

“WE ARE MEN, THOU AND I”: DEFINING MASCULINITY IN H RIDER
HAGGARD’S *KING SOLOMON’S MINES* AND *SHE*
CONOR REID

H. Rider Haggard’s two most successful and enduringly popular novels, *King Solomon’s Mines* (1885) and *She* (1887), encompass perfectly a number of the most pressing cultural themes and issues of late Victorian England. In a time when the British Empire was expanding across the globe, Haggard’s fiction treats the growing concerns of racial superiority and the “civilising” of other cultures, the place of the Victorian woman in a changing social environment both at home and in the colonies, and the definition of masculinity and manliness facing the English male. It is this last facet that this essay will focus on in particular, viewing it as a key feature in both novels as well as a point of convergence of the other issues mentioned above. The importance of gender and race can be explored in a definition of masculinity through its opposition to these features. Haggard’s notions of manliness are crucial in that they are set up in contrast to ideas of gender, in the guise of female potency and effeminacy, and race, in the form of the black, “savage” male, the primitive versus the civilised man. Finally, notions of masculinity encompass ideas of how imperialism and the Empire were defined as a strictly masculine sphere, a world conquered and ruled through a patriarchy of power. Both novels examined here reflect this imperial environment and promote its concerns while portraying them in the form of the extremely popular romance novel.

A definition of masculinity is very difficult to pin down, not least because it is one that has changed, and will continue to do so, over the course of time. An attribute such as strength, often associated with manliness, is not as important in a society that does not require all men to be soldiers or warriors, and yet it is still seen as an important masculine quality. A traditionally feminine characteristic such as sensitivity has perhaps today come to be seen as a significant attribute of a more rounded masculinity and reveal a comfort with one’s sexuality. In short, attempts at any definition need to take into account differences in culture as well as time period. At the time Haggard was writing, however, it was an era of rapidly shifting ideas of what it was to be a man, how one defined one’s masculinity, and there was a conflict between the mental and the physical aspect of a man’s identity. There were two aspects to masculinity – that of a man strong, courageous, daring and willing to die in battle and that of a rational and logical man, not prone to impulsiveness or erratic behaviour. John Tosh points out that “a great deal of the [early Victorian] literature of the day left the overwhelming impression that masculine identification resided in the life of the mind” but that “[t]his was certainly no longer the case at the end of the nineteenth century”¹. For examples of the importance of physical masculinity in the literature of

the time one need only look at a number of the late Victorian and Edwardian adventure novels - the character of Lord John Roxton in Arthur Conan Doyle’s *The Lost World* (1912) is a perfect example. The two novels under scrutiny here, published in 1885 (*King Solomon’s Mines*) and 1887 (*She*), are therefore exactly in the middle of this transition between two aspects of masculinity and so, as one might expect, feature both aspects significantly. This essay will, therefore, seek to address this ever-shifting definition of masculinity as a key to understanding both novels.

The most apparent definition of masculinity is in opposition to femininity and, in late Victorian England, the issue of gender and the place of the Victorian woman was one of much discussion and controversy. The emerging New Woman, “usually a middle-class woman who enjoyed a measure of personal independence in ways which affronted patriarchal propriety”², was a threat to masculinity in the late 1800s. The increasing number of women who worked for a living and were becoming significantly less dependant on the male patriarchy presented an affront to the established male-dominated British society. Many men saw their masculinity under threat, especially those whose jobs were lost to women or whose work environment was becoming feminised, and emigration to the colonies began to look increasingly attractive. Especially since, as Julia Bush points out, “[m]asculinism was deeply embedded in the currency of popular imperialism peddled at the turn of the century by novelists, poets, journalists, educators, politicians and the returning soldier heroes of the Boer War. At best, British women were usually absent (or admiringly distant) from the epics of manly bravery, strength, endurance and self-discipline which enthralled the British public”³. Indeed women are noticeable absent from practically all of the adventure fiction of this period⁴. There were, of course, numerous reasons for emigration, but a strong incentive was the prospect of a life in the colonies where one could prove one’s masculinity in the pursuit of a life largely devoid of British women. Both novels address this fear of the emerging power of the female in the characters of Gagool, in *King Solomon’s Mines*, and Ayesha, the titular character of *She*.

