The Rebellion of 1857, or ‘Mutiny,’ was not merely a military event; nor was it an episode that erupted one summer to be over by the next. As a cluster of disturbances within colonial society, the Mutiny began well in advance of the incident at the East India Company’s base in Meerut in 1857, and its institutional, discursive and cultural products remained influential for at least two generations afterwards. The war itself functioned as a lens, focusing, intensifying and also remaking a set of social concerns that were grounded in the diverse experiences of colonialism: white and native, Christian and heathen, peasant and princely, soldierly and zamindari. To these might be added masculine and feminine, and, as I shall suggest, adult and child. On the one hand, the Mutiny took place within a powerful set of domestic concerns, and underlined the essential domesticity of those concerns. On the other hand, the crisis served to accelerate the extraction of specific elements of family life from the shelter of domesticity and into the theater of public policy. The tension between these two movements was particularly acute when it came to the effect of the war on colonial children. These, including white and Eurasian children, became major objects of interest, experimentation and fantasy, not only for administrators and a new cadre of experts on the juvenile condition, but also for the producers and consumers of imperial popular culture.

These concerns were inseparable from the great anxiety over race and survivability that the Mutiny came to represent for Britons and Anglo-Indians. The white child in the colony – murdered in the cantonment, concentrated in the military orphanage, enervated in the tropics, diluted in the bazaar, or resurgent in khaki – came to signify
perils, possibilities and unlikely thrills that were otherwise inaccessible to adults, not only because of the perceived immutability of adult nature, but also because of the relative rigidity of adult social roles. Children were fluid in comparison: they seemed to flow easily across the lines of nurture and even of nature, and into differently shaped (and colored) bottles. It is not coincidental that the war was followed by a new visibility for white orphans – i.e., children that had lost their teachers of whiteness – and eventually by Kim: the unparented white child gone native in the colony.

The centrality of the family in the Mutiny requires no great elaboration, but its relocation to a relatively public space, and consequent transformation into something more than a domestic institution, do stand in need of close inspection. It is reasonably well understood that Indian discomfort with Liberal-Utilitarian interventions in the native family, ranging from the abolition of sati and the legalization of widow remarriage to the implications of the Doctrine of Lapse, was a significant factor in shaping the various rebel agendas. Likewise, it is adequately established that the ‘white narrative’ of 1857, with which I am concerned here, was obsessed with violations of the Anglo-Indian family in general and white womanhood in particular. Less attention has been paid to the reality that the endangered colonial family also included children. Popular and military narratives of the Satichaura Ghat and Bibighar incidents were as much about the slaughter of children as about the killing or rape of women. While the contemporary emphasis on the outraged family served to depoliticize rebel motives, it also altered the relationship between the British-Indian state and colonial children, triggering an ideological and financial investment by the governing elites of the empire in institutions such as orphanages and boarding schools.
The children who entered these institutions were marginal twice over: once because they came from the margins of colonial society (as orphans, and as the children of subaltern whites and Eurasians), and again because the spaces to which they were consigned were themselves located on a productive fringe. These, for the most part, were not prestigious showpieces of the technology of colonialism. Those who ran them – a motley collection of retired soldiers, IMS men, educators, ‘matrons,’ clergy and bureaucrats – had only a precarious status as experts in the management of children, and they were quite aware of it. As a moment of crisis in Anglo-Indian society, in which a chronic problem suddenly took on calamitous overtones, the Mutiny invested these modest institutions with the task of producing undeniably important imperial resources: white children, white orphans, and whiteness itself.

