Chapter One

Domicile and Diaspora: An Introduction

The photograph on the cover of this book was taken in February 1948, six months after Indian Independence and the Partition of India and Pakistan. It was taken outside a bungalow in a railway colony near Chittagong in what was then East Pakistan and is now Bangladesh (see Figure 1.1). It is a photograph of an Anglo-Indian girl, Felicity, with her ayah's daughter,[1] both dressed up in saris made from a pair of old curtains, and it was taken by Felicity's father, who worked on the railways. In many ways, this photograph could be viewed as a classic representation of British domesticity in India, forming part of a long tradition of British families posing with their servants and reproducing an empire within as well as beyond the home.[2] But this photograph differs in three main ways. First, it was taken after Independence, when many of the British elite had left India. For those who remained, either waiting for a passage home or, in fewer cases, 'staying on',[3] family photographs could now less easily represent imperial domesticity and an empire within the home. Second, although the Bengali girl looks far less confident than two-year-old Felicity, they appear more similar than different in other ways. The Bengali girl is standing further back, with her hand to her face, and returns a far less assured gaze to her mother's employer. But both girls are dressed up in the same way, both are holding dolls, and both have been playing together. Finally, unlike photographs of British domesticity in India, Felicity is an Anglo-Indian rather than a British girl.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the term 'Anglo-Indian' referred to the British in India, and is still sometimes used in this way.[4] But since the Indian Census of 1911, the term has referred to a domiciled community of mixed descent, who were formerly known as Eurasian, country-born or half-caste. Anglo-Indians form one of the largest and oldest communities of mixed descent in the world, and continue to live in

Figure 1.1   Map of the Indian subcontinent

India as well as across a wider diaspora, particularly in Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States. Descended from the children of European men and Indian women, usually born in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries,[5] Anglo-Indians are English-speaking, Christian and culturally more European than Indian. Before Independence in 1947, the spatial politics of home for Anglo-Indians were shaped by imaginative geographies of both Europe (particularly Britain) and India as home. Although Anglo-Indians were 'country-born' and domiciled in India, many imagined Britain as home and identified with British life even as they were largely excluded from it. In many ways, Anglo-Indians imagined themselves as part of an imperial diaspora in British India. Indian nationalism and policies of Indianization gave a new political urgency to Anglo-Indian ideas about home and identity. Some Anglo-Indians who did not feel at home in India settled in a homeland called McCluskieganj, whereas

many more migrated after Independence. In 1947, there were roughly 300,000 Anglo-Indians in India and, against the advice of Anglo-Indian leaders, at least 50,000 had migrated by 1970, half of whom resettled in Britain in the late 1940s and 1950s.[6] The second main wave of migration was to Australia in the late 1960s and 1970s once White Australia migration policies had become less restrictive.

In the 1935 Government of India Act, Anglo-Indians were defined in relation to Europeans in terms of their paternal ancestry and domicile:

> An Anglo-Indian is a person whose father or any of whose other male progenitors in the male line is or was of European descent but who is a native of India. A European is a person whose father or any of whose other male progenitors in the male line is or was of European descent and who is *not* a native of India.[7]

Whereas Anglo-Indians and Europeans shared European paternal descent, Anglo-Indians were born in India and would, before Independence, and unlike most Europeans, expect to die there. Although written out of this definition, the maternal line of descent for Anglo-Indians usually included an Indian woman, often as far back as the eighteenth century. This gendered and geographical definition of what it meant to be an Anglo-Indian formed the basis for the definition that has been part of the Indian Constitution since 1950.[8] Since 2002, the date that the legal definition was adopted in 1935 has been designated 'World Anglo-Indian Day', which is celebrated by community functions held in India and across the wider diaspora.

The legal definition is important in personal as well as official terms as it informs how many Anglo-Indians understand and explain their identity and community. For example, a teacher who grew up in Lahore before Independence and now lives in Lucknow told me about her family background by explaining the origins of the Anglo-Indian community:

> I shall start from approximately three hundred years ago. The British came out to India and stayed there. Now some of them married. Well, there's no such thing as an Anglo-Indian that they married, they actually married the Indian girls. So the British and that Indian lady started up a line of Anglo-Indians. By the time my grandfathers came out, which was two hundred years after that, one came with the Welsh regiment and one came with the Irish regiment . . . there was a line of Anglo-Indian ladies. . . . They married a mixture of Anglo-Indians. Therefore we Anglo-Indians are a different strata. . . . I think I have two-thirds British blood in me, and one-third Indian, hence the way I dress, the way I speak, the way I live.

*   *   *

In 1951, three years after the photograph on the cover was taken, Felicity moved to Britain with her parents and older sister, Grace. Felicity lost both her knowledge of Hindi and her Anglo-Indian accent, and grew up as her family's 'foreign child'. This description comes from a 2001 album entitled *Panchpuran* by the folk-singer Bill Jones, who is Felicity's daughter Belinda. The album includes the same photograph of Felicity and her friend on the inside cover. The word *panchpuran* is Hindi for five spices and, according to Belinda, describes not only her music but also her family. As she says, 'my mum's family are Anglo-Indian and came to England in 1951, and my dad was born and bred in Wolverhampton in the West Midlands'. In the title track, the word 'is used to mean many different things all mixed together'. The a capella song describes, through her Aunty Grace's eyes, 'the trials of adjusting to life in a country which is not your homeland'.[9]

This book is about the spatial politics of home for Anglo-Indian women like Felicity and Grace, both in India and across a wider diaspora. I explore the intersections of home and identity for Anglo-Indians in the fifty years before and after Independence, both domiciled in India and resident in Britain and Australia. I consider the ways in which Anglo-Indian women have felt both at home and not at home in India, Britain and Australia, and the ways in which they have embodied and domesticated personal and collective memories and identities of mixed descent. I also investigate the ways in which such memories and identities have been politically mobilized and resisted through depictions of Anglo-Indian women and through the imaginative and material spaces of home.

