

Working the Permit System

ANGLO-INDIAN IMMIGRATION TO NEW ZEALAND, 1920–1940



IN 1920, THE NEW ZEALAND PARLIAMENT PASSED the Immigration Restriction Amendment Act (IRAA). The permit system initiated by the legislation enabled the state to deny entry to ‘undesirable’ migrants without expressly discriminating by race or nationality, an aim that it shared with other settler colonies in this period.¹ Such was the elasticity of this legislation that it set the terms of non-British and non-Irish migration until the late 1940s – three decades that were characterized by major fluctuations in the political and economic drivers of global migrations. In New Zealand historiography, the Act has been afforded considerable weight as shaping a racialized view of the nation, and 1920 is unanimously regarded as a turning point following a series of earlier legislative attempts to restrict ‘Asian’ migration.² While I do not dispute that the Act was highly effective in halting the flow of Indian and Chinese migrants, this article enlarges upon a racialized reading of the IRAA by shifting the focus to three relatively under-studied arenas in the New Zealand context. First, rather than focusing on excluded migrants, my analysis explores a community categorized as ‘race aliens’, who *were* permitted to cross the border in the 1920s and 1930s. Second, I look beyond the static point of enactment of the IRAA to the *mechanisms* controlling its implementation over a 15-year period. Third, my study takes an economic perspective that aligns the state’s regulation and control of migration primarily with labour shortages.³

Between 1923 and 1939, 85 permits were issued to Anglo-Indian migrants to New Zealand, categorized as ‘Eurasian’ by the Immigration Department.⁴ Of these, 54 were granted to graduates of St Andrew’s Colonial Homes (hereafter ‘the Homes’) in Kalimpong, a hill station in the Darjeeling district of north-east India. The Homes emigration scheme had been operating since 1908, whereby the mixed-race offspring of British tea planters and South Asian women – children often rejected in their local communities, and facing an uncertain future upon their fathers’ inevitable return to Britain – were housed and educated at the Homes. There they were made ‘fit’ for colonial emigration, and sent to New Zealand as adolescent farm workers and domestic servants. My argument pivots around the ability of this institution

to navigate the new permit system, despite indications that New Zealand would follow Australia and refuse entry to Anglo-Indians. Indeed, the new legislation appears to have instilled a greater confidence in this scheme, evidenced by the increased numbers and visibility of Homes arrivals after its enforcement.⁵ The continuation of this scheme, which seemed a likely target for the new legislation, is attributable, I suggest, to the Presbyterian network that supported it and to the discretion exercised by immigration officials. Connecting these two causal factors reveals the particular value of New Zealand as a ground for deepening our understanding of this type of legislation. The small numbers of emigrants seeking entry under the permit system, along with the closely entangled political, professional and social Presbyterian circles in Wellington, cast a spotlight upon the intricacies of granting and denying permits in a place where reputed egalitarianism has persistently been a key motivator for migrants of various origins.

By emphasizing the role of bureaucrats in *facilitating* the entry of Anglo-Indian migrants from the Homes, this article reverses previous readings of the IRAA. As with other legislation of its type, the effectiveness (and longevity) of the Act was largely due to the opaqueness of the processes around its implementation.⁶ Simply put, after 1921, all prospective migrants of non-British and non-Irish birth and/or parentage were required to be in possession of a permit to enter New Zealand. The terms upon which one might be granted a permit, as this article will reinforce, were never clearly defined nor widely publicized.⁷ Applicants were refused without explanation and there was no process for appeal. However, the looseness of this process also afforded officials a high degree of positive discretion. Here I am interested in the mechanisms through which this flexible legislation functioned: the policies established at a government level for particular categories of immigrants; the practices developed by the Customs Department for adhering to these policies; and the influence of individual bureaucrats, who received and responded to enquiries, processed applications and either granted or denied permits. I examine these mechanisms by a close reading of the Customs Department file for 'Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese'.⁸ The correspondence collated in the file appears to concern those cases where permits were either not applied for or not granted, given that matching the enquiries to the permit register reveals that none were successful.

The article places these enquiries from the wider Anglo-Indian community alongside the rich archive generated by the Homes' interest in their 'New Zealanders' – those who did cross the border and settle in the Dominion. Embedding the Homes scheme in the debate about the cultural suitability of Anglo-Indians not only reveals the crucial role of connections within the

Customs Department and a nationwide Presbyterian network; it also enables us to trace shifts in policy and practice in the Department over a prolonged period, shifts which are shown here to be ultimately determined by economic realities. Labour shortages prompted by insufficient 'ideal' British settlers willing to perform the required manual labour had long seen the pool widened by relaxing 'standards' in terms of race, or class, or both. Heightened racial anxieties in the 1920s indeed prompted a harsh response to the feared influx of Asian workers, which ensured the continued use of the IRAA to exclude Chinese and Indian migrants. But this was feasible partly because a 'second tier' of labour (less than ideal, but acceptable) could be sourced elsewhere – from Kalimpong, for example, or from southern Europe. Hence Anglo-Indians and others who were granted permits in the 1920s are productively included in the category that David Roediger and James R. Barrett describe as 'new immigrants' in the United States: migrants who were invested in blending into the 'white' majority and whose eventual acceptance as such was crucial in the formation of the white working class.⁹

Examination of the Kalimpong scheme contributes to a growing body of excellent scholarship around the experiences of mixed-race people in New Zealand, by bringing a hitherto unexamined category to light – that of the mixed-race *migrant*.¹⁰ Indeed, the key shifts in anxieties revealed by the Customs Department files were from cultural concerns to economic expedience, and later to a clear directive that people of mixed descent were not desirable migrants. Beneath that final directive lay a tension not articulated in the Customs Department files but clearly exerting increasing pressure on officials in the 1930s: namely, India's imminent withdrawal from the British Empire in 1947, which fundamentally altered the relationship between India and other colonies, including New Zealand.¹¹ The notion of imperial reciprocity was a key theoretical lever for the founder of the Kalimpong scheme from the outset, but in practice the emigrants were caught in the repositioning and autonomy-seeking activities of both New Zealand and India in this period. These political shifts and divergences were apparent at an institutional level. Because Anglo-Indians occupied a problematic social space in India, institutions for such children assumed an entrenched role in the community there.¹² This was evidenced by the fact that all of the enquiries in the Customs Department file were written *on behalf of* Anglo-Indians. In essence these organizations in India were seeking information, advice and support from government officials in lieu of any 'partner' organizations in New Zealand. This mismatch highlights the absence of institutions for regulating and managing mixed-race communities in New Zealand, which itself points to important differences in the racial politics of the two colonies.¹³