The absence of females in *King Solomon’s Mines* is quite clearly marked when the narrator, Allan Quartermain, notes in the opening chapter that “I can safely say that there is not a petticoat in the whole history”⁵. There are, of course, two females, Foulata and Gagool, but the latter “was a hundred at least, and therefore not marriageable”⁶ and, in any case, in the world of Haggard and his narrator, a black, savage woman, especially one who is no longer useful in her role as a bearer of children, is not considered a character of any importance. But it is these two characters that prove crucial in understanding Haggard’s version of masculinity. The issue of Foulata and interracial relations will be dealt with later; it is the issue of Gagool that is of initial importance. Gagool is in a position of unprecedented power given her status as a woman. She has lived for generations and has the ear of King Twala, leader of the Kukanas, as well as the power of life or death over the whole kingdom due to her brutal and terrifying witch hunts. It is quite clear that her position of power is one

of natural perversity, a fact which is made explicit in the fact that King Twala himself is the illegitimate ruler of the kingdom in the first place. It is in this unnatural world order that the three protagonists find themselves and, having revealed the true identity of Umbopa, set to reordering it based upon the patriarchy of the new king. Gagool is not only a woman in a position of power, but she is a savage, primitive one and, in keeping with many theories of racial generation and evolutionary theory of Haggard's time, she is described in terms of someone who has degenerated to the level of an animal. Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859), explaining his theory of "natural selection", had been published not quite thirty years previously and had influenced a generation of Social Darwinist theorists who could now add a scientific backing to many of their theories of race and generation. These theorists varied from the criminal anthropologist Cesare Lombroso, to the eugenicist Francis Galton, to racial theorists such as Vacher Lapouge and Gustave LeBon⁷. Darwin's *Origin* as well as his *Descent of Man* (1871), which focuses on humankind rather than simply animals, had outlined the origins of humanity as having animal ancestry. Much Social Darwinist thought, giving Darwin's biological theories a social application, held that as savage races were inferior to civilised races, they were thus closer to man's original state as primates. This is played out in Haggard's novel when Gagool is described as a "withered-up monkey"⁸ and her appearance is one of "deep and yellow wrinkles", her "visage might have been taken for that of a sun-dried corpse" while her hands are "skinny claw[s] armed with nails nearly an inch long"⁹. She is thus far removed from the civilised, white Englishmen.

It is this most degenerate of characters, however, that maintains a reign of terror over all the male figures in the novel and also, crucially, is the only one who has access to the treasures of the mines. This last point, as Anne McClintock points out, is of importance as it highlights the fact that "the secret of the production of mineral wealth in South Africa and thus the hoped-for regeneration of Britain, did indeed lie in the generative labor power of women"¹⁰. The masculinity of the three men, therefore, is reaffirmed in the destruction of Gagool and the threat of the New Woman is successfully quashed. The masculinity and dominance of the three main characters is asserted in a resolute manner, a manner which serves to compliment the numerous other moments throughout the book – from the hunting of big game – "eight elephants is a pretty good bag for one day"¹¹, to Sir Henry's courage facing battle – "Well, so be it; at any rate, it will be a man's death!"¹²

Written two years later, *She*, presents a more complicated view of the threat to masculinity, one which is wrapped up in notions of imperialism, racial generation and patriarchal power. Many critics have read Ayesha, "she-who-must-be-obeyed", as the ultimate symbol of power gone wrong in the hands of a female, and in many respects Ayesha certainly does represent one of the greatest threats to patriarchal power and masculinity in Haggard's novels. But critic Laura Chrisman has crucially noted that reading Ayesha solely in a feminist critical vein "overlooks entirely the topoi of "race", black Africa, and the processes of imperialism, as matrices and

themes in Haggard's discourse"¹³. This is a crucial point and something which will be explored throughout this essay as a definition of masculinity must equally encompass these features. There is no doubt, however, that Ayesha's character has much to do with the threat of the New Woman, and there are many overlapping points with *King Solomon's Mines*. It is, however, important to highlight that the feminist reading of Ayesha is simply one side of a multi-dimensional process.

