

A ‘scandal to the English name and English Government’: European pauperism in colonial Calcutta, 1858-the 1920s¹

By Satoshi Mizutani

Introduction

The last chapter discussed how the British elites excluded both poor-white and racially mixed groups from their privileged community. British colonialism defined India as a land for administrators, capitalists and missionaries, and the social prestige of these people was to be secured partly by positively suppressing the existence of those British with lower social origins. In principle, subordinate whites should not be brought to the colonial context. And those who were already there should be taken home before they became ‘degenerate’ and ‘mixed’, swelling the number of an already large mixed-race population. But despite British efforts to regulate immigration and to repatriate ‘undesirable’ white immigrants, also existing in the colony were the ‘domiciled’ whites, who were born, bred, and permanently settled in India, and were usually racially mixed. Unlike ‘poor whites’, they were already part of India, and therefore the colonial authorities could not remove them at will by repatriation. Legally the domiciled were not British - with India as their place of domicile, they were designated as ‘Statutory Natives of India’. The British starkly disregarded their domiciled brethren as legitimate members of the select circle of gentlemanly colonisers. But this chapter will show that such exclusion did not mean that the British completely neglected their domiciled kin and allowed them to become thoroughly assimilated into the indigenous populations. .

British attitudes towards their domiciled fellows were not characterised only by exclusionary discourses and practices. Rather they were also ambiguously predicated on another inclusionary premise of a peculiar sort. Whilst firmly rejecting the domiciled materially, the British in India also pulled them back towards their racial body politic, albeit strictly within the framework of philanthropy as social control. Far from simply labelling the domiciled as a fallen contaminated species and neglecting them as such, the British middle class developed a keen interest in their social condition and urgently attempted to ameliorate it with special measures. Such an inclusionary stance was demonstrated in the continuous agitation of the British press in favour of such special measures and the quick responses thereto by both Government and missionary establishments. The aim of this chapter is to describe the inclusionary politics of philanthropy that was engaged by both state and philanthropic agents of colonialism, and demonstrate that this peculiar social politics was invoked to secure a projected authority of the ruling race.

The chapter will discuss various aspects of colonial philanthropy by examining certain key public commissions and policies, most of which formed in Calcutta. The most important among these were the Pauperism Committee (1991), the Calcutta Domiciled Community Enquiry Committee (1918), as well as several employment

¹ This paper is primarily based on the chapter four of my doctoral thesis, *The British in India and their Domiciled Brethren: Race and Class in the Colonial Context, 1858-1930* (submitted to the Modern History Faculty, Oxford University)

schemes, such as the idea of a special military regiment and of establishing agricultural communes outside the cities. The first part of the chapter will chronologically trace the evolution of policies of philanthropic inclusion, their institutional structures and the practical problems connected therewith. It will seek to explain how and why the colonial authorities interpreted the pauperisation of the domiciled class as a threat to social order. In particular, it will show how the philanthropic circles articulated the whole question as a governmental responsibility. The second part of the chapter will examine, in minute detail, the purpose, scope and limits of each of the proposed philanthropic policies. It will focus on British perceptions of the racial and cultural identity of the domiciled within the bounds of philanthropic inclusion, and attempt to define what the inclusive impulse of philanthropy sought to produce.

Ideological and Institutional Foundations

It cannot help the cause of Christianity that Indians shall see a community in India, Christian by birth, suffering from want of education, and including a seriously depressed class which affords a very poor example of practical Christianity.²

In the wake of the native revolt, Bishop Cotton, the Metropolitan of the Anglican Church in India, remarked:

‘it is nothing less than a national sin to neglect a class of persons who are our fellow-Christians and fellow-subjects, whose presence in India is due entirely to our occupation in the country, but who, unless real efforts are made for their welfare, are in great spiritual and moral danger’.³

The Viceroy, Lord Canning, to whom Cotton made this remark, took this view seriously.⁴ He agreed that the domiciled class had a special claim upon their British brethren, as it was nothing but the colonial presence of the latter which made them come into being in the first place. Or in Canning’s words, ‘The presence of a British Government has called them into being’.⁵ What underlay such a move towards special care was a perceived threat of the community’s poverty which seemed to be growing endemic. What both Cotton and Canning were afraid of was the ways in which this phenomenon of pauperism might emerge as a scandal to British racial prestige. Like it or not, the domiciled community had been perceived as a part of British society. Certain portions of the community might have darker complexions and acquired modes of living that actually appeared more ‘Indian’ than ‘European’. But they had not been assimilated into any of the various Indian communities, Hindu, Muslim or otherwise. Being English-speaking and, moreover, Christian, the domiciled community was usually seen by the rest of Indian society as an appendage to the colonising community. At this juncture, the colonial authorities contended that the British in India had to put their domiciled brethren under their tutelage in order to abate the negative political

² Wood, W. H. Arden, ‘The Problem of the Domiciled Community in India’, *The Asiatic Review*, 24 (1928), pp.417-437

³ Quoted in ‘Children of the Poor’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 2 Jun. 1864, p.594

⁴ This passage appeared in Cotton’s call for a European intervention for the education of the domiciled class. See Ch. 5 for details.

⁵ *Review of Education in India in 1886* (Government of India, Calcutta, 1888) (IND K.8), p.294

consequences the latter could possibly cause. Cotton and Canning both left a long-lasting impact on the formation of British attitudes towards the domiciled class. Philanthropy-minded Britons shared their ambiguous sense of responsibility and urged the British community at large to take the plight of its domiciled counterpart as its own problem. *The Statesman* proclaimed that members of the domiciled community ‘may be of bad character, they maybe idle, they may be drunkards – but they are countrymen and they call themselves Christians’.⁶ It would be better, as the paper noted, not to conceive these people as a distinct class, but to integrate them, to some extent at least, into the British community.⁷ For their neglect had already been:

‘creating a race lower than any other known in India, and that pleases some people, but it is exceedingly dangerous, for it (which cannot be reached on any general principle) reacts on other portions of the same race’.⁸

To prevent such from going further, the affluent British should assume a responsibility for the well-being of their less fortunate kin.

But how in practice could the British save their domiciled brethren pauperism – what could the former do to integrate the latter economically? During the first three decades of Crown rule, educational initiative expanded significantly. By the mid-1870’s there was a wide-spread recognition among the European educationalist circle that the Government should play a central role in trying to reduce European pauperism by aiding educational efforts. Joseph Baly, the Archdeacon of Calcutta, made a crucial contribution for systematising the education of India’s domiciled community. His efforts bore fruit in the form of the European Education Code, drafted in Bengal in 1883. Back then there were hopes that education would be able to equip domiciled children with practical knowledge and/or skills and so enable them to compete successfully with educated Indians. Both government and private employers would be happy to take them; all would be able to find employment one way or another. The new education system, however, was not as effective in countervailing European pauperism as its promoters had hoped. Not only was it impossible to remove illiteracy, but it was also always extremely difficult to find employment even for those who attended school.⁹

By the beginning of the 1890s, it seemed increasingly clear that the British could not solve European pauperism merely by creating schools: an urgent and more specific form of intervention appeared. It was the District Charitable Society, a governmental institution to supervise British philanthropic work, that made a move towards such intervention (May 1887). H. Beverley, the Society’s President, issued a circular to the parishes of the Church of England asking for cooperation in ‘an attempt to procure trustworthy information regarding the extent of pauperism among the Christian poor of this city’.¹⁰ By this time, the British middle class were convinced that the Government had to commit itself more fully to relieve the further pauperisation of the domiciled class. As *The Statesman* declared:

⁶ *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 28 April 1864, p.451

⁷ ‘East Indians’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 22 Sep. 1864, pp.1067-68

⁸ ‘A Loafer’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 1 Jun. 1871, p.628

⁹ See Ch. 5. for details.

¹⁰ *Report of the Calcutta Domiciled Community Enquiry Committee, 1918-19* (Calcutta, 1920) (OIOC 8285/g/43) (*Report of the CDCEC* hereafter), p.173

‘The Government has not given the community the least assistance or encouragement. [...] Why should so much be done for the conquered race and literally nothing for those who are the kith and kin of the British?’¹¹

To dismiss the domiciled community out of the Government’s responsibilities would eventually ‘reflect discredit on the national name’.¹² It was in this context of a highlighted awareness of national crisis that the District Charitable Society approached the Government on the subject of European pauperism (3 February 1891). Together with the Eurasian and Anglo-Indian Association, which also approached the Government in early March, the Society engaged the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal to appoint a Commission to enquire into the question of indigence among Calcutta’s domiciled community. In response, Resolution No. 479 (18 April 1891) appointed a representative Committee ‘to enquire into the extent and nature of the poverty and destitution which prevail in the town of Calcutta among Europeans and Eurasians, and other matters connected therewith’.¹³ Thus the ‘Pauperism Committee’ [hereafter PC] was launched with Sir H. L. Harrison as the chair. The Board of the Committee had prominent figures from the European philanthropic circle, including government officials, educationalists, missionaries, social workers and lawyers. It also had certain representatives of the Eurasian and Anglo-Indian Associations. The PC had five Sub-Committees: Statistics, Avenues of Employment, Education, Charitable Endowment, and Housing. The Committee elicited the support of a number of Britons in Calcutta, such as policemen, missionaries and private employers who had first-hand experience with members of the domiciled class. The findings of the PC, both quantitative and qualitative, were published in *Report of the Pauperism Committee* (submitted to the Government of Bengal on 3 March 1892). In August of the same year, the Government made its formal reply to the recommendations contained in the *Report*.