The Homes emigration scheme has received recent scholarly attention in Andrew May's article 'Exiles from the Children's City'.¹⁴ While May includes a section on 'juvenile emigration', the article is chiefly an exploration of identity and the legacy of familial disruptions, paying little attention to the highly uneven trajectories of Homes graduates who were sent abroad directly from Kalimpong. May does not address the fact that New Zealand was the only colony ever to accept groups of emigrants from Kalimpong, but briefly contrasts the difficulties of entering Australia with the 'less draconian' policies of New Zealand. Yet the Kalimpong case can tell us much more by bringing the Dominion's border controls into a more strident conversation with scholarship that connects the development of nation states with global inscriptions of race and migration policy.¹⁵ More than just another rendering of this wave of race-based restrictions on mobility, the enactment and particular enforcement of the New Zealand legislation caused ripples around the empire. As I demonstrate below, neither the Homes emigration scheme, nor the permit system enacted by the IRAA, can be fully understood within a narrative of exclusion.

Pre-1920 Emigration from Kalimpong

The Homes were established in 1900 by the Reverend Dr John Anderson Graham. After a decade of missionary service with the Church of Scotland in Kalimpong, Graham returned to Britain to garner support for a scheme that would make educational and social provision for the mixed-race children he had encountered during his visits to tea plantations in Darjeeling and Assam. Graham's plan to permanently resettle his charges in the colonies upon reaching working age was regarded as an innovative solution to persistent British concerns about the Anglo-Indian population in India.¹⁶ Deploying both the methods and the discourse of child rescuers in Britain, Graham entered an established debate over the Anglo-Indian 'problem' in India. In the initial brochure that advertised his institution, Graham stipulated that children should be sent to the Homes as early as possible, where they would be isolated from 'injurious native influence' and made 'fit' for the colonies through a disciplined programme of domestic duties, schooling and manual training.¹⁷ Following William Quarrier's Scottish model, the children were housed in cottages with housemothers. Ideally they would spend ten to fifteen years at the Homes before being resettled permanently in 'the colonies'. Government and private support were immediately forthcoming, and the roll and infrastructure grew rapidly. By 1908, the first residents had reached working age, and finding placements for them became Graham's pressing concern. Clear indications of the settler colonial desire to keep their

populations 'white' were already causing consternation at the Homes and would continue to do so for the duration of the scheme.

Graham never publicly voiced opposition to the principle of restricting migration on racial grounds. His persistent appeals to colonial authorities were based instead on his belief that such restrictions should not apply to his graduates. In Graham's view, Anglo-Indian children brought up at the Homes were, in every way that mattered, white. Hence it was discrimination based on *colour* – the one mark of the children's racial heritage that could not be erased – that was his great frustration.¹⁸ The earliest archived correspondence seeking advice about resettling Homes graduates in New Zealand was penned in 1905 by one of Graham's Calcutta supporters, D.M. Hamilton, to Charles Holdsworth, a shipping official in Dunedin. Hamilton wrote they had recently attempted to send a Kalimpong graduate to Australia, where he had great difficulty getting off the boat owing to him being 'a little dark in colour'. 'The boy had quite an English upbringing', Hamilton continued, stating his hope that 'you are more enlightened in New Zealand and are prepared to give any decent lad or young woman a chance'.¹⁹ These early appeals essentially questioned whether the Dominion's egalitarian reputation extended to mixed-race youth originating from outside national borders – but within the bounds of empire.

The advice Graham received prior to sending any graduates to New Zealand was that provided they could complete the language test required by the current legislation, there was no legal obstacle to their entry.²⁰ The overriding concern among those who were consulted, however, was the question of their likely 'absorption'. Graham too was concerned about more than the navigation of borders. Like others who made enquiries on behalf of Anglo-Indians, Graham sought advice about employment and housing, as well as assurances about the possibility of their integration into local communities – a seemingly insurmountable challenge for Anglo-Indians in India.²¹ Graham's activation of a local Presbyterian network, including many men and women with existing connections to India, facilitated the emigrants' entry and transition into colonial life. The Dominion's relatively small population and close links between Presbyterian professional families and politicians meant this established network was to be of great assistance to Graham when the IRAA was enforced from 1922.

Between 1908 and 1921, 62 Homes graduates arrived at Port Chalmers in Dunedin (see Table 1). Most were placed in Dunedin city and the surrounding countryside, although a number were dispersed around the South Island and in the lower North Island. The men's placement on southern farms was arranged by Reverend James Ponder, a Presbyterian minister in Waitahuna (in Southland) and Graham's first key supporter in the Dominion. In August

1909, Graham visited New Zealand to assess its suitability for himself, and to check on the progress of the first four emigrants. He also brought with him the first young woman to be placed as a domestic servant with a Dunedin family. Graham extended and consolidated his Presbyterian connections on this tour, and was much encouraged by signs of harmonious relationships between British settlers and Māori. Several small groups followed, and in 1912 the first large ‘batch’ was sent from Kalimpong to New Zealand. A full-page article in the *Homes Magazine* described ‘the biggest farewell we have ever had’ (in Calcutta) for the 13 emigrants.²² Four smaller groups followed before wartime shipping restrictions temporarily halted the scheme. In the immediate post-war period, three groups, a total of 19 emigrants, arrived in quick succession after shipping restrictions were lifted and prior to the implementation of the IRAA.

Table 1: Kalimpong Arrivals by Gender, 1908–1921

| Group # | Year of Arrival | Men | Women | Total |
|---------|-----------------|-----|-------|-------|
| 1 | 1908 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 2 | 1909 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 3 | 1909 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 4 | 1910 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 5 | 1911 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 6 | 1911 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 7 | 1912 | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| 8 | 1914 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 9 | 1914 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| 10 | 1915 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 11 | 1915 | 0 | 6 | 6 |
| 12 | 1920 | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| 13 | 1920 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| 14 | 1921 | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| Total | | 35 | 27 | 62 |

