The Emotional Economies of Colonial Capitalism and Its Legacies

Jana Gohrisch

INTRODUCTION

In his essay "Imagined, Real and Moral Economies" published in 2014, John Clarke defines 'imagined' as "the discursive or ideological representation of what an economy is" (97). In his contribution to this volume "Why *Imagined* Economies?" he uses the term interchangeably with 'imaginary' as a device to escape the dominant neoliberal narrative of 'the Economy' and to open up intellectual space "for imagining other economies, or even for imagining economies otherwise" (see chapter Clarke in this volume). However, neither text employs the categories race and ethnicity, which are as central as class (and gender) to understand how, since the onset of large-scale colonisation, capitalist agricultural and industrial enterprises owned mainly by whites have managed to enlist the state and public funding to secure cheap black and brown labour to make private profit. An equally unacknowledged white perspective predominates in Ute Frevert's introduction and survey essay in her edited collection *Moral Economies*. Despite the focus on the – slave-trading – 18th century that comes with her topic, she mentions colonialism and enslavement as means of accumulating capital only in passing

(Frevert, "Moral Economies" 20, 37, 39). Both Frevert and Clarke, however, borrow E. P. Thompson's term 'moral economy' to understand past and present economic thought. While Frevert refutes Thompson's politics and eventually uses the term very generally to specify the "conflicting views on economic activities" (Frevert, "Introduction" 11), Clarke treats "'moral economies' as another form of imagined economy" ("Imagined, Real" 95). He employs Thompson's ideas as a springboard to reflect convincingly on "whether the moral, political and economic can – and should – be related" today (107).[1]

Taking literally the second half of this volume's title, real fictions, I will read the colonial novel *Lutchmee and Dilloo. A Study of West Indian Life* (1877) by Edward Jenkins, a British writer and political reformer, to highlight the connections between race, class and the economy from the perspective of literary studies. With this, I wish to extend the interdisciplinary discussion of imagined economies into the past, thus complementing Melissa Kennedy's literary studies contribution to this volume. She investigates the potential of the arts and humanities "to intervene in education, public discourse, and economic decision-making" (see chapter Kennedy in this volume) for which she conjures up a contemporary 'we' to imagine a collective subject in opposition to neoliberal capitalism. In my chapter, however, I propose to acknowledge the conflicting interests of the distinctly racialised agents in capitalist economy and, from there, to understand the cognitive and emotional effects

1 Clarke writes: "Thompson's use of the idea [of a moral economy] was located in a specific social formation and its disruption, producing a moment in which food rioters in 18th century England laid claim to collective understandings of how economic relations were structured by moral obligations. Rioters – and those who judged them – understood this field of moral ties as legitimation for public anger and action. The current instabilities of the dominantly imagined economy have made it more possible to pose questions about questions of whether the moral, political and economic can – and should – be related." (107)

of these unresolved conflicts in both quotidian and academic discourses today.

Lutchmee and Dilloo. A Study of West Indian Life is set in British Guyana's sugar plantation economy of the 1870s and is, despite the investigative connotations of 'study', marked out as 'real fiction' by its generically mixed aesthetics. It is a work of artistic imagination self-confidently embedded in British economic imperialism and its concomitant racist colonial ideology. I argue that the novel establishes a racialised emotional economy to normalise the extensive exploitation of underpaid brown and black migrant labour for its implied white middle-class and metropolitan readership. To take the argument further, this normalising discourse has had both epistemological and emotional repercussions in Britain, which continues to shape the debate about economy and race to this very day. The most conspicuous legacies of the emotional economies of colonial capitalism are a select epistemological silence and an equally select emotional eloquence. Together, they serve to disconnect what is causally connected: capitalist economy and racist discrimination.

LEGACIES IN 21ST-CENTURY NON-FICTION: EITHER ECONOMY OR RACE

Neither the British sociologist (John Clarke), the German historian (Ute Frevert) nor the literary studies scholar based in Austria (Melissa Kennedy) quoted above mentions race (although the latter has published widely on colonial capitalism). Neither do the two US-American representatives of economic criticism, a relatively new approach in literary criticism, as they dismiss the category to a footnote (Woodmansee and

Osteen 43). Conversely, if one takes a look at the long history of American Critical Race Theory[2], race is central, but one finds little to no fundamental censure of capitalist economy when practised by whites. To this field Nancy Leong has recently added a substantial essay on "Racial Capitalism" published in the specialist *Harvard Law Review*. Similar to Eva Illouz's critique of the commodification of emotions and their transformation into "emodities" (Illouz 1ff.), Leong analyses the commercialisation of non-white racial identities. She then suggests legal measures to ameliorate the detrimental effects of this process on African and white Americans alike.