Domicile and Diaspora considers the spatial politics of home in relation to imperialism, nationalism, decolonization and multiculturalism, and seeks to extend feminist and postcolonial ideas about mobile and located homes and identities in relation to critical 'mixed race' studies. This book is part of a wider attempt not only to explore material and imaginative homes as key locations for theorizing identity, but also to write the home and domesticity into grand narratives of modernity, imperialism and nationalism.[10] Moving beyond binaries such as public and private space and imaginative geographies of 'self' and 'other', I investigate the power-laden interplay of home and identity in terms of spatial politics. This term refers to home as a contested site shaped by different axes of power and over a range of scales. Mobilizing identity beyond an individual sense of self, and geographies of home within, but also beyond, the household, I focus on their collective and political inscription over space and time and on their contested embodiment by women.

To do so, I explore the spatial politics of home on three intersecting scales. On a household scale I discuss social reproduction, material culture, domesticity and everyday life, particularly focusing on the ways in which Anglo-Indian domesticity has been influenced by both European

and Indian ideas of home. I also explore the ways in which an identification with Britain and/or India as home was reproduced on a domestic scale, and the roles of Anglo-Indian women, particularly as wives and mothers, in fashioning a distinctively Anglo-Indian domesticity. On a national scale, I am interested in the intersections between home, identity and nationality and the ways in which Anglo-Indians identified with Britain and/or India as home both before and after Independence and how this was embodied by women and both domesticated and resisted within the home. I also explore the political mobilization of Britain as fatherland and India as motherland, ideas about Anglo-Indians as a homeless community within the country of their birth, and the foundation and promotion of homelands for Anglo-Indian colonization and settlement. Finally, on a diasporic scale I chart transnational geographies of home and identity for Anglo-Indians in Britain and Australia, reflecting the two main waves of migration by Anglo-Indians after Independence. I explore the implications not only of Independence but also the 1948 British Nationality Act and the White Australia Policy on Anglo-Indian migration, and the ways in which an Anglo-Indian identity has become more visible in the context of official multiculturalism.

Domicile

The term 'domicile' invokes geographies of home, settlement and residence, and is both conceptually and empirically significant for this book. One of the main arguments of this book concerns the critical connections between home and identity, whereby a sense of self, place and belonging are shaped, articulated and contested through geographies of home on scales from the domestic to the diasporic. But, more than this, the term 'domicile' is particularly apt for studying Anglo-Indians, who formed a large part of the 'domiciled community' in India. Unlike the 'heaven-born' British elite, who usually returned home on their retirement, the 'country-born' domiciled community consisted of people of European descent who were permanent residents in India.[11]

The home has begun to attract an increasing amount of critical attention across the humanities and social sciences.[12] As a space of belonging and alienation, intimacy and violence, desire and fear, the home is charged with meanings, emotions, experiences and relationships that lie at the heart of human life. Studies of home as a space of lived experience and imagination range from a focus on everyday life and social relations to domestic form and design, and material, visual and literary cultures of home. Moving beyond the separation between public and private spheres, current studies of home often investigate mobile geographies of dwelling, the political significance of domesticity, intimacy and privacy, and the ways in which

ideas and lived experiences of home invoke a sense of place, belonging or alienation that is intimately tied to a sense of self. Such geographies of home traverse scales from the domestic to the global, mobilizing the home far beyond a fixed, bounded and confining location. Studies of home on a domestic scale include work on housing, household structure, domestic divisions of labour, paid domestic work, material cultures of home and homelessness. On a national scale, ideas about home have been studied in relation to debates about citizenship, nationalist politics, indigeneity and multiculturalism. Beyond national borders, research on diasporic, transnational and global geographies includes studies of different domestic forms, multiple places of belonging, cultural geographies of home and memory, and global patterns of domestic labour. A key feature of research on home has been the ways in which it is not only located within but also travels across these different scales,[13] as shown by research on the political significance of domesticity in anti-colonial nationalism,[14] the bungalow and the highrise as transnational domestic forms,[15] and the transnational employment of domestic workers.[16] *Domicile and Diaspora* explores how the spatial politics of home are mobilized on different, coexisting scales and over material and imaginative terrains.

Another key theme within recent research on home is an interest in the critical connections between home and identity, whereby ideas of home invoke a sense of place and displacement, belonging and alienation, inclusion and exclusion, that is not only intimately tied to a sense of self but also reflects the importance of intimacy.[17] An interest in home and identity within geography can be traced back to the work of a number of humanistic geographers writing in the 1970s and 1980s who celebrated the home as a site of authentic meaning, value and experience, imbued with nostalgic memories and the love of a particular place.[18] But, as Gillian Rose argues, humanistic geographers largely failed to analyse the home as a gendered space shaped by different and unequal relations of power, and as a place that might be dangerous, violent, alienating and unhappy rather than loving and secure.[19]