Military orphanages – i.e., institutions containing the children of dead white and Eurasian soldiers, along with significant numbers of children whose parents were pauperized, criminalized, Indianized, indifferent, or otherwise absent from their lives, but presumably alive – already existed in India in the decades preceding the Mutiny. These had developed under the triple impulses of a growing population of Indian-born whites and Eurasians, the growing centrality of middle-class familial norms in safeguarding racial prestige, and the Utilitarian faith in institutional remedies. It is not coincidental that orphanages became larger, more numerous and better funded after 1857, for it is only after the war that colonial Utilitarianism achieved its full dimensions. Their growth was, among other things, a part of the flowering of carceral projects in British India – prisons, mental asylums, juvenile reformatories, lock hospitals, etc. – that accompanied or followed the Mutiny. The archipelago of institutions was not only a patchwork of spaces
that might enable administrator-experts to investigate the dark interiors of native society, it was also a zone where specific problems generated or illuminated by the Rebellion, such as threats to the whiteness of Anglo-Indian children, might be located physically and discursively. Like prostitutes and lunatics, derelict children were periodically rounded up (or ‘rescued’) by the police, churchmen and magistrates, and sent to orphanages. The active role played by the state and its affiliates in the production of inmates ensured a link between this production and a public crisis such as the Mutiny. Orphanages expanded suddenly during the war not so much because large numbers of parents had suddenly died as because the institutionalizing and incarcerating mechanisms of the colonial regime had become unusually energetic in targeting a broad range of marginal populations, including white children that were viewed as untenanted or ‘at risk’ in the particular circumstances of the rebellion.

By the end of 1857, one military orphanage in Kidderpore, near Calcutta, already contained more than 700 children. It is unlikely that all, or even most, were the children of soldiers killed in the ongoing fighting. Nevertheless, the entire group was encapsulated by the war, its institutions and its language, and the children were transferred to the Lawrence Asylum, established in 1846 by Henry Lawrence in Sanawar. Situated in the Himalayan foothills, Sanawar was the first of several orphanages that came to be associated with Lawrence, either in his lifetime or posthumously. He and his wife had contributed Rs. 10,000 towards the project, seeing a mismatch between the environment of the colony and a racialized and sentimentalized childhood. The new orphanage, Lawrence wrote, was to be ‘an asylum from the debilitating effects of tropical climate, and the demoralizing influence of barrack life.’ Lawrence had acted within a pre-
existing Evangelical agenda of religious salvation directed inwards towards the self and community of colonizers; this agenda had, in fact, marked popular British perceptions of the military service of ‘saintly’ soldiers like Lawrence and Henry Havelock during the Mutiny.\textsuperscript{12} By establishing orphanages in the mountains, however, Lawrence had also located his salvaged white children within an emerging discourse of health, race and climate.\textsuperscript{13}

The transfer to Sanawar of the children from Kidderpore indicates the heightened intellectual and political value of white children in India during and after the war. The Governor General in Council had no doubts about the ‘public benefit to be expected from the training in habits of order, industry and religion, of a large number of children of Europeans, who, from a residence from their early years in the bracing climate of the Hills, will escape the enervating influences which almost invariably impair the constitutional vigor in afterlife of the children of Europeans brought up in India.’\textsuperscript{14} Lord Canning’s reference to ‘habits’ is significant, because colonial carceral institutions had just entered a phase marked by a faith in the congealing of habits, i.e., the belief that habits, over time, acquired roots in the body – especially the body of the child.\textsuperscript{15} While the habits of delinquency might be intercepted or segregated, those that were desirable could be enforced. The new orphanage thus gave the colonial regime an opportunity to reinforce a racial identity that was both cultural and biological. The government agreed to fund the Lawrence Asylum generously, over the existing annual allocation of Rs. 2400. In 1861, the budget was again increased to cover the cost of the ‘diet, clothing and contingencies’ of European children.\textsuperscript{16} The Punjab government also contributed funds,
allowing the asylum to recruit ‘suitable’ (i.e., white and Eurasian) teachers at salaries of Rs. 250 per month.\textsuperscript{17}

