vain and weak-willed husband rebuffs her advice and hides his further deteriorating circumstances, squandering an inheritance that he has not yet secured. As their relationship rapidly breaks down, she lives with worsening rough and rudimentary domestic arrangements, and is left largely bereft of company. Her husband descends into alcoholism, his practice falls apart, and she is physically assaulted by him. Most of the novel is set in colonial Rangoon, with a brief sojourn to London where he attempts to rebuild his reputation while they rely on her upper-middle-class (although not especially wealthy) family for meagre support, attempting to hide the true extent of their poverty. The book ends with Mrs Moung Gyaw giving birth to a baby girl that she feels no love for and that she abandons to the care of a Karen *ayah* and Christian nuns while she leaves her family to make her own future.[26]

The novel makes claims to authenticity through deliberate and pointed suggestions that the story is autobiographical in content. This is indicated in the para-texts to the book through her choice of 'Mrs M. Chan-Toon' to appear as her name. She had previously published under her maiden name, Mabel Cosgrove, and then under the Burmese pseudonym 'Mimosa';[27] although this was no secret and was known to be her. By the time she wrote *A Marriage in Burmah* in 1905 her husband had been dead for around a year, dying of heart failure in Rangoon's law library.[28] Now publishing under Mrs M. Chan-Toon she foregrounded her unconventional relationship, which was also the subject of her book. The name of the author's counterpart in the novel echoes this, as she is almost exclusively referred to throughout the text as Mrs Moung Gyaw. The Burmese provenance of the name provides her with a claim to expertise, a move further sustained by making the husband hail from Arakan, a region in the west of the colony bordering Bengal. It was also where Chan-Toon himself was known to come from.[29] Detailing Arakanese customs in the book builds her credibility by demonstrating a knowledge not of the generalised figure of the Burman but of a particular ethnic identity. This attempt to build credibility is further

reinforced in the para-texts of the book through the brief, two-sentence preface. In this she outlines her purpose in sketching 'the life of an English girl who married a native of Burmah' so as to reveal 'the gulf that divides the Eastern from the Western', while professing to 'merely record things as they actually occurred'.[30]

In the substance of the book itself the sense of autobiographical authenticity is sustained through a number of narrative devices. In one chapter, she purports to be directly quoting snippets from her (Mrs Moung Gyaw's) diaries of the time to illustrate the mental anguish of her isolation, and does so at length. Other than in these extracts, she uses the third-person point of view, while still anchoring the plot in her heroine's introspective thoughts. In contrast, the motives of other characters are presented as inferences on the basis of their behaviour. The effect is to give the impression that the author is not writing about a different person, but about a past self. The emotionality of the text also gives the effect of truthfulness through her use of an almost confessional style. There are silences produced in the book around particularly harrowing moments that add to the sense of realism. Marital rape is hinted at. Two difficult pregnancies and one miscarriage are apparent, although only through passing mentions. The episodes of domestic violence are rendered in sparing but affecting detail. As the book draws to a conclusion, Mrs Moung Gyaw gains resolve through her involuntary but unshakable dislike of her baby. She pours scorn on the notion of women as being innately maternal, describing it as 'the most puerile of delusions, the most illogical of human fallacies'. The candid disclosure of unwelcome feelings and forceful prose in these passages stand out from the rest of the book, perhaps indicating their provenance in a deeply personal place, maybe even that they were born out of painful lived experience.[31]

Nevertheless, Mrs Chan-Toon is knowingly playing with fictive elements in her writing. This comes through in the less-than-subtle names given to Mrs Moung Gyaw's enemies in Rangoon society, such as the gossip Mrs M'Chatter. In a more subtle move, Mrs Moung Gyaw is made English, whereas the author herself was Irish. This distancing of the author from Mrs Moung Gyaw, when elsewhere the two were quite deliberately conflated, infers an attempt to emphasise the protagonist's uncomplicated whiteness that may have otherwise been compromised, although not undone, through her Irish heritage.[32] Throughout her literary career the deliberate blurring of the boundary between truth and falsehood is what Mabel Cosgrove Chan-Toon's writings specialised in. Her 1912 book, *Love Letters of an English Peeress to an Indian Prince*, purported to be a collection of romantic correspondence penned by an aristocratic white woman to a rebel leader in the 1857 uprising, Nana Saheb, a man implicated in the massacre of women and children during the siege of Kanpur; a provocative premise and use

of history.[33] She is something of a trickster figure, most famous for likely penning the play *Love of the King: A Burmese Masque*, published in 1922, and successfully passing it off as a manuscript authored by Oscar Wilde to publishers and, subsequently, to much of the literary establishment. She was accused of fabricating not only the play itself, but the accompanying letters from Wilde evidencing a friendship between the two. In these letters Cosgrove Chan-Toon carefully interwove truthful elements of both of their lives to produce a credible account of when and why Wilde had written it. In 1926, the play became the subject of a widely publicised defamation case brought by its publisher, Methuen against one of Wilde's biographers, who accused them of knowingly publishing a forgery; a case that Methuen won.[34] Mabel Cosgrove, now going by the name Mabel Wodehouse Pearse following a re-marriage, was unable to testify at the trial because she had been jailed for theft.[35]