Pauperism Committee

The PC came to many conclusions and offered specific recommendations. Among other things, it found the impoverishment of the domiciled class singularly alarming. As a whole, 7.9% of Britons of pure European descent were found to be in receipt of charitable relief. The Committee noted that 7.9 was a very large percentage, given that the British community was supposedly predominantly middle-class, necessarily precluded from any risks of becoming paupers. What they learnt from this was that Britons who did not belong to the non-domiciled, middle-class group, tended very strongly to become a pauper; that in India the rate of poor Britons being reduced to pauperism was nearly twice as high as in England and Wales. And even more alarming was the pauperisation of the mixed-race population. 22.3% of Eurasians were found to be dependent on European charitable relief. The Committee lamented:

‘22.3 among Eurasians is an enormous percentage which can scarcely be paralleled in any other community in the world’.¹⁴

¹¹ G. T. Potenger, ‘Letters to the Editor; The Eurasian Question’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 28 June 90, p.1

¹² ‘Pauperism in Calcutta’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 24 Jan. 1891., p.3

¹³ *Report of the Pauperism Committee* (Calcutta, 1892) (OIOC P/4089) (*Report of the PC* hereafter), p.1

¹⁴ *Report of the PC*, p.3

The PC argued that in the face of such a critical condition of their domiciled brethren, the British had a special responsibility to discharge:

‘The circumstances of the Indo-European [i.e. domiciled] community are such as equitably entitle them to special and exceptional consideration at the hands of the Indian Government’.¹⁵

The Committee also claimed that the degree of impoverishment was such as to necessitate urgent state involvement. As the Avenues of Employment Sub-Committee wrote:

‘We think that the condition is such that philanthropic help cannot effect any permanent good. It is an evil of large magnitude, and we would very respectfully remark that the only possible remedy lies in the Government giving the subject their full consideration and taking the action which the case demands. We think that the situation is one that has passed out of the sphere of self-help or the help which any other than the Government can give. To us it appears that when all avenues of employment are closing round a community and the pauperism found among them is represented at least as being 16.57 per cent., or one pauper for every six Europeans and Eurasians taken together, the question becomes a political question, and State interference is necessary’.¹⁶

What practical measures should the Government take in order to discharge such responsibility to the domiciled paupers? The PC doubted that the Government could easily help the latter to find employment within the British establishments, whether governmental or commercial. In this respect, the Committee’s view differed from that of Archdeacon Baly. The Committee acknowledged their indebtedness to Archdeacon Baly, who after all was *the* person who brought the case of European pauperism before the Government.¹⁷ But, unlike Baly, members of the PC thought that school education offered only a partial solution. Though appalled by the extent to which the domiciled had declined economically, Baly still believed that the British could still transform its rising generations into employable youths and save the community as a whole from future pauperism.¹⁸ Members of the PC, however, found this view too optimistic:

‘the difficulty is experienced now more acutely than it was when the Archdeacon was making his enquiries 11 and 12 years ago, but be that as it may, we beg to place on record our dissent from the statement that all steady, sober, honest, industrious and able-bodied Indo-Europeans can find employment in Calcutta’.¹⁹

The PC found, if reluctantly, that European business employers were not generally keen on taking domiciled persons, especially those from poor families. Even the railways, the biggest employer of the domiciled class since the mid-nineteenth century, would not recruit from the impoverished portion of the domiciled class. For example, in reply to the Committee’s inquiry, the Bombay-Baroda and Central Indian Railway claimed:

‘the class of persons in whose interest the Pauperism Committee are enquiring are understood to be principally composed of men without a profession or who have been thrown out of

¹⁵ *ibid.*, p.12

¹⁶ *ibid.*, p.112

¹⁷ *Report of the PC*, p.12

¹⁸ See Ch. 5

¹⁹ *Report of the PC*, p.16

employment, and these men can find no work on Railways'.²⁰

The company recommended a creation of special 'Homes' where these men could be given adequate disciplinary training.²¹ Another railway company, the Eastern Bengal State Railway, also dismissed the possibility of employing these men and suggested to train them as domestic servants, postmen, and tailors.²² It was certainly true that past governments had made considerable use of the domiciled community for colonial administration and public works, and that, as a consequence, the class had grown dependent on the British for employment. But the Committee found that the present situation surrounding these avenues of employment was blatantly hostile to the domiciled class. Their view was that British should face the fact that the pauperisation of their domiciled brethren had already become a constitutional part of colonial Indian society. The kind of general scheme represented by Baly's education policy would be insufficient in addressing this particular problem of pauperism because the former underestimated the latter's depths and complexities in which the entire community had been entangled. In stead, the British in India should develop policies and institutions more specifically targeting the poorer sections of their domiciled fellows.²³ The best the Government could do would be to sanction and generously support welfare efforts to suppress domiciled pauperism.

The Committee saw that it was with the recognition of this harsh reality that the British effort to regenerate their domiciled compatriots must begin. They should discharge their due responsibility by making the domiciled *unlearn* the latter's dependence on them, whilst providing alternative livelihoods outside British establishments. The PC condemned the ongoing practices of relief aid for its allegedly making many members of the domiciled class habitual dependants, thus increasing the problem of pauperism instead of solving it. And it recommended establishing a new central organisation, the Charity Organisation Committee, which would supervise the distribution of relief aid more closely in ways that did not produce any more professional mendicants.²⁴ The Committee also recommended that the Government should launch special employment schemes to provide younger members of the community with fresh opportunities. The Government should sanction the establishment of a special military regiment composed exclusively of the domiciled men. This would inculcate the members not just in military skills but also in endurance and self-discipline, possibly opening the prospects of a military career. The Government should also establish a training vessel in the river Hooghly. Such would provide them with a disciplined life and a possible career in the field of marine piloting.²⁵

The Government's response to these recommendations was not exactly encouraging. Charles Elliot, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, did find that the ideas expressed by the PC possessed the seeds of genuine social reform. But he did not see how the state could justify the spending of public money on policies that targeted one

²⁰ *ibid.*, p.116

²¹ *ibid.*, p.116

²² *ibid.*, p.118

²³ As Chapter 5 shows, European education policy itself increasingly headed towards this direction.

²⁴ *Report of the PC*, p.9, 17

²⁵ On these proposals for a regiment and for a training vessel, see the next section of this chapter.

particular community without an accusation of preferential treatment. The domiciled class was certainly an important group but at the same time it was only one of the many 'Native' groups to which the colonial state was equally responsible:

'Government can do nothing more than see that Europeans and Eurasians domiciled in India receive fair treatment, equally with other persons included in the term "natives of India"'.²⁶

Elliot largely denied financing the new schemes which the Committee had proposed. He ordered that the proposed reorganisation of the charity regime, with a central charitable headquarters as its head, was too drastic. Instead of creating a new Charity Organisation Committee, the British could continue to rely on the District Charitable Society for governing the existing charitable societies available in Calcutta.²⁷ As for the two aforementioned youth labour schemes, Elliot concluded that the state was not in a position to establish and finance schemes that did not benefit the Indian nation as a whole. There were no pre-existing demands, whether military, economic or otherwise, for domiciled regiments or marine pilots.²⁸

The appointment of the PC was undoubtedly significant in that it informed British society of the sheer scale and complexities of European pauperism. It was a vivid illustration of how concerned the British middle class in India were about their domiciled brethren. But whilst bringing the question of the domiciled poor to the fore, the Committee fell short of convincing the Government of taking any truly radical measures for its solution.

Calcutta Domiciled Community Enquiry Committee

After the PC ended, the appeal for the establishment of a communal military regiment and of a special vessel for pilot training was continually made. But the Government remained committed to the view that such schemes would be unjustifiably costly. At the turn of the century the only substantial aid the Government was making for the domiciled class fell in the category of education. But even that was not making tangible improvements when it came to the immediate relief of pauperism: in all India there remained about 7,000 domiciled children who received no school education whatsoever.²⁹ Domiciled paupers concomitantly presented their existence to the British as though to condemn the latter for their prolonged failure to bring the problem under control. By this time, the problem of the domiciled poor had not only remained unsolved but had hardened into a chronic state. As *The Statesman* observed, 'Like the poor, the Eurasian problem is ever upon us'.³⁰ Increasingly, it was not as an appendix to the European colonial enterprise but as a source of unfit individuals that the domiciled community were noticed. W. Francis, an ICS officer who was in charge of the Madras branch of the 1901 Census, noted that 'The popular idea that Eurasians are mainly employed as fitters or clerks or on the railways [was] clearly inaccurate'.³¹ Most, he

²⁶ *Report of the PC*, p.3

²⁷ General Department.; Miscellaneous – no. 2263; Calcutta, the 8th August 1892; RESOLUTION in Proceedings of the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, General Department – Miscellaneous, Calcutta, September 1892, OIOC; P/4089, p.4, 9

²⁸ *ibid.*, pp.4-7

²⁹ See Ch. 5 for details.

³⁰ 'The Eurasian Problem', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 13 Ap. 1899, p.5

³¹ *The Census of India, 1901: vol. XV.: Madras: Part I – Report* (Government of India, Madras, 1902)

observed, were living ‘on endowments on their relatives and friends, in convents, in lunatic asylums, in jail or by begging’.³² The Conference on the Education of the Domiciled Community in India at Simla (1912) concluded that the problem of domiciled unemployment and pauperism was so deep-rooted that the only educational policies that could possibly effect a genuine solution were compulsory education and institutionalisation of children in special orphanage-type schools.³³—As of the late 1910s, nothing about the domiciled class had changed for the better since the PC was appointed nearly three decades before, and only the danger seemed to have increased. As a missionary organ, the All-India Committee noted:

‘There is a community of poor Europeans in the city of Calcutta, unrivalled in any slum in the world of misery and degradation. Here the rate of pauperism is higher than in any community in Christendom’.³⁴

It was out of the above sense of crisis that, in 1918, another committee, the Calcutta Domiciled Community Enquiry Committee (CDCEC), was launched. Unlike the PC, this Committee was not a Government initiative, but a private one. But it was clearly modelled on the former, with prominent Britons, such as the Right Reverend Bishop Lefroy, Metropolitan of India, J.H. Hechle, and Arden Wood as its founding members. The CDCEC’s specific objective was to investigate the living condition of poor Europeans and the people of mixed descent living in Calcutta, and to make recommendations for ameliorating that condition.