Targeting a much larger audience in Britain, award-winning journalist Reni Eddo-Lodge and former barrister-turned-journalist Afua Hirsch, popular historian David Olusoga, and rapper Akala (to name but a few) write about race in late-capitalist Britain. They keep a high profile on the internet with blogs, videos and websites as well as in other media, especially documentary and educational film. Eddo-Lodge has won several awards; Hirsch was one of the judges for the 2019 Booker Prize; and Olusoga is a much sought-after writer, broadcaster, TV presenter and filmmaker who, through his work, has continuously drawn attention to the importance of race in Britain. While the tone of the academics mentioned above is emotionally detached, with some irony added in Clarke, the journalists opt for emotional display to make themselves heard and, ironically, seen.

More than 30 years ago, Paul Gilroy published his antiracist polemic *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack. The Cultural Politics of Race*

2 The overwhelmingly rich African American discussion of race is not part of my discussion but there is plenty of material dissecting the intricate connections between race and the economy which, to name just one seminal text, Angela Davis's Women, Race and Class (1981) shows. For an antiracist critique of Gender Studies see Sabine Broeck's Gender and the Abjection of Blackness (2018). See also her co-edited collection (with Jason R. Ambroise) Black Knowledges/Black Struggles: Essays in Critical Epistemology (2015).

and Nation (1987). It is one of the most outstanding in a long line of similar texts that have come out since the end of the 20th century and the millennium, when New Labour's policy of multiculturalism encouraged fictional and non-fictional writing by black and Asian British writers. Why should two young black British professional women (Eddo-Lodge, Hirsch) see the need to cover the same ground again and to such public acclaim? Fred D'Aguiar, Guyana-born writer and critic of the Gilroy-generation, explains the reason in a fictive letter to Beryl Gilroy, the Guyanese-British author of the autobiographical *Black Teacher* (1994) and mother of Paul Gilroy. 15 years after her death, D'Aguiar honours her brave struggle against frequent occurrences of institutional and everyday racism. Employing an economic metaphor, he deplores with some bitterness that Beryl Gilroy had fought "without an insurance policy against their reoccurrence" ("Letter to Beryl Gilroy" 759). He continues: "It is this sad and dismaying reality which informs racism in Britain, that it is ever lasting, that the vigilance against it must be a perpetual stance, never to be relaxed and certainly never retired from use." (759) Subsequently, D'Aguiar retraces his bold statement made 30 years earlier when he provocatively opened an essay with the claim: "There is no Black British literature, there is only literature with its usual variants of class, sex, race, time and place." ("Against Black British" 106) Despite the fact that the "bigger white-owned presses have cashed in on the demand for black creativity" (111), he states in his letter to Beryl Gilroy that black British writers "feel that Britishness obliterates difference rather than seeing difference in others as an enrichment of it" ("Letter to Beryl Gilroy" 761). He mentions public administration, police and prisons explicitly as places of racism (759) but not the economy.

Afua Hirsch and Reni Eddo-Lodge differ in their registers from both the earlier writers and from each other. Hirsch's *Brit(ish): On Race, Identity and Belonging* is a generic mixture of memoir, reportage and political analysis, which comes across as personally concerned but calm and reflective. Situated at the other end of the emotional spectrum, Eddo-Lodge adopts a belligerent stance occasionally resorting to anger

and rage as evident in the book's sarcastic title *Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People about Race* taken from a blog posted in 2014. Although the two writers are explicit on the imperial origins and economic implications of British racism and refer to the large-scale economically motivated immigration after the war, they do not discuss the causal and structural links between the neoliberal economy and racial discrimination. Both, however, comment on social class. Afua Hirsch is very much aware of her middle-class status and privilege, especially in contrast to black working-class people, which allow her to explore her identity as a mixed-race professional woman. Despite this economic belonging, she feels emotionally excluded from British society. Based on statistics and census data, Reni Eddo-Lodge exposes the phrase 'white working class' as a construct in the tradition of 'divide and rule' (Eddo-Lodge 95-96, 202, 206) designed to remove from sight black and brown working-class people.

Both writers forcefully denounce that, "in Britain, we are taught not to see race" (Hirsch 10). Eddo-Lodge spells out the consequences: "Colour-blindness does not accept the legitimacy of structural racism or a history of white racial dominance. […] In order to dismantle unjust, racist structures, we must see race" (Eddo-Lodge 83-84). Hirsch ends her book with the following caveat: "Colour […] blindness […] is not a good strategy for seeing what is there. Race is there, as lived experience, as the basis for the most dramatic economic and human shifts in history" (318). While Hirsch uses the adjective 'economic', Eddo-Lodge explains racism more generally as "the survival strategy of systemic power" (64). She convincingly contends that racism is not "about moral values" (64) but then does not spell out what 'systemic power' would comprise in her view. Similar to Hirsch's style, her diction shows a preference for passive constructions and abstract references to 'structure' and 'system'. Alluding to her (unwillingly taken) role as "the angry black woman" (186), she declares: "I have no desire to be equal. I want to deconstruct the structural power of a system that marked me out as different. […] Equality is fine as a transitional demand but […] it is the easy route" (184). Eddo-Lodge's argument leaves the reader to choose

from two imagined camps: white, dominant and complacent or black, oppressed and angry. "[R]acism is a white problem. It reveals the anxieties, hypocrisies and double standards of whiteness. It is a problem in the psyche of whiteness that white people must take responsibility to solve" (219). Eddo-Lodge then warns of pointless "white guilt" and demands: "Instead, get angry. Anger is useful. Use it for good" (221). I shall now take up Eddo-Lodge's call indicating the agents and their conflicting interests in the economic processes that constitute the systemic power she condemns.