Source: Compiled from *St Andrew's Colonial Homes Magazine*

1920s: Kalimpong Arrivals under the Permit System

In 1921, the *Homes Magazine* carried an article entitled ‘New Zealand and Our Emigrants: Will There Be Exclusion?’, which reported ‘considerable difficulty’ in landing the latest group.²³ This experience, alongside news of the ‘fresh legislation’, created fears that ‘the door has been closed to us’. The report indicated that Graham was in communication with New Zealand authorities on the matter, adding that he was ‘certain that the legislation has not been passed with reference to individuals or indeed with special thought of India’, given India’s right to ‘press for differentiation in treatment’.²⁴ This was a reference to directives from the British government at the Imperial War Conferences of 1917 and 1918 that Indian migrants, as British subjects, should be treated as a special case among other ‘race aliens’ seeking to enter settler colonies.²⁵ If New Zealand authorities would not continue their ‘past generous policy’, the editors ‘pleaded’ that they at least modify the rule to be ‘not less than 50 per cent of European blood’, thereby allowing Homes graduates to continue to cross the border.²⁶

The same article included excerpts from a letter written by a Homes teacher, Miss McFarlane, on her visit to the women settlers in New Zealand. The editors believed her report would ‘give an idea of the general conditions under which the girls work and throw light on the new attitude towards the admission of the children’.²⁷ Regarding ‘The Colour Question’, McFarlane relayed a conversation with a Presbyterian minister, Reverend Axelsen, in Dunedin. Axelsen spoke of large numbers of emigrants being brought out by the ‘Home Presbyterian Church’ and the general shortage of labour needed to ‘work the great wealth of the country’.²⁸ He felt that it was feasible while ‘the Anglo-Indian [came] in small numbers’, but warned that ‘there might be a hue and cry against big numbers coming’. McFarlane concluded the report by noting that the women ‘keep very much to themselves, with perhaps one or two friends among the Colonials’.²⁹ The article highlighted the tension between the demand for labour and public opinion about the people who might meet that demand, as reflected in the new legislation. The implication was that concerns about the entry of non-British workers would be felt not only in restricting further emigration from the Homes, but also in hampering the full social integration of Kalimpong graduates already settled in New Zealand.

Despite the implementation of this new legislation, the 1920s was, in numerical terms, the ‘heyday’ of the Homes emigration scheme, with 54 new arrivals between 1923 and 1929 (see Table 2). Prior to enforcement of the IRAA, the scheme proceeded unnoticed at the state level, as evidenced by an official’s later admission that ‘no information is available as to the number [of

Table 2: Kalimpong arrivals under the Permit System, 1923–1929

| Date of Permit | Date of Arrival | Number in Group | Men (n=) | Wome (n=) |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Dec 1922 | Nov 1923 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Oct 1924 | Feb 1925 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| Aug 1925 | Dec 1925 | 17 | 11 | 6 |
| Oct 1926 | Dec 1926 | 17 | 6 | 11 |
| Dec 1927 | Jan 1928 | 6 | 1 | 5 |
| Unknown | Jan 1929 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| Total | | 54 | 25 | 29 |

Source: Permanent Entry Record Books, 1921–1926, Department of Labour, R19007319, ANZ-W

Anglo-Indians] admitted prior to 1922'.³⁰ From this point onwards, however, Homes emigrants were required to be in possession of a permit before leaving India, and upon arrival in New Zealand were recorded in the 'Eurasian' section of the permit register.³¹ Emigration from the Homes resumed in late 1923 when a group of three young men sailed unaccompanied into the care of P.E. Suttie, a 'good friend of the Homes in Narayanganj and Calcutta ... now settled in Auckland'.³² Suttie's continued support for Graham after leaving India demonstrates the transcolonial reach of the scheme, and the mobile nature of the network that centred around Kalimpong. The *Homes Magazine* noted that this was the first group to emigrate under the new legislation and that it was hoped 'many more of our girls and boys may enter the re-opened door'.³³ Permits for this group were secured a full year prior to their arrival in Auckland.

The next group of six emigrants arrived in Wellington in February 1925. They were followed by a group of 17, whose departure in November 1925 was marked with a full-page article in the *Homes Magazine* dedicated to their farewell. In the accompanying photograph the women were dressed in maids' uniforms complete with white aprons, and the men in a military-style suit-and-tie ensemble (Figure 1). Full details of the vessels, chaperones and route taken were given in the article, which reported: 'Our good friend, Mr A.W. Blair, Barrister, Wellington, had secured beforehand situations for all the party



Figure 1: November 1925 Group to New Zealand
Source: Slater family archive, Wellington



Figure 2: November 1925 Group En Route to New Zealand
Source: Kalimpong Album, Slater family archive, Wellington



Figure 3: November 1926 Group to New Zealand
Source: Gammie family archive, Hamilton

(that is a condition of obtaining a permit to land), and had found his labours much lightened as regards the boys by the most favourable impression made on the Farmers who had engaged the previous year's band. There are many applicants for girls.'³⁴

A less formal photograph, stored in a private family archive, was taken en route to New Zealand (Figure 2). For this group, permits had been obtained just four months prior to arrival in Wellington and were not sighted until a full month afterwards. At the end of 1926 another group of 17 arrived. Their permits were granted only two months prior to arrival – about the time they departed Calcutta. This suggests a growing confidence in obtaining permits, in contrast to other Anglo-Indians, only four of whom entered New Zealand with permits during 1925 and 1926. Again a full-page article was printed in the *Homes Magazine* upon the 1926 group's departure, with a photograph that was notable for the less uniform appearance of the graduates – in terms of dress, pose, and outdoor setting, as opposed to the formal setting of the studio (Figure 3). Blair again made arrangements for settlement of this 'fresh band'.³⁵

Compared to the immediate dispersal of the earlier groups, the 1926 emigrants made a highly visible entrance to New Zealand. They alighted at Invercargill and toured around the South Island en route to Wellington,

visiting noted scenic attractions such as Milford Sound. Roland Spencer, already in New Zealand, had heard from one of the new emigrants, who was staying at the Wellington ‘Salvation Hostel’ and was apparently waiting for his employment to be arranged. Spencer had heard of a job opportunity and having secured agreement from the farmer, ‘hopped into town and phoned up Mr Blair who soon let me take Donald away’.³⁶ Spencer’s report evidences special treatment afforded to the scheme, since permits had been granted without prearranged employment or accommodation. In fact there is no evidence that securing a permit *required* proof of either of these, although as will be shown in the next section, the practice of doing so clearly assisted the Homes scheme.³⁷ Nevertheless, it seems that once Blair had satisfactorily placed a number of emigrants, the bureaucratic requirements loosened.

