

‘A hand prepared to be red’: Manliness and Racial Violence on Britain’s Colonial Frontiers

Robert Hogg

Some men, and at times great numbers of men, engage in violent behaviour. As Bob Connell (*Masculinities*, 5) points out, it is overwhelmingly males who control and use violence. Ray Evans, in examining the evidence accumulated by feminist historians such as Judith Allen (1982), Kay Saunders (1984) and Marilyn Lake (1986), concludes that we cannot avoid the “historical ubiquity of largely male derived violence” (“Gun”, 202, 207). So ubiquitous is male violence that John Archer argues that it should be considered a “normal” characteristic of masculinity (*Male Violence*, 24). Similarly, Elizabeth Stanko argues that violent behaviour is neither deviant or abnormal but “an ordinary part of life” (*Everyday Violence*, 5-7).

Wars, slavery, and conquest are inherently violent enterprises, and men have been at the forefront of these activities. In a study of white male settler societies in the late imperial period, Jock McCulloch demonstrates that violence was an indispensable part of the management of the British Empire (“Empire”, 220-239). Pointing out that the subject of violence has been a neglected part of studies of imperialism (223), he describes how, in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, white males in particular used violence to ensure a compliant labour force, so that they could compete economically with more efficient indigenous agricultural producers. McCulloch’s study is interesting in that it draws attention to the ways in which violence is shaped by gender.

Following McCulloch’s lead and given the concurrence of views among other historians regarding the masculine nature of violence, this paper explores violence on the frontiers of Queensland and British Columbia in the mid-nineteenth century and the part the manly ideal played in the violent actions of frontier men. After outlining the nature of “manliness” and male violence in mid-nineteenth century Britain, it examines white male violence against indigenous peoples in Queensland and British Columbia. It argues that the mid-Victorian masculine ethos, denoted by the term “manliness”, had within it the potential for violence. On the frontier, not only was violence a routine and normal part of life, it was often considered to be manly. In contrast to the espoused values of Christian reason, self-restraint, honour and rectitude, on the colonial frontier the practice of manliness often entailed violence and manly ethos could be distorted to justify and legitimise violent acts.

From the late eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth there emerged, concomitantly with the rise of the British middle-classes, a dominant gender order, including a hegemonic masculine code denoted by the term “manliness” (Roper and Tosh, 1991; Mangan and Walvin, 1987; Beynon, 2002). The term “manly” was an adjective that could be applied to encapsulate a wide range of attributes, virtues and behaviours. Of paramount importance to Victorians was the possession of “character”. Character was a somewhat intangible concept, embracing a number of virtues, each important in its own right. Combined, these virtues made the man, and to possess

“character” was to be held in esteem by peers, superiors and inferiors alike. Despite some differences among historians as to what “character” entailed, there is a fair degree of consensus regarding the essential virtues. Stefan Collini describes the core of qualities invoked by the term as including self-restraint, perseverance, strenuous effort, and courage in the face of adversity (*Public Moralists*, 100). Peter Gay states that character encompassed all the bourgeoisie’s ideals and anxieties. Character was a flexible concept, an all-embracing term. According to Gay it “meant realism, self-control, temperance, thrift, hard work, purposeful energy ... aggression disciplined and sublimated” (*Cultivation*, 502). It was a manifestation of the qualities needed to cope with life.

Self-help advocate Samuel Smiles placed character at the apex of manly virtue:

The crown and glory of life is Character. It is the noblest possession of a man, constituting a rank in itself, and an estate in the general goodwill; dignifying every station, and exalting every position in society. It exercises a greater power than wealth, and secures all the honour without the jealousies of fame. It carries with it an influence which always tells; for it is the result of proved honour, rectitude, and consistency – qualities which, perhaps more than any other, command the general confidence and respect of manhood. (*Self-Help*, 314)

It would seem that for Smiles, to possess “character” was to be the perfect man. Character was noble, exalted, and glorious. Character was a political necessity for a moral, well-governed society. In *Self-Help* “manly” and “manliness” are key epithets. Hard work, perseverance, self-reliance, and energetic action were the attributes essential to the acquisition of a “truly noble and manly character”.