The CDCEC reconfirmed that the state of indigence among the domiciled community was at a critical stage. A substantial number within the community lived in poverty and constituted what looked to be an urban ‘residuum’. The Sub-Committee on Health and Physique noted that there were great numbers of domiciled persons who:

‘live below the poverty line and herd together like animals in unspeakably filthy, undrained slums, Indians and Anglo-Indians living side by side in mud and bamboo huts’.³⁵

What was alarming was that the lives of these impoverished people were so ‘un-European’ and presented little difference from those of certain poor-indigenous inhabitants of the city. As it was noted: ‘This class merges into the pure Indian Christian and a point is reached at which separation is difficult to determine’.³⁶ In the CDCEC’s view, faced with this plight of their domiciled brethren in Calcutta, the non-domiciled, wealthy Britons must come to their rescue without any delay. Instead of just minding their own career advancement and commercial profit-making, the British community should acknowledge its historical responsibility for the well-being of its impoverished domiciled relations:

‘the community exists because of the coming to India of various European peoples and that it is

IND H.9.12.1, pp.204-5 (my parentheses)

³² *ibid.*, p.205

³³ Though the Government did not grant the recommendation for compulsory education. See Ch. 5. for details.

³⁴ The All-India Committee, *‘The European of India’: A responsibility and an opportunity*, in M. B. Turner (ed.), *An alien in his own country* (London, 191-), (191-), Pamphlets, OIOC P/T/314, pp.3-4

³⁵ *Report of the CDCEC*, p.141

³⁶ *ibid.*, p.135

the obvious duty of the immigrant European community to accept the burden of the troubles to which communally it had given birth. Apart from Government assistance in matters like education, comparatively little of the enterprise, the money, and the brains which are the special characteristics of the home-bone European community, would set in motion forces which would provide as speedy a remedy as so complex a problem is susceptible of. In so urging we include those who have made their money in India and who are now enjoying the fruits of their labour in Europe'.³⁷

But unfortunately, the Committee found that European employers were almost invariably reluctant to recruit members of the domiciled class:

'The accusations levelled against the Domiciled Community by employers are condemnatory to an exceptional degree'.³⁸

Of the 61 firms which replied to the circular issued by the CDCEC, 21 reported that they employed members of the domiciled class.³⁹ These European managers found that the domiciled were far too undereducated and undisciplined to be recruited. The Committee took this verdict as a fact to be faced. Employment would not be created out of sympathy, as they observed:

'It is of little use applying to the employer's sympathetic consideration; the business man has little time to enquire into the domestic conditions of the individual'.⁴⁰

The Committee argued that the British sympathisers should *not* work on behalf of the domiciled class to win partial treatments from employers. Rather they should work with the domiciled poor in an effort to improve their mental, hygienic and social fitness, with a view to increasing 'the earning capacity of the individual'.⁴¹ After all, 'The community must apply self-help and improve their capacity for work of the natural demand'.⁴²

According to the CDCEC, if there was anything that could be asked of British employers, it would be a generous donation of facilities and funds which served to improve the living condition of the domiciled youth, many of whom had been forced to live in dreadful slum environs.⁴³ The CDCEC put greater weight, than the PC did, on the amelioration of living conditions. For the former, the problem of the domiciled poor was to a large extent one of environment – it was the slum condition of Calcutta that had shaped their social, cultural and racial selfhood. The effort of Europeans to save their domiciled brethren had to start by ameliorating this very condition.

As for employment, the CDCEC largely followed the PC's view that the labour market within the Europe-related sectors, both civil and commercial, had been structurally closed, and that there was nothing practical be done about it. The Committee expressed its regret that the Government had repeatedly denied the request for offering help to make domiciled youths into soldiers or pilots. Given the steady

³⁷ *ibid.*, p.2

³⁸ *ibid.*, pp.1-2, p.134

³⁹ *ibid.*, p.138

⁴⁰ *ibid.*, p.137

⁴¹ *ibid.*, p.137

⁴² *ibid.*, p.138

⁴³ *ibid.*, p.22, 138

decline of employment opportunities, the demand for these special labour schemes had only increased.⁴⁴ What the British could do was to orient members of the domiciled community towards such occupations as artisanship and low-grade engineering. Employment had to be found, as the domiciled were bound to lose both to those born and educated in Britain and to Indians who offered their labour at cheaper rates.

The CDCEC was only right in observing that it was becoming ever more difficult for the domiciled to obtain state-related jobs. Especially after the reorganisation of the civil service following the Government of India Act (1919), the situation surrounding government and railway employment was disheartening for most of the domiciled community. Political leaders of the community vehemently complained that its members had been cruelly sacrificed in order to make room for their Indian fellows who had been vigorously empowered under the on-going scheme of reforms, which gradually veered towards 'Home Rule'.⁴⁵ To make matters worse, the 1920s saw an unprecedented and vexing problem of unemployment, which hit the already pauperised domiciled class especially hard. The post-war economic boom in 1919 had lured some men of the domiciled class to new businesses. To join these opportunities, which promised them larger salaries, they had resigned their appointments on railways and elsewhere. But when the booming economy collapsed in 1923, they were no longer able to return to their previous jobs and were quickly reduced to pauperism.⁴⁶ The numerous reports in *The Statesman* about this predicament demonstrates how seriously the British in India took European pauperism. As for 'poor whites', who were not yet domiciled in India, the British tried to repatriate as many of them as possible.⁴⁷ And as far as the domiciled class was concerned, they tried to reach those affected by the crisis through both the organisations such as the Ex-Services Association and the Anglo-Indian Unemployment Committee [AIUC], the second one of which had been run by the members of the domiciled community themselves.

The economic crisis was widely publicised through European papers such as *The Statesman*, which often quoted from the reports of the AIUC. These reports of the AIUC showed that, in the mid-1920's, Calcutta alone witnessed well over 1,000 people of the domiciled class who would not survive without immediate relief measures. The Committee's first report (covering the period since January 1924) indicated that the Committee had about 2,500 people of the domiciled class under its care.⁴⁸ The second report (October 1924 – March 1925) revealed that the AIUC had on their rolls about 500 unemployed men. With their wives, children and other families included, the total number of people living in absolute poverty amounted to 1,500. Of these people, about

⁴⁴ The Sub-Committee for Employment was of the opinion that the Government should re-consider the formation of both a special communal regiment and a scheme of marine training in India. Regarding military recruitment, it said, all who have the interest of the community at heart regret that Government should have vetoed the proposal. All the arguments brought forward by the Pauperism Committee in favour of military employment appear to have acquired added strength during the laps of years' (p.138). The General Committee acknowledged the importance of both schemes but differed somewhat on the question of military regiment. It did find military recruitment useful, but, unlike the Sub-Committee, argued that the recruitment of individuals to the British Army would be better than the formation of a regiment. *ibid.*, p.21, p.138.

⁴⁵ See Ch. 6

⁴⁶ 'Unemployment in Calcutta', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 18 Sep. 1924, p.4

⁴⁷ See Ch. 3

⁴⁸ 'Living in Poverty', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 4 Dec. 1924, p.19

200 received regular weakly monetary relief.⁴⁹ The third report (April 1925 - December 1925) showed that there were still 300 men and about 600 – 700 of their family members on the list, of whom 200 were in receipt of monetary relief.⁵⁰

The self-help efforts of the domiciled community were manifold. To find jobs for the unemployed men, the AIUC liaised with employers of the railways, certain government offices such as the Telegraph Department, and the various European businesses. The Committee offered railway fares if these men had to travel to take up appointments. It also gave money to them so that they could acquire vocational skills, such as motor-driving. To the families of unemployed men, the Committee gave a subsistence allowance, food rations and accommodation. The AIUC also worked closely with European schools to make sure that children of the unemployed were safe and asked them to reduce fees as a special measure against the current distress.⁵¹ The British appreciated these self-help efforts by the domiciled community and supported them by subscribing to the AIUC's fund.⁵² But gradually, they grew convinced that the AIUC should be placed on a permanent basis through direct financial assistance from the Government of Bengal.⁵³ They considered the financing of employment bureaux as a legitimate function of Government. Thus, when the AIUC was closed in June 1927, the District Charitable Society took over the relief work for the domiciled class. The Society formed a sub-committee for this special purpose.⁵⁴ In May 1931, the Bengal Chamber of Commerce announced a grant of Rs. 3,500 to the Society, whilst giving Rs. 1,500 to the European Unemployment Relief Association which was in charge of poor Europeans.⁵⁵

Nature of Intervention

The domiciled European is commonly charged with want of manly vigour, self-reliance, steadiness, and self-control. He is called imprudent, extravagant, petulant, conceited, and often with good reason.⁵⁶

The destitute Eurasian, however deplorable his position or remote his connection with Europe, clings tenaciously to the fact that he is in part European. As such he will not do the manual work of the casual labourer and indeed, as has been frequently pointed out before, the work under Indian conditions practically closed to him. The climate and the charity of the bazar make the life of the destitute in a town like Calcutta much less physically painful than that of the destitute in a European town. Consequently in the life of the lowest of the half-caste community you have ideal conditions for the creation of loafers.⁵⁷

⁴⁹ 'Anglo-Indians and Unemployment', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 4 June 1925, p.19

⁵⁰ 'Relief of Distress: Anglo-Indian Unemployment Problem', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 11 Feb. 1926, p.24

⁵¹ 'Living in Poverty', p.19; 'Anglo-Indians and Unemployment', p.19; 'Relief of Distress: Anglo-Indian Unemployment Problem', p.24

⁵² An example of the substantial subscriptions made by the Europeans was a grant received in October 1926 of Rs. 10,000 from Her Excellency the Countess of Reading, 'Unemployment in Calcutta', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 17 Jun. 1926, , p.13

⁵³ 'Bengal Workless Problem', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 1 Jan. 1925, p.18

⁵⁴ H. B. Whitham, 'To the Editor: Anglo-Indian Employment', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 8 Sep. 1927, p.6

⁵⁵ 'Aid for Calcutta's Workless', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 21 May 1931, p.11

⁵⁶ 'The European in India', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 24 Jun. 1879, pp.558-9, p.559

⁵⁷ *Third Quinquennial Report of Education in Bengal [1902-03 to 1906-07]* (The Government of India, Calcutta, 1907) IND Bengal K.3, p.150

We have thus far discussed the material and ideological reasons why the British in India included their domiciled brethren in their welfare schemes. The following section of this chapter will focus more squarely on the contents of these schemes. In doing so, it will try and reconstruct the British perception of the domiciled identity, with all the stereotypes ascribed to it. The philanthropic circles believed that in order to salvage the domiciled from their characteristic pauperism, British colonials had to help the latter in eradicating certain physical and mental ‘defects’. Let us start from a discussion of British efforts to define categorical limits of the ‘domiciled class’, and accordingly, to decide who were to be included in (or excluded from) the net of philanthropic care which targeted that category. This discussion will be followed by an inquiry into the alternative modes of identity and living which the reformatory measures of philanthropy purported to invent.