MID-19TH-CENTURY COLONIAL FICTION: ECONOMY, RACE, EMOTIONS

Someone who unashamedly 'sees' race, as well as the hierarchies of class and ethnicity, and openly presents them as pillars of 19th-century imperial economy is Edward Jenkins (1838-1910). The once well-known writer disappeared from view for most of the 20th century and was only rediscovered by postcolonial-studies scholars in the 21st century enquiring into the role of indenture in post-emancipation Caribbean economies.

After the abolition of slavery in the British Empire in 1833, the former slave-owners, especially in the newer colonies of Trinidad and Guyana, imported migrant labourers mainly from India and China to replace the Africans who left the industrial plantation economy due to oppressive conditions and low wages. "Between 1838 and 1918, approximately 500,000 Indians and 200,000 Chinese were brought to work in the Caribbean […]" (Klein 4). Describing the situation for Guyana, Brian Moore specifies the exact numbers and hints at the tax-based financial arrangements underpinning the process: "By 1900 a total of 270,448 immigrants, nearly three times the native [African-Guyanese] population of 1838, were brought into the colony at public expense: from Madeira 32,216 […], from India 210,639, from Africa 14,060, and from China 13,533" (Moore 8). In order to escape their impoverished conditions in

colonial India following massive displacements especially in the provinces of Bihar, Bengal and Madras (Klein 67), thousands of Indian peasants and small artisans agreed to contracts offering five years of badly but steadily paid plantation work in the Caribbean. In Guyana, "the planter-dominated colonial regime" spent "large sums of public money to import new immigrant labourers" (Moore 8) which "conflicted directly with the interests of the native Creoles" whose "wages fell" as "jobs became scarcer, taxation to support immigration rose" (Moore 11) and land became more difficult to acquire. The British state, that is the Colonial Office, administered the process through its representatives in London and the colonies such as Guyana. "The state was responsible for protecting the economic interests of the plantations, as well as the social and political interests of the white minority" (Moore 13). State-paid governors, administrators, magistrates and other staff made sure the local colonial economies ran smoothly. After the Second World War, the British state was once again responsible for the supply of cheap labour for British businesses as well as British public services, such as transport and the NHS, and achieved this by importing large contingents of workers from the Caribbean in the 1950s and 1960s, followed by South Asians in the 1960s and 1970s. These are similar processes based on the same racist principle: state-managed import of cheap black and brown labour to serve the needs of privately (but also welfare state-) owned white businesses.

In 1870 Jenkins, then a liberal MP and barrister, went to British Guyana on behalf of the London-based Aboriginal Protection and Anti-Slavery Society to report on the work of a royal commission investigating the conditions of indentured labourers on the sugar plantations. In 1871, he published the comprehensive study *The Coolie. His Rights and Wrongs* with which he calls for more state control over the plantation owners' abusive treatment of their workforce.[3] As the text had not stirred

3 The cover and title page of the 1871 American edition advertised the text as "By the Author of Ginx's Baby" instead of giving the author's name. Letizia Gramaglia used this edition for the re-publication of The Coolie. His Rights

the British public into the pity and compassion Jenkins wished it to feel for the Indian labourers' plight, he took to fiction to popularise the matter. By then, he was already famous for his satires *Ginx's Baby* and *Little Hodge*, two slim volumes, which today make for annoying reading compared to the great tradition of English satire. They are both condescending in tone and conservative in politics because they suggest that the working and the peasant classes are in need of help by the middle and upper classes. The latter, however, do nothing but meddle incompetently with the affairs of the poor instead of alleviating their sufferings.[4] Published after the two satires, *Lutchmee and Dilloo. A Study of West Indian Life* was widely reviewed in the British quality press. A search in the British Library Newspapers Database yields at least eleven longer reviews and many more short notices, which suggest that the novel was indeed read – even if not always favourably. A good summary of the general opinion appeared in the Cardiff-based *Western Mail*, whose reviewer juxtaposes *Lutchmee and Dilloo* with Jenkins's earlier writings to conclude:

> "Lutchmee and Dilloo" […] is a dreadfully weary and ill-structured tale, and I should think would find no more favour with the public than his account of the results of the commission of inquiry in British Guiana on the same subject. Whatever little reputation Mr. Jenkins has derived from "Ginx's Baby"

---

and Wrongs in The Guyana Classics Library in 2010 to which she also contributed an introduction.