The world of the Amahagger is very different to that of the Kukuana, most obviously because it is a world where "women [...] are not only upon equal terms of perfect equality with the men, but are not held to them by any binding ties"¹⁴. Women choose their male partners and can leave them if they so wish, heritage is traced through a female lineage and, of course, the entire civilisation is ruled over by a woman, the terrifying and merciless Ayesha. The affront to masculinity and male dominance which greets the travellers on their arrival in the Amahagger city is sharply contrasted to the feats of endurance involved in getting there. Having survived their shipwrecked boat they proceed up an ancient canal watching a battle between a crocodile and a lion – "a wonderful and a shocking sight"¹⁵. This is a particularly spectacular example of Herbert Spencer's "survival of the fittest", a term later used by Darwin as a means of summing up his theory of "natural selection". They brave big game, mosquitoes, and the inhospitable climate while hauling their boat up the canal, emphasising the strength of the men, especially Holly who "was supposed to be strong enough to pull against the two of them"¹⁶. The fact that this society of female power is a savage and inferior one is enough to condemn it, but this is emphasised by the fact that the Amahagger people turn out to be cannibals, a practice which "represented the nadir of savagery, more extreme even than slavery (which, of course, a number of "civilised" nations practiced through much of the nineteenth century)"¹⁷. It becomes increasingly clear that power in the hands of the female is a perverted world order and, to confirm this, Holly talks to Billali later in the novel and discovers that periodically the Amahagger men "rise, and kill the old [women] as an example to the young ones, and to show them that we are the strongest"¹⁸. So not only does this threat to masculinity result in a cannibalistic, savage society but the males will only tolerate it for a certain period of time before they too must assert their dominance and power.

If the threat of the Amahagger society is complicated due to its fear not simply of female power, but of racially degenerate female power, the threat of Ayesha's power is equally complicated due to its blurring between her importance as a figure of female potency as well as imperial power. Her importance as an imperial figure will be dealt with in the final section of this essay; firstly it is crucial to examine her significance as the ultimate threat to the masculine power of Leo and Holly, both of whom are emasculated in her presence. Her erotic allure is made explicit throughout and her very presence renders Holly and Leo impotent – linguistically, mentally, and in terms of power. In the chapter "A Soul in Hell", Holly describes himself as a "rational man"¹⁹ both words equally crucial in understanding his feelings of emascu-

lation. Firstly, as a man associated with logic, rationality and clarity, he can not comprehend the possibility that Ayesha is a supernatural being leading him to doubt himself and his way of thinking. Then, further emasculated, and crawling through the womb-like tunnel leading to Ayesha's private boudoir, he is rendered linguistically impotent as he realises that an attempt to describe her beauty will "surpass my powers of description"²⁰. Finally, despite being a self-proclaimed misogynist, Holly falls deeply in love with Ayesha and is enchanted by her beauty – "I would give my immortal soul to marry her"²¹. Leo, of course, is similarly enchanted and is incapable of resisting her charms as soon as she reveals her face to him.

It is interesting to note here that masculinity is not only about the relationship between men and woman but also that between two men, a bond of brotherhood (or in this case of surrogate father and son). These two types of bond are put to the test at this point in *She*, and it results in the sanctity of the male relationship remaining intact. Leo has fallen in love with Ustane, however when she is murdered by Ayesha in front of his eyes the outraged Leo breaks the bond of love between man and woman and soon "with the corpse of his dead love for an alter, did Leo Vincey plight his troth to her red-handed murderess"²². Holly, on the other hand, is tempted repeatedly by Ayesha's enchanting beauty, and professes his jealousy of Leo on several occasions. But the bond is never broken; he is enthralled by Ayesha but always remembers to check on the dying Leo's progress and, later on, is "rent by mad and furious jealousy" but manages to maintain the bond with Leo and notes that - "I do not quite know how – I got the better of myself"²³. Once more the bond between men is strengthened in the face of the threatening female and male dominance is assured. This male dominance, and the assertion of masculinity are, however, not solely confined to Haggard's characters; they are also quite evident in the gendering of the African landscape. In *King Solomon's Mines*, the treasure map the male party follows takes the form of an inverted female body, running from Sheba's Breasts to the Three Witches, a cave hiding the treasures of the mines, whose bodily significance hardly needs explaining. As Rebecca Stott points out in an essay exploring this issue, "*King Solomon's Mines* does have its female body. That body is that of Africa herself, waiting to be explored"²⁴. The point here is that while the novel may profess to be unrestrained by the presence of females, the entire adventure is based around trying to "penetrate" and "tame" the female landscape. The masculinity of the English gentlemen is, therefore, threatened and must be asserted, usually aggressively, in order to regain dominance over the female. This is done in a number of ways. The heroes emerge alive at the close of the novel but it is only after a battle with the landscape which includes a death-defying struggle through the desert and the defeat of those spawned from the land itself, the autochthonic Kukuanas. It is through displaying the facets of Victorian manliness that Curtis, Good and Quartermain overcome the feminine landscape – they show strength and courage in the killing of large animals, endurance and stamina in their survival through climatic extremes (Ventvögel, "being a Hottentot"²⁵ does not fare so well²⁶), as well as cunning, logic and superior intelli-