Victorians also drew a connection between civilisation and manliness. The concept of “civilisation” entailed a belief in human progress, based on economic, social and moral improvement. Civilisation was a progressive, unbroken movement. Furthermore, Europeans were civilised and non-Europeans or “savages” were uncivilised. Savages were uncivilised because of their isolation from Europe and the overwhelming effect of their environment. The idea of civilisation buttressed white male supremacy. Science supported the belief that racial difference, civilisation and manliness advanced together. Allied to this understanding of civilisation was the masculinist appropriation of the Enlightenment conception of reason. The Enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was based on the belief that human reason could solve the problems of society as it had the workings of the natural world. As Genevieve Lloyd has argued, since the Enlightenment, reason has been assumed to be the exclusive property of men (*Man*, x). Of the relationship between reason and masculinity Victor Seidler writes:

Because society has taken as its self conception since the Enlightenment a version of itself as a ‘rational’ society, and because reason is taken to be the exclusive property of men, this means that the mechanisms of the development of masculinity are in crucial ways the mechanisms of the development of the broader culture. (*Rediscovering*, 4).

In addition to these quite complex and often contradictory associations, manliness in the mid-nineteenth century was also connected to violence, albeit again in contradictory

ways. In the eighteenth century, male violence was often not prosecuted as there was an expectation that men would defend their reputation, position and manhood by fighting. Towards the end of the eighteenth century violent behaviour was increasingly frowned upon and punished by the law, and intolerance of male violence grew (Archer, *Male Violence*, 41-42). Nevertheless, according to Vic Gatrell, “violence in the nineteenth century was ubiquitous” (“Crime”, 296-297). He cites industrial disputes, popular recreation areas, the streets and the home as common sites of violence. In addition, there were regular moral panics about violence including that of Chartists in the 1840s, garrotting and trade union violence in the 1860s, and child abuse, hooliganism and armed burglary in the latter part of the century. To observers such as Henry Mayhew (1861) and Charles Booth (1902) criminals appeared to form a separate social class. That class was the working class, and violence was constructed as a working-class problem. It was a widely-held belief that working-class adult males were prone to outbursts of physical violence (Rowbotham, “Only When Drunk”, 159). The middle and upper classes however, committed their own forms of violence. The systems of discipline in the public schools, both formal and informal, the institutionalised violence of the army and Royal Navy, the violence committed overseas in the name of the Empire, and parental discipline are a few examples of the violence which pervaded these classes (D’Cruze, *Everyday*, 3; Mangan, *Manliness*, 364; Royle, *Modern*, 364).

Despite the growing intolerance towards male violence, there were deeply held beliefs and values in regard to a man’s right to fight. Physical prowess was a key part of the manly ideal and the manly attributes of courage and strength could be readily translated into aggressive behaviour. Courage could mean not backing out of a fight, or being able to take care of oneself in a fight. Strength could mean having the physical capability to fight. Some inclination and skill in violence was considered to be desirable for boys. To be regarded as a “real” boy, a boy had to display a willingness to fight when necessary. “After all”, wrote Thomas Hughes, “what would life be without fighting, I should like to know? From the cradle to the grave, fighting, rightly understood, is the business, the real highest, honestest business of every son of man” (*Tom Brown’s Schooldays*, 227).

It was held that men possessed instinctive aggression, and part of the progress from boyhood to manhood was the development of the appropriate use of physical force (Rowbotham, “Only When Drunk”, 159). What was appropriate depended on assumptions about class, age, gender and context. It was accepted that middle-class men had the same innate capacity for violence as working-class men, but they were presumed to be able to exercise manly self-control and channel it into rugby and other sports. Violence deployed to defend the weak, to defend one’s honour, or in defence of the country and Empire was considered just and honourable (D’Cruze, *Everyday*, 15). In mid-Victorian Britain, violence, in one form or another, was an acceptable, sometimes even desirable, part of manhood. Mid-Victorian men took these attitudes towards violence to Britain’s colonial frontiers where, mixed with prevailing notions of race, violence became an integral part of the colonial and imperial project.

The interplay of race, gender and violence in the colonial and imperial project is illustrated when one considers the prevalence of white male violence in Queensland and

British Columbia in the mid-nineteenth century. The two colonies had much in common. Both are located on the Pacific Rim, and the coastlines of both were charted by James Cook. Each had a period of initially limited settlement and exploitation followed by a larger influx of population in the mid-nineteenth century. Each had gold rushes. Settlers extracted resources to provide staples for export to the British market; wool, gold and sugar were the main products provided by Queensland, and timber, gold and salmon were the foremost in British Columbia. The climate of both colonies was attractive to Europeans, or, in the case of Queensland, at least not a deterrent. Each had significant indigenous populations and both were integral parts of the British Empire governed by men sent out from the Colonial Office.

From the 1840s to the 1870s, both Queensland and British Columbia attracted large numbers of British male migrants. When Queensland was separated from NSW in 1859 it contained 23,520 predominantly British settlers and around 60,000 Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders (Harris, "Regional", 38; Anderson, "Queensland", 301). Over the next twelve years the immigrant population increased rapidly. In 1861 the general white population stood at 30,059, doubled in the next three years, and doubled again by 1871 to 120,104. Queensland had a more heterogeneous population than Australia's southern colonies, with significant numbers of Pacific Islanders, Chinese and other Asians.