More recent research has addressed the spatial politics of home and identity in more critical and contextual ways, redressing not only the 'suppression of home', but also apolitical celebrations of home. In metaphorical terms, images of home form part of a wider spatial lexicon that has become important in theorizing identity, and are often closely tied to ideas about the politics of location and an attempt to situate both knowledge and identity.[20] Through life stories and through archival, textual and ethnographic research, feminist and postcolonial critiques have been particularly important in tracing and traversing the metaphorical and material meanings of home. Feminist postcolonial work has investigated the contested sites of home and domesticity as critically important not only in the social

reproduction of nation and empire, but also in revealing the interplay of power relations that both underpinned and undermined such processes of social reproduction. Important themes within this work include the domestication of imperial subjects, particularly as servants, housewives, mothers and children; the material cultures of domesticity, both in the metropolis and in the wider empire; and the home as a site of inclusion, exclusion and contestation, both at times of conflict and in the more everyday practice of imperial rule.[21] Other research has explored the importance of the home and domesticity in shaping anti-imperial nationalist politics, particularly through the roles of women both within and beyond the home.[22] Such studies challenge the masculinist knowledge that either ignores the home completely or overlooks the power relations that exist within it. Alongside the work of many black feminists who have rewritten home as a site of creativity, subjectivity and resistance,[23] such studies also challenge a white, liberal feminism that has understood the home primarily as a site of oppression for women. Rather than see home as a solely gendered space, usually embodied by women, such writings also reveal domestic inclusions, exclusions and inequalities in terms of class, age, sexuality and 'race'.[24]

Ideas about home and identity are a recurrent theme in work on, and by, people of mixed descent. Alongside a wide literature on 'interracial' partnering, parenting, fostering and adoption,[25] there is a growing literature on home and identity that extends beyond domestic life and family relationships to explore a wider sense of place and belonging. According to Joanne Arnott, 'possibly the most difficult issue for people of mixed heritage is that of belonging':[26] of finding a place to call home. In a book entitled *Scattered Belongings,* Jayne Ifekwunigwe writes that 'In the de/territorialized places, which ''mixed race'' cartographers map, the idea of ''home'' has, by definition, multilayered, multitextual and contradictory meanings.'[27] Such complex and multiple mappings of home often reveal a sense of identity and belonging as simultaneously personal and transnational, as shown by feminist autobiographical writings on the plural concurrence of homes and identities. For example, Velina Hasu Houston writes that 'As an Amerasian who is native Japanese, Blackfoot Indian, and African American, I am without the luxury of state (''home'')....Home is sanctuary from the world, but it is not found in one physical place or in a particular community.'[28] In recent years, particularly in the United States, many people have claimed and asserted their place within a wide and diverse community of mixed race, both exploring and celebrating their racialized identities through discussions, organizations and websites.[29] Unlike Houston's essay and other life writings about the personal uniqueness of mixed descent that cannot be traced to a 'particular community',[30] and unlike the political mobilization of diverse collectivities of mixed race, my focus on

Anglo-Indians reveals the complex mappings of home and identity for one particular community of mixed descent.

Drawing on interviews with self-identified women of 'mixed race' in Toronto, Minelle Mahtani argues that the term is used in different ways as a 'linguistic home' that can create 'new geographies of inclusion'.[31] Mahtani critiques popular discourses that are characterized by 'a relentless negativity' in their portrayal of 'mixed race' individuals as out of place or with no place to call home.[32] In similar terms, Jill Olumide writes that 'one of the salient features of the social construction of mixed race has been its characterisation as a marginal, detached and confused state in which individuals so designated are condemned to wander in search of belonging and acceptance'.[33] As Olumide continues, the social construction of 'mixed race' usually depicts it 'as an inherently problematic, confused and isolated state', or as a state that is celebrated, also in problematic ways, as 'a paradigm of [racial] harmony'.[34] For both Mahtani and Olumide, it is important to challenge such stereotypically negative and positive views, partly by studying individuals of 'mixed race' in their own terms and partly by analysing 'the mixed race condition' in context. Exploring both personal and collective memories and identities of mixed descent, this book investigates the spatial politics of home for Anglo-Indians in social, cultural and political context. Moving beyond solely metaphorical images of being in and out of place, at home and not at home, I study the materialities and social relations of everyday domestic life and their wider political significance in relation to imperialism, nationalism, decolonization and multiculturalism. I am particularly interested in the ways in which material and metaphorical geographies of home have been mobilized and resisted both in political debates and in everyday life.

By exploring the spatial politics of home and identity in ways that articulate both mobility and displacement alongside location and positionality, the book is part of a wider attempt to explore the spatialized production of knowledge. In feminist theory, for example, Susan Stanford Friedman charts the contours of what she terms 'locational feminism', and explores different discourses of positionality that characterize the spatialized production of knowledge. 'Situational approaches' are, for Friedman, an important part of these wider discourses of positionality. Not only do such approaches 'assume that identity resists fixity, but they particularly stress how it shifts fluidly from setting to setting', whereby '[e]ach situation presumes a certain setting as site for the interplay of different axes of power and powerlessness'.[35] I explore geographies of home on domestic, national and diasporic scales as critical and contested settings for the production and reproduction of Anglo-Indian identities.

Throughout the book, I use the term 'mixed descent' rather than 'mixed race'. This is to reflect the inheritance and ancestry shared by

Anglo-Indians that often dates back to the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and which spans 'race', ethnicity and nationality. As George MacMunn wrote in 1934, the term 'Anglo-Indian'

> includes all those persons of mixed European and Indian parentage, whether as the result of direct union of persons of the two races or by the union of those already of mixed descent. Its source is a wide one, and may descend from the union, regular or irregular, of members of the official class, civil and military, with Indian women of high or lowly birth, or may have its origin in the marriage of retired European soldiers with the women of the country. In the last few generations, the community principally marries within itself or with those of pure European origin, in place of augmentation by the direct union of persons of European or Indian races.[36]

In other words, the mixed descent of most Anglo-Indians dates back several centuries, like other *métis* groups that emerged elsewhere under imperial or colonial rule.[37]

