

Exploring Social History Of Colonial India: Issue Of The Mixed Race Children (1765-1857 AD) Social Issues Mixed Race Children Faced During Colonial Period 1765-1857 A.D

Usha Devulapalli

Affiliation: Banasthali Vidyapith
Corresponding Author: Usha Devulapalli

Date of Submission: 07-05-2018

Date of acceptance: 21-05-2018

I INTRODUCTION

The Industrial Revolution that took place in Europe caused the early settlers to search for a region enriched with the raw materials that could be used in the newly built industries. The rationale behind this search was to acquire the resource materials from the region and to identify a potential market where the finished goods could be marketed. Europeans kept an eye on India, as it was a land of plentiful resources and a potential market. Thus, the early settlers targeted India as their destination. The country was accessible to the world, after Vasco Da Gama, the Portuguese and the Dutch explorer, discovered the sea route to India in 1498. Through this route, many of the Europeans, if not all, travelled to India. As the gates were wide open to these travellers, the citizens of India underwent several impacts, due to the influence of European culture, socially, politically, culturally, and religiously¹. In order to stay in India for a long period of time, the early settlers did leave their members of their families in their homeland. Such a long stay away from the homeland caused the early settlers especially the military personnel to have relationships with indigenous women. These relationships did involve other European settlers of India like the Dutch, the French, and the Portuguese and not only limited to the officials of East India Company alone. There were many long-term and temporary relationships with the indigenous women of India involving the European settlers and when these settlers had to leave India, they hardly provided any financial support to their indigenous spouses². These relationships, to a great extent, did not end up in wedlock, as these men did not feel responsible and committed³.

As the British colonialism in India began, the condition somewhat changed. Like any other European settler, the British officers left their immediate and extended family members back home in Great Britain and settled in India. Some British officers married the indigenous women clandestinely from the 1790's or maintained harems or hired them as the servant maids at their homes and continued their relationships. At the same time, it can also be said that these officers were accustomed to the prevailing culture in India and its customs and started to become Indianised due to their relationships⁴. In the famous guide book "*East India Vade Mecum (1810)*" authored by Captain Thomas Williamson, the custom of having Indian mistresses had been defended saying that maintaining European wives was costlier than having Indian mistresses. Thus, it is possible to see that, in this period of time, many settlers had relationships with the local women. Even though these relationships did not result in matrimony, they were open and loud. Certain officers provided financial assistance for their native spouses in their last wills by risking their military and other types of careers, thus challenging the political system⁵. However, the major concern in light of these relationships is the children born out of such relationships. They had to face the social stigmata and had to bear the full brunt of the social issues.

¹Tiscali, "Women in a Man's Empire," *Myweb*, 2016, <http://myweb.tiscali.co.uk/kenanderson/histempsequel/page7.html>.

²Erica Wald, "From Begums and Bibis to Abandoned Females and Idle Women," ed. Eleanor Newbiggin, Leigh Denault, and Rohit De, *The Indian Economic & Social History Review* 46, no. 1 (January 5, 2009): 5–25, doi:10.1177/001946460804600102.

³Indrani Sen, *Woman and Empire: Representations in the Writings of British India, 1858-1900* (New Dehi: Orient Longman, 2002).

⁴Flavia Agnes, *Women and Law in India: An Omnibus*, Oxford University Press (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004).

⁵Bina Agarwal, "Gender and Command over Property: A Critical Gap in Economic Analysis and Policy in South Asia," *World Development* 22, no. 10 (October 1994): 1455–78, doi:10.1016/0305-750X(94)90031-0..

Therefore, this paper explores the social issues faced by the mixed-race children born out of interracial relationships between the native women and the British settlers. The social issues include predicament of identity, social exclusion, and the problem of being treated as “other.”

II BRITISH OFFICERS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH NATIVE WOMEN

The British soldiers, who came to India during the East India Company’s rule, were under the commitment of settling in India. Such stay would usually end up with their deaths as they would live their full life time in India; however, a few of them would have a chance of going back to their original homeland, Britain⁶. As the British soldiers had higher skills and literacy rate, they came to India with an idea of settling and continuing to live in the country. Hence the British nationals filled up various positions like sepoy regiments in the public works projects overseas and also book-keeping and clerical cadres in the Non Commissioned Officer (NCO) creed⁷. These people who arrived in India to serve the British Empire in colonial India got married to Christian women in India or Eurasians or the indigenous women and started to set up the families. As the officers mingled well with the local population in India, they acclimatised themselves with the native habits and customs and became “almost native.” As they blended well, they were attracted to *bibis* called “sleeping dictionaries” from whom the settlers leaned of the local convention⁸. The children born out of such relationships and marriages were called Anglo-Indians.^{9,10}

