

Formation of a Mixed-Race and its Identity: A Study of the Anglo-Indian Community

Prof. Lyndon D. Thomas, Prof. Sthitaprajna, Prof. Rasabihari Mishra

¹Doctoral Research Scholar, Dept. of Humanities and Social Sciences

Siksha 'O' Anusandhan (SOA), Deemed-to-be University and, Training Head, GITA Autonomous College Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India, asher.thomas09@gmail.com

²Associate Professor, Dept. of Humanities and Social Sciences, Siksha 'O' Anusandhan(SOA), Deemed-to-be University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India. sthitaprajna@soa.ac.in

³Dept. of Basic Sciences and Humanities, GITA Autonomous College, Bhubaneswar. rasbihari04@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Lyndon D. Thomas, Sthitaprajna, Rasabihari Mishra (2024) Formation of a Mixed-Race and its Identity: A Study of the Anglo-Indian Community. *Library Progress International*, 44(3), 11004-11013.

Abstract

Anglo-Indians are a mixed-descent Indian minority community which came into existence when Europe and India, came into contact around 1498 with the arrival of Vasco da Gama on the Malabar Coast. After the Portuguese, the British gained control and their men came into contact with the local Indian women with whom they had relationships. The children born out of this union were not accepted by the British nor by their mother's community as the mother was often ostracized. These children are the Anglo-Indians, as we know them today. This article is contextualized in the historical attempts that marginalized the community and examines the attempts of Anglo-Indians to build a presence in politics and the public sphere through the building of a community identity.

Key-words: Anglo-Indian, Identity, Mixed-race community, Eurasian, Ethnicity

Introduction

A study of the history of Asia would be incomplete if colonial histories were to be ignored, as the colonial experience is responsible for the production of mixed-race populations across a range of Asian societies. Törnigren et al., (2021),¹ note that multiracial people are a rapidly growing demographic in much of the world while Rico et al. (2023) note an increase of over 150% (since 2010) in the United States, where 15% of adolescents and children are multi-racial.² Thus, the increasing interest worldwide in mixed-race and ethnic identities has prompted a study of the Anglo-Indian community.

The origins of the Anglo-Indian community can be traced back to the first known contact between Europe and India as early as 1498 when Vasco da Gama landed at Calicut. After the Portuguese, the British gained prominence in India and their men entered into relationships with the local Indian women and produced offspring initially known as Eurasians. Men from many other European nations like the Dutch, the Danes, the French, the Scots, the Irish and the Germans, to name a few came also came into contact with Indian women and entered into relationships with native women and added to the community. Though the community can be linked to many different European forbearers, the community was named Anglo-Indian, to emphasize its British ancestry.

The Community

The Constitution of Independent India, which came into effect on January 26, 1950, in Article 366(2), defines an Anglo-Indian as follows:

An 'Anglo-Indian' means a person whose father or any of whose other male progenitors in the male line is or was

of European descent but who is domiciled within the territory of India and is or was born within such territory of parents habitually resident therein and not established there for temporary purposes only.³

This definition emphasizes two essential facts about the Anglo-Indians. It specifies their European "descent" from the male line and, second, that they are natives of India by being born "within the territory of India of parents habitually resident therein." This dual heritage has set them apart as an Indian community with a distinct linguistic and cultural identity. Throughout this article, the term 'Anglo-Indian' will be used with reference to the definition of that term in Article 366(2) of the Constitution of India, 1950.

Though the Anglo-Indian community has typically been located in urban areas, in large numbers, in Calcutta, West Bengal, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, Cochin, Kerala and Mumbai in Maharashtra, there are members of the community who lived and worked away from these centres, in other states of India. Though many have migrated for work or education to other states, Anglo-Indians still live across the country.