In later life she was, by most accounts, an eccentric figure, often dressed in a long coat and with a parrot perched on her shoulder.[36] Three years after the publication of *A Marriage in Burmah*, she was reported as having been charged with blackmail in Mexico.[37] It seems that it was here that she acquired the parrot, called Monsieur Coco.[38] It is intriguing, therefore, that she incorporated an eccentric Australian woman as a key character called Mrs Rooney into *A Marriage in Burmah*, complete with pet cockatoo. The character's age and aspects of her physical description fit onto Mabel Chan-Toon's at the time she would have drafted the novel. Rooney is good-hearted, but belligerent and vulgar when drunk. Her world-weary attitude stands in contrast to Mrs Moung Gyaw's naïve outlook and she acts as a salutary lesson to the young woman; a warning of the dangers of remaining in Rangoon. Mrs Rooney's presence in the book complicates any straightforward reading of the novel as directly autobiographic. But it does suggest that through her portrayal of the neglectful and tyrannical aspects of her husband's character, traits she indicates are typically 'Eastern', she is exploring different subject positions beyond the pale of acceptable bourgeois femininity in colonial Burma and late Victorian, early Edwardian England. The fiercely independent-minded and earnest Mrs Moung Gyaw, having transgressed racial boundaries in her marriage, ultimately rejects the expectations upon a wife and mother to build her own future. So does Mrs Rooney, the easy-going, jovial outcast of polite white society, but sadly downtrodden and bitter drunk. Both, in their own way, represent a 'flight from domesticity' through different forms of escapism in the empire; travel and drink.[39]

The setting is crucial to the book. Rangoon is not an incidental backdrop. Contextualising the novel within the gender politics of colonial Burma allows us to see how the racialised binary between coloniser and colonised

was animated through portrayals of contrasting masculinities. Central to this co-constitutive relationship between British and Burmese masculinity was the spectre of India. As studies of South Asia have shown, conceptions of masculinity on the subcontinent were highly variegated by caste, class, religion, and region.[40] Nevertheless, in most colonial-era writings on Burma this complexity was homogenised into a monolithic stereotype of the Indian man against which the Burmese man was contrasted. This is suggestive of the fractal nature of colonial masculinities. The closer the historian hones their focus, the more differentiations appear. Within writings on Burmese masculinity, comparisons were drawn separating out Bama, Karen, Shan, Arakanese, and other ethnicities in colony.[41] The distinction between India and Burma made by British writers and state officials was the prominent and public presence of Burmese women, particularly in their economic activities and rights to property.[42] Often these depictions held Burmese women to be the overbearing partner in marriages, accused of beating their hapless men. India was associated with purdah and a subjugated femininity, Burma with raucous female market traders and hen-pecked husbands.[43]

Burmese masculinity was rendered in particular ways in relation to this. In terms of descriptions of their physicality, British writers depicted the typical Burmese man as stout and muscular.[44] In habits, they were said to be lazy, easy-going, and of mild temperament, to a point. Once roused, the Burmese man was supposed to be prone to outbursts of violent anger, followed quickly by remorse and regret. The apparently casual nature of marriages, and freedom of women within them, was said to be a frequent cause of domestic violence. A repeated narrative in colonial police reports held that men would divorce their spouses, regret their decision, and attack their former partner in the resulting jealous rage when she formed a new connection.[45] Mrs Chan-Toon also deployed this trope. As the book unfolds, Moung Gyaw's behaviour becomes increasingly stereotypical. He becomes slothful and laconic, his passivity occasionally broken by moments of violence towards his wife. The implicit figure of British masculinity constituted through these portrayals, at least for the male officials deploying these tropes, was of a secure, virile manliness able to hold women in a respectful, companionate but firmly subservient position. As we have seen above, for Mrs Chan-Toon this figure of Burmese man was doing rather different work.

In the context of the late nineteenth century, this articulation of masculinity was also a response to first-wave British feminism, the figure of the New Woman, and legislative restrictions on male sexuality.[46] Indeed, feminists in Britain and some nationalists in India used this portrayal of Burmese women as evidence to support their causes.[47] In contrast white British male writers in the colony explicitly rendered the position

of Burmese women a spectre of the potential culmination of suffragist reform. For these men, Burma as a nation had been stunted by women's independence and predominance which had emasculated the men, sapping their energies and stifling societal dynamism. Others spun the comparison to contemporary British feminists differently, emphasising the ease with which Burmese women were able to elegantly embody their high status without undermining their femininity, contrasting this to the clamouring noise of white women activists in Britain.[48] Here, there was a tension between the local toleration of white male sexual desire for Burmese women within imperial society in Burma, and the growing condemnation of the resulting cross-racial relationships in segments of British society.[49] References to the allure and beauty of Burmese women were commonplace in imperial texts situated in the colony, perhaps most famously appearing in Rudyard Kipling's poem 'Mandalay' through the nostalgic longings of a British Tommy. Mrs Chan-Toon also relies on this trope through her description of Mrs Moung Gyaw's Burmese rival for her husband's affections, a scene that, in spite of its rather minor place in the book as a whole, was reproduced in the frontispiece.[50]

While having a Burmese wife might lead to official approbation and a limiting of opportunities for government employment for white colonists,[51] 'temporary marriages' were reportedly a widespread practice. Mrs Chan-Toon does not address this practice, but her depiction of the inverse relationship would have been read within a wider imperial awareness of the scandals related to it. Christian imperial critics concerned about the toleration of prostitution and white slavery in the empire used Burma as an example of the degrading effects of the practice on white British men, dubbing them 'Western men with Eastern morals'.[52] Within official circles, at the turn of the century Viceroy Curzon set himself against these relationships.[53] However, white colonists who formed connections with Burmese women were largely absolved of responsibility for their 'lapses' by the lack of white society and the resulting loneliness of the colony, the oppressive and stultifying effects of the climate, and the seductive behaviour of Burmese women and girls. The Burmese woman as succubus was a frequent narrative device in imperial novels set in the colony, recurring across texts with diametrically opposing positions on female sexuality.[54] Mrs Chan-Toon does not touch upon this issue, nor does she portray Mrs Moung Gyaw's Burmese rival as a seductress. Instead, she uses the husband's infidelity to demonstrate *his* moral weakness.