III MIXED MARRIAGES

The British officers of the company were willing to start the relationships during the colonial era with native women without any commitment or obligation, as it was easy for them to have relationships in India, but still could have British wives and children in Britain, as they had indifferent and low opinion about oriental culture because of their supreme attitude that was the result of Victorian ideologies. Due to the rampant attitude and discrimination that were widespread at that time, they did like to have a relationship that would be free of any moral obligation. Dalrymple¹¹ estimates that one out of three British officers belonging to 17th century had relationships with the native women that did end up in wedlock. Bell¹² observes that the imperialists were afraid of a rebellion by the Indian soldiers, as the soldiers from Britain exploited the native Indian women. Therefore, the racial echeleons were made rigid by the British administration banning the interracial relationships. Moreover, the financial assistance was not provided for the women who were less than the elite class, even though domestic support was provided by them. The domestic support was not a solid agreement however, but instead British officers paying out of deference to their wedding. However, many officers did not leave their native spouses without any financial assistance¹³. The British administration also feared a possible rebellion, if the financial assistance was refused for the native spouses of the British soldiers, and the impending harm to the Empire as a result.

The stability of the governing bodies was also put to test and this resulted in further apprehension in the minds of the administrators, when the conflicts arose between the judicial system and the “Company’s charitable institution.” Providing the pension for the widows of British officers and the children belonging to the mixed race was the core of the conflicts. Moreover, this argument was seen as a result of the rise of the Anglo-Indian families on all spheres – social, national, and legal.

As per the statement of the board of the East India Company charitable institution, the British government should provide the financial aid in the form of pension for the widows of the British officers in India. But this financial aid was actually obtained by the native Indian women rather than the British wives of these officers. Therefore, the East India Company insisted that, if the financial aid had to be availed, either parent had to be from the British ancestry. The screening of the wives’ names for the British ancestry was done, supposing that if the names were Christian, then they would be of British origin. However, the native Indian spouses and their mixed race children born out of the relationship with the British officers had Christian names

⁶Abhijit Banerjee and Lakshmi Iyer, “History, Institutions, and Economic Performance: The Legacy of Colonial Land Tenure Systems in India,” *The American Economic Review* 95, no. 4 (2005): 1190–1213.

⁷Liesbeth Coppin, “The British-Indian Experience: Flora Annie Steel as an Unconventional ‘Memsahib’” (universiteit gent, 2010).

⁸Pran Nevile, *Sahibs’ India: Vignettes from the Raj*, Penguin Books India (New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 2010).

⁹Coppin, “The British-Indian Experience: Flora Annie Steel as an Unconventional ‘Memsahib.’”

¹⁰Carina Ray, “Chapter 11. Interracial Sex and the Making of Empire,” in *In A Companion to Diaspora and Transnationalism* (Hoboken: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2013), doi:10.1111/b.9781405188265.2013.00012.x.

¹¹British Identity and Society, “British Identity and Society,” *The Guardian*, 2002, <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2002/dec/09/britishidentity.india> and Society.

¹²Emma Bell, “Normalising the Exceptional : British Colonial Policing Cultures Come Home,” *Mémoire(s), Identité(s), Marginalité(s) Dans Le Monde Occidental Contemporain* 10, no. 9 (July 25, 2013), doi:10.4000/mimmoc.1286.

¹³Kathleen Wilson, *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840* (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

and hence this attempt was a failure. Many mixed race families came out, as many of the mixed race children in these families had been baptised with English names¹⁴.

A few of the interracial families were not legitimate and this also created a furore and dispute. Some children who were fathered by the high-ranking British officers because of their relationships with the native Indian women were sent to England to be brought up by their English relatives in order to make them acceptable in the English society. However, this did not go down well with the native women because of undermining of the maternal ancestry. Moreover, these women were not empowered enough to exercise their rights on these officers. An example of such scenario comes from the family of historian Dalrymple himself, which involves Mooti Begum Dalrymple. The historian, William Dalrymple, was scrutinising the historical material and wills at the Indian British library. At that time, he came to know of Mooti Begum Dalrymple, who was his ancestor, James Dalrymple's spouse. In his account, he was of the view that her name was purposefully blacked out in all the familial records that he was able to get. This otherwise would mean that the maternal ancestry in this case was intentionally blacked out. Moreover, he also found out that both Mooti Begum and James Dalrymple divided the responsibility of bringing up their children between themselves according to the gender of the children. According to the agreement between them, two boys were brought to the then Madras from the city of Hyderabad from where they were transported to Ireland to be raised as English children in order to embrace James' English society. However, one girl child called Noor Jah Begum was looked after in Hyderabad and brought up as Muslim¹⁵.

There were reports, as per the research done by Chatterjee¹⁶, along similar lines, that the British officers in India were also worried about the erosion of their whites' lineage because of their relationships with the indigenous Indian women, as their civic laws and that of India were totally different. The civic laws of the British society are based on the governance whereas the Indian civic laws were highly based on the cultural and religious identities of the people. So the East India Company administration was very much worried about the problems associated with the classification of these mixed-race children and their future. The imperial administration, with respect to the indigenous women, was very apprehensive that these women had the moral rights to be supported by the officers, who had the moral obligations to these women.