4 The following editions of Ginx's Baby sold well, not least because the cover carried one of the most famous photographs of the 1870s, which represents an enraged toddler. Charles Darwin himself had commissioned the picture from the controversial art photographer Oscar Gustav Rejlander for his study The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals (1872). Neither Darwin nor Rejlander ever disclosed that the latter had seriously modified the image to bring out better the anger and pain of the depicted infant. The photographer not only sold the picture to the popular press but also in its hundreds of thousands as carte(s)-de-visite (Smith 226).

> will not long survive such pitiable literary efforts as "Lutchmee and Dilloo". ("London Correspondence")

On the other side of the evaluative spectrum resides *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper* whose reviewer calls the novel an "admirable work" because it will stir the otherwise complacent readers of Mudie's Lending Library into some awareness of injustice ("Literature"). While this review offers Jenkins "hearty thanks" for having "striven valiantly on behalf of the coolies", *The Saturday Review*, reflecting the taste of well-educated readers, falls in with the verdict passed by the *Western Mail*. "Meanwhile no good will be done to the coolie by writing third-rate sensational novels about him" ("Lutchmee and Dilloo" 720). Other reviews repeatedly problematise Jenkins's purpose, such as the *London Society*, a magazine dedicated to "light and amusing literature for the hours of relaxation", which sharply quips: "Mr. Jenkins is a novelist who always writes with a purpose, and what he gains in purpose he frequently loses in the construction of the story" ("New Books" 565). Having pointed out twice the "exaggerated" tone of Jenkins's novels and of *Lutchmee and Dilloo* in particular (565), the reviewer in the end praises the "many scenes of pathos and eloquence" (565-66) which he obviously deems fit for his readers' "hours of relaxation". F. M. Owen, writing for *The Academy*, an intellectual weekly dedicated to raising the quality of fiction, has no desire to cover up the novel's failure, attributing this to "its subject, the wrongs of the Coolies in Demerara", which he thinks "is inartistic" (Owen 547). Like most of the other reviewers, he speculates about the readers' feeling sympathy for Dilloo but not "sufficient interest in the story as a story to pursue it, except from a high sense of philanthropic duty" (547). Unsurprisingly, *The Athenaeum* and *The Saturday Review*, the two leading review journals with famous writers as reviewers, offer the most scathing criticism of the novel's failed aesthetics: "the reader feels that there is something wrong somewhere" ("Literature: Novels of the Week" 491). *The Athenaeum* points to Jenkins's problematic use of sources mixing Mauritius with Guyana, which gives the novel an air of "unreality" ("Literature: Novels of the Week" 491), while *The Saturday*

Review, with ironic verve, draws attention to Jenkins's free copying from a variety of Blue Books, especially on Barbados ("Lutchmee and Dilloo" 719). Both reviewers systematically discuss the novel's shortcomings with regard to plot, character, description and dialogue, drawing attention to striking contradictions. Instead of the Uncle-Tom style indictment of the hardships of indenture, expected by the reviewers, the novel presents an improbably well-off major Indian character and individual white mismanagement as cause for some merely minor injustices ("Literature: Novels of the Week" 491). Moreover, the reviewers criticise the novel's unconvincing presentation of the Indian characters' feelings ("Lutchmee and Dilloo" 720). Taken together, the reviews document that the novel was widely read across the social spectrum and variously appreciated or rejected depending on the journals' inscribed readership. None of the reviewers, however, finds fault with imperial economics based on contract labour. Yet, it is this system that Jenkins deems useful for the exploited workers if only administered properly. Thus, he writes in the preface to his novel:

> I have long since expressed the opinion that a Coolie system, under proper supervision and restraint, could be made a system of incalculable benefit to the Asiatics. But the sole condition on which we can allow it to exist within our dominions is that our Government shall exercise over it […] most rigid control. (Jenkins 29)

Jenkins was "a staunch British imperialist" (Sutherland 330, Graves and Milne) but "no clichéd" one (Dabydeen 8). The few literary critics who read the novel today welcome it – despite its shortcomings and obvious racism – as the first literary representation of Indian indentured labourers (Dabydeen, Jackson, Klein, Poynting). Indo-Guyanese novelist and critic David Dabydeen has made possible the only two existing re-editions of *Lutchmee and Dilloo*: in 2003, in the Caribbean Classics series of Macmillan Education, introduced by himself, and in 2010, in The Guyana Classics Library, with him as general editor. In the preface to the series, financed by the Government of Guyana, Bharrat Jagdeo, then