In the early years of the East India Company, British men were encouraged to marry Indian women, and – like Dutch and Portuguese men – were often given financial incentives to do so.[38] But from the 1790s, a series of social, administrative and military regulations distanced British rulers from their Indian and Anglo-Indian subjects. Following the uprising in Saint-Domingue (later named Haiti) in 1791,[39] British rulers began to fear a similar insurrection in India. While Anglo-Indians had previously been seen as providing a strategic buffer between rulers and ruled, their loyalty was now a source of concern. The regulations that distanced British rulers from Indian and Anglo-Indian subjects were reflected by domestic anxieties that centred on intermarriage and miscegenation and were in part allayed by the growing number of British women who travelled to India from the early nineteenth century. The order prohibiting women from travelling to India was rescinded when the Charter of the East India Company was renewed in 1833, and, two years later, the opening of the overland route to India considerably reduced the journey time.[40] In the mid-eighteenth century, an estimated 90 per cent of British men in India were married to Indians or Anglo-Indians, but, by the mid-nineteenth century, intermarriage had virtually ceased.[41] In the words of Frank Anthony, who led the Anglo-Indian community in India from 1942 until his death in 1993, the community became increasingly endogamous, resulting in 'distinctive racial-cum-linguistic-cum-cultural' characteristics that included 'certain common customs, manners and cultural affinities, with the supreme bond of English as their mother-tongue'.[42] From the mid-nineteenth century onwards, in part because of their loyalty to the British during the 'Mutiny' of 1857, Anglo-Indian men were employed in certain jobs that were protected under British rule. These jobs were usually at an intermediate level of

seniority – often positioned on a hierarchy between British and Indian men – and were particularly concentrated on the railways, in the Posts and Telegraphs Department, and in the Customs and Excise services. Anglo-Indian women were often employed as nurses, teachers and office workers, particularly from the early twentieth century onwards. Reflecting the loyalty and service of Anglo-Indians to the government and adminis-tration of British India, Reginald Maher, an Anglo-Indian journalist and commentator, wrote that 'almost the entire community from its cradle to its grave was born, lived and died for one thing – service to the Crown'.[43]

Diaspora

The term 'diaspora' is inherently geographical, implying a scattering of people over space and transnational connections between people and places. Geography clearly lies at the heart of diaspora both as a concept and as lived experience,[44] encompassing the contested interplay of place, home, culture and identity through migration and resettlement. While geography is clearly central to understanding diaspora both in theory and in practice, ideas about diaspora also raise important questions about space and place. The entanglements of 'roots' and 'routes', for example,[45] invoke different geographies of diaspora, which are often articulated through dif-ferent geographies of home.[46] While the term 'roots' might imply an original homeland from which people have scattered, and to which they might seek to return, the term 'routes' complicates such ideas by focusing on more mobile and transcultural geographies of home. Rather than view place, home, culture and identity as located and bounded – and geography as little more than territory – an emphasis on 'routes' suggests their more mobile, and often deterritorialized, intersections over space and time. And yet, such mobility does not preclude what Avtar Brah terms 'a homing desire'. As she writes, 'the concept of diaspora offers a critique of discourses of fixed origins while taking account of a homing desire, as distinct from a desire for a ''homeland''. This distinction is important, not least because not all diasporas sustain an ideology of ''return''.'[47]

This book is about the 'homing desire' of Anglo-Indians living in an imperial diaspora in British India and in a decolonized diaspora in Britain, Australia and India after Independence in 1947. Brah argues that her ideas about diaspora space are part of a broader process of 'theoretical creoliza-tion', which represents 'a point of confluence and intersectionality where insights emerging from these fields inhere in the production of analytical frames capable of addressing multiple, intersecting, axes of differenti-ation'.[48] Closely connected to such ideas about theoretical creolization, notions of hybridity have been important in recent work on mobile and

multiple identities, cultures and ideas of home, usually in the context of migration, diaspora, transnationality and globalization.[49] Homi Bhabha's influential work charts the hybrid subject as split and mobile, located in a contradictory and ambivalent 'third space' that disrupts the binary opposition between 'self' and 'other'. 'Third space' is an in-between space, where hierarchies between cultures, colonizers and colonized become destabilized. Travelling into 'third space'

> may open the way to conceptualizing an *inter*national culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the *diversity* of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's *hybridity*. To that end we should remember that it is the 'inter' – the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the *in-between* space – that carries the burden of the meaning of culture.[50]

And yet, as Katharyne Mitchell explains, 'without context, this ''in-between'' space risks becoming a mobile reactionary space, rather than a travelling site of resistance'.[51] Hybridity – and mobile theorizing more generally – is not necessarily politically progressive. While the 'hype of hybridity' disrupts essentialist, authentic and apparently stable notions of culture, home and identity, it continues to invoke racial divisions that underpinned colonial discourse often without interrogating such divisions in colonial and postcolonial context.[52]

Although metaphorical references to hybridity abound, material histories and geographies of mixed descent remain largely absent from postcolonial theorizing and diaspora studies. At the same time, ideas about hybrid cultures and identities are often critiqued within the growing field of 'mixed race' studies. For David Parker and Miri Song, 'the over-exuberant deployment of a notion like hybridity can connote an uncomfortable claiming of heterosis, the inherent biological superiority of ''mixed race'' '.[53] An uncritical celebration of hybridity also implies a problematic notion of racial 'purity' prior to mixing, and often overlooks 'the specific power relations and historical influences' shaping interracial intimacy over space and time.[54] Unlike the abstractions of hybridity in theory, this book explores the material histories and geographies of mixed descent within a particular community. Brah's emphasis on theoretical 'creolization' reflects, in part, her attempt to distinguish between diaspora as a concept and the specificities of different historical and contemporary diasporas. And yet, as I argue, the 'specific maps and histories'[55] of an Anglo-Indian diaspora raise important questions for theorizing diaspora space and its contested terrains of home, identity and culture.