According to Iceland and Nelson¹⁷, the indigenous people and the British were demarcated along the residential lines. However, as per the opinion of the officers at higher ranks, the social prejudice would harm the children belonging to the mixed race. Jones¹⁸ points that the local people and the society criticised the cohabitation of English officers with the local women devoid of any moral binding on the relationship. The obvious fear of the imperial government was that the mixed race children would run into the financial trouble and they would not get any financial aid from the officers for their education and growth.

Ghosh¹⁹ tells that the English government was concerned that English officers were obliged to ensure the social status and bequeath the estates to the mixed race children. Wills' officers had had the interracial marriages and their native spouses were not left with much of the support. This meant that the spouse's financial rights were not ensured. The officers were reluctant to provide the same privileges for their native spouses as those entitled to their British spouses. Even though the English officers did not endow the same financial liberty as that of their British counterparts with their native spouses, they were obligated to the children born out of the relationship. As these officers, traders, merchants, and civil servants belonged to the worldwide renowned empire, they are very much conscious of the differences. Mani²⁰ says that such a mingling of the officers with the native community would undermine the prestige, value, and respect for the empire because of the eradication of the white lineage.

Newton²¹ echoed the same opinion that there would be an impending danger to imperial rule that could be caused by the rise of the Anglo-Indian societies. They were also worried that the political authority of the

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵William Dalrymple, "British Identity and Society," *The Guardian*, 2002, <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2002/dec/09/britishidentity.india>.

¹⁶Nandini Chatterjee, "English Law, Brahma Marriage, and the Problem of Religious Difference: Civil Marriage Laws in Britain and India," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52, no. 3 (2010): 524–52, doi:10.1017/S0010417510000290.

¹⁷John Iceland and Kyle Anne Nelson, "The Residential Segregation of Mixed-Nativity Married Couples," *Demography* 47, no. 4 (November 2010): 869–93, doi:10.1007/BF03213731.

¹⁸Antwan Jones, "Stability of Men's Interracial First Unions: A Test of Educational Differentials and Cohabitation History," *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 31, no. 2 (June 17, 2010): 241–56, doi:10.1007/s10834-010-9186-3.

¹⁹Durba Ghosh, *Sex and the Family in Colonial India: The Making of Empire* (Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

²⁰Braj Ranjan Mani, *Debrahmanising History: Dominance and Resistance in Indian Society* (New Delhi: Manohar Publishers & Distributors, 2008).

²¹Melanie .J Newton, "The King v. Robert James, a Slave, for Rape: Inequality, Gender, and British Slave Amelioration, 1823-1834," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 47, no. 3 (2005): 583, https://www.jstor.org/stable/3879392?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.

English empire could be periled due to the gradual erosion of the pure English society. The British officers were also afraid of the the legal status demanded by the native women. Pomfret²² in this line of thought demonstrates that the indigenous women asked for ensuring their legal status. Because of this, the colonial government had to re-evaluate their financial, social, and legal frameworks by reconsidering their definition as to who should be classified as citizens of Britain²³.

Beresford and Omaji²⁴ provide the same viewpoints as that of Pomfret²⁵ as can be seen from the description of criminal and civil case studies that exposed so many inequalities in the colonial arrangements of physical relationships between the British officers and the native women. In light of this fact, the case of Khair un Nissa, who was the wife of the officer Kirkpatrick, who was endowed with the right to property by Kirkpatrick whereas many women belonging to lower echelons battled the obscurity. This revealed that the opportunity that the indigenous women should bargain with the governing bodies of British Empire implied that they fought for their rights to the financial aid and their rights to the property as the wives of the officers.

IV THE IDENTITY PROBLEM OF MIXED-RACE CHILDREN

On account of the direct policies of the Dutch, the Portuguese, and the British colonists and traders, the Anglo-Indians came to the fore in the society. In the 18th century, the term “Anglo-Indian” was coined by the English General, Warren Hastings to refer to the children of mixed race. The problem of “identity” was the chief issue encountered by the Anglo-Indian community. It was not easy, in the early years of imperial rule, to answer the question “Who am I?” by the people belonging to the Anglo-Indian community. One gold mohur or pagoda was sanctioned for the mixed race children born out of relationship between the European father and the native women as the family allowance by the East India Company (that was established in the year 1629) directors²⁶. These children served as the interface between the subjects and the rulers and also as a defence for the British Empire, as they were called “country-born” and assimilated into the Anglo-Indian society. The support like this, the treatment that these children were not seen differently from the English people and the employment offer for the Anglo-Indians into the East India Company encouraged the community.