The weakness of Burmese men in relation to women fed into the adoption of a paternalistic attitude towards them on the part of white British officials. According to this view, the Burmese were at risk of being taken advantage of by guileful and predatory Chinese and Indian traders and

moneylenders. The lackadaisical Burmese population, who it was believed lacked any entrepreneurial spirit, needed protecting from these exploitative outsiders, particularly when it came to vices. Burmese men were portrayed as being particularly weak-willed and thus especially vulnerable to ruin through drink, gambling, and opium. This racial understanding structured government policies in these areas, with restrictions on participating in these activities differentiated by categories of race.[55] Mrs Chan-Toon too reproduced this view. The most vitriolic and overtly racist descriptions in her novel are reserved for her characterisation of Moung Gyaw's Bengali moneylender and his wife. She portrays Moung Gyaw's feeble vanity as making him susceptible to the preening flattery of the ruthless, calculating greed of Mr and Mrs Chundera.[56] Moung Gyaw's inability to curb his growing addiction to brandy, likewise, was a sign of his weak mental fortitude. His indifference to money was another inherent flaw of his character that resonated with these wider imperial tropes.

As much as Chan-Toon was posthumously framed by wider imperial notions of Burmese masculinity through his wife's fictionalised, quasi-autobiographical novel based on their marriage, he was also an active figure in participating in the construction of these gendered perceptions of Burma. He further pushed at the racialised limits of inclusion and recognition as an imperial subject. Somewhat contrary to the portrayal of his career in *A Marriage in Burmah*, by the time that they married in 1893 he had established a formidable reputation for himself as a scholar and public intellectual in London. He arrived in London to study for the bar around 1885, a pivotal time in Burmese history. While all of coastal Burma had been colonised by the British by 1852, with Chan-Toon's home district of Arakan having been under British rule since 1826, the cultural heartland of the Konbaung dynasty remained an independent rump state until 1885 when the last king, Thibaw, was deposed and taken into exile by the Indian Army. Shortly after the deposition, Chan-Toon was present at a meeting of the National Indian Association – an imperial society set up by the social reformer and advocate of female education and women's suffrage Mary Carpenter and British feminist Charlotte Manning in the 1870s – at which the fate of this new colony was discussed.

Dr Cullimore, who had been a resident surgeon in Mandalay, the courtly capital of Thibaw's kingdom, spoke about the country and its peoples, and held forth in favour of the recent British annexation. However, the report of the meeting in the *Standard* dedicated most of its column to Chan-Toon's contributions to the ensuing discussion. He framed his opinion as that of a native, a position well-received in the liberal space of the association: 'he [Chan-Toon] thought his [Dr Cullimore's] experiences must be balanced by Burmese opinion (hear, hear).' He went on to argue that while

he had no objection to annexation, he believed that the seeming ease with which Thibaw was deposed was but a superficial impression of calm, as the people had not yet been placed under British rule. He anticipated that colonisation would not be welcome.[57] The protracted and brutal pacification campaign combatting the widespread rebellion that followed in the years to come proved his insight to have been correct.[58] Gender relations were central to his argument. He reproduced the already well-developed narrative that Thibaw was king only in name, with the true ruler being his formidable wife, Queen Supayalat. This too was well-received: 'even the King in Burmah had to do all that his wife told him to do (laughter).'[59] In this space, afforded by imperial feminism yet redolent of the masculine culture of British learned societies, a colonised subject voiced a critique of a white imperial actor's knowledge, in part, by deploying the racialised and gendered notion of the hen-pecked Burmese husband.

Meanwhile in London Chan-Toon excelled in his studies, winning a scholarship in 1886. This achievement was eclipsed by the manner in which he was called to the bar in the summer of 1888. During his studentship at the Middle Temple he entered all eight principal prizes for law students and won every one, receiving a total of £338.[60] He was the first student to achieve this. To mark his unprecedented success he was honoured in a resolution passed by a parliament of the benches of the Middle Temple, drafted by Sir Henry James, and in a letter from Queen Victoria. No student prior to him had been complimented in this way.[61] While in the press he generally received plaudits, in some quarters his success was framed within the discourse of a crisis of white masculinity. The London correspondent of the *Liverpool Mercury* wrote, melodramatically, 'Bow your heads, ye Anglo-Saxon students, not to you go the prizes of the future. Here is a Burmese, Mr Chan-Toon – who has done in the law examinations what was never done yet by any Englishmen … English eyes will henceforth turn to Burmah for its scholars.' Explicitly linking Chan-Toon's achievements to women's recent entry into some higher education institutions, the correspondent went on, 'Our boys, indeed, seem to be far behind the race. At universities they are beaten by their sisters, and in law examinations they are beaten by a Burmese.'[62] This passage made explicit what was implied in other reports, that part of the interest in Chan-Toon's success stemmed from his being a racial other. Although he was a British imperial subject, to the English newspaper-reading public he was framed as not one of 'our boys'.