gence in their infiltration and subsequent destruction of Twala's kingdom. Thus, the threat to masculinity is successfully overcome and serves to highlight the attraction of the rugged, manly life of the colonial explorer.

It is interesting to note that as the three adventurers travel further from civilisation they descend further and further towards the savage and barbaric practices the British Empire wished to stamp out. This is the second major threat to their identity as British males. Apart from the threat of the feminine there is the threat of degeneration, of becoming almost contaminated by the race one wishes to civilise. "Can the white male imperialist or explorer, with the restraints of civilisation removed, retain his whiteness, his manhood, in the face of barbarism?", Stott asks²⁷. As the adventure proceeds into the desert, away from civilisation, the explorers begin a gradual process of degeneration and the acceptability of what can be eaten by the three gentlemen rapidly changes. Firstly they eat the cured "biltong" they carry with them, however as the journey progresses they must drink stale water, and do not "hesitate at its black and unpleasant appearance"²⁸. Next they run out of fuel and so, despite the "savagery" of it, must eat the raw organs of an antelope²⁹. This process serves to highlight one of the greatest fears of any colonising power – that of racial degeneration, the settlers becoming "more savage than the savages themselves". Patrick Brantlinger discusses the fears of "going native" and the common view that "the Boers [had] 'degenerated into white savages'; the British hero finds that Kaffir 'savages' are 'socially superior' to them, a typical assertion well before the Boer War of 1899-1902"³⁰. Racial degeneracy, therefore, was as much of a threat to masculinity as effeminacy, and something with which Haggard deals extensively.

Chrisman's article regarding the over-simplification of reading Ayesha simply as a female threat to patriarchy can quite equally apply in the case of racial degeneration and its implications for masculinity. She describes how "imperialism is already profoundly split in its identity and value-scheme, utilising an other in order to dramatise its ambiguities, ambivalences and indeterminacies"³¹. It is certainly worth keeping this ambiguity in mind when considering the depiction of the masculine values of bravery, strength and courage – particularly in the case of Umbopa/Ignosi. Critics have pointed out that despite the quite obvious racial stereotyping evident in Haggard's work he does present, in the character of Umbopa, a heroic figure. Andrew Smith writes that "while Haggard's writings do consolidate certain prejudices, they also explore the possibility of moving beyond a colonialist identity politics reliant on conceptions of racial otherness"³². However it seems that this is to misread Haggard's intentions in many instances and, in the case of Umbopa, a closer look reveals that the imperialist view leads to an elevating of Umbopa only to a certain point. The doubling of his character with that of Curtis serves to highlight Haggard's attempts to depict the manliness of the Zulu race while trying to avoid undermining the superiority of the white Englishmen. Haggard manages to achieve this in his descriptions of the two great men together. They are repeatedly paired as the bravest of all men, Quartermain's own cowardice in battle only serving to highlight this, but as Gail

Ching-Liang Low points out, a “heroic cult of masculinity can only be formed through the reflection of blackness”³³. The glorifying of Umbopa serves to raise him up to a point where his masculinity can reflect on Curtis. This comes to a fore when Curtis dresses in the Kukuana tribal dress going into battle, highlighting the fact that:

Umbopa cannot, of course, dress like Curtis. In this fantasy cross-cultural dressing works in one direction only. Curtis is the white civilised hero with all the sexuality and physical power of a savage, but at best, Umbopa can only be the black noble savage.³⁴

It can be seen, therefore, that what would seem to be a promising depiction of a racial Other is manipulated in order to affirm the masculinity of the colonising power. Umbopa is made king but it is Curtis that gains the status of a supernatural being and enters into the folklore of the Kukuana – “any extraordinary blow or feat of strength was henceforth known as ‘Incubu’s blow’”³⁵.