Racial limits of philanthropic intervention

By definition, as the PC noted, members of the privileged European community, or ‘non-domiciled’ Britons, required no philanthropic support. The majority of them were temporary residents, furnishing very few paupers. They were more than self-supporting and were in a position to assist the domiciled class.⁵⁸ Within the white social body, it was domiciled Europeans and the people of mixed descent who were responsible for the crisis of European pauperism. As the PC defined it, the whole British crusade against European pauperism concerned specifically the ‘domiciled European community of Calcutta and Eurasians of all degrees of mixed blood’.⁵⁹ These two groups of British descent constituted what the PC and the CDCEC respectively called the ‘Indo-European community’ or the ‘Domiciled Community’. Whether mixed or not, most of them posed the same kind of threat to British imperial prestige with their impoverished presence. As the CDCEC made clear, the British effort to reduce indigence among the domiciled should recognise ‘no distinction between persons born in India of European parents and brought up in India, and persons of mixed-blood’.⁶⁰

It was not that all members of the domiciled community were paupers. The colonial authorities usually divided the community into (usually three) different strata according to economic position, and identified the poorest group as the major object of their concern. There was an upper-class stratum, made up of certain mixed-race families. They held positions of high official and occupational prestige. Members of this upper-class section were seen as often living ‘outside’ the community.⁶¹ The second stratum was tinted by poverty but showed potentials for economic independence and socio-cultural ‘respectability’ as people of British origin. This class, in fact, came closest to embody the ideal manner of living which the colonial authorities sought to construct.⁶² But this group of the ‘respectably poor’ was giving way to the class below it, swelling the rank of European paupers. And it was to this last class that the British

⁵⁸ *Report of the PC*, pp.2-3

⁵⁹ *ibid.*, p.2

⁶⁰ *Report of the CDCEC*, p.2

⁶¹ *ibid.*, p.135-136

⁶² *ibid.*, p.135

felt it necessary to confine their attention. For, it was in this section that ‘all the failings levelled against the Domiciled Community as a whole’ was found ‘in the most aggravated form’.⁶³

Efforts had also to be made for establishing racial criteria for inclusion. For in Calcutta, there were some people who were not racially British but resembled and sometimes claimed themselves to be part of the domiciled population. To make their welfare investment effective, it was necessary for British philanthropists to clarify the ground they intended to cover and exclude those who were deemed irrelevant to the social problem they were attacking. Census commissioners, police inspectors, charitable workers, pastors and other agents of colonial social control found a group of people who were not of British descent but were almost ‘dangerously’ similar to domiciled Europeans and Eurasians. There were two notable peoples of this sort: Indian Christians most of whom descended from low-caste natives converted to Christianity, and Luso-Indians, descendants of Portuguese men who had settled in India before the British came to power. When interviewed by the PC, Thomas McGuire, the Superintendent of the District Charitable Society’s Alms-house, said that, even though Calcutta’s Indian Christians or their ancestors had adopted Christianity and European names, their habits were ‘very little removed from those of the natives’, and they spoke ‘chiefly Hindustanee’.⁶⁴ After all, they were ‘originally drawn from a very low class of natives’.⁶⁵ They pretend to be ‘European’ but they were nothing but ‘pure natives’.⁶⁶ Likewise, Luso-Indians were also noted for their being nominally Christian and European. L.S.S. O’Malley, a census commissioner in Bengal, wrote that these people strongly tended to use such Portuguese-sounding names as DeBarros, Fernandez, DeSouza, DeSilva or DeCruz. But, he went on to observe: ‘In manners and habits [...] they resemble natives [and] are even darker in colour’,⁶⁷ and would hardly be considered as ‘European’. Their Europeaness was superficial - ‘Their religion, dress and names are practically the only things that distinguish them from their neighbours’.⁶⁸ They were ‘Bengalis in everything but name and religion’.⁶⁹ In fact, it had been an acknowledged fact that some Luso-Indians could claim descent from British soldiers in the Company. But, as A. Nundy noted:

‘the[ir] European blood diminished, till at last very little of it is found in the veins of the present generation [...] in their habits and mode of living they are strongly Oriental. [...] That they have degenerated, and are degenerating still more every day, is an undoubted fact [...]’.⁷⁰

It was precisely because Luso-Indians had ‘gone native’ so completely that what little was left of their British lineage would no longer count. Both Indian Christians and Luso-Indians were considered ‘native’, and as such were to be excluded from the

⁶³ *ibid.*, p.135

⁶⁴ Appendix I, Report of the Statistics Sub-Committee, *Report of the PC*, p.xvi

⁶⁵ *ibid.*

⁶⁶ *ibid.*

⁶⁷ *The Census of India, 1911: vol. V: Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and Sikkim: Part I. – Report* (Government of India, Calcutta, 1913), p.218

⁶⁸ *The Census of India, 1911: vol. V: Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and Sikkim: Part I. – Report*, p.218

⁶⁹ *ibid.*, p.219

⁷⁰ A. Nundy, ‘The Eurasian Problem in India’, *The Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review*, 9 (1900), pp.56-73, pp.59-60

welfare schemes meant for the domiciled class.

In reality, however, it was often difficult to distinguish between poorer members of the domiciled community on the one hand, and the Indian Christians and Luso-Indians on the other. It was precisely because they were so porous and ambiguous that the boundaries between these two groups had to be kept distinct. Both were under a strong influence of the Roman Catholic Church, as the majority of Eurasians were Catholic. The Bengal census (1911) noted that, in the province, the Roman Catholic Church possessed by far the greatest number of Eurasian adherents, the proportion being 58% in Bengal and 55% in Bihar and Orissa combined. The Church of England followed next with the figures of 32 and 37 % respectively; the rest were either Baptists, Methodists or Presbyterian.⁷¹ Because of this Catholic influence, it was not uncommon for some domiciled persons to carry such a Portuguese surname as 'D'Cruz' or 'D'Souza'. This made it difficult for European state and philanthropic agents to tell the difference between certain of the domiciled people, on the one hand, and 'Indian Christians' / 'Luso-Indians', who also bore such names, on the other. As the CDCEC remarked:

'No reliable test of a claim either for inclusion or exclusion merely on the ground of the possession of a Portuguese name can be established'.⁷²

In fact, it was observed that among those natives who adopted 'English modes of life', there were a substantial number merging with the domiciled community. The PC recorded the existence of those who had 'virtually joined' the poorer ranks of the domiciled class.⁷³ The CDCEC also noted that these people would 'congregate in districts with the Anglo-Indian proper, and mix intimately with them in their religious observances'.⁷⁴ Miscegenation was also an issue. An anonymous essay in *The Calcutta Review* (1905) wrote that the boundaries between the domiciled community and its Indian-Christian and Luso-Indian counterparts had been violated by miscegenation. What the essay called an 'invasion' carried on steadily throughout the nineteenth century and, as it observed, proceeded 'merrily up to this very hour, Eurasia with open arms receiving the invaders and hailing them as brethren beloved'.⁷⁵ By this 'influx of Indian blood', it wrote '[T]he genuine Eurasian community is being rapidly denationalised'.⁷⁶

The problem of conflated racial boundaries was further exacerbated by the fact that both Indian Christians and Luso-Indians often *claimed* to be a member of the domiciled community. W. Francis, a census commissioner (Madras, 1901), recorded that in Madras, between 1881 and 1891 the number of 'Eurasians' increased at an unusual rate of nearly 21%. This was due, as he noted, to 'Indian Christians who had taken to European ways and dress having returned themselves as Europeans with the idea of enhancing their social position'.⁷⁷ To prevent this from recurring, the authorities had to

⁷¹ *The Census of India, 1911: vol. V: Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and Sikkim: Part I. – Report*, p.218

⁷² *Report of the CDCEC*, p.39

⁷³ *Report of the PC*, p.2

⁷⁴ *Report of the CDCEC*, p.141

⁷⁵ Anon. ('Amicus'), 'Our cousins, the Eurasians of India - A plea', *The Calcutta Review*, 121 (1905), p.382

⁷⁶ *ibid.*

⁷⁷ *The Census of India, 1901: vol. XV: Madras: Part I – Report* (Government of India, Madras, 1902),

appoint Eurasians as enumerators of places where ‘pseudo-Eurasians’ were most common.⁷⁸ The census authorities took with alarm the ‘growing tendency’ of Indian Christians to pass off as members of the domiciled class.⁷⁹ The census commissioner (Bengal, 1931), A.E. Porter, noted that in Noakhali the number of Anglo-Indians that year stood at 441, while it was only 23 a decade earlier. The reason for this extraordinary increase was undoubtedly due to the fact many of them claimed to be part of the domiciled community.⁸⁰ Similar problems existed in obtaining information about the Luso-Indian community. J. H. Hutton, the census commissioner (India, 1931), noted that as in the previous decades the inflated numbers of Anglo-Indians were due to ‘a number of the descendants of Portuguese dependants’ as well as those of Indian Christians.⁸¹

The colonial authorities feared that by passing off as members of the domiciled class, these individuals would manage to find their ways into the inclusive social policies intended primarily for the domiciled class. Social reformers and commentators often insisted that ‘psuedo-Eurasians’ be sufficiently excluded from the welfare schemes for the domiciled. The authorities of European education, for instance, feared that they may disguise their racial origins and claim inclusion beyond the prescribed quota.⁸² Inclusion of too many Indians would obscure the true purpose of European education, which was nothing but to alleviate European pauperism before it became ‘racially’ problematic. British philanthropists were frustrated that ‘Europeanised Indians’ were getting in their way of controlling and disciplining the *bona-fide* members of the domiciled community.⁸³ As the CDCEC asserted explicitly:

‘It is beyond question that Indians who have adopted European habits of life class themselves as Anglo-Indians, hoping thereby to command higher salaries’.⁸⁴

All these efforts at definitional clarifications revealed the extent to which it was for solving a problem of particular order that British social reformers invented and utilised the category ‘domiciled class’. Members of this class were supposed to represent a definite population unit, distinct from any other groups, so that the problem they posed could be effectively scrutinised and contained.