Anglo-Indians form a very small part of a much larger and diverse South Asian diaspora, which dates from the forced movement of indentured

labourers from the 1830s and now includes up to 17 million people world-wide.[56] Throughout this book, I consider diaspora space as both gendered and racialized. As many studies have shown, 'feminizing the diaspora'[57] is important both in terms of studying the migration of women and in the domestic symbols often used to represent resettlement. The feminization of the diaspora is often understood through a focus on feminized spaces of home, as shown by research that ranges from the diasporic employment of women as domestic workers to imaginative geographies of home and identity for women living in diasporic spaces.[58] Although this book focuses on Anglo-Indian women and the spatial politics of home, I also explore masculine spaces of domicile and diaspora in both imaginative and material terms. Anglo-Indian women were seen to embody western modernity both within and beyond the home, but the 'homing desire' of Anglo-Indians often invoked ideas of imperial masculinity through the figure of a European (and often British) forefather. I argue that the mixed descent of Anglo-Indians was both manifested and erased by a collective memory of an imperial forefather who influenced home-making in the following contexts: on a domestic scale; through a national identification with Britain as fatherland; in attempts to establish independent homelands; and in the migration of Anglo-Indians after Independence. Unlike studies of gender and diaspora that explore the symbolic importance of feminized spaces of home, I explore the ways in which memories of a masculine imperial inheritance were both symbolically and materially important for Anglo-Indians. As a central part of this, I consider the intersections of material and imaginative geographies of diaspora by interpreting memories and experiences of migration and resettlement alongside an analysis of how the British Nationality Act of 1948 and the White Australia Policy from 1901 to the mid-1960s affected the migration of a distinct community of mixed descent.

Home, Memory and Nostalgia

Personal and collective memories are an important theme throughout this book. I explore the ways in which personal and collective memories of mixed descent have been manifested, erased and refigured through narratives of home and identity on domestic, national and diasporic scales. As such, this book contributes to the recent critical interest in the spatiality of memory and nostalgia across the humanities and social sciences.[59] Work on memory often revolves around writing spatial histories that invoke, but also extend far beyond, spaces of home. Ideas about personal memory are closely tied to debates about identity and attempts to situate knowledge, and are reflected not only in the content, but also in the form, of a diverse

range of autobiographical writings.[60] Memory, home and identity have also been recurrent themes in work on, and by, people of mixed descent.[61] Most of this work has explored diverse stories of personal memory and heritage, locating and identifying the self in relation to a genealogy rooted in different places and cultures.[62] Rather than focus on individual memories of home and identity, and the diverse genealogical geographies that they invoke, this book addresses their collective and political implications for a particular community of mixed descent.

Studies of collective memory are also concerned with space and identity, but on a shared, and often public, scale rather than through personal, and often private, experiences and memoirs. Particular sites and landscapes of memory have been analysed in relation to nation, empire and heritage, often in terms of home, belonging and contested authenticity.[63] Collective landscapes of memory have also been explored on a diasporic scale, as shown by Anne-Marie Fortier's study of Italian émigré culture in London.[64] In her discussion of ritual, tradition and performativity, Fortier describes St Peter's Italian Church in Clerkenwell, central London as 'a place of re-membering. It is a place of collective memory, in which elements of the past are cobbled together to mould a communal body of belonging. It is a place where individual lives, present and past, are called upon to inhabit the present space, to "member" it.'[65] Fortier shows that collective memory not only binds individuals into a wider community, but also traverses the past and present, and a sense of place, home and belonging, that are rooted both in Italy and Britain. While Fortier examines acts and images of 're-membering' in gendered terms, which are embodied by women as 'both moving and fixed figures of identity and change',[66] I explore the interplay of gendered and racialized 're-membering' for Anglo-Indians, which was embodied in different ways by men and women. Unlike other studies of collective memory that explore public sites and landscapes, I consider collective memory within the imaginative and material spaces of home.

Whereas sites of memory often invoke, but also extend far beyond, spaces of home, nostalgia invokes home in its very meaning. The term 'nostalgia' is derived from the Greek *nostos* for return home, and *algos* for pain, and implies homesickness and a yearning for home.[67] In Europe from the late seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, nostalgia was understood as a physical illness, but has since come to represent a state of mind.[68] However, by the late 1980s, 'even the pleasures of nostalgia [had] faded from memory'.[69] According to David Lowenthal, 'Nostalgia today is less often prized as precious memory or dismissed as diverting jest. Instead it is a topic of embarrassment and a term of abuse. Diatribe upon diatribe denounce it as reactionary, regressive, ridiculous.'[70] Lowenthal explains and critiques this antipathy towards nostalgia in terms of its commercialization and inauthenticity; its pervasive influence in the media; and its elitist

and reactionary politics. But, as he argues, 'The left no less than the right espouses nostalgia,' and 'it is wrong to imagine that there exists some *non-*nostalgic reading of the past that is by contrast ''honest'' or authentically ''true'' '.[71]

Whereas the sites and landscapes of memory inform spatial narratives of the past and present, a nostalgic desire for home has come to represent a wider 'desire for desire'.[72] As an imagined point of origin and return, home becomes a temporal signifier that implies a longing for an imagined and unattainable past. In her discussion of feminist fiction, for example, Roberta Rubenstein writes that