The population figures for Anglo-Indians over the years, as gleaned from various sources, are as follows:

Year	Population
1911	159283 ⁴
1921	113090 ⁵
1931	138298 ⁶
1941	250000-300000 ⁷
1947	100,000 ⁸
1951	111637 ⁹
1961	223781 ¹⁰
1994	3-4 lakh ¹¹
2019	3.5 lakhs ¹²

The Constitution of India guaranteed the community political representation through nominations in Central and State legislatures. State Legislative Assemblies of twelve states in India nominated Anglo-Indians to their legislatures¹³ (Dias, 2019). However, the state of Odisha, where all the authors reside, has never nominated an Anglo-Indian to serve in its Legislative Assembly. Dias mentions some states that offered Anglo-Indians seats in professional courses¹⁴ (Dias, 2019). Odisha has also never extended any support of this nature to the community in Odisha and is also one of the ten states that have yet to constitute a State Minorities Commission.¹⁵

Lionel Caplan wrote that Anglo-Indians were 'hardly present at all in histories of modern India' (Caplan, 2001)¹⁶, and Alison Blunt echoes that sentiment when she notes that the history of the community has remained a largely 'hidden history'¹⁷ (Blunt, 2005) which applies to the community in Odisha. The only information in the public domain is the local media reports of community Christmas and New Year celebrations. In a more significant national context, we found no literature on Odisha's Anglo-Indians so the next section attempts an analysis of the situation from the earliest possible point in time.

At first, the English in India accepted Eurasians as colleagues and friends and in the seventeenth century, the East India Company encouraged the growth of a Eurasian community as a support for English activities. In 1687 the Court of Directors wrote to their officials at Madras that 'the marriage of our soldiers to the Native women' was 'a matter of such consequence to posterity that we shall be consent to encourage it with some expense and have been thinking for the future to appoint a Pagoda to be paid to the Mother of any child that shall hereafter be born, of any such future marriage, upon the day the child should be christened, if you think this small encouragement will increase the number of such marriages'.¹⁸

The Community had prospered until around 1785. However, on 14 March 1786, the first of three repressive orders was promulgated against the community when the wards of the Upper Orphanage School at Calcutta, which the East India Company had established for the orphans of British Military officers, were prohibited from sailing to England to complete their education. A second order passed in April 1791 debarred the son of a native Indian from being appointed by the court in employment in the Civil and Military forces of the Company. A third resolution passed in 1795 disqualified all persons not descended from European parents on both sides from service in the army except as fifers, drummers, bandsmen and farriers.

These repressive measures were:

- (1) Partly due to a fear of mutinies, such as those that had occurred in the English forces under Clive in Bengal in 1776.¹⁹
- (2) Partly due to a panic in India and England caused by contemplating possibilities of a rebellion in India led by the now numerous Anglo-Indians. The Mullatos in Haiti , another mixed-race community, had overthrown the French (1791). A similar revolution had taken place in the Dominican Republic against the Spanish, besides the loss of the American colonies (1775-83) probably caused the British to panic. ²⁰
- (3) Partly due to a desire on the part of the East India Company shareholders to control the appointments in different important posts in India, which up to now was in the hands of the Indian Government. ²¹
4. Lord Viscount Valentia's report in 1806 pointed to the increase of the mixed race community who could become too powerful to control(mentioned the revolt of San Domingo) .

The following table illustrates the series of repressive orders passed by the Directors of the East India Company, which resulted in the decline of the economic and social status of the community :²²

Table 1: Summary of Proscriptions seen as inimical to Eurasian Interests, 1773-1813		
Date	Instrument	Effect
1773	Regulating Act	Use of terms Natives of India or British Subjects? Eurasians not mentioned, status open to interpretation
1786	Court of Directors" Directive, 14 March 1786	Bengal officers' illegitimate orphans cannot be returned to Britain. Many Eurasians but few European children illegitimate, severe effect on education, patronage, family connections for Eurasians.
1789	Recommendation of Cornwallis & Lever from War Office	No officers or soldiers to be appointed as Europeans who could not prove that both parents were Europeans, "without any mixture of the blood of natives of India." Eurasians could not serve in regular army limited employment and status
1790	Court of Directors Minute in 1790?	Ban on land ownership for Europeans and Eurasians from 1790-1837- effectively confined Eurasians to three presidency capital cities and under British surveillance.
1791	Court of Directors" Directives, EIC	Bar on covenanted Company service, marine, civil & military for sons of natives [ie. Eurasians]-further limited employment and status
1793	Military Consultations, Fort St George & London	Lord Clive's fund for EIC military and families specifically excludes Eurasians and natives from claiming benefits and is payable in Britain only-discouraging intermarriage and producing pauper families
1795	Court of Directors Minute, 1794	On recommendation of Cornwallis: no Eurasians to be combatants in EIC Armies except as sepoys or musicians-loss of employment, and reduced status or military Eurasians led into service of native rulers
1790s	Court of Directors interpretation of Regulating Act of 1773	Eurasians increasingly seen by EIC as natives of India and not British subjects and so could not serve on Calcutta juries-further Indianising Eurasians. Modified in 1827 to allow Christians to serve.
1803	Arthur Wellesley, August 1803, Military Proc.	Recall of all Europeans (especially British but including Eurasians) in Maratha service-Eurasians now European when expedient but could only serve Britain in 'irregular service'-EIC and regular army proscriptions against sons of natives remain in force.