Two further groups, each comprising five young women, emigrated in the 1920s. The ‘Sussex band’ landed in Auckland in January 1928 with Miss Earl, who reported that they were met by Blair’s brother-in-law, and that Blair was about to take up a position as a judge in Auckland. Two of the emigrants went to Days Bay, a picturesque Wellington suburb, and one was ‘put on a boat for Blenheim to be with Eva Masson’, an earlier emigrant who worked for the Mayoress. A Mr Hogg, named as Blair’s replacement for ‘shouldering Kalimpong interests in Wellington’, took the other two to be placed with his sister ‘in an exceedingly nice home’.³⁸ Permits had been obtained just three weeks before arrival – well after they departed India. One year later, the final group of the 1920s arrived in Wellington. No date of permit issue was recorded. A note in the register recorded the group as having ‘arrived temporarily 15.1.29 at Wellington and permitted to remain 20.6.30’.³⁹ The lack of male Kalimpong emigrants after 1926 (with one exception) and the admission of the final group of women on a temporary basis reflected the worsening economic situation.⁴⁰ The women who did emigrate were placed in affluent households connected to the Kalimpong scheme – households that were not seriously affected by the economic depression.⁴¹ Following the entry of the 1929 group, all emigration from the Homes to New Zealand was halted indefinitely.

Applications and Unease

For the particularity of the Kalimpong scheme to be understood from the perspective of New Zealand immigration authorities, it needs to be embedded in the enquiries around applications for other Anglo-Indians to enter. The correspondence held in the Customs Department files confirms that the high proportion of Kalimpong emigrants in the Anglo-Indian category did not simply reflect a lack of applicants outside the Homes scheme: numerous enquiries were made on behalf of other Anglo-Indian groups or individuals.

The nature of the responses to these enquiries illustrates the high level of discretion exercised by immigration officials.

In June 1925, Jean Porteous wrote to the Department on behalf of her brother, a medical missionary in India. He was about to return to New Zealand with his wife and children, and wanted to bring a 'Eurasian girl' with them.⁴² Porteous sought information about the permit system and received a standardized reply, which stated that the prospective emigrant would need to complete an application form accompanied by 'the certificates and photographs required thereby'.⁴³ In March 1926, a more detailed request was received from S.W. Briant of Madras. Referring to the 'Hand Book on the Dominion of N. Zealand', Briant noted that the section on 'Prohibited Immigrants' did not 'appear to include or apply to Anglo-Indians' and thus requested 'detailed information ... as to whether there are any special regulations restricting the immigration of Anglo-Indians'.⁴⁴ Briant was enquiring on behalf of an individual who wished to emigrate 'for the purpose of taking up employment upon a large farm in the neighbourhood of Christchurch which has been definitely promised him, and to ultimately settling there permanently. What prospects of employment would there be open to him?'.⁴⁵ Briant enclosed a postal order requesting pamphlets that would provide such information. He received the same standard letter as Jean Porteous, with the added note that 'no pamphlets respecting the restriction of immigration are published by this department'.⁴⁶

Two weeks later, D.C. Stewart-Smith wrote from Calcutta on behalf of 'European and Anglo-Indian boys in our Schools here regarding employment on farms in New Zealand' and, like Briant, requested pamphlets.⁴⁷ Stewart-Smith wrote of several boys possessing 'good physique and character' who would pay their own passages 'provided there was guarantee of work for them on arrival'. The difficulty of arranging their emigration was that shipping authorities in India were 'naturally unwilling to grant facilities unless they have definite proof that the would-be emigrant will be welcomed and employed when he reaches New Zealand'.⁴⁸ Stewart-Smith requested information, given that in India 'we have no High Commissioners for the Dominions or any emigration offices of any description and it is left to private enterprise to assist any of the young men'. Stewart-Smith's plea for assistance clearly highlights the advantages of Graham's local network. In addition to sourcing employment and providing support for the emigrants after their arrival, Graham's associates furnished the Homes with all manner of intelligence about the conditions of the colony at any given moment.

The reply from the Under-Secretary of the Customs Department to Stewart-Smith strongly intimates the possibility of government authorities

becoming personally involved in such cases. He wrote of being ‘deeply interested in a couple of cases at present in the Dominion’, but believed that the local work and climate made it ‘problematical that these boys will turn out a success’.⁴⁹ While the Under-Secretary was ‘prepared to lend a helping hand’, he was ‘not in a position to accept the responsibility of guardianship’.⁵⁰ Referring to the 1920 legislation, he wrote ‘the Immigration Department has no power to relax the requirements of the Act in so far as it affects those persons who are aliens according to the interpretation of the Act’.⁵¹ He enclosed a copy of the IRAA and informed Stewart-Smith that he had ‘asked the Publicity Officer of New Zealand to forward ... pamphlets concerning life in this Dominion’.⁵² Stewart-Smith was encouraged by this reply and six months later wrote on behalf of ‘several promising youngsters ... who have a little Indian blood in their veins and it is of course noticeable’. He asked whether their racial status – ‘no fault of theirs’ – would prevent them from entering New Zealand.⁵³ Most pointedly, he asked for ‘a clear definition of a European boy’, making apparent the difficulty of navigating immigration restrictions in a period of fluid categorization of mixed-race communities.⁵⁴ In January 1927, the Controller of Customs directed the Under-Secretary to despatch the standard reply. The permit register for 1927 recorded no Anglo-Indians other than Kalimpong emigrants entering New Zealand, and hence it is assumed that if Stewart-Smith did apply, he was unsuccessful in gaining permits.

Subsequent correspondence in the Customs Department file referred directly to the Kalimpong scheme. In January 1928, Mrs G. Kelly from Ashburton, south of Christchurch, wrote to the Department to express her interest in recent press articles regarding ‘Eurasian servant girls and their arrival in New Zealand’.⁵⁵ Mrs Kelly asked if any such girls were available for employment in the South Island. She received a prompt reply from the Controller of Customs, who informed her that she should communicate with A.W. Blair for this information and provided an address for him. A note on her letter added ‘applications are received by us through Mr A.W. Blair of Chapman, Tripp, Blair, Brooke and Watson, Solicitors of Wellington’, clearly indicating an established relationship between the Customs Department and Blair.⁵⁶ It also speaks to Graham’s use of publicity not only to garner support for the scheme, but to essentially advertise the availability of willing workers.