President of Guyana, honours Jenkins's novel as the "only substantial fiction on Guiana [sic]" in the 19th century (Jagdeo v). The series' aim is that "all Guyanese can appreciate our monumental achievement in moving from Exploitation to Expression" (vi). How exactly would this work with Jenkins's novel, which expresses exploitation in a way that makes it inexpressible and thus acceptable, as I shall reveal shortly? The answer lies in the very mode of expression it selects, in its imagined emotional economy, which functions by derailing and re-directing anger and its concomitant cognitions[5] of discontent and resentment to render it harmless. It is here that the emotional economy of colonial capitalism differs from the 'moral economy' E. P. Thompson found operating in 18th-century England on its transition to capitalist market economy. Relying on a wealth of historical sources he studied how the lower classes successfully transformed their "fury for corn" (Thompson 135), especially in times of dearth, into meaningful action by threatening riots to force the prices for corn down. "This fury for corn is a curious culmination of the age of agricultural improvement. […] The breakthrough of the new political economy of the free market was also the breakdown of the old moral economy of provision" (Thompson 135-36). In the following, I will look at the management of fury and anger in fiction, taking the concern with real history onto the level of representation and thus imagination.

5 The cognitive components of emotions refer to the perception of internal states and external stimuli, that is, they comprise the processes of evaluating, digesting, remembering and controlling emotions on the part of the individual (Ulich and Mayring 51).

MANAGING ANGER IN THE IMAGINED PLANTATION ECONOMY OF *LUTCHMEE AND DILLOO*

Whose anger does the novel select for representation? How does the text embed anger situationally? Which material and immaterial objects are evaluated by the emotion, that is, what is the aim of the anger? Which are its dominant cognitions and how does the text manage their display? How does the novel link anger to its imagined economy?

The novel's first five (of the 59) chapters are set in India. It begins with Lutchmee, the light-brown and beautiful female protagonist, who is sexually harassed by Hunoomaun, the dark-brown village watchman and long-standing opponent to Lutchmee's "manly" but "low-caste" husband Dilloo (Jenkins 34, 36). Lutchmee is saved first by Dilloo and then by the British deputy magistrate, whose wife she serves as a maid after Dilloo has left for Guyana. Not only does the novel imagine the white colonisers as protectors of the jealously warring natives but it also keeps quiet about the ravages of colonising rural India that cause emigration in the first place. Instead of hinting at the economic changes, which drive men like Dilloo away, the novel blames dark-skinned Hunoomaun, typified as "ugly" (36), "villainous" (36, 90) and, later, as "cowardly" (97-98), for destroying his opponent's crop and stealing his savings (37-38). The following chapter offers a way out by introducing an over-paid and manipulative recruiter whose promises lure Dilloo to Guyana, where the three Indians meet again as contract labourers on a sugar plantation.

What seems a mere exposition turns out to be a most effective narrative technique to derail anger, rage and wrath, the disruptive emotions the authorial narrator attributes to both white planters and brown labourers, on both sides of the economic divide in Guyana. This character-centred device serves to contain the economically caused social conflicts within an epically told tale of individual jealousy and revenge. The "revenge tragedy" (Poynting 218) culminates in a deadly fight between the two labourers, described in detail at the end of the novel, in which Dilloo

kills his opponent. In accordance with the genre conventions (to which the villain also belongs) and with contemporary racist notions of the non-white other, the narrator stereotypically refers to Dilloo's "passionate nature" (Jenkins 252) and "resentful passion" (279). He then presents him as melodramatically promising his wife: "'I will live only to revenge myself on those who have done us wrong, on the cursed tyrants who here enslave and torment us; and […] I, Dilloo, will give myself to work only for their destruction, worry, and death!'" (253). Jenkins's text immediately re-directs this anger by replacing its object, although it had shown at length that the anger was justified as Dilloo had to serve time in jail due to a corrupt interpreter and law court (173ff.). Instead of overpowering economic and legal "tyrants", Dilloo merely fights a single man of his own social, racial and ethnic group. Thus, the only destruction Dilloo brings about, apart from Hunoomaun's, is his own. With this plot device, the derailing is complete and the emotional economy firmly in place: the Indian labourers fight each other leaving the racialised colonial plantation system intact.

The novel concludes with a quick reconciliation scene between Lutchmee and Dilloo in the local Obeah man's jungle camp presenting this emotional economy as if in a nutshell. Nastily racist, the narrator describes the "obe man" as "an African of the lowest type" with "baboon-like features" which "altogether made a creature whose physical characteristics were worthy of the terror inspired by his infernal profession" (Jenkins 353). Thus, the Obeah man functions as the very incarnation of the white owners' fear (Jenkins 229, 349) of "insurrection" (348) that continues to haunt the plantation economy after emancipation. This fear had earlier put them into "rage" (227), "passionate excitement" (257, 262), "angry excitement" (258) and finally the very "terror" (289) that the narrator now ascribes to the Obeah man. His equipment inspires "grotesque horror" (355), a hyperbolic description preparing the melodramatic dying scene, which comes with a slightly comic edge, though.