1804	Regulations of Civil & Military Funds	Benefits not available to Eurasian and Native dependents. Financial hardship meant to discourage intermarriage and benefits seen as encouragement to the sin of miscegenation.
1808	Commander-in-Chief's Order	All Anglo-Indians to be discharged from all ranks of the 'British Army'- evidence suggests that this did not happen.
1813	Charter Act 1813	Hindus subject to Hindu law, Muslims to Muslim law, British subjects to law of England. EIC judiciary decision that the latter meant 'British-born' left confusion over what law Eurasians subject to. Challenged in 1822-legitimate Eurasians were British subjects but usage as natives of India continued; Eurasian Christians had no access of civil law with respect to marriage or property.

Seeking Identity and Community Formation

The reason for seeking British credentials and ignoring their maternal ancestry was a lack of acceptance in the higher rungs of Hindu society which, made it seem that the community rejected its cultural heritage in favour of the British by embracing Christianity and supporting the British. Language, religion and habits linked them to their father's side whereas, in the words of Lord Bentinck, 'if Hindus they must hold the lowest rank, and by whom if Mussulmans they are little likely to be respected'.²³

Class had always been a part of British society, and it was the same in India during the Raj. As many Anglo-Indians were descendants of the rank and file of the Army, who were typical British working class, class distinctions added to the mix and threw up social and cultural barriers to their acceptance. Most of the Company's recruits were agricultural labourers from the distressed areas of Scotland and Britain, and the social gap between them and the civil servants and officers was huge. Their low status in British society, coupled with the fact that they developed alliances with low caste native women who were exaggeratedly believed to be 'with few exceptions, common prostitutes bred to the trade',²⁴ a value judgement that is seen as a stigma that may still be attached to Anglo-Indians today.

Over the years, even though the evidence is absent either way as to how writers could consider an entire community illegitimate, this is countered by Anglo-Indian writers like Stark and Anthony, in what Charlton Stevens calls 'the need to build a positive self-identity...because illegitimacy was deployed as a marker of inferiority as part of a value system internalised by Anglo-Indians themselves'.²⁵

As there was no concept of a 'civil' marriage, only Christian marriages were recognised. Besides, many native women may not have converted before they could marry while several unions may have been solemnised according to local customs, as in the case of Muslim women of social standing living with British officials.²⁶ Colonel Gardner believed that, 'a Moslem lady's marriage with a Christian by a Khazi is as legal in this country as if the ceremony had been performed by the Bishop of Calcutta'.²⁷ What is conveniently overlooked by writers who focus more on the illegitimate nature of the unions, is that British men also married Anglo-Indians of similar status, 'amongst the officers who held the highest situation on the staff of the Company's service in Calcutta, there is not at present one who is not married to a female of Indian descent'.²⁸

Alice Brabcová writes that the basic requirement for a legally valid marriage was not a formal consecration in a church, but the completion of a marriage contract, commonly called 'spousals'. *Spousals were an act in which the bride and groom said their vows in the present tense—'per verba de prasenti'*. Even if there were no witnesses and the marriage was not consecrated in a church, it had the same legal validity.²⁹ This practice had existed in England since the twelfth century and lasted till 1753, and was most likely carried on in India. Captain Richard Burton noted that 'there was hardly an officer in Baroda who was not morganatically married to a Hindi or Hindu woman'.³⁰