This publicity came at a cost. An editorial from the *Wanganui Chronicle* – filed with the permit correspondence – revealed the public debate prompted by press attention to the scheme and connected it with anxieties over raced labour migration. Documenting the numbers of ‘Eurasian servant girls’ that had arrived in the 1920s, the editor mused that ‘it would be interesting to

know what exactly has become of the original party ... who have been for some time now resident in the country'.⁵⁷ The editor quoted a report from the *Auckland Sun* about the recent arrival of a Homes group, stating that although one should have sympathy for 'these unfortunate girls ... the arrival of these particular immigrants should not pass unnoticed'.⁵⁸ 'They come from the plains of India', it continued, 'from squalid and indifferent homes, and though they are educated in mission schools, their standards of life must necessarily be very different from those ruling in the Dominion.' The *Auckland Sun* article concluded by asking 'Who is responsible for these workers, once they have landed in a strange country?'.⁵⁹ Alongside the *Wanganui Chronicle's* query about what became of the women, these questions suggest that quiet absorption into settler families was not necessarily regarded as evidence of success. Indeed their silent presence seems to have left these authors with a marked sense of disquiet.

'At the present moment there is no shortage of female labour in the Dominion', the *Wanganui Chronicle* continued, challenging the economic advantages of the scheme and querying the women's wages. 'Even for the most benevolent of motives', the article concluded, 'the thin edge of the wedge of cheap labour from the East should not be inserted into the country.'⁶⁰ Connecting the Kalimpong scheme to fears of cheap Asian immigrant labour was dependent on a dismissive approach to the charitable element of the scheme. Both the *Auckland Sun* and the *Wanganui Chronicle* were concerned about the 'necessarily different' values that the emigrants embodied, which – along with the charitable impulse that enabled their entry into the colony – apparently reduced the likelihood of Anglo-Indians being fully socialized and integrated into the free labour market. A copy of this public debate was filed with the permit correspondence, and annotated with the numbers of Anglo-Indians who had been granted entry under the permit system.⁶¹ This indicates that staff had been directed to ascertain figures as a result of these publicly aired concerns, though the Homes scheme was not directly mentioned.

Overt mention of the scheme *was* made in the final archived enquiry on behalf of Anglo-Indians to the Customs Department in the 1920s. W. Clay, Secretary of the Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European Association in Rangoon, wrote to the Publicity Office in 1928 after receiving a booklet about New Zealand from the Publicity Bureau in Burma. He began his letter by noting that he assumed the object of such publicity was to 'set before prospective migrants the advantages of settlement in New Zealand'.⁶² Clay described Anglo-Indians as 'essentially British, with an equal standard of living' and suggested that New Zealand would be an ideal place of settlement for them. The problem according to Clay was that in India, 'very little is

known of New Zealand, its salubrious climate and promising future'; he added that 'Dr Graham of Kalimpong has done something to dispel this ignorance, through the reports disseminated by him of the youthful colonists sent by him from India'.⁶³ Clay's letter attests to the widespread and influential circulation of information about the Homes scheme. As previous applicants had done, Clay took care to assure immigration officials that there would be no influx of Anglo-Indians, stating that emigrant families of 'attested worth' would number 'not more than half a dozen a year'.⁶⁴ Clay received the standard letter in reply and it is assumed he was unsuccessful as no Anglo-Indian families were admitted between 1928 and 1930.

Economic Depression and Imperial Decline

A memorandum in the Customs Department file headed 'Policy followed during the year 1931' attests to the very limited number of permits granted during this decade. For Chinese and Indian migrants, only those with families already in residence were permitted to enter. Anglo-Indians were included under the heading 'Other Race Aliens', which recorded that no permits were granted to 'Japanese, Negroes, South Sea Islanders, or other coloured people, except to the Japanese wife of a New Zealand resident of European race, and to two families of Eurasians of superior standing'.⁶⁵ The separate and distinct treatment of Indians and Anglo-Indians as evidenced by this memorandum is significant. It demonstrates, as did the 1920s correspondence, that the policy of not admitting Indians other than family of those already settled was being followed. But as outlined earlier, many Kalimpong emigrants *were* admitted in the 1920s. And while relatives of resident Indians were permitted to enter, no such concession was made to the siblings of the Kalimpong settlers in the 1930s, nor in the 1940s when many joined the exodus from India as Independence approached. This suggests that it was their 'mixedness' rather than their 'Indianness' that determined their inclusion in the 'other race aliens' category.

Graham accepted the economic rationale offered by the New Zealand authorities' decision to desist granting permits to his emigrants in 1929. He turned his attention to India, and the great challenge of placing all of his graduates there. India was affected not only by economic depression, but in addition by the social upheaval of rising nationalism – a movement which caused much uncertainty about the future of Anglo-Indian communities. Graham's Indian focus saw a marked decline in the *Homes Magazine* reports of the fortunes of its New Zealand settlers. The public record of connections between Kalimpong and New Zealand was reignited in 1937, when Graham visited the Dominion for a second time, with two aims in mind: to petition

the government to allow emigration from the Homes to resume, and to visit graduates already settled there. With over a hundred graduates settled in New Zealand, this was a challenging task, but one Graham largely achieved during a hectic three-week tour that saw him travel the length of the country. Encouraged by those he found settled with their own young families, and by reunions of graduates in the main centres, Graham's public appeals for the scheme to resume grew in confidence over the course of the tour. His Presbyterian connections in Wellington arranged a meeting with the Acting Prime Minister, Peter Fraser, after which Graham noted in his diary 'We are now certain of sending a batch in August'.⁶⁶ Fraser's wife, he noted, knew many of the Kalimpong women placed with professional families in Wellington.

In September 1937, Graham applied to send another group of emigrants from Kalimpong. A letter from the Controller of Customs, E.D. Good, to the Minister of Customs referred to the meeting between Graham and Fraser, stating that Graham had traced those settled in New Zealand and found them 'well established as worthy citizens of the Dominion'.⁶⁷ The controller explained that 'in 1929 it became expedient to discontinue the practice of granting permits in such cases', and that Graham sought the renewal of the practice of issuing of permits 'in a few approved cases each year'.⁶⁸ Good then referred to a memorandum attached (but not in the file) where 'the position regarding the issue of permits to Eurasians during the years 1922-1929 is set out'. Good's letter then identified 'three main factors for discussion':

- (1) Whether there is scope in New Zealand for the employment of such children as domestic servants, farm labourers, etc.
- (2) Whether from a racial viewpoint, they can readily be absorbed into the population of the Dominion.
- (3) Whether by reason of the fact that they are of British nationality and partly of European race, they should receive special consideration.⁶⁹