Higher education was offered to the Anglo-Indian children by transporting them to England. In order to educate the children of Anglo-Indian community and make them employable into the public services, schools were started in Bangalore, Madras, Lucknow, and other cities where the British settled²⁷. Hence, in the 16th century, the Anglo-Indian community was the by-product of the British Empire expansion in India. The interracial marriage between the native Indian women and the British officers was given support during the time of colonial expansion. However, once the British colony was well-established in India, the support was stopped lest the mixed-race community pose a danger to the empire. Therefore, the situation changed gradually. The Anglo-Indians were removed from the army. They were denied entry into the military, civil, and marine positions. Owing to these restraints, they saw a discriminatory treatment against them, as they were once treated on a par with the British and they imbibed the British culture. The employment opportunities were also closed for them. Hence, they were distanced from the British Empire. Gaikwad comments that “these measures reduced the Anglo-Indian to political impotence and social degradation”²⁸. The Anglo-Indians were to live in that new situation; however, this situation was dynamic. The researcher Cottrell observes that, at first, the Anglo-Indians were denied jobs and then they were favoured in many positions²⁹.

The British distanced themselves from the coloured people by the 19th century; however, acknowledged the fairer (and richer) people – the Anglo-Indians, who have two kinds of ancestry. “Eurasian” was the name given to the poor and dark-skinned people. Anglo-Indians were recognised as the British subjects and British descent. In order to avoid the discrimination, other people also claimed that they were British, but the colonial government refused to recognise them. Even then, the Anglo-Indians were not seen as the kinsmen of the British. They were considered “half-caste” or inferior to their daughters and sons in the Great Britain.

²²David M. Pomfret, “Raising Eurasia: Race, Class, and Age in French and British Colonies,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51, no. 2 (2009): 314–43, https://www.jstor.org/stable/40270329?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.

²³Ann McGrath, “Consent, Marriage and Colonialism: Indigenous Australian Women and Colonizer Marriages,” *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 6, no. 3 (2005): 57–66, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/192181>.

²⁴Quentin Beresford and Paul Omaji, *Our State of Mind: Racial Planning and the Stolen Generations* (Fremantle: Fremantle Arts Centre Press, 2000).

²⁵Pomfret, “Raising Eurasia: Race, Class, and Age in French and British Colonies.”

²⁶C Younger, *Anglo-Indians from 1919-1983: Images of a Community in Transition* (New South Wales: University of Sydney, 1984).

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹A-B Cottrell, “Today’s Asian-Western Couples Are Not Anglo-Indians,” *Phylon* 40, no. 4 (1979): 351–61, <http://home.alphalink.com.au/~agilbert/paisj.html>.

By imitating the British, the Anglo-Indians handled this problem to some extent. Therefore, they did like themselves to be called the “Anglo-Indians” instead of “Eurasians”, as the term “Eurasian” was a generalized term whereas the term “Anglo-Indian” meant a close proximity with the British.³⁰

In the late 19th century, the marriages took place inside the community, which helped with the expansion of the community. The colonial government did not accept the marriage between the Anglo-Indian or Indian and the British³¹. So, marrying an Anglo-Indian or Indian woman became highly unacceptable for the British belonging to the high status, but low-status British did mingle with the Indians or Anglo-Indians.

The Anglo-Indians like the British embraced all the biases towards the coloured people and this highly irked the native people. Therefore, both the Indian and British communities refused to accept the Anglo-Indian community. Therefore, the Anglo-Indian community was caught between the mistrust of the native Indian people and the supreme attitude of the European community owing to their westernised mannerisms and the distance that they kept.

The Anglo-Indians were seen as different from other Indians at the cultural and social levels, even though they were biologically kinsmen of native Indians. According to Gaikwad, “... mid-way between two cultural worlds, and under the peculiar conditions of their origin and socio-cultural development, Anglo-Indians could never get to know the West to which they aspired to belong, nor did they have emotional ties with India where they really belonged...”. Therefore, throughout their existence, their situation was in limbo and they were discriminated.

The thinkers and philosophers like Taylor³² specify that the discussion on the problem of identity is a long-drawn debate since old times and is not new to this world. Taylor identifies the source of the discussion on identity and the related concepts in the European society. He theorises that there is a logical and intimate association between the concepts of “vital human need” and “inwardly derived, personal, original identity” within a society for the realisation of the identity.