This time the butt of the comedy are not the African characters[6] but the white reverend who offers Dilloo conversion to Christianity. With a final instant of derailing anger by directing its cognition of resentment at religion instead of humiliating exploitation, the novel renders Dilloo's last words in Pidgin English. Tellingly, it reserves the correct standard usage of the genitive for his oppressors: "'No!' cried the dying Coolie, loudly, almost fiercely, and with unconscious but terribly pointed satire […] 'No! No! Jesu Kriss Massa Drummond's God – Massa Marston's God – all Inglees God. No God for Coolie!'" (358) Drummond and Marston, the head manager on Dilloo's estate and the local magistrate, stand out as the embodied material objects of Dilloo's anger. However, the only successful resistance the novel allows its dying protagonist is to reject the caricature of a clergyman on a civilising mission.

The immaterial objects of his anger are the exploitative economic relations that leave Dilloo and his fellow workers at the mercy of those who dictate the conditions of their existence. This group comprises the government-paid Bengali recruiter in India, a set of white estate managers and overseers, white and mixed-race drivers and white colonial administrative staff in Guyana. Drummond, the allegedly "naturally kind-hearted" (66) head-manager, who is repeatedly designated as "planter" as if he owned the estate, cautions his Scottish apprentice manager Craig against relying on everyday racism acquired in the relations with the "dark races by whom his wealth was made for him" (66):

6 Employing an impressive array of sub-genres to racialise his characters, Jenkins assigns the lowest form of slap-stick comedy to black characters – a feature most contemporaneous reviewers mention as "native". F. D. Owen, reviewing the novel for The Academy uses a striking postpositive litotes to describe a feature that is quite common in colonial novels set in the Caribbean before and after abolition: "[Dialogue] is chiefly represented by a little negro foolery of the usual order, not at all unamusing, but merely episodic" (Owen 547).

> "You will never do for Demerara, my fine fellow," said the planter. "These niggers are brought here to work, and you must make them do it by hook or by crook. With your squeamish views, they would soon get the whip-hand of us; and we might as well shut up shop altogether." (171)

Craig, however, does not wish to treat the contract labourers, whom the manager tellingly equates with (enslaved) Africans disciplined by the whip, as suggested by his superior. This is remarkable because earlier in the story Craig had been stabbed by a Chinese labourer while attempting to arrest him for murder – falsely, as the reader knows, because the culprit once again is Hunoomaun. Craig survives the attack nursed by Lutchmee, which gives him some insight into her and her husband's lives. While Drummond, the planter's deputy, appreciates Dilloo's capacities as an exceptionally able worker (66, 96-97) he nevertheless detests him as "the spokesperson for his brethren" and "a firebrand" (169), Craig entertains a more respectful view of him. Subsequently, the novel sets up Craig as the centre for the readers' identification, augmenting this function with the generic devices of romance. Craig's love interest, however, is not Lutchmee – as she would be in the tradition of plantation fiction, which surfaces in Drummond's Creole "housekeeper" (71) – but the fair daughter of the local stipendiary magistrate, a relationship the narrator handles with some satirical distance. The relationship between Lutchmee and Craig, however, he stages differently – and with a purpose. Focusing on the young Indian woman, the narrator suggestively states:

> The Coolie [Lutchmee] had hitherto been giving herself up to her genial toil, with a devotion which by degrees grew to an enthusiasm, as her intimacy with the manly young Briton increased. […] The life was new. It brought into her life fresh human elements, feelings she had never experienced before: ideas – novel, sweet, piquant. […] she could not analyse the meaning of the feeling […]. (155)

Whereas David Dabydeen recognises here "a nascent feminism, a nascent defiance of patriarchal structures" (Dabydeen 18), I read the Craig-Lutchmee subplot as part of the novel's emotional economy which relies on derailing. The subplot redirects the discontent and anger arising from the racist plantation order in two ways: it provides another object for Dilloo's anger and rage and it constructs two lovable characters that emotionally appeal to the British metropolitan readers. When Craig shakes Lutchmee's hand in sincere gratitude, the narrator assures the reform-oriented among his readers that, at this moment, "the antipathy of race finally died within him; and […] this woman, without reference to colour or features, became to him as a fellow-being of one blood and one humanity with himself" (Jenkins 156). With this, "the pretty animal" (130) that Craig saw in Lutchmee earlier changes from "a subject of anxiety" into "an object of sympathy" (259, also 264, 269). Later he benevolently accompanies her to her husband's deathbed even though this makes him complicit in the murder. With Craig, the novel channels the readers' empathy with the dying Indian and his soon-to-be-abandoned wife through the emotions of a white man whose shy love affair with the magistrate's daughter makes him all the more likeable. She shortly follows suit developing "an actual sympathy" for Lutchmee (263, also 269).