Racial degeneration can be achieved through a “contamination” of the coloniser by the colonised, the settler can adopt the local customs and practices, but there is, of course, another way to truly “go native” and that is to intermarry in the local population. This fear of miscegenation was one that was very real for the coloniser of Haggard’s time and is perhaps the link between defining one’s masculinity in opposition to femininity and racial otherness; miscegenation is both of these fears combined³⁶. Life in the colonies was one that leant itself to behaviour that would not be tolerated at home, as Tosh points out – “Since ‘respectable’ white women were still very thin on the ground in many colonies, there was less countervailing censure, and less chance of deviant behaviour being reported back home”³⁷. The threat of the native woman is fictionalised by Haggard in the form of Foulata, in *King Solomon’s Mines*, and Ustane in *She*.

In *King Solomon’s Mines*, Foulata becomes the devoted handmaiden of Captain Good and, he being a sailor – “I knew the fatal amorous propensities of sailors in general”³⁸ – begins to fall in love with her. This is, of course, a major problem, one which Quartermain acknowledges: “that may be rather awkward if ever we get out of this”³⁹, he notes after Foulata has professed that she will go wherever Good goes. Foulata is used to highlight a real-life problem for settlers in Africa. There were many native women with the “grace, skill [and] personal attractions”⁴⁰ of Foulata with whom an English man could quite easily fall in love. Haggard questions the notion of miscegenation but, in the end, does not challenge it. Good’s virility and manliness are nearly his downfall but then Foulata is conveniently killed off - as Patteson cynically notes: “[g]enerally the paler the skin of the native woman the greater her chances of survival”⁴¹. In Foulata’s final scene, after she has been stabbed by Gagoool, Haggard wraps things up neatly by having Foulata agree with the racist prejudices earlier stated by Quartermain. She states: “I am glad to die because I know that he

cannot cumber his life with such as I am, for the sun may not mate with the darkness, nor the white with the black”⁴². Not only does Haggard highlight the racial superiority of the colonising Good by associating him with the sun, the giver of life, and her with evil and darkness, but he does it through the medium of the colonised. In doing so he both removes Good’s guilt in falling in love with a savage, which has undermined his masculinity, and manages to have the reader believe that the black colonised women, the oppressed Other, is actually in favour of her own convenient death. It is moments like this that make it harder to accept that Haggard “sought to break down these colonist binary distinctions”⁴³.

This risk of miscegenation is evident in *She* in the character of Ustane, but in this case is complicated by the presence of Ayesha. In the matriarchal world of the Amahagger it is Ustane who chooses Leo as her partner and, much like Foulata and Captain Good, she nurses him back to health and he falls in love with her. In similar fashion she must die, to contain the risk of miscegenation, and in this case she is also murdered by the symbol of female potency in the novel, but for very different reasons. Ustane is killed by Ayesha because she is a threat to her, a rival for Leo’s love. Leo is faced with a choice between Ayesha and Ustane, as Chrisman notes: “femininity is given two conflicting representatives”⁴⁴. This situation is far more complicated than that of Foulata and Good as it seems that Chrisman is correct in asserting that it is an oversimplification to reduce the conflict in imperialism and gender solely to the character of Ayesha. This, of course, applies to the exploration of masculinity too, and Leo’s manliness is threatened by two women, but in conflicting ways. His love for Ustane is pure and out of a genuine desire for her selfless character and great beauty but, of course, she is the colonised, black savage. His desire for the more beautiful and, crucially, white Ayesha is unnatural, the result of her Circean beauty; she is capable of making him feel “as if all the manhood had been taken out of him”⁴⁵. Ayesha represents a threat to patriarchy, to the male empire in the form of an alternate, matriarchal empire while Ustane offers a threat from within the patriarchy, that of degeneration and miscegenation. But Leo is incensed at the undignified murder of Ustane and the reader takes the righteous side of Ustane, thus pitting two sides of the same argument against each other. It seems that in this case, in stark difference to *King Solomon’s Mines*, Haggard tries to question the nature of imperialism and its relationship to masculinity with a significantly more complex viewpoint. In the end, of course, both female characters die, but not before Haggard has used them to address the complicated nature of masculinity and its multifaceted relationship with gender, race and imperialism – “questions of gender become inextricable from questions of generation, of racial reproduction, familial relations of power”⁴⁶.