“My discovering my own identity doesn’t mean that I work it out in isolation, but that I negotiate it through dialogue, partly overt, partly internal, with others. That is why the development of an ideal of inwardly generated identity gives a new importance to recognition. My own identity crucially depends on my dialogical relations with others ... Yet inwardly derived, personal identity doesn’t enjoy this recognition a priori. It has to win it through exchange, and the attempt can fail. What has come about with the modern age is not the need for recognition but the conditions in which the attempt to be recognised can fail.” (Taylor, C. in Docker and Fischer).³³

As per Fisher and Soon, the people are affiliated to many psychological communities. Moreover, every person belongs to a specific primary community which can provide and strengthen the values, norms, identities, social support systems, and structures with which the members of the community can live. In some cases, the people belonging to a particular group try to get affiliated themselves to a specific community, but they are disallowed by the members of that community. These researchers explore the reactions of the Anglo-Indians and coloured South African people, who tried to integrate with the Western society. These people tried to shed away their indigenous identities and traditions and improve their culture and the language that they shared with the Westerners by means of relative advantage, borrowing of the status, and the social comparison. But the Europeans rejected their integration into their societies as “inferiors”, though not summarily; they were accorded the status higher than that of indigenous people. The researchers found out that these distances and differences which were fabricated with the social milieu based on the racism, communities, marginalisation, and negative results that were related to the disapproval were due to the psychological and social manifestations to subdue the interest of the people who were desirous of integrating with a primary community. Therefore, these researchers state that the community level responses are to be analysed and not the individual responses in order to recognise the reaction to the suppression and oppression.

While communicating with the “significant others”, it is truly apparent that a sense of “identity” is developed (George Herbert Mead in Docker and Fischer).³⁴ Moreover, it is also equally important that such identity should be recognised and thus it should be confirmed.³⁵ Several definitions of identity surfaced throughout much of the 18th century from the Indian and European scholars. Hence, under the prevailing situation, it was very difficult for the Anglo-Indians to define their community identity more clearly. It was

³⁰M Bose, “One Corner of an Indian Slum That Is Forever England,” *New Society* 47, no. 848 (1979): 7–9, <http://home.alphalink.com.au/~agilbert/paisj.html>.

³¹Younger, *Anglo-Indians from 1919-1983: Images of a Community in Transition*.

³²Charles Taylor’s, “Knowledge and the Self: Charles Taylor’s Sources of the Self,” *SUNY Presspress*, accessed March 9, 2018, <http://sunypress.edu/pdf/60558.pdf>.

³³John Docker and Gerhard Fischer, *Race, Colour and Identity in Australia and New Zealand* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 2000).

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid.

perception of the Europeans that Anglo-Indians were Indians having some European lineage. On the contrary, Indians saw them as European with some Indian lineage.

Whether the discrimination against the Anglo-Indian population is imaginary or real, but the discrimination that they themselves had against the native Indians was affecting their own identity.³⁶ Several Anglo-Indians also thought that the Indians treated them as intruders and they did not consider them as true and genuine Indians. While speaking about the identity of Anglo-Indians, one Indian in Bombay pointed out, "Go to any Anglo-Indian home and what do you see? Almost invariably a picture of the British Royal Family." This is the perception of several Indians about the Anglo-Indian community, even though this is half-truth without any doubt.³⁷ "Because of their alienation from both the British and the Indians they were literally forced to think of themselves as a people apart and this self-image has persisted".³⁸ Therefore, it was not easy for them to provide a suitable answer to the question - "Who am I?"

V SOCIAL EXCLUSION

The problem pertaining to the racial exclusion or inclusion in the colonial administration in India was having close link with the classification of "poor whites" and the control of the middle class over their lives, while analysing the class dimension of miscegenation. The aspects of racial exclusion and inclusion were affecting very much the perception of people belonging to the mixed race in the colonial era during the mid-19th century.

In the large section of the mixed-race population, there was a notable underclass formation during the 19th century. This was caused by the "Indianisation" of the colonial public services in the late 19th century that vehemently happened all over the colonial India. The underlying principle of "Indianisation" was the recruitment of the native people in the colonial public services instead of mixed-race people because the cost-efficiency was able to be achieved by the colonial government, as the native people could be employed at lower wages than the mixed-race people. In addition, through this conciliatory arrangement (instead of conflict), political control could also be accomplished. On account of this development, the percentage of mixed-race people employed at the clerical cadre came down, between 1840 and 1890, from 99% to 18%.³⁹ The Anglo-Indian community was traditionally dependent on civil employment and this downsizing of the Anglo-Indian community affected it greatly.

The British population increased in India and this coincided with the sudden impoverishment of the mixed-race people and the decline in their employment in the public services. Both the mixed race and poor whites were classified together to be called the "domiciled class." Even though domiciled class was not very prominent numerically (approximately 200,000), this class tried to catch the attention of the English authorities. Among the British middle class in the late 19th century, the "Eurasian Question" was a very prominent issue and this pertained to the social problems faced by the mixed race and poor white people.