Diagnosis of the problem

Within the frame of the inclusive politics of welfare, concerned British represented themselves as anti-racist. They argued that it was the racial prejudice against people of mixed descent that had served to marginalise the domiciled community. Both the PC and CDCEC urged British society in India to discard stereotypical ideas about

p.134

⁷⁸ *ibid.*

⁷⁹ *General Report: the Census of India, 1911* (Government of India, London, 1914), p.140

⁸⁰ *The Census of India, 1931: vol. V: Bengal and Sikkim: Part I – Report* (Government of India. Calcutta, 1933), p.452

⁸¹ *The Census of India, 1931: vol.1- India* (Government of India, Delhi, 1933), p.429; for similar observations, see also *The Census of India, 1901: vol. VI: the Lower Provinces of Bengal and their Feudatories: Part I. – the Report*, p.409; and *The Census of India, 1911: vol. XII.: Madras: Part I – Report* (Government of India, Madras, 1912), p.173

⁸² See Ch. 5.

⁸³ *Report of the CDCEC*, p.4

⁸⁴ *ibid*, p.4

domiciled persons. The Secretary of the CDCEC argued it was proven that the admixture of blood did not lead to racial degeneration.⁸⁵ But this anti-racist gesture did not mean that colonial philanthropists were ready to admit that all problems relating to the domiciled class were caused by social contingencies external to the latter, such that they themselves had nothing to blame for their own impoverishment. On the contrary, they believed that much of the trouble derived from certain intrinsic traits of the domiciled poor themselves and argued that it was the duty of the non-domiciled British to point out these inimical traits. The PC, for one, argued that genuinely concerned Britons should not shy away from these ‘defects’, simply ‘owing to the fear of wounding susceptibilities’.⁸⁶ Negative and painful as it may be, it was a ‘duty’ of Europeans to address the issue. The CDCEC argued similarly. It was a ‘disagreeable task’, but ‘to enumerate some of the failings’ was necessary so long as the employers of labour accused them.⁸⁷

What exactly were these ‘defects’ and ‘failings’ commonly ascribed to persons from the domiciled community? The British press, such as *The Statesman*, frequently aired opinions to the effect that the domiciled were ‘by nature untrustful and dishonest, and would not work even when they have an opportunity’.⁸⁸ Instead, it was alleged that the domiciled poor wilfully exploited their appeal to the genealogical kinship to the British in order to ‘pray upon the public purse’.⁸⁹ Their false sense of kinship would induce them into becoming dependent on European benevolence. British also criticised the attitude of the domiciled towards their Indian fellows. They were said to entertain a sense of racial superiority over Indians. This led the former to employ poor Indians as domestic servants, making the children helplessly dependent and spoiled. Growing up, they would develop a prejudice against domestic work and menial labour.⁹⁰ These perceptions also found their way in the more official, authoritative views. Members of the PC did their utmost in trying to identify the ‘intrinsic traits’ of the domiciled person. On the basis of statistical, sociological and anthropological analyses into the minute details of everyday lives, the PC asserted the following: because they inherited the blood of Europeans, the domiciled had too much of a ‘pride of race’.⁹¹ It was the ‘defects of character more or less connected with this sentiment’ that ‘seriously interfere with Indo-Europeans in the struggle for work’.⁹² Since they were too proud of themselves, they characteristically disliked to get their hands on manual labour even when they led an impoverished life. And the poverty just became worse, because they went on spending to satisfy their vanity. In the PC’s view, this false pride was built into the psyche of domiciled individuals to the extent that ‘It is almost impossible to inculcate providence among persons thus circumstanced’.⁹³ Such a view of the

⁸⁵ Jean Finot’s *Race Prejudice* (London, 1906), he argued that racial differences were ‘almost entirely due to passing social conditions and not to innate racial characteristics’, and that the ‘scientific’ theory that admixture of blood must necessarily read to racial degeneration had already been refuted. *ibid.*, pp.43-44. For a discussion of racial theory, see Ch.3

⁸⁶ *Report of the PC*, p.8

⁸⁷ *Report of the CDCEC*, p.134

⁸⁸ ‘Eurasian Poverty in Calcutta’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 24 Jan 91, p.2.

⁸⁹ ‘Pauperism in Calcutta’, p.3

⁹⁰ See Ch. 5.

⁹¹ *Report of the PC*, p.5

⁹² *ibid.*,

⁹³ *ibid.*,

domiciled person as innately proud and indolent was also found in the academic discourse of Edgar Thurston, a renowned ethnologist and Superintendent of the Madras Government Museum. According to Thurston, the domiciled man was sickly prone to the love of luxury and pleasure. As a result of his characteristic ‘want of thrift’, there was a ‘wide spread tendency to allow expenditure to exceed income’.⁹⁴ Thus the domiciled man became indebted, losing his credibility as an employee and inevitably went unemployed.⁹⁵

The notion of false economic consciousness is nowhere better articulated than in the views presented by John MacRae in *The Calcutta Review* (1913). As a missionary based in Calcutta, he was well-known for his enthusiastic commitment to the problem of pauperism among the domiciled community. MacRae’s basic idea was that the pauperisation of Calcutta’s domiciled class was chiefly due to certain problems in the mental constitution of its members. Their poverty was not a real kind of poverty and the domicile poor not genuinely a poor people: ‘It does not seem real poverty. It occasions a strange lack of a sense of the value of things’.⁹⁶ There were certain other factors, such as the harsh climate and bad sanitary conditions, which might have helped to impoverish the domiciled, but these were nothing special, common to any other cases of poverty. When it came to the domiciled community, the real cause of its pauperisation was an incapability of its members of knowing who they really were, and by extension, their tendency to mimic the ways of the British middle class. According to MacRae, the domiciled could not recognise their difference from their non-domiciled brethren and, because of their racial connection with them, mistakenly assumed that they too could lead the latter’s affluent life-style. Most ‘Europeans’ in India were (at least by definition) middle class. They did not include a model working-class people from whom the domiciled might possibly learn an art of honest and humble living. As a result, the domiciled class took as its model what was actually a group of ‘temporarily detached fragments of a large and complete organisation’.⁹⁷ The domiciled class ended up emulating the wealthy although they themselves were nothing but the poor. MacRae wrote:

‘It is to organise life on an artificial and not a real basis, it is to live a life out of harmony with the true facts of existence. The roots of the Anglo-Indian are not sufficiently deep in reality [...] He starts from a false position and his life is spent among shadows. He fails, of one thing, to distinguish between necessities and luxuries’.⁹⁸

The British in India and their domiciled brethren occupied fundamentally distinct positions in the social order of colonial society. For MacRae, the only effective remedy for domiciled pauperism was to make the domiciled realise this distinction. The British, on their part, should not simply assist them by giving aid too readily. They should rather try and discipline the domiciled into embracing the fundamental differences

⁹⁴ Edgar Thurston, ‘Eurasians of Madras and Malabar’, *Madras Government Museum: Bulletin*, 2 (1898), pp69-164, p.76

⁹⁵ *ibid.*

⁹⁶ John MacRae, ‘Social Conditions in Calcutta – 1: The Problem for Charity among the Anglo-Indian Community’, *The Calcutta Review*, 1 (1913), pp. 84-94, p91

⁹⁷ *ibid.*, p.92

⁹⁸ *ibid.*, p.91

between them. As he said, ‘Any attempt to help the Anglo-Indian socially or economically must begin by recognising this difference’.⁹⁹

British philanthropists also thought hygienic negligence fostered in the ‘slum condition’ had inscribed an inexorable mark on the body and mind of the domiciled. As the Secretary of the CDCEC wrote, ‘the children of slum parents will have slum tendencies, irrespective of blood and country’.¹⁰⁰ One of their inimical ‘slum tendencies’ was early marriage. European observers were appalled by its degree and understood it as a major contribution to domiciled pauperism. In 1891, *The Statesman* wrote that ‘early and improvident marriages’ were one of the greatest cause of pauperism and;

‘one of the most important services which the Eurasian and Anglo-Indian Association and similar societies can perform, lies in discouraging such marriages’.¹⁰¹

William Forbes-Mitchell, a self-claimed expert on the problem of the domiciled community, asserted that early marriages had ‘done more to degenerate and abase the race than any other influence’.¹⁰² Many took early marriage as one of the symptoms of the ‘innate’ improvidence of the domiciled.¹⁰³ Edgar Thurston remarked that the results were too frequently disastrous, with:

‘a plethora of children, brought up in poverty, hunger, and dirt; but little to earn and many to keep; domestic unrest; insolvency; and destitution’.¹⁰⁴

He also attributed early marriage to an ‘innate’ immorality of the domiciled:

‘I may hazard a guess that it is because they have not acquired the power to “subordinate animal appetite to reason, foresight, and prudence”’.¹⁰⁵

But others thought that early marriage was itself a direct consequence of the slum environment in which the domiciled poor lived. The CDCEC’s Sub-Committee on Health and Physique reported that most early marriages were the inevitable result of over-crowded living conditions:

‘In many cases lads and girls of 14 to 18 years of age are sleeping in the same hut, with the

⁹⁹ John MacRae, ‘Social Conditions in Calcutta – 2: The Problem for Charity among the Anglo-Indian Community’, *The Calcutta Review*, 1 (1913), pp. 351-371, p.352

¹⁰⁰ *Report of the CDCEC*, p.43

¹⁰¹ ‘Pauperism in Calcutta’, p.3

¹⁰² W. Forbes-Mitchell, ‘Letter to the Editor: The Eurasian Problem and Missionary Employment’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 28 Nov. 1891, p.1. Elsewhere Forbes-Mitchell also said, ‘[I]f the pauperised Eurasian and Anglo-Indian are to rise, they must avoid all selfish indulgences early and imprudent marriages.’ W. Forbes-Mitchell, ‘The Gospel of the Regeneration of An Anglo-Indian and Eurasian Pauperism. - I.’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 31 Oct 1891, p.1

¹⁰³ For instance, Robert Joseph Carbery, the Vice-President of a charity organisation (St. Vincent de Paul) replied to the PC, saying, ‘[T]hey [Eurasians] marry early now. [...] I do not consider these early marriages as a sign of prosperity, but of improvidence’. ‘Appendix I, Report of the Statistics Sub-Committee’, *Report of the PC*, p.xiv

¹⁰⁴ Thurston, ‘Eurasians of Madras and Malabar’, p.75

¹⁰⁵ *ibid.*

inevitable result that the girls are ruined morally and physically at an early age'.¹⁰⁶

Because of these housing conditions of the slums, immoral sexual relations often led to incest. As a consequence, the Sub-Committee wrote, 'we have succeeding generations of weaklings, diseased and weak-minded poverty-stricken people'.¹⁰⁷ In their view, the question of Calcutta's domiciled paupers was one of environment, 'not only the legacy of bye-gone progenitors, but the consequence of the utterly unwholesome conditions in the recent and present generations'.¹⁰⁸

In order to check these psychological and hygienic tendencies among the domiciled class, a number of suggestions were made. As far as the psychological side was concerned, British thought it necessary to regulate access to charitable relief. The organisation of various European charitable efforts was necessary not just to extend the ground covered but in order to distinguish between those who were in need of relief and those who were not. It was as important to exclude from the scheme of charity those who volunteered to live on charity even though they were able-bodied. In fact charity had been criticised for giving relief far too readily and indiscriminately. Such a way of giving out relief did not solve pauperism but increased it by nurturing among the poor a disregard for work. As MacRae noted: 'to give money is usually not to strike at the roots of poverty but to water them'.¹⁰⁹ Charity did not help the poorer classes of the domiciled to become independent but enabled them to live as a 'parasite'.¹¹⁰ The PC recognised this problem of charitable aid only too well. It warned that pensions or doles had been given in ways that:

'destroy all spirit or love of independence and respect which springs from a person being self-supporting, but not sufficient to obviate the necessity of seeking further help elsewhere, and thereby converting the recipient into a skilful and professional mendicant'.¹¹¹

The PC identified the psychological factor as the prime cause of pauperism and in that connection criticised the existing mode of charitable relief. By failing to take the psychological factor into account European relief efforts were positively fostering the pauperisation of the domiciled class. What was ultimately thought to be necessary was to introduce a 'scientific' view of the phenomenon of pauperism. Calcutta was said to be a backward place, where the old conception of poverty, represented in the 1834 Poor Law in England, had still been observed. The charitable system of the colonial periphery had to be upgraded to the metropolitan standard, and one vital thing that had to be done urgently was the application of a more strict set of criteria to include only the deserving poor.¹¹² To counter pauperism, it was imperative not to help those who were just lazy or too proud to stain their own hands. These people had to be disciplined in reformatory and educational ways, instead of being spoiled by charity. And in certain cases, coercive institutionalisation in the alms house or workhouse should be done to

¹⁰⁶ *Report of the CDCEC*, p.142

¹⁰⁷ *ibid.*, p.142

¹⁰⁸ *ibid.*, p.143

¹⁰⁹ MacRae, 'Social Conditions in Calcutta – 2', p.363

¹¹⁰ MacRae, 'Social Conditions in Calcutta – 1', p.93

¹¹¹ *Report of the PC*, p.10

¹¹² *ibid.*, p.11

subject the paupers to a thorough process of confinement and discipline. Thus both the PC and the CDCEC recommended a stronger degree of the institutional confinement of the domiciled poor in the alms- and workhouses.¹¹³

With regard to hygienic problems, nothing would be more important than European support for the effort to ameliorate living environments. This concern was addressed particularly explicitly by the CDCEC which took housing as the most important of all problems. As its Sub-Committee on Housing observed:

‘If living conditions remain such that physical health and immoral family life are difficult or impossible, efforts to raise the community by improved education and other means are bound to be largely infructuous’.¹¹⁴

Such ugly conditions would inevitably cause a hygienic and sexual degeneration of the domiciled class, for this but the poor themselves were hardly to blame.¹¹⁵ The non-domiciled British community should assume responsibility and provide them with superior housing. The Sub-Committee especially noted that rents were excessively high even for the relatively well-to-do sections of the domiciled class. At rents within the means of the poor, sanitary and decent accommodation could hardly be obtained. Thus, the Sub-Committee recommended that European capitalists and charities combine their capital and energies to construct new buildings. For this, endeavour should be made to establish a trust or registered association. For the better classes, houses of economical construction should be built on the cheapest land obtainable and rented at Rs. 50 to Rs.100 a month. The Government should exercise compulsory powers for acquiring suitable land in large blocks. For the poorest classes, tenement dwellings should be built by European capital. Charitable funds should help the tenants pay the rents.¹¹⁶

Alternative ways of living

Along with the organisation of charity and improvement of racial hygiene, colonial efforts to alleviate the pauperisation of the domiciled class pointed to more radical measures as well. British were increasingly convinced that the question at hand would remain unsolved unless they could remove the domiciled poor from the social and economic context of the city altogether. The reasons were multiple. Firstly, the psychological ‘trait’ of the domiciled – namely the tendency of mimicking Europeans whilst despising Indians – would not be completely removed so long as they lived among the two groups. Secondly, their hygienic ‘degeneration’ would not be avoided unless the domiciled grew up outside the urban slums of Calcutta or other urban centres. Thirdly, the city did not provide its domiciled inhabitants with any new avenues of employment: social policies would not ultimately solve the question of pauperism so long as no employment was forthcoming. And fourthly, their impoverished existence would not be shielded from the eyes of Indian subjects as long as they lived among them. In view of these problems, British thought it necessary to isolate the domiciled poor from the social and cultural influences of the city. And they also saw it indispensable to somehow coordinate social relocation with education, vocational training and employment. Throughout the late colonial period, British philanthropic

¹¹³ *ibid.*, pp.75-100, *Report of the CDCEC*, pp.26-30

¹¹⁴ *Report of the CDCEC*, p.73

¹¹⁵ *ibid.*, p.74

¹¹⁶ *ibid.*, p.79

circles considered several schemes to realise this synthesis of isolation and labour. Among others, these schemes included military and marine training, agricultural resettlement, and emigration.

Regimental discipline

The idea of creating a military regiment entirely and solely composed of domiciled-class youth derived from a concern that men of this class characteristically lacked discipline and a healthy attitude to labour. A Calcutta mercantile company, Anderson, Wright & Co, wrote to the PC that it had employed several such men but found them particularly unsatisfactory, and therefore would no longer employ them even on an experimental basis. It supported the idea of forming a military regiment because, it argued, ‘the best chance of making men of them would be to place them under military discipline’.¹¹⁷ Another company, Whitney Brothers, wrote similarly in favour of a military regiment, as ‘The training they would receive would go a long way in teaching them self-reliance and habits of industry’.¹¹⁸ European capitalists were generally sympathetic to the plight of the domiciled community, but they would not employ the latter for charity. These opinions exercised a decisive influence on the PC’s decision to recommend to the Government the formation of a military regiment.¹¹⁹ Seeing that almost all avenues of employment had been closed, the Committee came to regard the special regiment as ‘the only one remedy at all adequate to the disease’.¹²⁰ The disciplinary aspect of the regiment scheme would provide a promising philanthropic solution to the question of European pauperism.

An isolated and disciplined environment of regimental life would eradicate from domiciled youth all the undesirable traces of family life. The special regiment would continue to subject them to institutional discipline even after their post-schooling years. As the PC remarked:

‘the pernicious home-influences which have been so often referred to would be intercepted and precluded from undoing the effects of school-life’.¹²¹ _

Once institutionalised, they would be taught the ethic of a labouring life, an alleged lack of which had made them unemployable to begin with. It would also prevent early marriages:

‘Service with a regiment will check, if not entirely put a stop to, the improvident marriages which young men are now only too ready to contract’.¹²²

A period of discipline and supervision may also reform the minds and bodies of who had already become loafers and paupers.¹²³

The major problem of the proposed system of military discipline was that the philanthropic need did not match the imperial criteria of military recruitment. The

¹¹⁷ *Report of the PC*, p.121

¹¹⁸ *ibid.*, p.128

¹¹⁹ *ibid.*, p.113

¹²⁰ *ibid.*, p.14

¹²¹ *ibid.*

¹²² *ibid.*, p.14

¹²³ *ibid.*, p.15

authorities did not find a domiciled regiment worth being established and financed, with its members remunerated as professional soldiers. Charles Eliot, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, rejected the possibility of the Government establishing a regiment especially for the domiciled class. From a military point of view, such a regiment was not necessary. British soldiers had been regularly imported from home and, as for native soldiers, there was no dearth of good material in India. Certain native subjects such as the Sikhs were thought to be not only cheaper but much more fit as a military force. There was essentially no room or need for a special domiciled regiment. The Government could not establish and finance a military regiment solely for meeting the 'philanthropic' needs of a particular community. Even though the plea was constantly presented till the end of British rule, no regular domiciled regiment was to come into existence.