While Craig and his beloved serve as models for the readers, whom the novel calls upon to grow equally benevolent moral sentiments, the second function of the subplot is overtly political. To demand their rights, the contract labourers, led by rich Dilloo (184, 303) and a free Indian banker and money-lender (104), whom the narrator labels "The Conspirators" (chapter heading, 145), employ a white lawyer to petition the governor (222ff.). Dilloo tells his wife: "'We are engaged in a great plot. Coolies on every estate are pledged to it. At first we are going to act peaceably and demand justice from the great Sahib, the Governor. If he will not give it to us, then ---' he stopped […]" (163). While the narrator, repeatedly arguing as if he was a lawyer (230, also 160, 199, 223), supports the Indians' claims, he shows in dramatic detail how their en-

tering into industrial dispute provokes the planters to such a "West Indian rage" (227) that they press the magistrate and the governor to reject it. The Craig-Lutchmee subplot, however, serves to remove this legally supported industrial action from the readers' attention focussing it, in turn, on a private matter as an object of rage and anger:

> But how greatly had his frank, manly nature suffered from the scorching bars of unjust justice, and the withering influence of ungenerous treatment! His mind was diseased with the sense of wrong, suspicion, resentment, the craving thirst for revenge, and he regarded the incidents of this meeting between his wife and the overseer with jealousy and anger. (303)

While the novel uses the tadja, a fictional blend of Muslim and Hindoo procession with dancing and ritual mock battles (cf. Moore 219ff.), to send Dilloo out to fight Hunoomaun, the daughter of the magistrate, influenced by Craig, takes her father to task for not having done his duty by the labourers (194ff.). The text suspends the irony and mild satire it generally uses for the white legal elite to introduce the moral change of the magistrate who begins to resist verbally the close surveillance on the part of the planters who press him to serve their interests (199). This is the only critical thrust that the novel promotes: it calls for improved legal regulations for contract labour, arguing that both sides benefit from such diligent and reliable workers as Dilloo to realise their potential (160-61, 223, 230). To put this across, the text infuses its social realism with elements of the political and legal pamphlet, which annoyed the reviewer of the *London Society* ("New Books" 565) and others. With the dominant realist narrative and its emotional economy of colonial capitalism, however, the novel subverts its own rational argument. Yet, the emotional argument is most successful in silencing anger and rage, emotions that threaten the plantation economy and its exploitation of cheap brown labour. Instead, the novel's deep plot encourages the metropolitan middle-class readers to condescendingly feel sympathy for suffering working-class Indians and identify with loving and fortunately reforming middle-class colonial whites.

CONCLUSION

My interpretation of this colonial novel written by a mid-19th-century white male uses the category of emotion to connect the conception of imagined economies with the antiracist activism of Reni Eddo-Lodge and Afua Hirsch by paying special attention to the objects and cognitions of anger as fostered by global capitalism.

With this, I suggest re-reading colonial fiction not primarily in service of today's identity politics which value it for the representation of neglected non-white ethnic groups. Instead, I propose the use of this text as one of a type to demonstrate the economic and emotional rationale of its aesthetics on the level of character, plot and sub-genres. The generic blend of social realism and legal pamphlet, of revenge tragedy and melodrama, of comedy and satire allows for a multi-layered argument that, despite its ambiguities, normalises the extensive exploitation of migrant labourers in the colonial plantation economy. To break up this normalising discourse, I propose to analyse these very ambiguities and internal contradictions as strategies of racialisation for plainly economic ends. As a result, the exploitation of cheap black and brown labour loses its alleged 'normality' and becomes visible as a condition for private profits of which the British (and Western) public has always had its share in being able to buy cheap goods, including novels.

To overcome the select epistemological silence and to make useful the equally select emotional eloquence on the connection between race and capitalist economy, literary studies scholars can benefit from the impressive work of Catherine Hall and her team of black and white historians. For more than a decade, they have researched the legacies of British slave-ownership and documented the results in numerous publications and on a website with a continuously expanding database.

> Slave-ownership is virtually invisible in British history. It has been elided by strategies of euphemism and evasion originally adopted by the slave-owners themselves and subsequently reproduced widely in British culture. […]

> Against this background, our project is to reinscribe slave-ownership onto modern British history." (Hall et al. 1-2)

In her tellingly titled essay "Gendering Property, Racing Capital", Catherine Hall adds an observation that ties in with Reni Eddo-Lodge: "Disavowal and distantiation have been crucial mechanisms facilitating avoidance and evasion […]. Our focus on British slave-ownership is a way of bringing slavery home and problematizing whiteness as an identity that carried privilege and power […]" (24-25). In this vein, literary studies should transform anger into a motivation to analyse how aesthetically constructed emotions mediate the connections between race and capitalism. These emotions always key into the economy – imagined and real.

REFERENCES

Clarke, John. "Imagined, Real and Moral Economies." *Culture Unbound*, vol. 6, 2014, pp. 95-112, www.cultureunbound.ep.liu.se/article.asp?DOI=10.3384/cu.2000.1525.14695.

Dabydeen, David. "Introduction." Edward Jenkins. *Lutchmee and Dilloo. A Study of West Indian Life*. 1877. Edited and with a new introduction by David Dabydeen, Caribbean Classics, Macmillan Education, 2003, pp. 1-21.