One final aspect of masculinity that needs to be explored is that of the relationship between it and imperialism, and the patriarchal rule of the British Empire. Haggard’s novels make the link quite clear, from his numerous depictions of manly strength and courage to his warnings of the dangers of power in the hands of the weaker, irrational sex. The concept of the British Empire was one that required

strength and perseverance to defeat native populations, ruthlessness to deal with local uprisings and rebellions, a sense of brotherhood between white males in the face of the colonised and a rugged independence needed to maintain one's centre of power and dominance so far from England. All these qualities, and others besides, were seen as strictly male qualities and the British Empire was one governed exclusively by male laws.

She deals more explicitly with the notion of empire than does *King Solomon's Mines*, and is challenging in its conception, with the character of Ayesha representing both a threat to a patriarchal empire and yet a validation of a legitimate racial empire. Chrisman's essay is again important in understanding Ayesha's dual role as undermining whilst sustaining notions of empire. She is a woman with absolute power, a threat to all men with her supernatural powers to enslave all mankind including the British Empire if she so chooses. Yet she is also the legitimising link to the past, beyond the degenerate race who rule Africa now; Ayesha's routes go back two thousand years to the "pure" Kingdom of Kôr, a racially similar predecessor to the current white patriarchy. She speaks Greek and Latin, is cultured in Western philosophy, and is the natural link with history that the Empire needed to validate its "civilising" of other cultures. Of course, one can argue, as Patricia Murphy does, that Ayesha's connection with the past only serves to highlight the gendering of history and the ahistoricity of Ayesha, cut off as she is from the outside world. She may be cultured in Western languages but "[a]s the linguistic distinction between the two speakers reveals, only Holly is identified with the diachronic movement of history"⁴⁷. While this is certainly true to one extent, and there is definitely a gendering of history evident in Haggard's novels, it fails to notice the other elements in play in its search to reduce Ayesha to a character of solely gendered importance. This reading overlooks what seems to be a genuine dichotomy of meaning in Haggard's portrayal of Ayesha. She is undoubtedly a feminine threat to patriarchal masculinity but her links to the foundations of Western culture and her own imperial ambitions result in her being an equally important agent of imperialism: "what is so significant is that imperialism cannot articulate itself through any one agent, representative or identity"⁴⁸. There is, therefore, both a threat to and a reaffirmation of masculinity in the form of empire.

In reading Haggard's novels one can not help but be drawn into his brilliantly scripted adventures and is left in no doubt of his capabilities as a story-teller. There is always a difficulty in reconciling this with a novel that can seem racist or misogynist by today's standards. In searching for a definition of masculinity it is hoped that this essay can be seen to explore the influence of Victorian social thought on Haggard's work in an attempt to understand the period in which he was writing. It must be recognised that although many Victorian English prejudices are evident in the novel, Haggard was not concerned simply with the debasing of other cultures in the name of a good romance and in many cases, particularly in *She*, he is more than willing to engage in a questioning and analytical debate on the very nature of impe-

rialism and the British Empire itself. He explores all notions of his, and the Empire's, masculinity in a time when to do so was to engage in a debate of race, gender and power and, in doing so, has created two infinitely popular and exceptional tales of adventure.

NOTES

¹John Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth Century Britain*, (Harlow, England: Pearson Education Ltd, 2005) [hereafter Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities*], 32.

²*Ibid.*, 117.

³Julia Bush, "The Right Sort of Woman: Female Emigrators and Emigration to the British Empire, 1890-1910," *Women's History Review* 3.3 (1994): 386.