The Mutiny had given the issue an urgency that could not be denied. The war was an overt challenge not only to the racial hierarchy, but to the visibility of race itself. The crisis in British authority had generated various fantasies and nightmares in which color – a product of authority – seemed to fade into ambiguity, and the danger of this ambiguity was perhaps greatest in racial material that had not reached the hardness of adulthood. When one examines a rare juvenile voice from the Mutiny – the fourteen-year-old Ruth Labadoor’s recollections of her captivity in the household of the rebel Javed Khan – it becomes apparent that Ruth’s whiteness was at considerably greater risk than her chastity.\textsuperscript{18} This was not only because Ruth’s maternal grandmother was Indian, but also because Ruth was young, possibly because of her gender, and certainly because of the political circumstances of a racial revolt. Indeed, it is apparent that Ruth undergoes a double transformation over the course of the narrative. In the initial movement, as the rebellion gathers momentum and sweeps away the signposts of British authority – administrations, congregations, soldiers, fathers – she becomes progressively native. She alters her dress, her habits and her patterns of social interaction to an extent that her mother Miriam/Mariam (who is herself not immune to these changes) finds alarming.\textsuperscript{19} In the second movement, which follows the fall of Delhi to the British and the gradual reversal of the rebels’ military gains, Ruth (and her mother) revert to whiteness: their English clothes return, along with a social-political identity that is self-segregating and authoritative.\textsuperscript{20} It is not especially useful to argue that such shifts are merely pretended responses to physical danger, because over extended periods of time, the difference
between ‘contrived’ identity and ‘real’ identity becomes almost meaningless. More pertinent is the possibility that white children, and especially Eurasian children, contained the germs of alternative racial identities which could be activated (or liberated) in times of political upheaval. The Mutiny, in other words, could be an uprising within the body of the individual against a particular racial-political order.

Following Ranajit Guha, it might be argued that the negation of race and its authority was a defining feature of the insurgency. A recuperation of race by an authoritative stamping of the plastic was thus of the utmost importance to the regime. Furthermore, the Kanpur massacre, the siege of Lucknow (which claimed Henry Lawrence as an early casualty) and newspaper coverage of the rebellion in Britain had generated powerful images of the vulnerability and sacredness of the white family in a time of colonial warfare. While Sharpe and Paxton have underlined the centrality of the Mutiny in defining white womanhood and others have noted its transformation of colonialism into a fantasy of metropolitan juvenilia, less attention has been paid to the impetus given by the war to the production of white children in the colony, where they were most ‘endangered.’ This production is certainly evident in Mutiny fiction from the nineteenth century: Flora Annie Steele’s On the Face of the Waters, noted for its concern with gender, also gives us the toddler Sonny, whose blond curls, cherubic innocence and lisping English set him up as an icon of beleaguered whiteness that brings together a bickering group of adult colonizers, moving them to recognize a shared military and political purpose. The Lawrence Asylums were places where children like Sonny – metaphorical survivors and reminders of the Kanpur massacres – might be salvaged over the longer term, once the war had been won. Identifying white orphans, moving them
from one location to another, concentrating them in an institution named after the martyr of Lucknow (where large numbers of white children had been conspicuously at risk), and providing them with racialized diets and instruction were all part of a project of saving the race and providing for its continued survival in a hostile environment.

The orphan was thus a text of both degeneration and recovery. In the immediate aftermath of the Mutiny, the Lawrence Asylum was held up by the colonial government as a successful instrument of recovery, and some decades later the building was graced by a portrait of its most famous inmate: Kim, the urchin’s discomfort with his inner sahib erased. Fiction merged here with realities of a colonial society, demonstrating the circular relationship between policy, fantasy and institution. That Kipling and the asylum administrators both saw fit to locate Kim at Lawrence indicates the relevance, at the turn of the century, of priorities sharpened by the Mutiny. In fact, it can be rewarding to analyze Kim as a late product of Mutiny literature. The central concerns of Kipling’s story are shaped by the impact of the conflict. Not only is the rebellion explained by the wise old sepoy as a mad attack upon the white man’s family, it informs the novel’s obsession with surveillance and sedition, the reality as well as the fragility of British supremacy over India.