In the few years that he remained in London following his qualification, he was a frequent public lecturer, particularly to the Balloon Society who met at St James's Hall in London. His talks on Burma reproduced the gendered colonial representations unpacked above. The summary of one of his talks reported in the *Morning Post* is worth quoting at length as it consists

of a neat synthesis of the key themes. After recounting the benefits of British rule, he made the following observations:

> The Burmese were a proud and conceited race, and they had no desire to amass wealth. They took life easily, and, when there was no necessity for work, were the laziest of human beings. If, through the tide of fortune, they became rich, they availed themselves of the means at their disposal to build a resting-place for travellers or to erect a padoga [*sic*]. Having alluded to the freedom and importance of the position occupied by women in Burma and touched upon the influence of Buddhism upon Burmese society, the lecturer spoke of the future of the country, and advocated the more direct control of Burma by Great Britain. The sentiments, religion, and institutions of the Indian races, and the two countries were dissimilar in every respect.[63]

Returning to speak on this topic to the Balloon Society again in 1895, he picked up on these themes with a particular concern about Asian immigrant populations in British Burma. He was reported as arguing that 'since the province had been opened up both Indians and Chinese were flooding into the country' and that the Burmese population 'had failed to compete successfully with foreigners, notably with the industrious Chinamen and the thrifty Indians'. Again, he advocated for Burma to be governed separately from British India.[64] In adopting these positions, Chan-Toon appears as an intermediary figure foreshadowing some of the concerns that would become manifest in Burmese anti-colonial nationalism. While his position was firmly liberal and loyalist,[65] his desire for separation from India and for controls on immigration became central political platforms for nationalists in the interwar years. The Indian man as a sexual threat to Burmese women, and miscegenation as a threat to the Burmese nation, emerged in this period as expressions of masculine anxieties.[66]

In his public life in London Chan-Toon was more than simply a native informant on the state of Burma. He was also invited to speak on 'the progress of man' and international law.[67] In 1889, he published his most successful book, *The Nature and Value of Jurisprudence*. This was not a volume of pure legal scholarship, but a sweeping philosophical and historical work drawing on a range of prominent British thinkers. The book opens with an eloquent chapter on the importance of 'relative' and 'kindred subjects', calling for breaking down of barriers between academic disciplines.[68] Practising what he preaches, the rest of his study drew from published works on early human societies, anthropological studies of 'primitive tribes', English liberal political thought, and, extensively, Herbert Spencer's social Darwinism. Chapter 5, titled the 'Disintegration of the Family', provides a grand narrative of the emergence of monogamous marriage as an attendant feature of human progress. The chapter passes through a study of

slavery in Roman law and Mexico, and anthropological studies of polygyny and polyandry in Indo-China and Tibet, before tracing the establishment of property rights of married women, the tendency for marriages to take the form of contracts in modern societies, and the rights of children.[69] Burmese family structures are not mentioned. Chan-Toon was showing his mastery of trends and developments in British scholarship, and applying them to the study of jurisprudence. And did so with some flair. The *Graphic* gave it a rave review, recommending it to general readers for its erudition, scientific approach, and lucidity. However, Chan-Toon's pleasure in the review, if he had read it, may have been marred by the reviewer's misrecognition of his race: 'It is a sign of the times when a Chinese writes a book full of teaching and suggestion on such a thoroughly English subject.'[70] Again, Chan-Toon was not fully recognised as a British subject; his (in this case, inaccurately) ascribed racial difference marked the reception of his work.

Mrs Chan-Toon's portrayal of Moung Gyaw's disastrous career does not wholly line up with that of Chan-Toon, at least not according to the extant evidence available in court records. His return to Arakan in Burma was widely reported and apparently marked by public celebrations, with crowds greeting him in the port town of Akyab.[71] Between 1893 and 1900 he appears representing clients in thirty-one cases in the printed records of the Lower Burma judicial court, which saw the final appeals in the southern half of the colony that had been governed since at least 1852. This meant that he was involved in approximately 10 per cent of cases at this highest level of judgement. This would suggest a healthy practice during these years, which were most of the years that he was married, factoring in a spell back in London during 1895–1896. During these years he won slightly more of these appeal cases than he lost. Strikingly, he won all five of his appeals in criminal cases against the Crown. The printed judgements do not often provide details of where in Burma the appellants and respondents in these cases came from, but where they do it indicates that his client base was mostly drawn from Arakan, suggesting strong ties with his home region.[72] Of course, it is still possible that both this practice was poorly managed and unprofitable, and that, given his meteoric successes as a student, a middling career as a barrister in Rangoon was a hard-felt disappoint.

Mabel Chan-Toon's novel makes clear that racial prejudice was part of the context in which the fictional Arakanese lawyer Moung Gyaw struggled; something also noted in sections of the press.[73] There was an awareness that obstacles stood before Chan-Toon making his way as a barrister in colonial society. In this context, the heroine of *A Marriage in Burmah* is introduced as someone without prejudice and ignorant of the existence of racism. This positioning was an acknowledgement that the figure of the 'pukka sahib' and the exclusive sociality of Anglo-Indians were losing cultural credibility

in sections of Edwardian Britain.[74] Nevertheless, Moung Gyaw remains a wholly irredeemable character. More importantly, in spite of the disavowals of racial prejudice on behalf of the author, the faults in him are not individual flaws, nor are they understood as part of a wider patriarchal culture. Instead, they are indicative of his racial difference. In this, transgressive desires had to be policed.[75] The implication that there may have been any romantic appeal to Moung Gyaw at the start of the relationship is rejected early in the book. This was a relationship of convenience. She declares Mrs Moung Gyaw as being unaware of the gallant behaviours of British men – by which she means *white* British men – and through this lack of worldly knowledge, initially being unsure of whether her experience was atypical.