⁴There are no women of any note in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1899) or Conan Doyle's *The Lost World* (1912), and no women at all in H.G. Wells' *The Island of Dr Moreau* (1896). Likewise, in Jules Verne's adventure stories women are seen as a hindrance. Indeed in *Journey to the Centre of the Earth* (1864) this is by Gräuben, the principal female character's, own admittance.

⁵H. Rider Haggard, *King Solomon's Mines*, (London: Penguin, 1994) [hereafter Haggard, *King*], 3.

⁶*Ibid.*, 3.

⁷There is not space here to discuss the various theories and theorists of Social Darwinism and its application in racial theories. Mike Hawkins' *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought, 1860-1945* provides an excellent introduction to all of these themes.

⁸*Ibid.*, 128.

⁹*Ibid.*, 134.

¹⁰Anne McClintock, "The White Family of Man: Colonial Discourse and the Reinvention of Patriarchy" in *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (London: Routledge, 1994), 246.

¹¹Haggard, *King*, 53.

¹²*Ibid.*, 198.

¹³Laura Chrisman, "The Imperial Unconscious? Representations of Imperial Discourse" in *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory: A Reader*, ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994) [hereafter Chrisman, *Imperial Unconscious*], 501.

¹⁴H. Rider Haggard, *She* (London: Penguin, 1994) [hereafter Haggard, *She*], 84.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, 73.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 76.

¹⁷Patrick Brantlinger, "Victorians and Africans: The Genealogy of the Myth of the Dark Continent", *Critical Inquiry* 12.1 (1985) [hereafter Brantlinger, *Victorians and*

Africans], 184.

¹⁸Haggard, *She*, 114.

¹⁹Ibid., 155.

²⁰Ibid., 160.

²¹Ibid., 185.

²²Haggard, *She*, 211.

²³Ibid., 220.

²⁴Rebecca Stott, "The Dark Continent: Africa as Female Body in Haggard's Adventure Fiction," *Feminist Review* No. 32, Summer (1989) [hereafter Scott, *The Dark Continent*], 77.

²⁵Haggard, *King*, 71.

²⁶The Hottentot people, now more correctly called the Khoikhoi, are a particularly dark race of people. Martin Fichman prints a picture of a Hottentot and a gorilla, "a blatant example from a late-nineteenth-century American anthropology text purporting to illustrate racial inferiority by exaggerating the supposed close physical similarities between blacks and primates" in *Evolutionary Theory and Victorian Culture* (New York: Humanity Books, 2002), 116.

²⁷Scott, *The Dark Continent*, 77.

²⁸Haggard, *King*, 79.

²⁹Ibid., 94.

³⁰Brantlinger, *Victorians and Africans*, 194

³¹Chrisman, *Imperial Unconscious*, 504.

³²Andrew Smith, "Beyond Colonialism: Death and the Body in H. Rider Haggard", *Empire and the Gothic: The Politics of Genre*, ed. Andrew Smith and William Hughes (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003), 104.

³³Gail Ching-Liang Low, *White Skins/ Black Masks: Representation and Colonialism* (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 59.

³⁴Ibid., 60.

³⁵Haggard, *King*, 225.

³⁶For examples of various theories on the effects of miscegenation, see Mike Hawkins, *Social Darwinism in European and American Thought, 1860-1945: Nature as model and nature as threat* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997), 184-215.

³⁷Tosh, *Manliness and Masculinities*, 200.

³⁸Haggard, *King*, 230.

³⁹Ibid., 242.

⁴⁰Ibid., 164.

⁴¹Richard F. Patteson, "King Solomon's Mines: Imperialism and Narrative Structure", *Journal of Narrative Technique* Vol 8 (1978): 113, quoted in Stott, 70. See also "Manhood and Misogyny in the Imperialist Romance," *Rocky Mountain Review of Language and Literature* 35.1 (1981): 3-12.

⁴²Haggard, *King*, 260.

⁴³Marysa Demoor, quoted in Smith, 104.

⁴⁴Chrisman, *Imperial Unconscious*, 505.

⁴⁵Haggard, *She*, 219.

⁴⁶Chrisman, *Imperial Unconscious*, 507.

⁴⁷Patricia Murphy, "The Gendering of History in She", *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 39.4 (1999).

⁴⁸Chrisman, *Imperial Unconscious*, 505