In British Columbia in 1855 there were an estimated 774 colonists on Vancouver Island, two-thirds of whom were male. The Cariboo gold rush of 1862-64 attracted large numbers of colonists. In 1863 there were 7,338 whites on Vancouver Island and the mainland combined, 95 percent of whom were male. This population was concentrated in a small number of towns such as Victoria, New Westminster and Nanaimo, although miners were scattered along the Fraser River and the Cariboo (Lamb, "Census", 51-58). In 1870 the total white population was 8,576, two-thirds of whom were male, the decline of the gold rushes and a concerted effort to bring women to the colony accounting for the changed male-to-female ratio since 1863 (Perry, *Edge*, 13). In 1871 the indigenous population was estimated at 45,000. As in Queensland, diversity was a feature of the population.

On the Queensland frontier, the lack of the various legal and moral restraints which existed in the metropole, combined with the harsh living conditions, created an environment in which men could do things they probably would not have done in Britain. Evans has suggested that the "demonstrable Australian historical characteristics" of "environmental confrontation, convictism, frontier conflict and the more pervasive vicissitudes of settler colonialism might all be interpreted as encouraging a particularly aggressive, conformist mode of masculinity" ("Gun", 203). From at least the late 1830s the Queensland frontier was a place where inter-racial violence was endemic (see, for example, Rowley, 1970; Reynolds, 1978; Evans, 1975; Collins, 2002; Roberts, 2005).

In British Columbia, violence was a key feature of the homosocial culture. According to Perry "the settlement process gave white men an 'intimate knowledge' of violence and normalised the use of force to control others." Barroom and back alley brawls were common, and mates would meet violence with violence in each other's defence (Edge,

44). Violence was used to assert white male authority over women and indigenous people and to solidify the male community. Violence was a key part of the discipline maintained in the fur trade forts. Corporal punishment, in the form of flogging, was management's response to indolence and disobedience, perceived or real (Harris, *Resettlement*, 46). British Columbia's history is replete with examples of direct physical and other forms of violence against indigenous people. The pattern of violence was set in the late eighteenth century on the maritime frontier of British Columbia when British and American fur traders used violence as a trade tactic to such an extent that it became a common feature of the coastal trade between white and indigenous people (Woodcock, *British Columbia*, 56).

A few words from a number of men of the Queensland frontier will serve not only to emphasise the prevailing culture of violence in frontier life, but illustrate the ease with which frontier men accommodated violence in their lives as a routine and normal part of frontier living, and as an appropriate way of dealing with "troublesome" Aborigines. From the Darling Downs in Queensland in 1841 George Leslie, younger brother of Patrick, wrote to one of his brothers: "Walter being down the country I can't leave home but Ernest Dalrymple and a party are out hunting the Niggers. They have killed a great many white men in this part of the country and not many days pass at a time, without hearing of some man being killed" (George Leslie to brother William, 1 January 1844). In 1862, the proprietor of Mitchell Downs station on the Maranoa wrote to the Colonial Secretary to express his gratitude for the efforts of the Native Mounted Police:

I do myself the honour of informing you that in accordance with instructions issued from your Office, the Native Police under Lieut. Morehead have thoroughly tracked and cleared this run of blacks who had assembled and attacked one of my stations. With a diligence deserving of every praise, Lieut. Morehead succeeded after many days pursuit in overtaking and dispersing a portion of the mob to which the murderers belonged. (Edmund Morey to Colonial Secretary, 12 September 1862)

In British Columbia, violence was a feature of contact from the outset. In one incident a fur trader, Captain Kendrick, reacted to the theft of linen from his washing lines with severe retaliation. He seized two chiefs of the Haida allegedly responsible for the theft, tied them to a gun carriage, cut off their hair, painted their faces with a ludicrous pattern, and threatened to kill them unless the Indians sold him their furs at a ridiculously low price, which they did. Two years later when he re-entered the area, the people remembered. Boarding his ship they took over the arms chest and forced the crew below decks. The ship's officers passed around their personal weapons and after a skirmish repelled the Indians. Subsequently Kendrick's crew kept a constant fire on the Haida with cannon and small arms chasing them and "making the most dreadful havoc by killing all they came across" (Woodcock, *British Columbia*, 57).