What is most pertinent about Kim for the purposes of this essay is that its protagonist is an orphaned juvenile who is only dubiously white, and who is nearly lost in (and to) an extracolonial India, with its burning sun, its food and soil, its languages and clothes, and its proclivity for deceit and disappearance. Clearly, threats to whiteness did not come from rebels alone. The link between the political-military interests of the imperial state and racial evaporation in the tropics – the risk that white children without
proper parents might go native in the bazaar – was understood by the British before Kipling set out to explore the possibilities of going native, but Kipling underscored that this evaporation could be seductive and pleasurable. The nature of that pleasure has been explored brilliantly by Ashis Nandy and need not be revisited here in its entirety.\(^{28}\) That whiteness is burdensome and escape desirable constitute a trope that surfaces repeatedly in submerged Mutiny narratives like Ruth Labadoor’s, and that anchors an alternative (non-dominant) imperial literature well into the twentieth century, marking most notably the writing of George Orwell.\(^{29}\) What Kipling does in *Kim* is suggest that it is the child that feels the white man’s burden most acutely, and that it is in childhood that escape is most viable.

The precious whiteness of the child of the Mutiny is thus given a broader relevance in the colonial imagination by Kipling, and an implication made that the racial perils of 1857 – including the chronic rebellion of the white child in the colony, evident in *Ruth*, *Kim*, and as Nandy suggests, Rudyard himself – were alive and well (although not unchanged) forty years later. It is in that sense, as much as any other, that *Kim* might be considered a novel of counterinsurgency. Kipling was concerned not only with portraying British confidence and mastery over the re-conquered land and people, and combating treasonous collusions of natives and Russians, but also with an equally explicit project of recovering politically, culturally and physically the English child that had strayed from Englishness or been stolen by natives.

While Kipling does not describe his protagonist as a kidnapped child and implies that *Kim* had merely fallen through the shoddy material of subaltern Anglo-India, there are tantalizing suggestions in Mutiny narratives that white children were, at least
occasionally, taken into the homes of natives. For instance, not only Ruth Labadoor, but several of her cousins went to live with families affiliated with the rebellion, and all became Indianized – or, at any rate, lost some of their whiteness – within a remarkably short time.\textsuperscript{30} We know that white women – including some from Kanpur – did in fact live with Indians during and even after the period of rebel ascendency.\textsuperscript{31} In 1858, when the political needs of the colonial regime changed from vengeful re-conquest to the reassertion of the key aspects of racial segregation, the rape hysteria of wartime was abruptly replaced by a denial that there had been any form of sexual contact between Indians and white women, and more generally by a determined silence on the issue (which, it might be added, has suited the Indian nationalist memory of the conflict).\textsuperscript{32} A similar silence envelops the issue of children who, temporarily or otherwise, slipped into native society. Yet, as in the issue of women and sex, the silence is not without cracks which allow anxiety and curiosity to seep through, and which allow the children to be glimpsed or imagined.

Kipling’s solution to the problem was both ‘typical’ of colonial counterinsurgency, and extraordinary. On the one hand, he emphasized the importance of physically retrieving the lost orphan into the care of white adults, and subjecting him (for Kipling, there are no girls in the colony, and childhood is simultaneously gendered and neutered) to a racialized education and to the technology of counterinsurgency and governance. Kim in channeled towards careers in surveying and spying, which constitutes not only a radical switching of political and intellectual sides in British-Indian society,\textsuperscript{33} but also an immersion in the power of the colonial state. The latter, in particular, is a pedagogical process, i.e., the making of an impression (of power and
superiority in their various forms), as well as the creation of a political utility that is itself closely tied to identity. The whiteness that had been lost is thus reinstituted, not unlike Ruth Labadoor’s ‘re-whitening’ upon the military defeat of the rebels. On the other hand, Kipling was able to voice his anguish at the necessity of this racial recovery, giving away, Nandy would argue, the confusion and unhappiness of the recovered child.