Ultimately, it is the difference between Moung Gyaw's external presentation of himself – as a respectable, English-educated gentleman – and his slovenly, dissipated private persona that reveals his true Oriental nature. Mrs Chan-Toon repeats this point throughout the novel through different spaces. Their first marital home is a metonym for his imperfect embodiment of masculinity. She describes it as 'splendour without, squalor within', adding that this is 'truly Oriental'.[76] The gradual decline in the quality of their lodgings through the marriage charts the erosion of his own civilised facade. Sartorial choices, diet, and his body all mark a similar dynamic. His clothing at home becomes more informal, Burmese, and sparse; a state of undress that revealed his true lack of civilisation.[77] He reverts to a Burmese diet of curries and ceases to adhere to the formalities of dining. Through his intemperate drinking and gluttonous diet, he becomes overweight – a repeated trope used for decadent and overpowerful Burmese men in British novels.[78] His now ill-fitting clothes and habit of going about in partial nudity reveal the tattoos that cover his body, yet another sign of his savage nature.[79] In this reading, Moung Gyaw qua Chan-Toon's British masculinity was but a hollow performance.

However, it was a particular form of colonial masculinity that Chan-Toon was inhabiting, or at least aspiring to inhabit. British legal actors in the empire, particularly judges and magistrates, enacted their masculinity through an attempt to appear detached, objective, and even-handed. It was a form of white masculinity that could not name itself, as the implication was that these men were the embodiment of independent judgement. Instead, it was only apparent as white and male through contrasts made with other bodies, the partiality of colonised women in particular. When, through either imperial scandals or anti-colonial critique, these white male bodies were criticised as a sign of inherent biases, there were moments of acute discomfort and denial. A strict adherence to a dispassionate style of judicial writing was one performative element in the sedimentation of this ambivalent mode of masculinity.[80] One reading of Chan-Toon's *Nature and Value of Jurisprudence* is that his

positionality in the text attempted to establish the same disembodied authorial locale. In other words, it was an attempt to shed his othered bodily differences and colonised cultural mores to disappear himself into the words and ideas of the British philosophical canon. But it could not happen. Whiteness was a barely apparent but impermeable barrier blocking a colonised subject from fully embodying British masculinity. From this perspective, Chan-Toon's public life might be read not as a superficial, surface performance but as a troubling performative embodiment disallowed.[81]

In 1890, Chan-Toon's brother, Shway Ban, emulated his sibling's successes by winning the University College School's prizes for Latin and geography. This was reported in the press with reminders of Chan-Toon's achievements a year prior. The *Daily News's* closing lines of its short report on the story encapsulate the ambivalence within the construction 'British imperial': 'Here is another example of what the rule of the English in the East means – of what English citizenship means to the "subject races".'[82] In this celebratory passage there is a gap maintained between English citizenship and 'subject races', even though the former is implied as bestowed on the latter. Moreover, this benefit of citizenship is predicated upon the continued rule of the English over the East, the two being fundamentally distinct and discrete. This captures the politics of what Partha Chatterjee has coined 'the rule of colonial difference', arguing that the governmentalising thrust of the colonial state was always limited by the imperative to perpetuate a division between the rulers and the ruled, a division marked by ideas of inherent racial difference.[83] The marriage of Mabel Cosgrove and Chan-Toon reveals the intimate politics of colonial differentiations.

A focus on masculinity reveals these tensions. On the one hand, masculinity was variegated by racial difference. Burmese masculinity was contrasted to British masculinity and Indian masculinity, all unstable and heterogeneous figures but nonetheless tropes that structured colonial 'common-sense'.[84] Both Mabel Chan-Toon and Chan-Toon himself cited and reiterated these contrasts in their public writings and talks. On the other hand, masculinity held the possibility of transcending racial difference for Chan-Toon. British legal masculinity, supposedly independent, objective, and detached, was a field of practice in which he sought to realise his imperial citizenship unmarked by bodily difference. His class status and elite education, supported by the capital accumulated of his merchant father profiting from the dramatic expansion of the rice frontier in British Burma,[85] made this a possibility. But ultimately it proved unattainable. His failed marriage, through Mabel Chan-Toon's retelling, rendered him as Eastern as East can be beneath his veneer of civilisation. He was cast to the other side of the gulf between the East and her West. Lurking in the margins and between the lines of the texts analysed here was whiteness. British masculinity in the

empire and at home was mediated by whiteness. As a concept, whiteness shares much with masculinity as an object of study. They have historically been taken as unacknowledged, universal subject positions. Scholars of both have struggled with issues of reification, wishing to avoid further cementing these exclusive subjectivities.[86] However, whiteness and masculinity interact and are entangled – although not rigidly or mechanistically. In the case of colonial masculinity, it may be through the vagaries of when and where the racial exclusivity of Britishness was made manifest in discourse or practice that we can see the work done by whiteness.

Notes

1 Ashwini Tambe, 'Colluding Patriarchies: The Colonial Reform of Sexual Relations in India', *Feminist Studies*, 26.3 (2000), 587–600; Catherine Hall, 'Of Gender and Empire: Reflections on the Nineteenth Century', in Philippa Levine (ed.), *Gender and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 46–76.