The land-based fur trade was predicated on co-operation between indigenous people and the British. Nevertheless, the Hudson's Bay Company thought it best to leave the locals in no doubt who possessed the superior force should force be required to maintain the trade. On arriving at Fort St. James in September 1828, George Simpson, Governor of the

HBC in North America, entered the fort “in the most imposing manner we could make for the sake of the Indians” (McLeod cited in Harris, *Resettlement*, 30). When within hearing distance of the fort, a shot was fired, a bugle sounded, and a piper began to play. The guide led the party, carrying the British flag; then the bugler and the piper, followed by the governor mounted on his horse. Behind the governor came two traders riding side-by-side, then twenty men in a line on foot, another horse and lastly another trader. As the group neared the fort it was welcomed with a brisk discharge of small arms and other weapons (31).

The Fraser River gold rush of 1858 continued the violent trend. Thousands of miners went to British Columbia to get rich quickly and were intolerant of any “savages” who got in their way. A transient population of Canadian, English and American miners became “habituated to violence” as a means of removing what they considered to be an obstacle to their get rich quick schemes (Matthew Begbie to James Douglas, 3 February 1859). One company of miners destroyed the winter provisions of a group of Indians at an unattended village on Okanagan Lake. The next day a group of unarmed Indians was massacred by miners (Fisher, *Contact*, 98). Such was the extent of inter-racial violence on the gold fields that Governor Douglas feared that a “war of races” would be the “inevitable consequence of a prolonged state of misrule” (James Douglas to Captain Frederick Montessor, 24 August 1858).

Frontier violence was not necessarily confined to physical force. It included extermination through other, indirect, means. In April 1862 a white man from San Francisco brought smallpox to Victoria (Duff, *Indian*, 59). The disease spread rapidly among the unimmunised Indian population of Victoria, killing them in large numbers. Instead of trying to contain the disease, white authorities dispersed the Indians, sending them north to the mainland from where they had come. This had the effect of spreading the disease to the interior and by the time it had wreaked its havoc, the indigenous population of the mainland had been reduced by over a third (Woodcock, *British Columbia*, 131).

In March 1864 William Brewster, a foreman on the Bute Inlet Road building project in British Columbia, believed a group of Chilcotin Indians may have stolen flour. Frustrated by their unwillingness to co-operate he took out a notebook and wrote down their names. The Chilcotins did not like to see their names written down. They were mystified by writing and their names were important to them, indistinguishable from the people who owned them. Writing down a person’s name was like casting an evil spell on them. Brewster said: “I have taken your names because you would not tell me who stole the flour. All the Chilcotins are going to die. The whites will introduce sickness into the country which will kill you all” (Rothenberger, *Chilcotin*, 41). The Chilcotins understood what he meant – they knew with dread the effects of smallpox.

The weaponry of George Leslie, the epistolary gratitude of Edmund Morey, the actions of Captain Kendrick and the threat of smallpox made by William Brewster, all of these occurrences are acts of violence perpetrated by white British males on indigenous people. It is not only the obvious references to physical violence by Leslie and Morey that

constituted violent conflict on the frontier. On both frontiers, the taking of indigenous lands, the exploitation of natural resources, and the construction of roads and townships destroyed indigenous lives, just as surely as a bullet from a Snider carbine or a shell from the deck gun of a British gunboat. The sum of the evidence indicates that on the frontier, outside the constraints of conventional society and impelled by frontier conditions, many white men engaged in these kinds of violent acts.

Violent acts on the part of white men were frequently considered acts of manliness. Manly courage was regarded as an absolute necessity:

Courage is a grand thing in first confronting the savage; it inspires immediate respect, whereas the slightest faltering or manifestation of fear leaves the traveler at the mercy of those who can entertain contempt, and detect a want of bravery as readily as any vassal of civilisation, and who hold as valueless that which they are not awed by. (Cornwallis, *New Eldorado*, 223)

Courage included the willingness to confront violent, or potentially violent situations, particularly those involving indigenous people. In his roll call of manly frontier men Queensland squatter Oscar de Satgé named Henry Gregory as a “first rate bushman” (*Pages*, 160). One of the virtues that made him so was his courage when others were afraid. De Satgé relates an incident when a group of Aborigines attempted to kill Gregory and rob his store in the middle of the night. Gregory “accounted for two of the aggressors with his first rifle shot, and then went out and shot several others, thus liberating the cowardly hands that dared not come out of the store” (160). Gregory was obviously defending himself and his property, but the point lies in de Satgé’s characterisation of Gregory’s actions as courageous in contrast to the “cowardly” inaction of his employees. Gregory is portrayed as the “real man” because he did not shirk a violent confrontation, while the obvious implication was that those who hid were unmanly.