In answer to his own questions, Good stated first that he believed the children were 'thoroughly trained' for employment and that 'in addition there is evidence of a real shortage of farm labour and domestic assistance in the Dominion'.⁷⁰ Against this, however, he questioned 'whether the importation of labour from other countries will provide a satisfactory solution of the problems raised by the present scarcity of labour' and concluded that 'I would not, on this score alone, recommend that a favourable consideration be given to Dr Graham's request'. It was the 'racial question' that Good found the 'most difficult to dispose of'. Although Graham's graduates were 'almost completely European in outlook', Good stated that 'the fact remains

that persons of mixed blood are not regarded, generally, as being the most desirable type of immigrant for reasons which are readily apparent'. This identification of the racial problem as 'mixed blood' rather than Indian heritage would negate Graham's appeals to colonial authorities to be sympathetic to India. On his 1937 tour, Graham lauded India as 'the birthplace of leading religions and the home of deep philosophies ... with a brilliant record of thinkers and scholars', and warned that if 'unfair restrictions' on Indian mobility continued, New Zealanders 'would find that entry into India was also restricted'.⁷¹ Such 'annoyances' also increased the likelihood of Indian secession, which Graham believed would leave Britain a 'second-rate power'.⁷² Good addressed these dynamics to some extent in answering the third self-posed question, acknowledging that the Kalimpong emigrants were British subjects and therefore 'it may be thought possible to relax the general rule to some extent'.⁷³

For this reason Good, in a very ambiguous 'suggestion', was hesitant to recommend declining Graham's request; yet he considered it 'inadvisable at the present time to permit the entry of any large number of Eurasians'. He went on to recommend that Graham's application be denied, before adding another paragraph suggesting that 'on the other hand you may desire to fix a small quota (say 5 permits per year) for these children'. Clearly Good found it difficult to make a recommendation in this case. The eventual outcome was a letter sent by Mark Fagan from the Minister's office, advising Graham that while his enquiry had been afforded 'the earnest and sympathetic consideration of the Government', it was 'not possible at the present time to accede to your request'.⁷⁴ Fagan offered to 'give further consideration to the matter when the general policy of the Government regarding immigration next comes under review'.⁷⁵ Here Good is suggesting that the Kalimpong emigrants are subject to the same broad *policy* as any other mixed-race migrants. He does not mention the earlier *practice* of making an exception in the Kalimpong case, which was never officially archived in this file.

Despite the refusal of his 1937 request, Graham remained confident of sending another group to New Zealand. Indeed permits were granted to one final group from the Homes, who arrived in November 1938. The conditions of their entry were temporary – a note in the permit register 15 months after their arrival stated that they were 'now permitted to remain permanently'.⁷⁶ Early in 1939 the *Homes Magazine* reported: 'In Autumn a Party of Boys and Girls will be going to New Zealand. We shall be glad to hear of any friends who are travelling from India then and who would be willing to guide them.'⁷⁷ An article on the same page noted the persistent requests for assistance from 'likely young Anglo-Indians' to emigrate to New Zealand, which no doubt

reflected the worsening situation in India and the beginning of an exodus of Anglo-Indians as withdrawal from the British Empire seemed likely. The Homes' advice to these enquiries was simply to write to the Customs Department, as they could 'only give financial assistance to our own pupils'.⁷⁸ In the interim, the Customs Department received an enquiry that referred to the Kalimpong scheme as setting a precedent for Anglo-Indian immigration. An internal correspondence agreed that although the Department would 'have to admit' that a Homes group had entered in 1938, this should not be regarded as a precedent and the enquiry was to be refused in accordance with the 'general policy' regarding Anglo-Indians.⁷⁹

Perhaps not surprisingly given the interest generated by the 1938 group, those supposed to be leaving Kalimpong in autumn of 1939 were not granted permits. News of this refusal was reported in the *Homes Magazine* and picked up by the *Evening Post* in Auckland. Graham wrote of receiving a cable from 'Mr C.G. White, Barrister, Wellington, Chairman of our NZ Committee' which read simply 'Government grants no more permits'.⁸⁰ The *Evening Post* story, subheaded 'No Eurasians for New Zealand', reported that the group had been refused admission on the grounds that 'no half-caste Tongan, Fijian or Anglo-Indian could be admitted'.⁸¹ The article cited a statement from the *Homes Magazine*: 'We used to be proud of the contrast between the freedom of New Zealand and the exclusiveness of Australia regarding emigration. It is nothing short of a tragedy to have New Zealand shut against the Anglo-Indians.'⁸² Graham was similarly emotive in later recollections of this final episode in the scheme to New Zealand. Shocked at the rationale for refusal being a general policy of excluding 'half-castes', he wrote that 'the assignation of these races seems absurd'.⁸³ Restating his belief that most New Zealanders were a blend of Pākehā and Māori, Graham felt that New Zealanders 'should be the last to base their exclusion on such grounds as of mixed blood'.⁸⁴ Graham's first recorded negative opinion of New Zealand after 30 years of praise indicates the level of perceived disconnect (from an outsider's view) between the Dominion's reputation for promoting racial harmony at home and this overt exclusion of 'half-caste' migrants.

Conclusion

This article has examined the application of the IRAA to Anglo-Indian migrants. While Anglo-Indians were perceived as both problematic and remedial in New Zealand and in India, the methods of regulating the community in these two discrete sites of the British Empire differed markedly. As shown above, several organizations involved in managing the Anglo-Indian community in India made contact with New Zealand's Customs Department, which effectively screened

their enquiries with non-committal and standardized replies. John Graham's strategy of activating a network of professional Presbyterian supporters in the Dominion proved a far more effective means of establishing a pathway for his graduates. Graham's navigation of the permit system exemplifies the power of this discretionary legislation not only to exclude, but to facilitate the entry of particular groups of migrants. However, even this established scheme for bringing a handful of emigrants per year was subject to the strict controls put into practice with the onset of economic depression in 1929.⁸⁵ The Department's final justification for refusing permits to Homes graduates, on the grounds of being mixed race, signalled an important shift away from concerns about cultural values and towards an emphasis on colour and appearance, which was to dominate assessments of potential absorption in the 1940s. Further research is needed to examine this shift alongside state policies towards local mixed-race communities, and hence bring migration into conversation with the compelling scholarship around this crucial arena of New Zealand's racial politics.