Although they were not implemented, the ideas of a military regiment as a philanthropic measure are significant. Even Charles Elliot admitted the possible use of such a scheme: 'the Committee are doubtless right in holding that military discipline would be of the greatest advantage to young men of this class'.¹²⁴

Marine training

Along with a special military regiment, the PC thought that the creation of a government-sanctioned training vessel would alleviate the social and economic plight of the domiciled poor. They recommended a scheme for a training-ship on the River Hooghly modelled after institutions of a similar nature found in British waters. Those British concerned with domiciled pauperism thought that the sort of training offered by a training vessel would offer an ideal period of institutional discipline and would possibly lead to a related career afterwards. Life on a training vessel would help domiciled youth to acquire self-discipline, and it would also enable a necessary isolation from their families.

The problem with the proposed scheme was that it was not expected to automatically prepare the domiciled trainees for an employment in piloting. As far as the recruitment policy of the colonial pilot service was concerned, there had been a more favourable atmosphere towards domiciled pilots than towards their native counterparts. But by the late 1870s, the domiciled had been rigidly excluded from this service, due to a policy of Europeanisation whereby the authorities preferred those Europeans trained at a metropolitan institution. Because of the 'inferior' environment and education facilities India offered, the domiciled were regarded as not fit enough for this service. In theory, domiciled youth could still try and join the service by going to the metropole to be trained on a British training vessel, but in practice few of them

¹²⁴ General Department.; Miscellaneous – no. 2263; Calcutta, the 8th August 1892; RESOLUTION, p.4. The movement for the creation of a domiciled regiment was not just philanthropic in the ways indicated in this Chapter. It was pressed forward as a material demand by the leaders of domiciled community, many of whom were engaged in political as well as philanthropic projects. Though well aware of the philanthropic value of the proposed regiment, what these leaders demanded was more than a mere philanthropic institution. It was necessary for them that the proposed regiment would be recognised as a special kind of 'British' regiment, with its members remunerated on a commensurate level. In his reply to the PC's suggestion, Charles Eliot implied that a domiciled regiment might as well be established only provided it was meant as an 'Indian' regiment. Such an arrangement might have satisfied the British proponents but not their domiciled counterparts. See Ch. 6 for detailed discussions on the domiciled community's political demands for material equality.

could afford it.¹²⁵ Thus, the proposal by the Committee was rejected by Eliot on the grounds of impracticality. He noted, rightly enough, that it would not guarantee the participants employment opportunities after their training.¹²⁶ After discharge, the trainees would return to the world of indigence whence they came.

Despite the aforementioned problems, the idea of pilot training continued to prove appealing in European philanthropic circles. Aside from the claim for the state-sanctioned creation of a special ship in India,¹²⁷ pleas were also made for allowing individual domiciled youths to be trained together with British trainees in British waters. A decade after the PC, the authorities finally made a concession to this plan a scheme for sending, on an experimental basis, a number of selected boys to some training-vessels operating in British waters. In 1906-8 about 20 youths were sent to a British training vessel, *Southampton*, from John Graham's orphanage, and several of them did succeed in obtaining a career in piloting.¹²⁸

It was its philanthropic value that made marine training appear so important. With no employment prepared for them after leaving school, the children of the domiciled community continued to be potential perpetrators of much cursed European pauperism. Even if they had been removed from the slums and subjected to institutional discipline at a boarding school or orphanage, they would inevitably follow the path of their parents. Marine training was expected to prevent this from happening – it would provide yet another occasion for discipline and isolation. This philanthropic value of marine training is well articulated by James Luke, the Secretary of the Marine Association. He noted that the youth of impoverished families would be detached from the slum quarters of big cities, 'instead of growing up to swell the ranks of loafers, already too full'.¹²⁹ Then, by sending them to Europe, the scheme would deprive the recruited trainees of 'The qualities of character which we sometimes deplore amongst them', which were 'largely the result of long hereditary surroundings'.¹³⁰

Agricultural communes

An alternative way of isolation / discipline was the idea of relocating the lives of such domiciled persons in the cities to distant places in or even outside of India. The possible efficacy of agricultural re-settlement to alleviate unemployment and pauperism was recognised from early on, inscribing itself in public awareness at least by the mid-1870s. One of the self-help efforts of the Eurasian and Anglo-Indian Association (EAIA) was to promote the agricultural settlement of the poorer members of the community. Concerned Europeans responded to this with a great interest. Many thought that it could (and should) be a field for Governmental support. As a form of philanthropy, it appeared to offer a radical solution to domiciled pauperism. It would permanently remove the domiciled class from their urban dwellings, where all their problems were engendered. In 1876, the newly found EAIA asked the Government to sanction an agricultural scheme in the countryside. This elicited a favourable response

¹²⁵ See Ch. 6

¹²⁶ General Department.; Miscellaneous – no. 2263; Calcutta, the 8th August 1892; RESOLUTION, p.

¹²⁷ The Sub-Committee on Employment of the CDCEC took up the subject of establishing a training ship in the Hooghly as suggested by the PC, and expressed its wish 'to bring this proposal forward again as one of their definite recommendations'. *Report of the CDCEC*, p.138

¹²⁸ See Ch. 5 for details.

¹²⁹ James Luke, 'A Training-Ship Institution', *The Calcutta Review*, 116 (1903), pp.329-333, p330

¹³⁰ *ibid.*, p.333

from the British community, as it would offer:

‘a fair chance of raising the “poor whites” and Eurasian population from the depths of misery and degradation into which that unfortunate class had been allowed to sink’.¹³¹

Though the proposed scheme did not see fruition, it did gain certain sympathy within government circles, notably Richard Temple, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. In Southern India, D. S. White, the President of the Madras branch of the EAIA, worked energetically and by the early 1880s created the Whitefield and Sausmond Colonies near Bangalore, and the Southern Eurasian Colony in Mysore. Agricultural settlement was not confined to the hill tracts alone. In 1921, a penal colony on the Andaman Islands was abandoned. It was decided that the Islands would be transformed into a free settlement, with a peasant population now added to native and convict populations. The Ex-Services Association helped a few ex-soldiers of the domiciled class to settle on the Islands as agriculturalists, with monthly doles, servants, free outfits, passages, rations, lodgings and land grants. This ‘Andaman Scheme’ intended to ease the ensuring pressure of the economic slump in the early 1920s. In addition, in the early 1930s, a ‘utopian’ colonisation scheme for the domiciled class was started in Bihar, and was named the McCluskiegunge Colony, after McCluskie, a prominent activist of the domiciled community.

But there was an observation that the domiciled poor were not fit enough for agricultural settlement. Such a scheme would require a strong initiative on the part of the intending settlers. It was only for a negative reason that their lives in the urban areas were shuttered that domiciled settlers took up an agricultural life. While acknowledging their possible use, *The Statesman* wrote of the domiciled people who were to be involved in the agricultural schemes initiated by D. S. White:

‘are they, either physically or morally, a class of men who would be expected to succeed in a calling where unremitting labour, hard and often unthankful [...] is required?’¹³²

And commenting on the Andamans scheme, *The Statesman* lamented that the settlers had been drawn ‘from too limited a class and subjugated to demoralising influences from the onset’.¹³³ On this, even the leader of the domiciled community, Henry Gidney, had to agree:

‘it does not follow, of course, that Anglo-Indians are incapable of sustained physical effort, but it seems that the men selected to take part in these experiments have not all been of the right class’.¹³⁴

Moreover, agricultural schemes were often poorly funded. Writing about such plans in southern India, *The Madras Times* pointed out that a want of funding was an obstacle as the EAIA could not always raise enough capital.¹³⁵ Also lacking was a dissemination of knowledge / skills and an organised guidance to use them properly. Cannon Russell

¹³¹ *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 15 Jan. 1876, pp.44-45, p.44

¹³² ‘The Southern European Colony’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 9 Jan. 1883, pp.46-47

¹³³ ‘Anglo-Indian Colonisation Schemes’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 8 May 1924, p.3

¹³⁴ ‘Anglo-Indians in the Andamans’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 14 Aug. 1924, p.3

¹³⁵ *The Madras Times [Weekly]*, 26 Feb. 1890, p.5,

Payro, reporting on the 12 men installed in the Andamans said the failure of these instant-made colonists was attributable to a lack of guidance. Material provision was necessary but it was not everything.¹³⁶

In spite of these difficulties, however, the idea of agricultural settlement remained popular among certain colonial philanthropists. Agriculture would give the poorer classes of the domiciled community a chance for a fresh start. The cool climate enjoyed by most agricultural colonies, such as Whitefield, would do much to restore the domiciled from the ‘degeneration’ of their body, inevitable in the plains of India.¹³⁷ Agricultural settlement would also offer an ideal social context for discipline, especially in the absence of both ‘superior’ Europeans to ask for help and of ‘inferior’ Indians to depend on for domestic work. Now they would have to be self-reliant, which would naturally orient them towards a spirit of independence and love of labour. As *The Statesman* observed: ‘some of our “loafing” population might honourably redeem the wretched life they lead in our cities’. Through ‘humbling themselves to honourable toil’ in the upland district, they would come to denounce their ‘invincible repugnance’ to manual labour.¹³⁸ They would get rid of their ‘false pride’¹³⁹ and learn the ‘dignity of labour’.¹⁴⁰