When Allan McPherson attempted to occupy Mt Abundance Station, near present day Roma, the resistance from the local Aboriginal tribes was violent and protracted. McPherson lost stock, stockmen and dray drivers to attacks from Aborigines protecting their land. Most of McPherson’s men were extremely fearful of Aborigines, but he was not. Accusing his men of being faint-hearted cowards, McPherson declared that he was not afraid of confrontation:

Some few blacks made their appearance in the evening, who fairly frightened the men into convulsions. I laughed at them as cowards and faint-hearted creatures, and, as I might have expected, got sulky looks, and expressive growls for my pains. To show them how little I feared the blacks, I told my men that in the morning I intended to start ahead by myself, and to camp out alone for two or three nights, exploring the water, and finding out the best spot for forming the head station. (*Maranoa*, np).

He was pleased to avenge the death of one of his shepherds:

I must own that it was a great consolation to me in the first conflict we had with the natives (and it was not the only one before we reached the Mount two days afterwards), that my keen eyed friend Charley found on the person of one of the

blacks who had fallen a pocket knife with the initials 'F.G.' engraved on the handle – being that of the poor hut keeper, John Gore, who had been brutally murdered, at the door of his hut, only a month before. Certainly in this case retribution was not swift, it was at all events sure. (*Maranoa*, np)

In his memoir McPherson depicts himself in contrast to his men. They are insolent cowards, he is brave and resolute. They fear death at the hands of Aborigines, he practically invites the Aborigines to attack him. McPherson clearly considers himself more manly than the men he employs. What is more, he considers that violence employed for revenge is justified, and violent conflict over possession of land is an occupational hazard and not something to shirk. In these examples, when the frontier tested men's courage, they reacted with violence which was regarded as an expression of manliness. Gregory and McPherson are manly because they are not afraid to act, to employ violence, while those who are too timid to act are depicted as unmanly.

For Anthony Trollope, the squatter embodied all that was manly in a frontiersman. Energetic, brave and commanding, the squatter occupied the summit of manhood on the frontier. According to Trollope:

There is a strong sect of men in England ... who think that the English settler abroad is not to be trusted, except under severe control, with the fate of the poor creatures of inferior races with whom he comes in contact on the distant shores to which his search for wealth may lead him. The settler, as a matter of course, is in quest of fortune and is one who, living among rough things, is apt to become less scrupulous than his dainty brother at home. (*Australia*, 107)

Yet for Trollope

The Australian grazier cannot live unless he defend his cattle. The pilferings have not been petty, and in many districts, I believe in all districts, would have absolutely destroyed the flocks and made grazing in Australia impossible, had not the squatter defended himself either with a red hand, or with a hand prepared to be red if occasion required. The stealing of cattle by tribes of black men – or rather the slaughter of cattle ... has in many cases been accompanied by preconcerted attacks upon the stations; and these attacks are made in the absence of the owner, when his wife and children are there almost unguarded. (103)

In Trollope's view, frontiersmen were fully justified in using violence against indigenous people. What is more, he implies that they were manly for doing so, more manly than men back in England. Trollope implies that the frontiersman, "in quest of his fortune" and fulfilling his manly and imperial duty, is entitled to take whatever action he sees fit to achieve his aims. That he may have to use violence in the course of this quest makes him manlier than the "dainty" men at home.

While violence perpetrated by white men was manly and virtuous, violence perpetrated by non-whites was depicted as unmanly and cowardly. In 1861 Aborigines massacred the Wills family on their station Cullin La Ringoe in the Springsure district of Queensland. Rather than see this as Aboriginal men defending their land and property (as de Satgé

depicted Henry Gregory above), white colonists, including a frontier squatter writing to the *Moreton Bay Courier*, had an entirely different view of the violence and its perpetrators. It was necessary “to abolish that absurd and false law which made it murder to kill a wild beast ... when peace and tranquility must be enjoyed through this beautiful land, and when all traces of an hostile, barbarous and useless set of beings must be swept away by the torrent of Christian civilization” (*Moreton Bay Courier*, 19 November, 1861). Far from being manly, indigenous violence was not even human. It was the violence of animals, the antithesis of the manly ideal.

Frontier violence did not only come from the barrel of a gun, but also from the point of a pen. Discursive violence was an inherent part of the imperial project, and the cultural assumptions of European conquerors formed a philosophical basis for the violent dispossession of indigenous people. The concept of civilisation – a belief in human progress, based on economic, social and moral improvement – underpinned much frontier violence, physical and discursive. An analysis of the official correspondence of William Wiseman, Commissioner of Crown Lands in the Leichhardt District of Queensland during the 1850s, demonstrates how discourses of civilisation and savagery, reason and unreason were used to justify violence against Queensland Aborigines. Wiseman’s correspondence not only illustrates how these discourses were used to justify racial violence, but also their contradictory nature. In his official capacity, Wiseman was a strong advocate of force against the Aborigines in his district. His letters to his superiors in Sydney themselves constitute a violent act, informing government policy and official attitudes towards Aborigines.