The specter of the deracinated child was most evident among the Eurasian population in the immediate aftermath of the Mutiny as well as subsequently. Ruth Labadoor was undeniably of ‘mixed’ race, and Kim’s maternal ancestry is left so vague by Kipling that the purity of his ‘white blood’ remains open to doubt; the Irishness of his father poses other problems which need not be discussed here. Indeed, it might be said that the British response to the Mutiny is suffused by the fear of miscegenation, notwithstanding (or explaining) the energetic participation on the British side of Eurasians like James Skinner. ‘Eurasian’ was, of course, a highly flexible racial category, subject to stretching or constriction by occupant as well as observer, closely tied to the occupant’s political location, and by no means a function of parentage alone. In some contexts, including colonial counterinsurgency, it is (and was) more useful to regard Eurasian identity as an inferior whiteness not far removed from the whiteness of subalterns or the Irish, than as something altogether separate from the political community of the ruling race. Although Kenneth Ballhatchet has observed that the existence of white ‘low life’ as well as Eurasians or any kind – Skinner, Ruth or Kim – threatened the racial prestige of the Raj, it is important to historicize and contextualize the point. The ‘problem’ of Eurasians and the dubiously white, and especially their children, became acute after the Mutiny had been defeated and white dominance
reestablished, i.e., when it became necessary to disaggregate, repair and reorder the various compartments of colonial India, including the hurriedly improvised white *laager* of 1857.

The possibility that Eurasian children might grow up as natives and yet demand the rights of Europeans alarmed administrators seeking to understand the causes of the near-disaster, and to preempt future disasters. Immediately after the war, Lord Canning mused:

> If measures for educating these children are not promptly and vigorously encouraged and aided by the Government, we shall soon find ourselves embarrassed in all large towns and stations with a floating population of Indianized English, loosely brought up and exhibiting most of the worst qualities of both races; whilst the Eurasian population, already so numerous that the means of education offered to it are quite inadequate, will increase more rapidly than ever. I can hardly imagine a more profitless unmanageable community than one so composed. It might be long before it would grow to be what might be called a class dangerous to the state; but a very few years will make it, if neglected, a glaring reproach to the Government.\(^{35}\)

Canning was particularly concerned about children that were in or approaching their teenage years. This concern is evident in Kipling’s writing at a historical moment when the conception of adolescence as a period of sexual and political rebellion had gained a measure of cultural currency in the metropole and in India as well.\(^{36}\) Canning’s delinquents, like Ruth and later Kim, reflect a fear of the adolescent/native/subaltern,
which merges with a fear of the mongrel who is already and visibly aberrant, and who is embarrassing evidence of the sexual-moral weakness of the ruling race. The danger was inseparable from opportunity. Ann Stoler has argued about Dutch Java that children located within mixed-race and poor-white domesticities (and sexualities) were vital to the discursive production of whiteness. The very plasticity that made white children of the subaltern classes a menace to the colonial polity, however, also made them potentially useful, provided they were re-invested with parents and habits of the right sort.

Eurasians, likewise, were an imperial asset under particular circumstances: Gautam Chakravarty has made the intriguing suggestion that colonial counterinsurgency bifurcated the nineteenth-century European discourse of war by relegating the definitive immoralities of ‘irregular’ warfare to the ‘irregular’ races, and Kipling makes it very clear that what makes Kim useful as a spy is his ability to straddle the color line. In fact, it is useful to see the Mutiny as a pivotal moment in the creation of a new imperial-racial identity: an irregular, suspect, but valuable and entertaining whiteness that incorporated selected cultural and even biological ‘impurities,’ and that was located most intensively in boys. The transformation of imperial boys’ culture in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, with its newfound love of blackface disguise, commando games and spying, culminating in Kim, the Boy Scouts and the cult of Lawrence of Arabia, really begins with colonial administrators’ attempts to come to terms with the disarray of race and childhood in India immediately after the war. Eurasian and quasi-Eurasian children manifested this disarray and its possibilities. Canning wrote:

If cared for betimes, [these children] will be a source of strength to British rule and of usefulness to India. They serve the Government…more
efficiently than the natives can as yet serve it, and more cheaply and conveniently than Europeans can do so; they are a class which…is without that deep root in…the soil of India from which our native public servants through their families and relatives derive advantage.\textsuperscript{40}

Thus, in a calculation that was both cynical and a sincere attempt to protect ‘one’s own,’ aberrant nature – the unrootedness of the stray child in the Indian soil and latent biological roots in whiteness – itself became a political and economic resource that the colonial state set out to exploit.