Emigration

Along with agricultural re-settlement, there were attempts to send domiciled youths to other parts of the British Empire, such as South Africa, Australia and New Zealand, and install them as farmers or menial labourers. These were largely ‘self-help’ efforts by the EAIA, but many British were also involved, sometimes making their own initiatives. In Madras, for instance, the Madras Emigration Society was established and run by prominent members of the city’s British community. The emigration scheme of the Friend-in-Need Society was also mooted by Europeans.¹⁴¹ In Bengal, the Scottish missionary, the Rev. John Graham, enthusiastically encouraged and assisted the child inmates of his Homes to emigrate to British settler colonies, in particular Australia and New Zealand. By the mid-1930s, Graham sent more than fifty to New Zealand, eleven to Australia, four to the United States, one to South Africa.¹⁴² There were hopes that, in such settler colonies, where the land had been tilled by European men, members of the domiciled class would forget their old dislike of manual labour and start a new life as labouring settlers. As *The Englishman* observed;

‘It may be that this prejudice against a person engaged in manual labour which exists amongst all classes of Anglo-Indian society has done a good deal to foster a dislike to it amongst Eurasians who are extremely susceptible to anything like contempt or reproach. In Australia this feeling does not exist’.¹⁴³

In spite of such enthusiasm, the fact remained that many practical problems presented

¹³⁶ ‘Anglo-Indians in Andamans: Lack of Experience’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 3 April 1924, p.10

¹³⁷ *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 27 July 99, p.20

¹³⁸ *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 11 Sep. 1875, p.830

¹³⁹ ‘Sir Richard Temple and Hill Colonization’, *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 22 Jan. 1876, p.76

¹⁴⁰ ‘The Southern Eurasian Colony’, p.46

¹⁴¹ Lionel Caplan, *Children of Colonialism: Anglo-Indians in a Postcolonial World* (Oxford, 2001), p.132

¹⁴² See Ch.V

¹⁴³ *The Englishmen [Weekly]*, 23 Aug. 1884, p.10

themselves to the idea of overseas settlement. The emigration of domiciled persons was not related to imperial territorial expansion in any positive sense. Nor was it for supplying labour to areas where there were shortages. There was no intrinsic economic demand and, as such, there were intrinsic barriers in the labour market. Labour competition existed in other British colonies as well, in ways that would disadvantage the domiciled class of British India. In South Africa, the domiciled would not qualify to enter the Imperial British East Africa Company, which was just as selective over recruitment. On the other hand, India's domiciled youths would not be needed as menial labour in a labour market which was already full of working-class labourers.¹⁴⁴ In Australia, there was already a large presence of Chinese labour, which would easily undersell the domiciled.¹⁴⁵ And, particularly in Australia, there also existed an issue of racism towards mixed-race persons, whose 'brown-ness' was frowned upon.¹⁴⁶ In any case, it appeared difficult to send abroad members of the domiciled class in large numbers. The CDCEC had read with interest the plan of a proposed scheme for colonisation in British East Africa. But they thought:

'it would be difficult to make such a scheme, or indeed any other scheme for emigration, successful on a sufficiently large scale to affect the conditions of the Domiciled Community'.¹⁴⁷

The domiciled class had little capital when they wanted to start out a new farm or an industry of their own. They would be as unfit a labourer abroad as in India:

'it would be a fatal mistake of any clerks, or persons unaccustomed to work, to venture to either country, as the first requires hardy, sturdy colonists with a little capital; and in the second the labour market is contested, and there is not the slightest opening for a young man without a grade'.¹⁴⁸

The fact that emigration was continually considered as an alternative, in spite of all these foreseeable problems, was itself a testimony to the graveness of the domiciled's employment situation. The fact that British continued to support these 'self-help' efforts reflected a sober pessimism that no place in British India could be found for their domiciled brethren; their life had to belong elsewhere. Such perspectives on emigration were well articulated in a pamphlet by the Rev. O. Younghusband, written in wake of the political reforms starting in the late 1910s. He insisted upon 'abolishing' the very presence of the domiciled class in India. For him, attacking unemployment and pauperism by philanthropic or educational measures was ultimately insufficient as long as it was done in India. He argued that the issue of European pauperism in India could be solved only by removing the children of the domiciled class from India and transferring them to other imperial dominions. As the

¹⁴⁴ 'The Prospects of Eurasians in Africa', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 23 Aug. 1890, p.2

¹⁴⁵ 'Eurasian Emigration', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 26 Sep. 1879, pp.839-840

¹⁴⁶ W. H. Arden Wood & Alex Francis, 'Letter to the Editor: Anglo-Indians and Australia', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 13 Jun. 1912, p.7 The formula that had been laid down by the Minister of the Interior being that A-Is of three-fourths white parentage would be allowed to land if they were in sound health, of good character and in possession of a British passport; another condition being that the Federal authorities must have no reason to believe that such persons would become a charge upon the public if admitted into the country ('Kalimpong Homes Look Ahead', *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 10 Feb. 38, p.13).

¹⁴⁷ *Report of the CDCEC*, p.138

¹⁴⁸ *The Statesman [Weekly]*, 31 Jan. 91, p.3

repeatedly elected President of the Domiciled Community of Northern India, Younghusband attended one of the Committees of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms (1919). He claimed that the domiciled class was not a self-wanted community; most remained domiciled in India only because they could not afford to leave.¹⁴⁹ Younghusband also thought that their existence in the post-Reform India found no positive meanings either from the European or Indian points of view.¹⁵⁰ He insisted that it was important to educate the new, rising generation of the domiciled class to make them suitable for the 'export scheme', which he had undertaken as his own task. Younghusband defined it as a responsibility of the Government to provide necessary conditions for carrying out the actual transplanting of young domiciled youths of British India across the different denominations of the Empire.¹⁵¹ He claimed:

'it would be best to take an interest in keenly spirited boys in Hill Schools so that they may not become poor whites, to take an interest in them both for their own sakes and for the future of the British Empire, to give them financial and other encouragement so that they may play a useful and valuable part in the building up of the young Dominions Overseas'.¹⁵²

* *

In reality, none of the aforementioned schemes can be said to have been successful, let alone being enough to solve domiciled pauperism. But the very fact that they emerged as possible alternatives at all demonstrated the severity of the problem at hand.

Under these schemes, labour and discipline would complement each other as a means to transform the attitude of the domiciled towards labour. And this disciplinary transformation was itself conditioned by a possibility of social and physical relocation, whether by institutionalisation or by migration. What those radical measures would purport to achieve was to remove the domiciled from the labour competition in colonial society, and from the problematic dialectic of coloniser / colonised, out of which they had allegedly developed their characteristic dependency and misguided understanding of their own position in society. British believed that in supporting these schemes they were committing themselves to a worthy imperial cause. James Luke defined the institution of marine training as a 'modest contribution towards the solution of the ['Eurasian'] problem', a problem which 'has long been a puzzle to the Government of India'.¹⁵³ And still earlier, in the late 1870s, Richard Temple, acknowledged the effort at internal migration as:

'one of the most important measures' [that can possibly solve] 'a difficulty which has been puzzling the brains of the most astute of Her Majesty's representatives in this country'.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁹ He explained that most 'Domiciled Europeans' remain domiciled in India only because they could not afford to get out of it. O.Younghusband, 'The Domiciled Community in India', Pamphlets, vol. 72, OIOC T. 722, pp5-6

¹⁵⁰ *ibid.*, pp4-5

¹⁵¹ *ibid.*, p.7

¹⁵² *ibid.*, p.7

¹⁵³ Luke, 'A Training-Ship Institution', p333

¹⁵⁴ 'Sir Richard Temple and Hill Colonization', p.76

Conclusion

Middle-class Britons in India invented their racial prestige not simply vis-à-vis the Indians they governed. The existence of the domiciled class also played a role. As the previous chapter showed, British organised their lives in the colony in ways that permitted minimum contact with the land and the peoples they colonised. They disparaged those people of their own racial origin who were seen as having lost their European sense of self, whether by tropical influences or by miscegenation. This chapter, however, has demonstrated that this exclusionary attitude of the middle-class colonials towards these 'inauthentic' Britons was only one part of a multilayered picture. The middle-class British were fully awake to the fact that the impoverishment of this section of Indian society would degrade their own collective racial prestige, which was essential for colonial rule. For even if they belittled them as a 'degenerate race', the domiciled class still belonged to the British body politic by descent, religion and language. If they were 'not European enough', they were never 'Indian' in any positive sense, either. This made the domiciled class, albeit ambiguously, a member of the British community. In order to countervail this perceived threat of internal disorder, the colonial authorities re-made the domiciled class into a social category through which state and philanthropic policies could be muscled. As was explicitly seen in the cases of the PC and CDCEC, they created a strange brand of imperial philanthropy. It was often done in the name of Christianity, but differed markedly from the 'civilising mission' of converting the non-Christians of the Empire. The aim of this philanthropy was obviously not to spread Christianity, but to save its name from those who would undermine its image and, by extension, the imperial myth. What the ruling British feared was that their European prestige would be threatened by a contradiction, not from outside, but from *within* the body politic.

The inclusionary aspect of this construction of the category of the domiciled class was inclusive only in the sense that it provided policy measures which controlled the people in question. It is important to note that inclusion never meant a levelling of material inequalities within the white community in India. The policies of inclusion did not aim at bridging the sharp distinction between the 'British' and their 'domiciled' brethren. If anything, they wished to reinstate and fix such a distinction. As we have seen, the common philanthropic argument was that the domiciled people had to *unlearn* their aspiration to 'live like Europeans'. The regeneration of the community had to start from the realisation of its members that they were *not* as 'British' as their non-domiciled counterpart. And many of the actual policies proposed by European philanthropy positively looked *outside* the mainstream of British Indian society. The philanthropists were in sober realisation that the domiciled community, with their class and racial complexities, had little room in the political and economic life of colonial society. Policies such as military discipline, marine discipline, agricultural resettlement, and emigration, all meant to remove the domiciled class from the colonising context altogether. It would only be in the outside that the problem of European pauperism would be solved. Thus the policy of philanthropic inclusion was simultaneously an imperial politics that pushed 'impure' elements elsewhere.