> nostalgia encompasses something more than a yearning for literal places or actual individuals. While homesickness refers to a spatial/geographical separation, nostalgia more accurately refers to a temporal one. Even if one is able to return to the literal edifice where s/he grew up, one can never truly return to the original home of childhood, since it exists mostly as a place in the imagination.[73]

Unlike the sites and landscapes of memory that are located and refigured in the past and present, the spaces of home invoked by nostalgia remain more elusive and distant. As Stewart puts it, 'Nostalgia is a sadness without an object, a sadness which creates a longing that of necessity is inauthentic because it does not take part in lived experience. Rather, it remains behind and before that experience.'[74]

It seems to me that an antipathy towards nostalgia reflects a more pervasive and long-established 'suppression of home', whereby spaces of home are located in the past rather than the present, in imaginative rather than material terms, and as points of imagined authenticity rather than as lived experience. Rather than perpetuate an antipathy towards nostalgia, which works in part by suppressing the home, I interpret the homing desire of Anglo-Indians in relation to a productive nostalgia. Rather than focus on nostalgia as 'the desire for desire', I refocus on nostalgia as the desire for home. At the same time, rather than view this desire as apolitical or confining, I explore its liberatory potential for Anglo-Indians in political debates about the future and status of the community, the attempt to establish an independent homeland before Independence, and the migration of Anglo-Indians to Britain and Australia since Independence. I also explore a longing for home that was embodied and enacted in practice rather than solely in narrative or imagination, and I argue that a nostalgic desire for home, and its enactment in practice, is oriented towards the present and the future as well as the past. Rather than signal loss, mourning and the impossibility of return, I am interested in the political mobilization of the past in relation to the present and future status and identity of the

Anglo-Indian community both in India and across a wider diaspora.[75] Finally, I consider the spatiality of home in both proximate and more distant terms. Rather than focus on the temporality of home as a site of origin, authenticity and an unattainable past, I consider the multiple and transnational spaces of home for Anglo-Indians both before and after Independence.

Underpinning my interest in the spatial politics of home, identity, memory and nostalgia is the attempt to challenge two stereotypical depictions of Anglo-Indians that persist today. The first locates Anglo-Indians within a broader nostalgia for the British Raj and represents them as 'tragic figure[s] of British colonialism',[76] anxiously enacting an idea of Britain as home, ridiculed by the British for doing so, and ultimately out of place in both British and independent India. As a recent embodiment of such tainted nostalgia, the character 'Cotton Mary' in the eponymous Merchant Ivory film[77] is a nurse employed to care for the baby of a British couple living in Kerala in the 1950s. In the immediate aftermath of Independence, Mary still yearns to be identified as a British memsahib, insinuates her way into the British home, and imagines Britain itself as home. Viewing Anglo-Indians as nostalgic for British rule and for an idea of Britain as home has two main effects. First, such portrayals perpetuate an imperialist discourse of Anglo-Indians defined, and defining themselves, purely in relation to the British and to an idea of Britain as home, which neglects their more complex attachments to Britain and India. Second, such portrayals consign Anglo-Indians to an imperial niche in perpetuity, rendering their lives in independent India, and across a wider diaspora, both invisible and unheard. But even as imperialist representations may continue to marginalize and to objectify Anglo-Indians, they also inspire resistance at the very sites of such marginalization and objectification. After protests at its derogatory portrayal of Anglo-Indians, *Cotton Mary* was banned in West Bengal and Kerala.[78]

Closely connected to the cultural revival of Raj nostalgia, the second stereotypical representation of Anglo-Indians objectifies women by focusing on their appearance and assumed sensuality. Geoffrey Moorhouse not only describes Anglo-Indians as 'quite the saddest result of British imperialism', but also writes that most Anglo-Indian women 'were very good-looking indeed; as though the chemical processes of assorted generations had compensated the outcaste by gradually purging her line of all coarseness until total refinement was reached'.[79] In his study of imperialism and sexuality – a study that tellingly castigates feminist research as 'fairly primitive and exploratory' and as 'sour and immature' – Ronald Hyam concurs that 'Anglo-Indian women were frequently of outstanding beauty.'[80] Such stereotypical representations of the beauty of Anglo-Indian women, alongside sexualized discourses of moral laxity and licentiousness, continue to exoticize Anglo-Indian women as objects of interracial desire,

perpetuating masculinist and imperial fantasies of a hybrid 'other'. In many imperial histories and novels, such images of Anglo-Indian women invoke assumptions about past interracial sex and its progeny, who were, and still sometimes are, assumed to be illegitimate.[81] Many Anglo-Indians have sought to dispel this 'slur of illegitimacy'.[82] Frank Anthony writes, for example, that 'The origin and growth of the Community have been along quite formal and legitimate lines' and, while praising Anglo-Indian women for their 'striking beauty', condemns 'penny-shovelling exercises in near-pornography' that sexualize them.[83] In contrast, I seek to understand how and why Anglo-Indian women both embodied and transgressed an ideal of feminized domesticity through their lives both within and beyond the home. I am interested in the ways that women were, and are, centrally important in political debates about the future and status of the community both before and since Independence, and their roles in establishing and maintaining Anglo-Indian homes and identities in the wider diaspora.[84]