D'Aguiar, Fred. "Letter to Beryl Gilroy." *Callaloo*, vol. 39, no. 4, 2016, pp. 757-61.

—. "Against Black British Literature." *Tibisiri. Caribbean Writers and Critics*, edited by Maggie Butcher, Dangeroo Press, 1988, pp. 106-14.

Eddo-Lodge, Reni. *Why I'm No Longer Talking to White People about Race*. Bloomsbury Circus, 2017.

Frevert, Ute. "Introduction." *Moral Economies*, edited by Ute Frevert, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, pp. 7-12.

—. "Moral Economies, Present and Past. Social Practices and Intellectual Controversies." *Moral Economies*, edited by Ute Frevert, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019, pp. 13-44.

Graves, R. P., and Lynn Milne. "John Edward Jenkins." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004. doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/34175. 31 July 2019.

Hall, Catherine. "Gendering Property, Racing Capital." *History Workshop Journal*, vol. 78, 2014, pp. 22-38.

—, Nicholas Draper, and Keith McClelland. "Introduction." *Legacies of British Slave-Ownership. Colonial Slavery and the Formation of Victorian Britain*, edited by Catherine Hall, Nicholas Draper, Keith McClelland, Katie Donington and Rachel Lang, Cambridge University Press, 2014, pp. 1-33.

Hirsch, Afua. *Brit(ish): On Race, Identity and Belonging*. Jonathan Cape, 2018.

Illouz, Eva. "Introduction: Emodities or the Making of Emotional Commodities." *Emotions as Commodities. Capitalism, Consumption and Authenticity*, edited by Eva Illouz, Routledge, 2018, pp. 1-29.

Jackson, Joseph. "Introduction." Edward Jenkins. *Lutchmee and Dilloo. A Study of West Indian Life*. 1877. Edited and introduced by Joseph Jackson, The Guyana Classics Library, The Caribbean Press for the Government of Guyana, 2010, pp. xi-xx.

Jagdeo, Bharrat President. "Series Preface." Edward Jenkins. *Lutchmee and Dilloo. A Study of West Indian Life*. 1877. Edited and introduced by Joseph Jackson, The Guyana Classics Library, The Caribbean Press for the Government of Guyana, 2010, pp. v-vi.

Jenkins, Edward. *Lutchmee and Dilloo. A Study of West Indian Life*. 1877. Edited and with a new introduction by David Dabydeen, Caribbean Classics, Macmillan Education, 2003.

—. *Ginx's Baby. His Birth and Other Misfortunes*. 1871. Henry King & Co., 1873.

—. *Little Hodge*. Henry King & Co., 1872.

Klein, Alison. *Anglophone Literature of Caribbean Indenture: The Seductive Hierarchies of Empire*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

Legacies of British Slave-Ownership. http://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/.

Leong, Nancy. "Racial Capitalism." *Harvard Law Review*, vol. 126, no. 8, 2013, pp. 2153-226.

"Literature." *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper*, 28 October 1977, issue 1823, p. 5. *British Library Newspapers, Part One: 1800-1900*.

"Literature: Novels of the Week." *The Athenaeum*, 20 October 1877, issue 2608, pp. 491-92.

"London Correspondence." *Western Mail*, 19 October 1877, issue 2641, p. 2. *British Library Newspapers, Part One: 1800-1900*.

"Lutchmee and Dilloo." *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, 8 December 1877, vol. 44, issue 1154, pp. 719-20.

Moore, Brian L. *Cultural Power, Resistance and Pluralism. Colonial Guyana, 1838-1900.* Press of the University of the West Indies and McGill Queen's University Press, 1995.

"New Books." *London Society: An Illustrated Magazine of Light and Amusing Literature for the Hours of Relaxation*, December 1877, vol. 32, no. 192, pp. 554-70.

Owen, F. M. "New Novels." *The Academy*, 15 December 1877, issue 293, pp. 547-48.

Poynting, Jeremy. "John Edward Jenkins and the Imperial Conscience." *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1986, pp. 211-21.

Rejlander, Oscar Gustav. "Ginx's Baby." *Royal Photographic Society Collection*, collections.vam.ac.uk/item/O1394739/ginxs-baby-photograph-rejlander-oscar-gustav/.

Smith, Jonathan. *Charles Darwin and Victorian Visual Culture*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Sutherland, John. *The Stanford Companion to Victorian Fiction*. Stanford University Press, 1989.

Thompson, Edward P. "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century." *Past and Present*, vol. 50, 1971, pp. 76-136.

Ulich, Dieter, and Philipp Mayring. *Psychologie der Emotionen*. Kohlhammer, 1992.

Woodmansee, Martha, and Mark Osteen. “Taking Account of the New Economic Criticism: an Historical Introduction.” *The New Economic Criticism. Studies at the Intersection of Literature and Economics*, edited by Martha Woodmansee and Mark Osteen, Routledge, 1999, pp. 3-50.