The problem had to be tackled by producing imperiled white children and concentrating them in new institutions like the Lawrence Asylum. The linguistic and geographic setting of their relocation – an ‘efficiently managed’ orphanage, with ‘trained’ staff, in a hill station – was a significant part of this salvaging of whiteness. Dumping children in a whites-only asylum was not enough. The orphans were vital specimens in larger experiments of matching bodies, places and institutional regimes.\textsuperscript{41} Such ‘fittings’ were never self-evident; they were subject to constant experimentation and negotiation in the asylums, reformatories and prisons of British India.\textsuperscript{42} The discovery of a location, a diet, a uniform, a curriculum, and a routine of work, play, sleep and study that might suit the race was a discovery of the race itself. If the Mutiny deepened the anxiety that the plastic of whiteness became warped and weakened in India, the new orphanage provided reassurance that compensating processes could be found.

Not all British observers read racial recovery in colonial orphans. Touring India in 1866, child-saver and church activist Mary Carpenter visited the Military Male Orphan Asylum in Madras. The institution housed three hundred inmates, ranging in age from
infants to teenagers, mostly Eurasians but also some with two white parents. Carpenter gave the orphanage a mixed review. The boys were pervaded by ‘apathy and dependent spirit,’ and unlike their counterparts in industrial schools in England, showed no eagerness to go to sea. They were, in other words, not especially white. Carpenter sought to explain the shortcoming in terms of an institutional environment that cocooned children with Indian servants. Here, she echoed the colonial (and metropolitan) fear of servants as agents of sexual and racial contamination; the ease with which native servants turned ‘Rudyard’ into ‘Rudy Baba’ or ‘Kim’ was as subversive to Carpenter as to Nandy. Carpenter admitted that the ‘listlessness…may be traceable in part to the inherent inaptitude for exertion existing in [Eurasians].’ She concluded nevertheless that the project could not be abandoned, for the orphans had ‘a strong claim on the English.’ Moreover, while Indian blood had surfaced powerfully in the Eurasians, all traces of whiteness had not been lost: the children were orderly, attentive in class, and the older ones played cricket. Carpenter was optimistic about the ‘pure’ white children: emerging from an inspection of the School for European Orphan Girls in Calcutta, she noted that many former inmates were respectably married and had produced children, proving that ‘with a judicious system of education – mental, moral, and physical – English girls may be brought up in a healthy condition in India.’ Quite aside from the gender- and class-based assumptions about the respective imperial roles of males and females, Carpenter’s agenda and conclusion are both founded on the assumption that a successful and self-perpetuating colonialism required effecting specific repairs in the racial Selves of children whose whiteness is in jeopardy or doubt, and on an infrastructure that had been reinvented by the Mutiny.
The continued relevance of these investigations – not only to senior policy-makers within the government, but also to the partially overlapping tribe of social scientists imbedded in associations that saw the empire as their field of operation – is visible in the activities and writings of any number of colonial veterans, such as F. J. Mouat and George Campbell. Campbell, having been governor of Bengal, went on to become the president of the anthropology section of the British Association. In 1886, he addressed his anthropologist colleagues on the subject of racial survival in a tropical colony, making sure to draw attention to the experiments with orphans. After reassuring his listeners that he had, as governor, done ‘the best I could to obtain a classification of our many races,’ he went on:

It is the fact that…the climate alters the British race? It has passed into a popular proverb that the European race cannot survive in India beyond the second or third generation, and the result of that belief has been [that] no sort of colonization has been attempted. Yet…it is one of those things that are universally believed because they have never been tried, and therefore cannot be contradicted. To this day opportunities for education and good upbringing are very much wanting [for Europeans in India] – the surroundings are most unfavorable to European children; yet a good many…Europeans brought up in India…are physically just as good as their parents. The mortality in the European orphan asylums is extraordinarily low. It is not all certain that the race might not be adapted to the climate.
More directly than Carpenter, Campbell was in search of an expanded colony that involved not only the widespread settlement of Europeans in India, but also the production of recognizably white children in the colony. (In the same breath, he advocated the settlement in England of Indians who might work as servants.) Also, anticipating the crisis of imperial confidence that followed the Boer War, Campbell was voicing a polemic about the racial-biological impact of urbanity, declaring that it was ‘impossible to see the crowded and inferior dwellings in which so vast a population lives in towns, without room for the gardens which their fathers had, and without the space and recreations natural to man, and not to fear for the result on the race.’

An inside-outside Baden-Powell, he was not so much concerned with creating quasi-colonial environments for metropolitan children, as with providing white children in the colony with quasi-English surroundings.

It is not coincidental that Campbell had been an early supporter of the Lawrence Asylum and of the concentration there of white orphans from the plains, writing even before the Mutiny: ‘The benefit to the health and vigor of the children can be fully appreciated only by those who have seen the aspect of the European children in Bengal, and have been able to contrast it with the ruddy, stout, English appearance of those who from an early age have had the Lawrence Asylum and its mountain climate as their constant home.’ Ruddy, stout, and of English appearance: this was nothing less than the recovery of the cherub Sonny from the clutches of an India that had turned him into Kim.

Campbell’s interest in colonial children was not limited to Europeans, for the study of race and childhood was necessarily a comparative project. Addressing his anthropologist friends in 1886, he wondered whether there was ‘anything in the breed
that enables Britishers to rule over Hindus,’ and whether ‘the Negro,’ given ‘equal advantages,’ might grow up to be ‘nearly as intelligent as Europeans.’\textsuperscript{53} Trying to answer his own questions, he remarked that ‘the most important inquiry is to sift out those qualities in regard to which we must look to improvement in the breed, and those which more depend on education, so that power may not be wasted…by breeding for qualities which already exist or educating where the breed renders a particular education useless.’\textsuperscript{54} The expertly orphaned child thus had much to contribute, both as a text and as a developing member of a race with a specific political destiny.

\textbf{Conclusion}

By focusing attention on the immediate and long-term survivability of Anglo-India as a racial entity, and highlighting the connection between this survivability and the political fortunes of the colonial state, the Indian Mutiny made the white child in the colony a major site of cultural production, government policy and institutional intervention. As a moment when the authority of the colonial state, of whiteness and of the white patriarch (who was also an agent of the state) crumbled simultaneously, the Anglo-Indian child emerged both as a victim of rebellion and as a mutineer in his or her own right. Literally and metaphorically, significant numbers of white children came to be viewed as endangered and dangerous ‘orphans,’ evincing profoundly mixed feelings of pity, empathy and anxiety. Consequently, the reestablishment of legitimate authority at the end of the war and for a considerable time thereafter required subjecting such children to multiple relocations, in which they were restored to physical safety, cultural propriety and political community, and provided with racial-biological and political-ideological correctives. Over the decades that followed the Mutiny, this restorative project
overlapped with emerging anxieties and fantasies, such as adolescence, eugenics and the secular culture of imperial adventure.

Relocating white children to sites where their whiteness might be recast could mean a renewed investment in orphanages like the Lawrence Asylum, which sought to mold their inmates in a desirable racial image, and marked them with new political meanings and purposes. It could also mean writing about Anglo-Indian children and childhood. Kim and the real children who were taken into the Lawrence Asylum were the other, darker, side of the coin that Sonny – the angelic Mutiny infant – represented. The orphanage, like colonial fiction and imperial boys’ culture, was designed not so much to eradicate this darkness as to manipulate it, wringing from it utilities as well as a particular kind of pleasure. This was close but not identical to the subversive pleasures of deracination, i.e., the dangerous appeal of the child ‘lost’ in the colony. It was, rather, the pleasure of darkness that had been tamed and incorporated into whiteness.
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