Methodology

The research for this book combined historical and contemporary qualitative research in a transnational, comparative framework. One of the methodological aims and challenges of the book has been to bring historical and contemporary research together, and to interweave personal with more public accounts. My archival research in India, Britain and Australia involved the analysis of parliamentary papers, particularly concerning Anglo-Indian petitions and other representations to the British Government before Independence; the report of the Calcutta Domiciled Community Enquiry Committee (1918–19); and official letters and other documents concerning the impact of the British Nationality Act, 1948, and the White Australia Policy, on Anglo-Indians seeking to migrate from India.[85] I also studied the journals of various associations, particularly the *Anglo-Indian Review* (the monthly journal of the All-India Anglo-Indian Association) and the *Colonization Observer* (the monthly journal of the Colonization Society of India). In addition to the analysis of archival and other documentary sources, I also conducted 92 semi-structured interviews and 13 focus groups with a total of 180 Anglo-Indian women and men born before and after Independence.[86] I talked to officers of Anglo-Indian associations and, in India, members of Legislative Assemblies and two former MPs; Anglo-Indian women who attended, taught or teach in one of seven girls' schools; Anglo-Indians who live, or lived, in key enclaves or settlements; and members of nine Anglo-Indian associations in India, Australia and Britain. Some interviews focused on the past and present status of the community, while others were more personal, telling stories about growing up in India

and what it felt like either to remain domiciled or to migrate to Britain or Australia. I interviewed Anglo-Indians from two main generations: those who remember life in India before Independence, many of whom migrated to Britain in the late 1940s and 1950s; and those who were born just before or soon after Independence, many of whom migrated to Australia in the late 1960s and 1970s. I quote extensively from these interviews, particularly in the chapters on the spatial politics of home for Anglo-Indians in India, Britain and Australia since Independence. Although many of my interviewees gave me permission to use their names, I have decided to maintain confidentiality throughout, partly because the open nature of interviews involved the discussion of personal and sometimes painful memories, and partly because many interviewees told me about other people's lives as well as their own.

Oral history interviews were particularly appropriate for my research, for three main reasons.[87] First, until recently, the history of the community has remained a largely 'hidden history', in part because of imperial prejudice and in part because of the ambiguity of the term 'Anglo-Indian', which originally referred to the British in India. Anglo-Indians have European surnames, and it is often hard to identify them within archival and other documentary source material. Second, like many other feminist researchers who employ oral history and other life story interviews, I wanted to challenge the stereotypical objectification of Anglo-Indian women by learning about their lives in their own words.[88] Third, I wanted to ask about personal stories and memories, and about everyday life and the home. As Perks and Thomson explain, such interviews document 'particular aspects of historical experience which tend to be missing from other sources, such as personal relations, domestic work or family life, and they have resonated with the subjective or personal meanings of lived experience'.[89] Through my focus on the home on domestic to diasporic scales, and through tracing personal memories and experiences of domicile and migration, I was interested in the spatial histories of everyday life for Anglo-Indian women that revolved around ideas and lived experiences of home.

The home is the thread that weaves my historical and contemporary research together, reflecting the ways in which the home is invested with memories and nostalgia for the past, alongside lived experiences in the present and future dreams and fears. As Derrida famously observed, the very idea of the archive is bound up with an idea of home. As he writes, the word 'archive' comes from the Greek *arkheion*: 'initially a house, a domicile, an address, the residence of the superior magistrates. . . . It is thus, in this *domiciliation*, in this house arrest, that archives take place. The dwelling, this place where they dwell permanently, marks this institutional passage from the private to the public, which does not always mean from the secret to the nonsecret.'[90] The archive, like the home, is a place of

inclusion and exclusion, of imagination as well as materiality, and a place located on thresholds between the past, present and future. As Harriet Bradley observes, the public and private spaces and records of the archive have become inverted. Whereas Derrida described the domiciliation of public records in a private space, Bradley writes that 'As the archive develops and adopts the familiar institutional forms of modernity...the original relationship seems inverted: details about private lives are found in what have become public spaces.'[91]

In her study of the writings by three Indian women, either in or about India in the 1930s, Antoinette Burton traces the ways in which memories of home are used 'to claim a place in history at the intersection of the private and the public, the personal and the political, the national and the post-colonial'.[92] Two of the questions that motivate Burton's study are particularly relevant for my research on Anglo-Indian women and the spatial politics of home. First, 'Can private memories of home serve as evidence of political history?' and, second, 'given women's vexed relationship to the kinds of history that archives typically house, what does it mean to say that home can and should be seen not simply as a dwelling-place for women's memory but as one of the foundations of history – history conceived of, that is, as a narrative, a practice, and a site of desire?'[93] In contrast to Burton, I am studying narratives of home in public and official archives rather than in historical texts written by Anglo-Indian women themselves, partly because I am interested in the central place of the home, and its contested embodiment by women, in political debates about the future and status of the Anglo-Indian community, and partly because few historical texts by Anglo-Indian women exist. Alongside my analysis of the imaginative and material geographies of home in archival and other documentary sources, I have interviewed Anglo-Indian women and men in India, Britain and Australia about their lives before and after Independence, creating an oral history archive of personal and collective memories.

From the outset, my main methodological concern was how to reflect the diasporic connections between Anglo-Indians. At first, I hoped to interview members of the same families who lived in India, Britain and Australia, but most of the letters I wrote did not receive a reply, and I soon realized that some families had lost touch after migrating, and that interviewing family members in different places – and often in very different socio-economic positions – would raise many difficult and sensitive issues. Instead, I studied the diasporic connections between Anglo-Indians in two other ways. First, I interviewed past and present residents of particular places in India, concentrating on Calcutta, Lucknow, McCluskieganj and, to a lesser extent, Bangalore, Whitefield, New Delhi and Ranchi (see Figure 1.1). Both Calcutta and Lucknow were important historical centres for Anglo-Indians and still have Anglo-Indian enclaves, schools and residential homes for

older community members. McCluskieganj was established in 1933 as a homeland for Anglo-Indians in the rural east Indian state of Bihar, and is forty miles from Ranchi, where I also interviewed a number of Anglo-Indian teachers. Bangalore was the location for the first international reunion of Anglo-Indians to be held in India, which took place in 1998, in the fiftieth anniversary year of Independence. Bangalore is also fifteen miles from Whitefield, which was established as an Anglo-Indian settlement in 1882, and where I interviewed a number of current residents. Although the Anglo-Indian population in the capital remains small, the headquarters of the All-India Anglo-Indian Association moved from Calcutta to New Delhi in 1941.