On 28 August 1855 he wrote a lengthy report to the Chief Commissioner of Crown Lands in Sydney. His views on the relative levels of civilisation between the British and Aborigines are evident from the following extract:

I also think the first murder in a new country is generally committed by Blacks, nor can I recall to my mind in these Northern Districts an unprovoked or wanton attack by a squatter on Aborigines, the whites by education disposed to kindness and benevolence, whereas on the contrary the savage is by nature greedy and prone to steal, feels no compunction on committing murder, is generally addicted to pillage those who treat him kindly and treacherously attempts the life of such as he knows will not shoot him thinking as they do that such conduct proceeds from fear. (W.H Wiseman, Rannes, to Commissioner for Crown Lands, Sydney 28 August 1855)

In Wiseman’s eyes the contrast between whites and Aborigines could not be more stark. By virtue of their education, a civilising process of learning and moral training, white Englishmen are disposed to kindness and benevolence. “Blacks”, on the other hand, being deprived of “education”, and therefore civilisation, are ruled by “nature” and are consequently murderous, greedy, treacherous savages for whom no atrocity is impossible. There is an obvious dichotomy in this extract in the opposition between civilisation, or education as Wiseman terms it, and nature. In Wiseman’s view these categories are mutually exclusive, occupying extreme positions on a continuum of civilisation. However, they are inextricably intertwined and mutually defining, because civilisation,

which is positively valued, can only be understood in opposition to nature which here is negatively valued.

In the late eighteenth century the British conceptualisation of civilisation was influenced by the emergence of industrial capitalism. Capitalism drove economic and social progress. The world of business and commerce in nineteenth-century Britain was an exclusively male domain, and one's manly status could be, in part, dependent upon one's success in business or the professions. A number of scholars have theorised the connection between masculinity or patriarchy on the one hand, and capitalism on the other. Zillah Eisenstein, for instance, has labeled the interaction between capitalist economic structures and other patriarchal structures "capitalist patriarchy". She defines capitalist patriarchy as "the mutually reinforcing dialectical relationship between capitalist class structure and hierarchical sexual structuring". This means that capitalism and patriarchy are neither autonomous systems nor identical: they are mutually dependent (*Capitalist*, 50). Furthermore, as Jean Lipman – Bluman has argued,

Males learn that society's goals are best met by aggression, by actively wrestling their accomplishments from the environment. Force, power, competition and aggression are the means. Achievement, males are taught, is measured in productivity, resources and control – all the result of direct action. In the Western world, the importance of self-reliant, individual action is systematically inculcated in males. To be masculine requires not only self-reliance and self-control, but control over people and resources (*Gender*, 7).

Many of the virtues required to be manly and the virtues required for success in a capitalist economy – self-control, self-reliance, action – are identical.

The colonial frontier was a place where capital could find new outlets for expansion and profit. It was a place where competitiveness, force, aggression, and control over people and resources were considered vital for success. One capitalist who saw such opportunity on the British Columbia frontier was Alfred Pendrill Waddington. Waddington brought these values to bear in his business projects, principally the construction of the Bute Inlet Road. In 1861 gold was discovered in the Cariboo country of mainland British Columbia. These goldfields were a long way inland and Waddington conceived the idea of building a road from one of the inlets along the coast to the Cariboo. Such a road would give Victoria a virtual monopoly on trade with the new mines, trumping its mainland rival, New Westminster. Waddington formed the opinion that Bute Inlet offered the best prospects as a starting point for a road. From there a route could be established 'which must eventually become the shortest, cheapest and easiest line of communication with the northern mines' (Waddington to the *British Colonist*, 1 August 1862). Construction of the road started in 1862. Thus began a significant intrusion into indigenous land.