2 Mrinalini Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity: The 'Manly Englishman' and the 'Effeminate Bengali' in the Late Nineteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995).

3 Tracey Rizzo, *Intimate Empires: Body, Race, and Gender in the Modern World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).

4 Stephen Heathorn, 'How Stiff Were Their Upper Lips? Research on Late-Victorian and Edwardian Masculinity', *History Compass*, 2.1 (2004); Harald Fischer-Tiné and Susanne Gehrmann (eds), *Empires and Boundaries: Race, Class, and Gender in Colonial Settings* (London: Routledge, 2008).

5 John M. Mackenzie, *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and British Imperialism*, Studies in Imperialism (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988); M. S. S. Pandian, 'Gendered Negotiations: Hunting and Colonialism in the Late 19th Century Nilgiris', *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 29.1–2 (1995), 239–263; Joseph Sramek, '"Face Him like a Briton": Tiger Hunting, Imperialism, and British Masculinity in Colonial India, 1800–1875', *Victorian Studies*, 48.4 (2006), 659–680.

6 Julie E. Hughes, *Animal Kingdoms: Hunting, the Environment, and Power in Indian Princely States* (New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2013).

7 Heather Streets, *Martial Races: The Military, Race and Masculinity in British Imperial Culture, 1857–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004); Gavin Rand, '"Martial Races" and "Imperial Subjects": Violence and Governance in Colonial India, 1857–1914', *European Review of History: Revue Européenne d'histoire*, 13.1 (2006), 1–20; Daniel J. R. Grey, 'Creating the "Problem Hindu": Sati, Thuggee and Female Infanticide in India, 1800–60', *Gender & History*, 25.3 (2013), 498–510; Jessica Hinchy, 'Obscenity, Moral Contagion and Masculinity: Hijras in Public Space in Colonial North India', *Asian Studies Review*, 38.2 (2014), 274–294.

8 Joseph S. Alter, 'Indian Clubs and Colonialism: Hindu Masculinity and Muscular Christianity', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 46.3 (2004), 497–534; Shruti Kapila, 'Masculinity and Madness: Princely Personhood and Colonial Sciences of the Mind in Western India 1871–1940', *Past and Present*, 187.1 (2005), 121–156; Shefali Chandra, 'Mimicry, Masculinity, and the Mystique of Indian English: Western India, 1870–1900', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 68.1 (2009), 199–225; Douglas E. Haynes, 'Selling Masculinity: Advertisements for Sex Tonics and the Making of Modern Conjugality in Western India, 1900–1945', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 35.4 (2012), 787–831.

9 Subho Basu and Sikata Banerjee, 'The Quest for Manhood: Masculine Hinduism and Nation in Bengal', *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 26.3 (2006), 476–490; Chie Ikeya, *Refiguring Women, Colonialism, and Modernity in Burma* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2011).

10 Although, the field is still comparatively small. See Chie Ikeya, 'Masculinities in Asia: A Review Essay', *Asian Studies Review*, 38.2 (2014), 243–252.

11 Sramek, '"Face Him like a Briton"'; Marjorie Levine-Clark, 'From "Relief" to "Justice and Protection": The Maintenance of Deserted Wives, British Masculinity and Imperial Citizenship, 1870–1920', *Gender & History*, 22.2 (2010), 302–321; Ashok Malhotra, 'Performing Imperial Masculinity in British Theatre in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century', *Cultural and Social History*, 9.2 (2012), 227–250; J. A. Mangan, *The Games Ethic and Imperialism: Aspects of the Diffusion of an Ideal* (London: Routledge, 2013).

12 Mrinalini Sinha, 'Giving Masculinity a History: Some Contributions from the Historiography of Colonial India', *Gender & History*, 11.3 (1999), 445–460.

13 Christopher E. Goscha, 'Widening the Colonial Encounter: Asian Connections Inside French Indochina during the Interwar Period', *Modern Asian Studies*, 43.5 (2009), 1189–1228; Tamara Loos, 'Transnational Histories of Sexualities in Asia', *American Historical Review*, 114.5 (2009), 1309–1324.

14 Simon Yarrow, 'Masculinity as a World Historical Category of Analysis', in John H. Arnold and Sean Brady (eds), *What Is Masculinity? Historical Dynamics from Antiquity to the Contemporary World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 114–138.

15 Antoinette Burton, 'Not Even Remotely Global? Method and Scale in World History', *History Workshop Journal*, 64.1 (2007), 323–328; Simon J. Potter and Jonathan Saha, 'Global History, Imperial History and Connected Histories of Empire', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, 16.1 (2015).

16 Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830–1867* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002); Tony Ballantyne and Antoinette Burton (eds), *Bodies in Contact: Rethinking Colonial Encounters in World History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose (eds), *At Home with the Empire: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

17 Warwick Anderson, 'The Trespass Speaks: White Masculinity and Colonial Breakdown', *American Historical Review*, 102.5 (1997), 1343–1370; Catherine Hall, *Macaulay and Son: Architects of Imperial Britain* (New Haven: Yale

University Press, 2012); James Epstein, *Scandal of Colonial Rule: Power and Subversion in the British Atlantic during the Age of Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

18 Julia Clancy-Smith and Frances Gouda (eds), *Domesticating the Empire: Race, Gender, and Family Life in French and Dutch Colonialism* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1998); Elizabeth Buettner, *Empire Families: Britons and Late Imperial India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Durba Ghosh, 'Household Crimes and Domestic Order: Keeping the Peace in Colonial Calcutta, c. 1770–c. 1840', *Modern Asian Studies*, 38.03 (2004), 599–623; Emily J. Manktelow, *Missionary Families: Race, Gender and Generation on the Spiritual Frontier* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).