The approach taken here presents a strong counterpoint to previous readings of the IRAA. A focus on statutes and subsequent exclusions can divert attention from the workings of bureaucracy – which, in a small-scale society, can be responsive to the overtures of particular individuals. My approach differs in the first instance by examining a racially marginalized community who were admitted under the permit system. John Graham rejected claims that Anglo-Indians were race aliens, particularly in a culture that had seen extensive intermarriage between Māori & Pākehā. Second, my attention to the mechanisms of implementing the Act reveals the merit of examining the New Zealand context in greater depth, where the relatively small scale of both migration flows and bureaucracy meant that Graham's personal networks played a vital role in influencing bureaucratic decisions. Third, the Kalimpong case clearly demonstrates that the Depression shut down arguments about need for labour – and at its end, new definitions of 'half-caste' came to the fore. This articulation of anxiety around mixed-race people reflected not only a hardening of racial boundaries in New Zealand, but was also at least partially in response to the uncertain future faced by the Anglo Indian community in India. Immigration has to be understood in terms of both the place of origins as well as the place of arrival. The Kalimpong story underscores the fact that we cannot fully understand the implementation of the permit system in New Zealand without making overt connections to events in India.

JANE McCABE

University of Otago

NOTES

1 Alison Bashford, 'Immigration Restriction: Rethinking Period and Place from Settler Colonies to Postcolonial Nations', *Journal of Global History*, 9 (2014), p.32. Similar sentiment was located in the Canadian context by Radhika Mongia in 'Race, Nationality, Mobility: A History of the Passport', *Public Culture*, 11, 3 (1999), p.536.

2 For example, Jacqueline Leckie, 'Indians in the South Pacific: Recentred Diasporas', in Jacob Edmond, Henry Johnson and Jacqueline Leckie, eds, *Recentring Asia*, Boston, 2011, p.64; Manying Ip, *Home Away From Home: Life Stories of Chinese Women in New Zealand*, Auckland, 1990, p.15.

3 W.D. Borrie made this argument regarding the dominance of economic imperatives in the history of migration regulations in *Immigration to New Zealand, 1854–1938*, Canberra, 1991. The study was written at Knox College, Dunedin in 1937–1938 and published later with minor editorial corrections.

4 'Anglo-Indian' in this article refers to the mixed-race community of India. The term officially replaced 'Eurasian' in 1911. For a summary of the various terminology see Laura Bear, "'Anglo-Indian": Historical Definitions', in *The Jadu House: Intimate Histories of Anglo-India*, London, 2000, pp.287–91.

5 Here the 'small numbers' of Kalimpong emigrants are argued to be nevertheless significant, in line with Sekhar Bandyopadhyay's characterization of Indian migrations as generating significant anxiety despite representing a minimal proportion of the colonial population. See Sekhar Bandyopadhyay, 'A History of Small Numbers: Indians in New Zealand c.1890s to 1930s', *New Zealand Journal of History*, 43, 2 (2009), pp.157–59.

6 Rieko Karatani noted similar processes in Britain, in *Defining British Citizenship: Empire, Commonwealth and Modern Britain*, London, 2003, p.73.

7 Allen Bartley, '(Un)problematic Multiculturalism: Challenges and Opportunities for Social Cohesion in New Zealand', in Norman Vasu, Yolanda Chin, and Kam-ye Law, eds, *Nations, National Narratives and Communities in the Asia-Pacific*, New York, 2014, p.90.

8 Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, Archives New Zealand, Wellington Office (ANZ-W). Uma Dhupelia-Mesthrie takes a similar approach to immigration archives in South Africa in 'The Form, the Permit and the Photograph: An Archive of Mobility between South Africa and India', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 46, 6 (2011), pp.650–62.

9 James R. Barrett and David Roediger, 'Inbetween Peoples: Race, Nationality and the "New Immigrant" Working Class', *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 16, 3 (1997), pp.3–44.

10 On mixed-race communities in New Zealand, see for example Angela Wanhalla, *In/visible Sight: The Mixed-Descent Families of Southern New Zealand*, Wellington, 2009; Damon Salesa, *Racial Crossings: Race, Inter-marriage and the Victorian British Empire*, Oxford, 2011; Manying Ip, *Being Māori-Chinese: Mixed Identities*, Auckland, 2008; and Senka Bozic-Vrbancic, *Tarara: Croats and Māori in New Zealand: Memory, Belonging, Identity*, Dunedin, 2008.

11 Deana Heath identified the need for greater scholarly engagement with comparative colonial studies in 'Comparative Colonialism, Moral Censorship and Governmentality', in Durba Ghosh and Dane Kennedy, eds, *Decentring Empire: Britain, India and the Transcolonial World*, New Delhi, 2006, p.229.

12 Lionel Caplan, *Children of Colonialism: Anglo-Indians in a Postcolonial World*, Oxford, 2001, pp.27–28.

13 As Salesa argues, pp.79–81, the policy of racial amalgamation was pursued within a relatively unregulated framework in New Zealand.

14 Andrew May, 'Exiles from the Children's City: Archives, Imperial Identities and the

Juvenile Emigration of Anglo-Indians from Kalimpong to Australasia', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, 14, 1 (2013).

15 Most notably Adam McKeown, *Melancholy Order*, New York, 2008, and Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, *Drawing the Global Colour Line: White Men's Countries and the International Challenge of Racial Equality*, Cambridge, 2008.

16 Graham was not the first to propose emigration as a solution to the Anglo-Indian problem, but as Satoshi Mizutani suggests, the Homes scheme represents a landmark in this debate due to its realization of emigration over a sustained period. See Mizutani, *The Meaning of White: Race, Class and the 'Domiciled Community' in British India, 1858–1930*, Oxford, 2011, p.138. Caplan summarizes earlier attempts by British organizations, pp.131–2.

17 John Graham, 'St Andrew's Colonial Homes', Printed brochure, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:15:1, National Library of Scotland (NLS), Edinburgh.

18 James Minto, *Graham of Kalimpong*, Edinburgh, 1974, pp.75–76.

19 D.M. Hamilton to Charles Holdsworth, 15 July 1905, Union Steam Ship Company Records, AG–292-005-004/135, Hocken Library (HL), University of Otago, Dunedin.

20 Scholars agree that the pre-1920 legislation did little to stem the flow of Indian immigration. See Arvind Zodgekar, 'Demographic Aspects of Indians in New Zealand', in Kapil Tiwari, ed., *Indians in New Zealand*, Wellington, 1980, p.187; and Leckie, 'Indians in the South Pacific', p.64.

21 The Anglo-Indian community was subject to strict regulation by British colonial authorities through management into employment in railway 'colonies', and rejected socially by British and Indians who used distance from this community as a strategy for maintaining their own status. See for example Laura Bear, *Lines of the Nation: Indian Railway Workers, Bureaucracy and the Intimate Historical Self*, New York, 2007.