Second, as already mentioned, I interviewed women who attended, taught or teach at particular girls' schools. The schools that Anglo-Indians attended and taught at before Independence were very often modelled on British public schools. Pupils sat junior and senior Cambridge examinations, usually learnt French as their second language, and were taught European, and particularly British, rather than Indian history and literature. Schools, like homes, were important sites for forging an Anglo-Indian identity and culture that was more western than Indian.[94] Moreover, many schools attended by Anglo-Indians provide a diasporic focus for the community today through associations, newsletters, websites and reunions in Britain, Australia and elsewhere. I selected particular schools to reflect socio-economic differences within the Anglo-Indian community and the influences of both Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism: the La Martiniere girls' schools in Calcutta and Lucknow; one Loreto Convent school in each city, which were established to educate poor and orphaned Anglo-Indians; and Dow Hill School in Kurseong, near Darjeeling, in the lower Himalayas of northern West Bengal, which was a government-funded school that educated Anglo-Indian girls from Calcutta and the daughters of railway workers posted throughout northern India (Figures 1.2 and 1.3).

The boys' and girls' La Martiniere schools were founded by the bequest of Claude Martin, a Frenchman who had worked for the East India Company, was a confidant of the Nawab of Avadh, the Mughal ruler of the princely state, and had died in Lucknow in 1800. He left his fortune to fund schools to educate children in 'the English language and religion'.[95] The girls' school in Calcutta opened in 1840 and the girls' school in Lucknow opened in 1860, and, until 1935, the schools only educated Europeans and Anglo-Indians.[96] Unlike the non-denominational foundation of the La Martiniere schools, Loreto Convent schools throughout India were founded to educate Roman Catholic girls of all classes. A group of twelve Irish Loreto nuns, with an average age of eighteen, arrived in Calcutta in 1841. They were the first European nuns to travel to northern India, and a number of Irish Loreto nuns continue to teach at

Figure 1.2   Loreto St Agnes, Lucknow

the schools that were established in India from the 1840s. Loreto Entally in
Calcutta and Loreto St Agnes in Lucknow were founded in 1845 and 1904
to educate poor and orphaned Anglo-Indian girls. As a historian of the
Loreto Order in India writes, 'In the free schools and orphanages, the
majority of the children were Anglo-Indians, in Loreto House [the Mother
House in Calcutta] and the fee-paying schools, a minority.'[97] Finally, Dow
Hill School is one amongst many Himalayan and other 'hill schools' that
Anglo-Indian girls attended (see Figure 1.4).[98] I selected Dow Hill for a
number of reasons. First, Dow Hill, along with Victoria boys' school, was
founded in the late nineteenth century, and so fitted the time-scale of my
research very well. Second, the Victoria and Dow Hill Association
(VADHA) is an active society. Annual reunions have been held in London
since 1957 and are today attended by up to seventy former pupils. Re-
unions and other gatherings are held in India, Australia and Canada, most
recently celebrating the 125th anniversary of the founding of the schools in
Kurseong. As well as interviewing many former Dow Hill pupils in Britain
and Australia, I have also attended annual VADHA reunions in London
since 1998. Third, and most importantly, I met Grace Pereira, who is
Felicity's older sister, and the Secretary of VADHA, at the start of my
research. Grace attended Dow Hill from the age of five for nine months
each year until she and her family left the subcontinent in 1951. Grace had

Figure 1.3   Dow Hill School, Kurseong (Reproduced courtesy of Grace Pereira)

been friends since university with one of my mother's friends, and wrote her undergraduate dissertation on the Anglo-Indian community. Grace, and her husband Dereyck, soon became good friends and have been a great help and inspiration in my research.

Chapter Outline

Unlike imperialist depictions of the pervasive futility of Anglo-Indians desiring Britain as home and feeling out of place in India, I argue that Anglo-Indians had more complex attachments to both India and Britain before Independence. By studying the spatial politics of home for Anglo-Indians in India, Britain and Australia since Independence, I also consider their lives in the present as well as the past, and both domiciled and across a wider diaspora. *Domicile and Diaspora* begins by considering the place of Anglo-Indians both at home and not at home in British India, focusing on national and imperial discourses of Britain as fatherland and India as motherland (Chapter 2), the ways in which such discourses were reproduced and resisted on a domestic scale (Chapter 3), and the mobilization of such discourses in the attempt to establish an Anglo-Indian homeland at McCluskieganj in the east Indian state of Bihar from 1933 (Chapter 4).

Figure 1.4   Dow Hill girls, homeward bound, 1950 (reproduced courtesy of Grace Pereira)

I then turn to the two main migratory flows after Independence: first, to Britain in the late 1940s and 1950s and the implications of the British Nationality Act of 1948 (Chapter 5), and, second, to Australia in the mid-1960s and 1970s and the transition from the White Australia Policy to official multiculturalism (Chapter 6). Whilst many studies explore home and identity over diverse diasporic spaces, fewer focus on the effects of migration on those people who remain domiciled. This book ends by considering the place of the Anglo-Indian community who remained domiciled in independent India (Chapter 7).