The ethnic boundaries thrown up by the British in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century were due to the Protestant revival in Britain. The Church ensured British racial superiority by promoting Christian morality, which extended to relationships, especially between native women and Britishers. The quest to maintain racial purity ensured public disapproval of marriages between the British elite and Anglo-Indian women, and as a result, the community became endogamous, marrying among themselves, which led Anthony to claim its 'distinctive racial-

cum-linguistic-cum-cultural entity' (Anthony, 1969).³¹

Charlton Stevens notes that social closure and the backing of the state enabled colonial Britons to attempt boundary making which the Anglo-Indians chose to ignore by conflating their Britishness or Englishness. They attempted to blur the boundaries through 'rhetoric and early constructions of identity'.³² Educated Anglo-Indians sought better opportunities and inclusion in British society to the point that they disassociated themselves from the vernacular languages and emphasized their Britishness by keeping Indian children out of their children's schools, a habit not approved by the famous Anglo-Indian poet, Derozio. There was a vast gulf between the Anglo-Indian elite and the lower classes socially and economically. The findings of the reports of the economic and social condition in 1819 and 1919 reveal that the majority of the community was either unemployed, lived in terrible conditions and had hardly any education, while there was a relatively small and educated group at the upper strata of that group.

The Anglo-Indians attempted to follow a British way of life, codes and beliefs to surmount the racial barriers that excluded them from British society. This exclusion meant that Anglo-Indians imitated the language, social behaviour and dress of the British. The Anglo-Indians were considered unfavourably by the British 'a poor imitation due to a lack of money and the absence of actual contact with England' and got minimal sympathy from the whites. Indians resented their claims of racial superiority and looked upon them with contempt and indifference.³³ Their claim to Britain as 'home' was ridiculed by the British in India, and the distancing from British society increased owing to their Indian ancestry, class, culture and colour. The Anglo-Indians were treated differently by the colonials on the basis of their colour. As a result, many Anglo-Indians who looked white 'chose to obscure the presence or identity of Indian maternal ancestors' to benefit from this racial passing.³⁴

Colour as a racial discriminator may have been in India before the British, with the seventeenth-century Mughals preferring to marry Kashmiri women for their fairness and looks and that children of the third and fourth generation, who have the brown complexion, and the languid manner of this country of their nativity, are held in much less respect than newcomers'.³⁵ The Portuguese in Malabar wed the lighter skin Muslims rather than the black Malabarese women,³⁶ while in Pondicherry, governed by the French, who were believed to be more relaxed than the British in the matter of colour, a light-skinned Anglo-Indian was more likely to be successful. According to Hawes, 'the rhetoric of the 1820s and 1830s suggests that skin colour was becoming a more critical social discriminator than hitherto. Colour was crucial in deciding if a boy would be sent back to England for education. By the 1840s, when more British women came to India to live, colour placed even the well born Eurasian woman outside the pale of society. At Benares, an army officer who married a wealthy Eurasian, described by a contemporary as a 'nigger half-caste woman was ostracized. The regimental colonels who preferred their officers to keep Indian mistresses than to marry Eurasian women suggests that once the supply of eligible British women increased in India, Eurasian women, as their brothers before them, began to be pushed away from the centres of British upper-class society'.³⁷

The obsession with colour and the separation from native descendants is seen in Governor Malcolm's observation that the 'male part rarely marry the European women, and their connections with their own class, or with the native females of India, produce a race darker than themselves.. while, on the other hand, the children of females who have inter-married with Europeans, from being fairer and belonging to another society, become in one or two generations, separated from that race of natives from whom they are naturally descended'.³⁸

Thus, during the years 1784 to 1833, the community suffered under the repressive policies of the British, which led to unemployment, economic, political and social suppression and thus it was also during this period that the Anglo-Indians were forced through British rejection to form a cohesive unit. Goodrich asserts that 'Eurasians were systematically being set apart as a class, all connections with the European community being carefully and deliberately severed'.³⁹

Hindus also rejected the community because of the caste system, and Indian women who bore European children became outcasts. Though Lobo writes that the Muslims did not accept miscegenation, there are writers who believe that this kind of 'informal prejudice' was not seen in Muslims of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the selection of 'European husbands or of Eurasian wives'. The children born of marriages or liaisons between Muslim women and European males were accepted and raised in the faith of their fathers. However, the community which was neither completely 'Anglo' nor 'Indian' remained in 'no man's land' owing to their dual heritage.