Irrespective of the origin of the people whether poor white or mixed race, the people classified as "domiciled" were seen differently from the "whites." They were seen as the "race apart." This viewpoint let the critics of "Eurasian Question" argue that, as they were not integral part of the British society, they should be declined all the benefits and concessions that they enjoyed so far. In the year 1979, this could be seen in The Calcutta Review,

"The ['domiciled'] race, it seem to me, must ultimately merge into the general population of the country. [...] let him throw off the feeling which prompts this isolation [from Indian society], let him declare himself a fellow countryman to the rest of the people of India, and it will be seen that the Indianisation which must necessarily be the moulding force of his character, will become [...] the means of great and good results."⁴⁰

The social exclusion of the "domiciled class" from the race was also accompanied with the legal exclusion. The people belonging to the "domiciled class" were accorded the legal status called "Statutory Natives of India" in the beginning of the 1870s. This was done with the aim that the "domiciled class" could draw the benefits of "Indianisation" that was taking place in the governmental services locally. The underpinning principle of the social exclusion of the "domiciled class" from the mainstream middle class of the whites was negative and ambivalent definition given to the "domiciled class" as "not quite white" instead of

³⁶N.P Gist, "The Anglo-Indians of India." in *The Blending of Races: Marginality and Identity in World Perspective*, ed. N.P Gist and A.G Dworkin (New York: Wiley Interscience, 1972); N.P Gist and R.D Wright, *Marginality and Identity: Anglo-Indians as a Racially Mixed Minority in India* (Netherlands: Noel Pitts Gist, 1973).

³⁷Gist, "The Anglo-Indians of India." in *The Blending of Races: Marginality and Identity in World Perspective*.

³⁸Ibid. p.6.

³⁹Hathi Trust, "Report of the Pauperism Committee," *Hathi Trust*, 1892, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/100523096>.

⁴⁰Anonymous, "The Anglo-Indian Question," *The Calcutta Review* 69 (1879): 382-91, <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=satoshimizutani.pdf&site=15>.

identifying them with “native” population. However, the people belonging to the “domiciled” were not even considered as “natives” and gradually ousted from the process of “Indianisation” subsequently.⁴¹

Problem of being treated as ‘others’

During the nineteenth and twentieth century of India, individuals belonging to the European heritage were classified into three groups. The first one is the wealthier Europeans, who didn’t have any problem economically to maintain continuous interaction with the metropole by taking up periodic journeys between India and Britain. The second were Europeans but termed as ‘domiciled’ in the Indian country, and were generally not that rich than the transients. The third is the Eurasians/Anglo-Indians. India was never found to be an appropriate destination for the Britons who are contemplating on settling abroad in the permanent basis. Countries like Australia, Canada, South Africa, New Zealand, Kenya, or Rhodesia were rather promoted for this.⁴² Due to the above-mentioned reason, those who lost contact with Britain were generally linked with the racially mixed through colonial elites. Their original ancestry not taken into concern, they experienced the same drawbacks like the Anglo-Indian community. This in turn doesn’t fall in the scope of whiteness, besides its associated privileges. John Hartigan has coined ‘intra-racial othering’ with regard to the present-day USA in relation to this aspect; the term consigned ‘domicile Europeans’ into a type of racial category considered inferior due to this geography and class. This was practiced by more wealthy Britons living in India.⁴³

For the purpose of maintaining a barrier between the Eurasian and British, there were various legal restrictions and social norms. However, this barrier never turned out to have sweeping effect. Similarly, the Eurasians functioning mainly in the form government servants at the time of the British rule were strongly related with colonial rule and overthrow of the British, as far as the mindset of the Indians was concerned. Both the Indians and the British considered the European and Indian ancestry as a problem.⁴⁴

They comprised a small set of population; they mostly didn’t have any political power besides well-being. A closed area between the colonised and the colonist restricted the living of the Anglo Indians. They suffered from national problems and also colonial dominance. They were restricted from getting into the British legal system with regard to the Regulation VIII of 1813,⁴⁵ in the initial stage. For the purpose of removing the preconceived notions residing on the minds of youth Anglo-Indians against involving in businesses, a brochure was written in 1821. Another pamphlet was in trail with this; it was formed by the East Indian Committee. The Committee requested the British Parliament for taking care of their complaints.

The improvement in the position of the Anglo Indians within the country was recognized by John William Ricketts. He, being a forerunner in this, started on this mission to England. His attempts fructified and as result the Indian Government was asked to provide government jobs to Anglo-Indians post April 1834.⁴⁶ This adheres to the Act of Parliament which was earlier passed during August 1833.

Several British women entered India with their family of British army and officers. This can be attributed to the primary reason for the building of the Anglo Indian Community, which is marriage. Because of this British men were not that inclined in tying the knot with Indian women. Post the Rebellion that happened in 1857⁴⁷, the concept of intermarriage saw an abolishment. Due to this, the Indians and British people in India ignored the Anglo Indians.

The future generations saw the Anglo-Indians inter-marrying other Anglo-Indians. This ended up in the coming up of a separate community. This community eventually got a distinct culture. The important elements including food, language, religion (Christianity), and clothing assisted them in distinguishing them from the other population. Several other factors instigated a strong sense of unity that was prevailing in the Anglo-Indian population. They were in unity due to their British-focused culture, their English schooling system, and also their religious philosophies, with the dominance of Christianity.