19 Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Esme Cleall, Laura Ishiguro, and Emily J. Manktelow, 'Imperial Relations: Histories of Family in the British Empire', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, 14.1 (2013).

20 Michael Roper, 'Slipping Out of View: Subjectivity and Emotion in Gender History', *History Workshop Journal*, 59.1 (2005), 57–72; Cleall *et al.*, 'Imperial Relations'.

21 Damon Ieremia Salesa, *Racial Crossings: Race, Intermarriage, and the Victorian British Empire*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); T. J. Tallie, 'Queering Natal: Settler Logics and the Disruptive Challenge of Zulu Polygamy', *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 19.2 (2013), 167–189; Mary A. Procida, *Married to the Empire: Gender, Politics and Imperialism in India, 1883–1947* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017).

22 *Evening Telegraph*, 29 July 1893; *Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser (Weekly)*, 5 September 1893, 8.

23 K. A Ballhatchet, *Race, Sex and Class under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and Policies and Their Critics, 1793–1905* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1980).

24 Onni Gust, 'Mobility, Gender and Empire in Maria Graham's *Journal of a Residence in India* (1812)', *Gender & History*, 29.2 (2017), 273–291.

25 Homi Bhabha, 'Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse', *October*, 28 (1984), 125–133.

26 Mrs M. Chan-Toon, *A Marriage in Burmah: A Novel* (London: Greening and Co., 1909).

27 Accurate details of her publications can be found here, although the biographical details contain numerous errors: 'Chan-Toon, Mrs M.: Mabel Mary Agnes Cosgrove', in Sandra Kemp, Charlotte Mitchell, and David Trotter (eds), *The Oxford Companion to Edwardian Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

28 *Evening News*, 20 February 1904, 2.

29 *Morning Post*, 13 October 1888, 3.

30 Chan-Toon, *A Marriage in Burmah*.

31 *Ibid.*, 286.
32 Radhika Mohanram, 'Dermographia Written on the Skin or, How the Irish Became White in India', *European Journal of English Studies*, 9.3 (2005), 251–270; Angela Woollacott, 'Whiteness and "the Imperial Turn"', in Leigh Boucher, Jane Carey, and Katherine Ellinghaus (eds), *Historicising Whiteness: Transnational Perspectives on the Construction of an Identity* (Melbourne: RMIT Publishing in association with the School of Historical Studies, University of Melbourne, 2007), 7–15.
33 *Aberdeen Daily Journal*, 18 March 1912, 3.
34 Gregory Mackie, 'Forging Oscar Wilde: Mrs. Chan-Toon and *For Love of the King*', *English Literature in Transition, 1880–1920*, 54.3 (2011), 267–288.
35 *Evening Telegraph and Post*, 13 January 1926, 3; *Aberdeen Press and Journal*, 12 November 1926, 8.
36 Mackie, 'Forging Oscar Wilde'.
37 *New York Times*, 8 June 1907.
38 *Aberdeen Press and Journal*, 1 March 1924, 4.
39 Chan-Toon, *A Marriage in Burmah*.
40 Ajay Skaria, 'Shades of Wildness: Tribe, Caste, and Gender in Western India', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 56.3 (1997), 726–745; Charu Gupta, 'Feminine, Criminal or Manly? Imaging Dalit Masculinities in Colonial North India', *The Indian Economic & Social History Review*, 47.3 (2010), 309–342; Avril A. Powell and Siobhan Lambert-Hurley (eds), *Rhetoric and Reality: Gender and the Colonial Experience in South Asia* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006); Prem Chowdhry, 'Militarized Masculinities: Shaped and Reshaped in Colonial South-East Punjab', *Modern Asian Studies*, 47.3 (2013), 713–750.
41 Tinzar Lwyn, 'Stories of Gender and Ethnicity: Discourses of Colonialism and Resistance in Burma', *Australian Journal of Anthropology*, 5.1–2 (1994), 60–85.
42 Chie Ikeya, 'The "Traditional" High Status of Women in Burma', *The Journal of Burma Studies*, 10 (2005), 51–81.
43 Jonathan Saha, 'The Male State: Colonialism, Corruption and Rape Investigations in the Irrawaddy Delta c.1900', *Indian Economic Social History Review*, 47.3 (2010), 343–376.
44 Deborah Deacon Boyer, 'Picturing the Other: Images of Burmans in Imperial Britain', *Victorian Periodicals Review*, 35.3 (2002), 214–226.
45 Jonathan Saha, 'Madness and the Making of a Colonial Order in Burma', *Modern Asian Studies*, 47.2 (2013), 406–435.
46 Frank Mort, *Dangerous Sexualities: Medico-Moral Politics in England since 1830*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2000).
47 Lucy Delap, 'Uneven Orientalisms: Burmese Women and the Feminist Imagination', *Gender & History*, 24.2 (2012), 389–410; Shobna Nijhawan, 'At the Margins of Empire: Feminist-Nationalist Configurations of Burmese Society in the Hindi Public (1917–1920)', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 71.4 (2012), 1013–1033.
48 Saha, 'The Male State'.