Gist and Wright mention that the need for individuals to form a collective unit arises from two factors. One is a psychological element in which individuals create a distinct collectivity and share common or similar interests,

values and cultural characteristics. The second is a formal or informal set of organisations designed to satisfy and fulfil the aspirations and needs of individuals forming a collective unit.⁴⁰ Thus, the community formed a cohesive unit as a response. Hawes, however, questions this view of community formation and says, 'If a sense of 'belonging' is accepted as an essential attribute of a true community, the predicament of Eurasians was that they sought to belong to the British community, rather than to one another'.⁴¹

During the first half of the 19th century (1800-1850), the Anglo-Indians tried to find a practical way to better their economic condition. For some thirty years, the Eurasian elite of British India seemed to have accepted the discrimination, but in the 1820s, a new spirit was abroad amongst them and the community took social, educational, occupational and political initiatives, all designed to enhance their position in the resident British community. This new-found drive was most evident in Calcutta, where most educated Anglo-Indians lived, but was paralleled to a lesser extent in the Presidency towns of Madras and Bombay.⁴²

Though some schools and orphanages for Eurasians existed in the 17th and 18th centuries, these were all private initiatives. The community made its first serious attempt to provide for the education of its children during the first half of the 19th century (1800-1850). Numerous schools sprang up in cities such as Bangalore, and Madras. The Parental Academic Institution, established in 1823, resulted from the united efforts of the prominent Anglo-Indians of Bengal, with the main aim being to provide an education suitable for the public services departments. Eurasians undertook schemes for settling Eurasians in farming communities, set up philanthropic committees and established apprenticing societies. New initiatives were publicised and the correspondence columns of the English language press in India were used to press the Eurasian cause. Most boldly of all, at the end of the decade Eurasians protested publicly at their uncertain legal position, and at their exclusion from the covenanted services of the Company.⁴³

In 1825, a group of prominent East including Ricketts, James Kyd, Master Shipbuilder of the East India Company, renowned painter Charles Pote, and the famous poet Henry Vivian Derozio, met to put together a petition that would list all the grievances of the East Indians. The 'East Indians' petition (as the community was calling itself then), was presented by Ricketts to both houses of parliament in England in 1830, from the growing mixed-race community of European and Indian parentage, begging redress for the discrimination they had suffered under the rule of the East India Company (Otto, 2015).⁴⁴ The petition succeeded in bringing Eurasian grievances to the fore, and the debate upon it engaged the Company's government and British society in India. In Britain, it involved Parliament, the Board of Control, and the Company's Directors (Hawes, 1996).⁴⁵ The petition asked Parliament to rule on the legal status of Eurasians as 'British Subjects', but the Company view prevailed, and they continued to be 'Natives of India'. Though Ricketts was technically not the spokesman for all Anglo-Indians, the petition signified that Anglo-Indians identified themselves as subjects of the Crown to which they pledged their allegiance. The initiative to appeal to an authority higher than the Company is significant as it suggests that a strong and forceful leadership was beginning to emerge from within the community.

Charlton Stevens, notes how, in order to challenge the petition, four distinct classes were put forth by *The Chronicle*.⁴⁶ The 'First Class' they claimed, were 'Indo-Britons born in wedlock of aboriginal Indian, other Asiatic, or Indo-British fathers, and also their descendants born in wedlock. Crucially, this group were constructed as 'virtually British subjects entitled to all the rights and privileges, and liable to all the disadvantages of European-born Englishmen'.