Since most of these people were talked in relation with the British people, they faced antagonism and cynicism from their Indian contemporaries. The nationalists also did the same. This caused great predicament to the Anglo-Indians. A feeling of faithfulness towards their British ancestry besides their Indian partnership arose.

⁴¹Satoshi Mizutani, “Rethinking Inclusion and Exclusion: The Question of Mixed-Race Presence in Late Colonial India,” *Journal of Contemporary History*, 2002, 1–22.

⁴²Arnold, “White Colonization,” *Arnold*, accessed March 8, 2018, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09612020000200242.p.154>.

⁴³John Hartigan, “Unpopular Culture: The Case of ‘white Trash,’” *Cultural Studies* 11, no. 2 (May 1997): 316–43, doi:10.1080/09502389700490171. p. 317

⁴⁴Alison Blunt, *Domicile and Diaspora: Anglo-Indian Women and the Spatial Politics of Home* (United States, 2011).

⁴⁵Bodleian Library, *Accounts and Papers (2) East-India Affairs: Annual Revenue Account's* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1821), https://books.google.co.in/books?id=1TFbAAAAQAAJ&dq=Regulation+VIII+of+1813&source=gbs_navlinks_s.

⁴⁶World Heritage Encyclopedia, “Anglo-Indian,” *World Heritage Encyclopedia*, 2018, <http://central.gutenberg.org/articles/eng/Anglo-Indian>.

⁴⁷Douglas M. Peers, “Sepoy Mutiny (1857-1859),” in *The Encyclopedia of War* (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2011), doi:10.1002/9781444338232.wbeow565.

Since the country made it compulsory to be a part of the independence movement of India so as to maintain a post in Government offices, they felt insecure.