49 Jonathan Saha, 'Whiteness, Masculinity and the Ambivalent Embodiment of "British Justice" in Colonial Burma', *Cultural and Social History*, 14.4 (2017), 527–542.
50 Chan-Toon, *A Marriage in Burmah*.
51 Carol Ann Boshier, *Mapping Cultural Nationalism: The Scholars of the Burma Research Society, 1910–1935* (Copenhagen: NIAS Press, 2018).
52 Archibald Mackirdy and William Nicholas Willis, *The White Slave Market* (London: Stanley Paul & Co., 1912).
53 Ballhatchet, *Race, Sex and Class*; Jeremy Neill, '"This Is a Most Disgusting Case": Imperial Policy, Class and Gender in the "Rangoon Outrage" of 1899', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, 12.1 (2011); Saha, 'Whiteness, Masculinity and Ambivalent Embodiment'.
54 Jonathan Saha, 'Among the Beasts of Burma: Animals and the Politics of Colonial Sensibilities, c.1840–1950', *Journal of Social History*, 48.4 (2015), 933–955.
55 Jonathan Saha, 'Colonization, Criminalization and Complicity: Policing Gambling in Burma c.1880–1920', *South East Asia Research*, 21.4 (2013), 655–672; Ashley Wright, *Opium and Empire in Southeast Asia: Regulating Consumption in British Burma* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
56 Chan-Toon, *A Marriage in Burmah*, 52–60.
57 *Standard*, 18 December 1885, 3.
58 Jordan Carlyle Winfield, 'Buddhism and Insurrection in Burma, 1886–1890', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 20.3 (2010), 345–367.
59 *Standard*, 18 December 1885, 3.
60 *Manchester Courier and Lancashire General Advertiser*, 19 January 1891, 5.
61 *Pall Mall Gazette*, 21 June 1888, 10; *Singapore Free Press and Mercantile Advertiser (Weekly)*, 3 March 1904, 134.
62 *Liverpool Mercury*, 22 June 1888, 5.
63 *Morning Post*, 13 November 1888, 3.
64 *Standard*, 12 June 1895, 5.
65 This position was not uniformly welcomed in the British press. The radical newspapers ridiculed his praise for the freedom and meritocracy of England. William Morris's Anarcho-Communist journal, *The Commonweal*, drew attention to Chan-Toon's father's successful rice merchant firm to cast him as an imperial stooge acquiring his legal skills to keep Burmese working classes in subjugation. *The Commonweal*, 21 July 1888, 228.
66 Ikeya, *Refiguring Women*.
67 *Pall Mall Gazette*, 19 October 1888, 6; *Daily News*, 3 May 1889, 3.
68 Chan-Toon, *The Nature and Value of Jurisprudence*, 2nd (enlarged) edn (London: Reeves and Turner, 1889), ix–xviii.
69 *Ibid.*, 103–124.
70 *Graphic*, 14 November 1889, 330.
71 *Pall Mall Gazette*, 9 December 1889, 6.
72 *A Reprint of the Printed Judgments of the Court of the Judicial Commissioner, Lower Burma, and Special Court, for the Period Extending from 1893–1900*, 2nd edn (Rangoon: Office of the Supdt., Government Printing, 1905).

73 *Cambridge Independent Press*, 4 March 1892, 4.
74 E. M. Collingham, *Imperial Bodies: The Physical Experience of the Raj, c.1800–1947* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001).
75 Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality, and the Colonial Order of Things* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995).
76 Chan-Toon, *A Marriage in Burmah*.
77 Philippa Levine, 'States of Undress: Nakedness and the Colonial Imagination', *Victorian Studies*, 50.2 (2008), 189–219.
78 Cecil Champain Lowis, *The Machinations of the Myo-Ok* (London: Methuen, 1903); George Orwell, *Burmese Days* (London: Penguin, 1989).
79 Clare Anderson, *Legible Bodies: Race, Criminality and Colonialism in South Asia* (Oxford: Berg, 2004); Jordanna Bailkin, 'Making Faces: Tattooed Women and Colonial Regimes', *History Workshop Journal*, 59.1 (2005), 33–56.
80 Saha, 'Whiteness, Masculinity and Ambivalent Embodiment'.
81 Colin Tyler, 'Performativity and the Intellectual Historian's Re-enactment of Written Works', *Journal of the Philosophy of History*, 3.2 (2009), 167–186.
82 *Daily News*, 8 August 1890, 5.
83 Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1994); Elizabeth Kolsky, 'Codification and the Rule of Colonial Difference: Criminal Procedure in British India', *Law and History Review*, 23.3 (2005), 631–683.
84 Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Commonsense* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009).
85 Michael Adas, *The Burma Delta: Economic Development and Social Change on an Asian Rice Frontier, 1852–1941* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974); Peter A. Coclanis, 'Southeast Asia's Incorporation into the World Rice Market: A Revisionist View', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 24.2 (1993), 251–267; Ian Brown, *A Colonial Economy in Crisis: Burma's Rice Delta and the World Depression of the 1930s*, RoutledgeCurzon Studies in the Modern History of Asia, 28 (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2005).
86 Angela Woollacott, '"All This Is the Empire, I Told Myself": Australian Women's Voyages "Home" and the Articulation of Colonial Whiteness', *American Historical Review*, 102.4 (1997), 1003–1029; Mohanram, 'Dermographia'; Woollacott, 'Whiteness'; Sara Ahmed, 'A Phenomenology of Whiteness', *Feminist Theory*, 8.2 (2007), 149–168.