The building of the road deeply alienated and then precipitated an orgy of violence on the part of native British Columbians, followed by a police and military response from whites culminating in the judicial killing of a number of indigenous men. Just before dawn on 30 April 1864 twenty of Waddington's workmen slept in their camp on the banks of the Homathko River. While they were sleeping, a group of Chilcotin Indians armed with

guns and axes quietly approached. The Chilcotin were intent on making what today would be called a “pre-emptive strike”, killing the white men before the white men could destroy their tribe through dispossession and disease. Fourteen white men were killed, shot and hacked to death, including the foreman, Brewster. After shooting him, one of the Chilcotin cut out his heart and, according to the Reverend Lundin-Brown, ate it (Lundin-Brown, *Klatsassan*, 15-16). Three of Waddington’s men escaped (*British Colonist*, 10 May 1864). Twelve days later the *Daily Chronicle* bore the headline “HORRIBLE MASSACRE”. Sparing its readers no detail, it called for the Government to immediately recruit a party of volunteers to dispense summary justice. It reported:

On the spread of news in this city, the first feeling which showed itself was a strong desire for bloody revenge upon these dangerous races who live around us but whom we can never trust. Had the people of Victoria the power, they would have gladly exterminated the whole tribe to which the murderers belong. (12 May 1864)

Victoria’s *British Colonist* could scarcely believe it. Contrasting the manliness of the whites with the unmanliness of the Chilcotin its correspondent wrote: “There is an air of doubt cast over the tragic story, when it is asserted that, seventeen strong, robust, fearless men, even although soundly reposing after a weary day’s labor, could be attacked and nearly all murdered by a dozen cowardly savages assisted by a few boys” (*British Colonist*, 13 May 1864). This violent episode and the further violence to which it led (another party of whites were killed a few days later and eventually five Chilcotin Indians were tried and hanged) is probably the apotheosis of violence on the British Columbian frontier. What is also of note are the preceding acts of *indirect* violence by whites of which the Bute Inlet massacre, as it was known, was the culmination. At the most fundamental level, the cause of both direct and indirect violence lay in the pursuit of profit and the ideal of progress and its practice in the colonies.

To state that the origins of frontier violence lay in the prevailing concepts of manliness, civilisation and reason is not to ignore substantive factors such as competition for resources such as land and water, disputes over the sexual services of indigenous women, or the loss of pastoral stock. Nor is it to deny that some men are prone to violent methods in order to get what they want. Rather it is to say that on the frontier, the potential for violence within the mid-Victorian ideal of manliness, and its mutually supportive relationship with civilisation, reason and capitalism, came to the surface. What this study reveals are the tensions and contradictions between the ideals of Christian enlightenment and the manly virtues, and the various forms of violence on the frontier, enacted by white males and legitimised by them as “manly”.

Works Cited

Primary

British Columbia, Colonial Correspondence (Inward Correspondence to the Colonial Government), BCA, GR-1372, file 142a.

British Colonist

*British Columbian
Daily Chronicle*

Cornwallis, Kinahan. *The New Eldorado or British Columbia*. London: Thomas Cautley Newby, 1858.

de Satge, Oscar. *Pages from the Journal of a Queensland Squatter*. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1901,

Leslie Family Papers, John Oxley Library, OM71-43.

Lundin-Brown, Rev. R. C. *Klatsassan*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1873.

McLeod, Malcolm ed. *A Canoe Voyage From Hudson's Bay to Pacific, by the late Sir George Simpson; (Governor, Hon. Hudson's Bay Company) in 1828 Journal of the late Chief Factor, Archibald MacDonald (Hon. Hudson's Bay Company) who Accompanied Him*.

McPherson, Allan. *Maranoa 70 Years Ago and How I Lost Mt Abundance*. 1879, Fryer Library, University of Queensland, mss F1500.

Moreton Bay Courier

Queensland, Colonial Correspondence, Inward Correspondence to the Colonial Secretary, QSA , A/322.

Trollope, Anthony. *Australia*. Edited by P.D. and Joyce R.B. Edwards. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1967 [1873].

Waddington, Alfred Pendrill. *The Fraser Mines Vindicated*. Fairfield: Ye Galleon Press, 2000. First published 1858.

Wiseman Letter Book, Queensland State Archives, CCL7/G1.

Secondary

Allen J. "The Invention of the Pathological Family: An Historical Study of Family Violence in New South Wales 1880-1939", in O'Donnell C., and Craney J., eds. *Family Violence in Australia*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1982, 1-27.

Anderson, Christopher "Queensland Aboriginal Peoples Today", in J.H. Holmes ed., *Queensland: A Geographical Interpretation* (Brisbane, 1986); *Queensland Geographical Journal* 4th series, 1, Brisbane , (1986).

Archer, John ed. *Male Violence*, London: Routledge, 1994.

Beynon, John. *Masculinities and Culture*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2002.

Booth, Charles. *Life and Labour of the People of London*. Vol. 1. London: Macmillan, 1902.

Collins, Patrick. *Goodbye Bussamarai: The Mandandanji Land War, Southern Queensland 1842-1852*. St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 2002.

Collini, Stefan. *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850-1930*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Connell, R. W. *Masculinities*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1995.

D'Cruze, Shani, ed. *Everyday Violence in Britain, 1850-1950*. London: Longman, 2000.