VI CONCLUSION

This paper probes the social issues faced by the children of mixed race during the period 1756-1857. The foundation of the colonial social order was the interracial relationships that were an element of governance and early colonial state formation in British India. Moreover, the interaction between the native people and the British was very complex and hence the social exclusion and inclusion were difficult and equivocal. By investigating the important issues on which this problem based, essentially sexuality, race, and class, this paper indicates that the offshoot of the colonial prestige was the social stigma and other associated travails faced by the mixed-race children. Thus, this paper emphasises the benefits of re-examining the role of race and class to the colonialism historiography.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Agarwal, Bina. "Gender and Command over Property: A Critical Gap in Economic Analysis and Policy in South Asia." *World Development* 22, no. 10 (October 1994): 1455–78. doi:10.1016/0305-750X(94)90031-0.
- [2]. Agnes, Flavia. *Women and Law in India: An Omnibus*. Oxford University Press, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [3]. Anonymous. "The Anglo-Indian Question." *The Calcutta Review* 69 (1879): 382–91. <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=satoshimizutani.pdf&site=15>.
- [4]. Arnold. "White Colonization." *Arnold*. Accessed March 8, 2018. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/0961202000200242>.
- [5]. Banerjee, Abhijit, and Lakshmi Iyer. "History, Institutions, and Economic Performance: The Legacy of Colonial Land Tenure Systems in India." *The American Economic Review* 95, no. 4 (2005): 1190–1213.
- [6]. Bell, Emma. "Normalising the Exceptional: British Colonial Policing Cultures Come Home." *Mémoire(s), Identité(s), Marginalité(s) Dans Le Monde Occidental Contemporain* 10, no. 9 (July 25, 2013). doi:10.4000/mimmoc.1286.
- [7]. Beresford, Quentin, and Paul Omaji. *Our State of Mind: Racial Planning and the Stolen Generations*. Fremantle: Fremantle Arts Centre Press, 2000.
- [8]. Blunt, Alison. *Domicile and Diaspora: Anglo-Indian Women and the Spatial Politics of Home*. United States, 2011.
- [9]. Bodleian Library. *Accounts and Papers (2) East-India Affairs: Annual Revenue Account's*. Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1821. https://books.google.co.in/books?id=1TFbAAAAQAAJ&dq=Regulation+VIII+of+1813&source=gbs_navlinks_s.
- [10]. Bose, M. "One Corner of an Indian Slum That Is Forever England." *New Society* 47, no. 848 (1979): 7–9. <http://home.alphalink.com.au/~agilbert/paisj.html>.
- [11]. Chatterjee, Nandini. "English Law, Brahma Marriage, and the Problem of Religious Difference: Civil Marriage Laws in Britain and India." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52, no. 3 (2010): 524–52. doi:10.1017/S0010417510000290.
- [12]. Coppin, Liesbeth. "The British-Indian Experience: Flora Annie Steel as an Unconventional 'Memsahib.'" universiteit gent, 2010.
- [13]. Cottrell, A-B. "Today's Asian-Western Couples Are Not Anglo-Indians." *Phylon* 40, no. 4 (1979): 351–61. <http://home.alphalink.com.au/~agilbert/paisj.html>.
- [14]. Dalrymple, William. "British Identity and Society." *The Guardian*, 2002. <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2002/dec/09/britishidentity.india>.
- [15]. Docker, John, and Gerhard Fischer. *Race, Colour and Identity in Australia and New Zealand*. Sydney: UNSW Press, 2000.
- [16]. Ghosh, Durba. *Sex and the Family in Colonial India: The Making of Empire*. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [17]. Gist, N.P. "The Anglo-Indians of India." in *The Blending of Races: Marginality and Identity in World Perspective*. Edited by N.P. Gist and A.G. Dworkin. New York: Wiley Interscience, 1972.
- [18]. Gist, N.P., and R.D. Wright. *Marginality and Identity: Anglo-Indians as a Racially Mixed Minority in India*. Netherlands: Noel Pitts Gist, 1973.
- [19]. Hartigan, John. "Unpopular Culture: The Case of 'white Trash.'" *Cultural Studies* 11, no. 2 (May 1997): 316–43. doi:10.1080/09502389700490171.
- [20]. Hathi Trust. "Report of the Pauperism Committee." *Hathi Trust*, 1892. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/100523096>.
- [21]. Iceland, John, and Kyle Anne Nelson. "The Residential Segregation of Mixed-Nativity Married Couples." *Demography* 47, no. 4 (November 2010): 869–93. doi:10.1007/BF03213731.
- [22]. Jones, Antwan. "Stability of Men's Interracial First Unions: A Test of Educational Differentials and Cohabitation History." *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 31, no. 2 (June 17, 2010): 241–56. doi:10.1007/s10834-010-9186-3.
- [23]. Mani, Braj Ranjan. *Debrahmanising History: Dominance and Resistance in Indian Society*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers & Distributors, 2008.
- [24]. McGrath, Ann. "Consent, Marriage and Colonialism: Indigenous Australian Women and Colonizer Marriages." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 6, no. 3 (2005): 57–66. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/192181>.
- [25]. Mizutani, Satoshi. "Rethinking Inclusion and Exclusion: The Question of Mixed-Race Presence in Late Colonial India." *Journal of Contemporary History*, 2002, 1–22.
- [26]. Nevile, Pran. *Sahibs' India: Vignettes from the Raj*. Penguin Books India. New Delhi: Penguin Books India, 2010.
- [27]. Newton, Melanie J. "The King v. Robert James, a Slave, for Rape: Inequality, Gender, and British Slave Amelioration, 1823-1834." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 47, no. 3 (2005): 583. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3879392?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.
- [28]. Peers, Douglas M. "Sepoy Mutiny (1857-1859)." In *The Encyclopedia of War*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2011. doi:10.1002/9781444338232.wbeow565.
- [29]. Pomfret, David M. "Raising Eurasia: Race, Class, and Age in French and British Colonies." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51, no. 2 (2009): 314–43. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40270329?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents.
- [30]. Ray, Carina. "Chapter 11. Interracial Sex and the Making of Empire." In *In A Companion to Diaspora and Transnationalism*. Hoboken: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2013. doi:10.1111/b.9781405188265.2013.00012.x.
- [31]. Sen, Indrani. *Woman and Empire: Representations in the Writings of British India, 1858-1900*. New Dehi: Orient Longman, 2002.
- [32]. Society, British Identity and. "British Identity and Society." *The Guardian*, 2002. <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2002/dec/09/britishidentity.india> and Society.

- [33]. Taylor's, Charles. "Knowledge and the Self: Charles Taylor's Sources of the Self." *SUNY Presspress*. Accessed March 9, 2018. <http://sunypress.edu/pdf/60558.pdf>.
- [34]. Tiscali. "Women in a Man's Empire." *Myweb*, 2016. <http://myweb.tiscali.co.uk/kenanderson/histempsequel/page7.html>.
- [35]. Wald, Erica. "From Begums and Bibis to Abandoned Females and Idle Women." Edited by Eleanor Newbigin, Leigh Denault, and Rohit De. *The Indian Economic & Social History Review* 46, no. 1 (January 5, 2009): 5–25. doi:10.1177/001946460804600102.
- [36]. Wilson, Kathleen. *A New Imperial History: Culture, Identity and Modernity in Britain and the Empire, 1660-1840*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [37]. World Heritage Encyclopedia. "Anglo-Indian." *World Heritage Encyclopedia*, 2018. <http://central.gutenberg.org/articles/eng/Anglo-Indian>.
- [38]. Younger, C. *Anglo-Indians from 1919-1983: Images of a Community in Transition*. New South Wales: University of Sydney, 1984.

Usha Devulapalli." "Exploring Social History Of Colonial India: Issue Of The Mixed Race Children (1765-1857 AD) Social Issues Mixed Race Children Faced During Colonial Period 1765-1857 A.D." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)* 7.05 (2018): 51-59.