22 'Farewell to our New Zealanders', *St Andrew's Colonial Homes Magazine* (SACHM), 12, 3/4 (1912), p.38.

23 'New Zealand and Our Emigrants: Will There Be Exclusion?', SACHM, 21, 1/2 (1921), p.6.

24 'New Zealand and Our Emigrants: Will There Be Exclusion?', SACHM, 21, 1/2 (1921), p.6.

25 See Jacqueline Leckie, 'The Southernmost Indian Diaspora: From Gujarat to Aotearoa', *Journal of South Asian Studies*, 21 (1998), p.172.

26 'New Zealand and Our Emigrants: Will There Be Exclusion?', SACHM, 21, 1/2 (1921), p.6.

27 'A Visit to Our New Zealanders', SACHM, 21, 1/2 (1921), p.6.

28 'A Visit to Our New Zealanders', SACHM, 21, 1/2 (1921), p.6.

29 'A Visit to Our New Zealanders', SACHM, 21, 1/2 (1921), p.6.

30 Controller of Customs to Minister of Customs, 13 September 1937, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

31 Permanent Entry Record Books, 1921–1926, Department of Labour, R19007319, ANZ-W.

32 'New Zealand Emigration', SACHM, 24, 1/2 (1924), p.11. Suttie had been employed by a jute company in Narayanganj and is likely to have used his position to facilitate placements for Kalimpong graduates there. P.E. Suttie is mentioned several times in R.S. Finlow, *Memoirs of the Department of Agriculture in India: 'Heart Damage' in Baled Jute*, Calcutta, 1918.

33 'New Zealand Emigration', SACHM, 24, 1/2 (1924), p.11.

34 'The New Zealand Emigrants', SACHM, 26, 1/2 (1926), p.14.

35 'Our Emigrants' First Impressions of N.Z.', SACHM, 27, 1/2 (1927), p.11.

36 'Our Emigrants' First Impressions of N.Z.', SACHM, 27, 1/2 (1927), p.11.

37 The permit issued required a declaration of intended employment, and for all Homes graduates this was listed as simply 'farm work' or 'domestic service'; intended address was not required. Information compiled from Permanent Entry Permits to Enter New Zealand, Department of Labour, R15971851, ANZ-W.

38 'New Zealand', SACHM, 28, 1/2 (1928), p.17.

39 Permanent Entry Record Books, 1921–1926, Department of Labour, R19007319, ANZ-W, p.160.

40 Charles Moller travelled as an unofficial member of the 1928 group to be reunited with his sister in New Zealand.

41 G.R. Hawke, *The Making of New Zealand: An Economic History*, Cambridge, 1985, pp.125–6.

42 J. Porteous to Minister of Internal Affairs, 23 June 1925, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

43 Controller of Customs to J. Porteous, 1 July 1925, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

44 S.W. Briant to Minister of Customs, 11 March 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

45 S.W. Briant to Minister of Customs, 11 March 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

46 Controller of Customs to S.W. Briant, 21 April 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

47 D.C. Stewart-Smith to Immigration Officer, 3 May 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

48 D.C. Stewart-Smith to Immigration Officer, 3 May 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

49 Under-Secretary to D.C. Stewart-Smith, 21 June 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

50 Under-Secretary to D.C. Stewart-Smith, 21 June 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

51 Under-Secretary to D.C. Stewart-Smith, 21 June 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

52 Under-Secretary to D.C. Stewart-Smith, 21 June 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

53 D.C. Stewart-Smith to Under-Secretary, 23 November 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

54 D.C. Stewart-Smith to Under-Secretary, 23 November 1926, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

55 G. Kelly to Immigration Department, 29 January 1928, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

56 Note to letter, G. Kelly to Immigration Department, 29 January 1928, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

57 'Eurasian Labour', *Wanganui Chronicle* WC, 23 January 1928, filed in Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.

58 'Eurasian Labour', WC, 23 January 1928, filed in Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W. The story ran in the *Auckland Star* ten days earlier: 'Eurasian Domestics: Homes in New Zealand', *Auckland Star*, 12 January 1928.

59 'Eurasian Labour', WC, 23 January 1928, filed in Immigration and General: Anglo-

- Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 60 'Eurasian Labour', (WC), 23 January 1928, filed in Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 61 Memorandum, 27 January 1928, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 62 W. Clay to Publicity Office, 9 January 1928, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 63 W. Clay to Publicity Office, 9 January 1928, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 64 W. Clay to Publicity Office, 9 January 1928, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 65 W. Clay to Publicity Office, 9 January 1928, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 66 'Pour Les Intimes', Dr Graham's Diary (DGD) 1937, transcribed by James Purdie, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:8:2, NLS, 40.
- 67 E.D. Good to Hon. Minister, 13 September 1937, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 68 E.D. Good to Hon. Minister, 13 September 1937, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 69 E.D. Good to Hon. Minister, 13 September 1937, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 70 E.D. Good to Hon. Minister, 13 September 1937, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 71 John Graham, 'The Call of India', Wellington broadcast, 4 July 1937, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:8:1, NLS; 'Future of India', *Evening Post* (EP), 30 June 1937.
- 72 'Future of India: Importance to the People, Secession Undesirable', *Auckland Star*, 7 August 1937.
- 73 E.D. Good to Hon. Minister, 13 September 1937, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 74 Mark Fagan, for the Minister of Customs, to John Graham, 21 September 1937, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 75 Mark Fagan, for the Minister of Customs, to John Graham, 21 September 1937, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 76 Permanent Entry Record Books, 1926–1938, Department of Labour, R19007318, ANZ-W.
- 77 'New Zealand Notes', SACHM, 38, 1 (1939), p.5.
- 78 'New Zealand Notes', SACHM, 38, 1 (1939), p.5.
- 79 Controller of Customs to Hon. Minister, 13 February 1939, Immigration and General: Anglo-Indians, Eurasian and Anglo-Burmese, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
- 80 John Graham, Typed notes, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:15:1, NLS.
- 81 'News of the Day', EP, 15 November 1939.
- 82 'News of the Day', EP, 15 November 1939.
- 83 John Graham, Typed notes, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:15:1, NLS.
- 84 John Graham, Typed notes, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:15:1, NLS.
- 85 Between 1908 and 1938, 130 Anglo-Indians emigrated under the Homes scheme – on average fewer than five individuals per year.