Duff, Wilson. *The Indian History of British Columbia*. Victoria BC: Royal British Columbia Museum, 1997.

Eisenstein, Zillah R., ed. *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979.

- Evans, Raymond, Kay Saunders, and Kathryn Cronin. *Exclusion, Exploitation and Extermination: Race Relations in Colonial Queensland*. Sydney: ANZ, 1975.
- Evans, Ray. "The Owl and the Eagle": The Significance of Race in Colonial Queensland." *Social Alternatives* 5:4 (1986): 16-22.
- Evans, Raymond. "A Gun in the Oven: Masculinism and Gendered Violence." In *Gender Relations in Australia: Domination and Negotiation*, edited by Kay Saunders and Raymond Evans. Sydney: Harcourt, 1994, 202-215.
- Fisher, Robin. *Contact and Conflict*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1992.
- Gatrell V.A.C., "Crime, Authority and the Policeman State," in *The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950, V.3*, ed. F.M.L. Thompson Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, 243-310.
- Gay, Peter. *The Cultivation of Hatred: The Bourgeois Experience, Victoria to Freud Vol Iii*. New York: Norton, 1984.
- Hall, Catherine. "Going a-Trolloping: Imperial Man Travels the Empire." In *Gender and Imperialism*, edited by Clare Midgley. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- Harris, Cole. *The Resettlement of British Columbia: Essays on Colonialism and Geographical Change*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997.
- Harris, C.P., *Regional Economic Development in Queensland: 1859 to 1981 With Particular Emphasis on North Queensland*, (Canberra, 1984).
- Hartmann, Heidi. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union" in Lydia Sargent ed., *The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: A Debate on Class and Patriarchy*. London: Pluto Press, 1981, 14-24
- Hughes, Thomas. *Tom Brown's Schooldays / by an Old Boy*. London: Cassell and Company, 1907.
- Lake, Marilyn. "The Politics of Respectability: Identifying the Masculinist Context." *Historical Studies* 22:86 (1986): 116-131.
- Lamb, W.Kaye, ed. "The Census of Vancouver Island, 1855" *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, 4:1 (1940), 51-58.
- Lipman-Bluman, Jean. *Gender Roles and Power* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1984).
- Lloyd, Genevieve. *The Man of Reason: "Male" and "Female" in Western Philosophy*. London: Methuen, 1984.
- McCulloch, Jock. "Empire and Violence, 1900-1930". In Levine, Phillipa ed. *Gender and Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004, 220-239.
- Mangan, J. A., and James Walvin, eds. *Manliness and Morality: Middle Class Masculinity in Britain and America 1800-1940*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987.
- Mayhew, Henry. *London Labour and the London Poor*. London: Griffen, Bohn & Company, 1861.
- Perry, Adele. *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.
- Reynolds, Henry ed. *Race Relations in North Queensland*. James Cook University, 1978.
- Roberts, Tony. *Frontier Justice: A History of the Gulf Country to 1900*. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 2005.
- Roper , Michael and Tosh, John eds. *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800*. London: Routledge, 1991

- Rowbotham, Judith "Only When Drunk: The Stereotyping of Violence in England, 1850-1900," in *Everyday Violence in Britain, 1850-1950*, ed. Shani D'Cruze (London: Longman, 2000).
- Rothenberger, Mel. *The Chilcotin War*. Langley B.C.: Mr Paperback, 1978.
- Rowley, C.D. *The Destruction of Aboriginal Society*. Canberra: ANU Press, 1970.
- Royle, Edward. *Modern Britain: A Social History 1750-1997*. London: Arnold, 1997.
- Saunders, Kay, and Raymond Evans, eds. *Gender Relations in Australia: Domination and Negotiation*. Sydney: Harcourt, 1994.
- Saunders, Kay. "The Study of Domestic Violence in Queensland: Sources and Problems." *Historical Studies* 21:82 1984: 68-84.
- Seidler, Victor J. "Masculinity, Violence and Emotional Life". in Gillian Bendelow and Simon J. Williams eds. *Emotions in Social Life: Critical Themes and Contemporary Issues*. London: Routledge, 1998, 193-210.
- . *Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language and Sexuality*. London: Routledge, 1989.
- Smiles, Samuel. *Self-Help*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002 [1859].
- Spirenborg, Pieter. ed. *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor and Rituals in Modern Europe and America*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998.
- Stanko, Elizabeth. *Everyday Violence: How Women and Men Experience Sexual and Physical Danger*. London: Pandora, 1990.
- Stoler, Laura Ann. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995.
- Woodcock, George. *British Columbia: A History of the Province*. Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1990.