The 'Second Class' as those whose British male progenitor had not been lawfully married to his Indian, Asian, or Indian British partner, which would thereby consign all descendants of this first interracial union, regardless of any subsequent patterns of legally recognised marriage, to the status of 'natives of India. The *third* class of legitimate offspring of such unions being liable to be made 'prisoners of war during hostilities with their father's country, and the *fourth* class of illegitimate offspring of this kind being exempted from such treatment. A fifth class was said to include 'descendants of aboriginal Asiatic Christians from the Malabar coast, from Damaun, the Malayan Archipelago, and from Manilla Macao' who had merely 'assumed the European habiliments, and ... [were] vulgarly but incorrectly called Portuguese'.⁴⁷ A class boundary was being ascribed solely to the dividing line of legitimacy, but at the same time, it was conceded that 'complexion, education, or family connections might reduce an individual's 'interest' in 'the Company's covenanted service, or ... the King's. These were attempts to categorise, subdivide, and essentialise, deployed various tropes and distinctions with morals and class as well as racial symbolism.⁴⁸

In 1825, a group of prominent Anglo-Indians in Calcutta under the presidency of G. S. Dick formed The East India Club. Dick stated, 'we are deserted by Europeans in this country; and although united with them by the most sacred bonds of relationship, we are avoided and looked upon as their inferiors', and urged the community to close

ranks. The Apprenticing Society was formed in Calcutta in 1827, with the object of paying premiums for lads apprenticed to mechanical firms. From the 1850s to the 1950s, there were attempts to create a physical space or homeland for the community and deal with the question of identity faced by the mixed-race group. The Phoolshair Palace project was an attempt to bring together a scattered community mainly living in urban areas and small railway colonies to provide a sense of rootedness in the soil of their birth and turn them into agriculturalists. In the late 19th century, Anglo-Indian leaders sought to persuade the British to turn India into a settlement colony, in which imported whites would join the mixed-race group to create prosperous strategic islands .

Whitefield in the princely state of Mysore was begun in 1879 by J. White, probably with the intention of creating a future homeland for the mixed-race group. In the early 20th century, Abbott Mount, a colony, was founded in Uttaranchal in the Himalayas. There was also an attempt to settle ex-servicemen in the Andaman's . Ernest Timothy McCluskie, the Anglo-Indian businessman from Kolkata, set up Meluskieganj, a town for Anglo-Indians now in modern Jharkhand.

Macaulay's Minute on Education describes his intent to create a class of interpreters Indian in blood and colour but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, in intellect'. This best described educated Anglo-Indians who had worked for the British over the previous decades but this was interpreted as 'Natives of the full-blood', leaving the community out once again thus prompting Hawes to say 'For the last fifty years Eurasians had not been British enough. After 1835, they were not Indian enough'.⁴⁹

However, by the end of the 1920s , changes in education and employment showed that Anglo-Indians were moving slowly away from traditional occupations, like the railways, and into the private sector. By the end of the 1930s, the community had undergone a significant change and was no longer a totally subservient, demoralised class of people content to subsist on the crumbs of British or Indian patronage. With the Government of India Act of 1935, the British connection was severed and the community could take their place as citizens of India.⁵⁰ Even Gandhi did not believe in separate representation for Anglo-Indians and said: 'Why are Anglo-Indians afraid of their interests being neglected? Because they are Anglo-Indians? No, they are afraid they have not served India. Let the Anglo-Indians enter the legislatures by the open door of service'.⁵¹ However, it was Frank Anthony who espoused the concept of 'Indian by nationality. Anglo-Indian by community', and reoriented the community.⁵² It was to the credit of Indian leaders like Patel and Gandhi that the community was recognised as a minority with representation in the legislatures and in Parliament. Even though the country had accepted the Anglo-Indians, Anthony clearly distinguished between assimilation and integration – 'Integration yes, assimilation no. Unity in diversity must be the key to national solidarity'.

Discussion

Writing on Cultural Marginality, Gist and Wright say:

"Perhaps the most 'visible' of all cultural possessions are language and other forms of symbolic behavior, but others such as 'manners', diet, rituals, attire and family behavior are likewise perceptible and often furnish the yardstick by which the worthiness or unworthiness of individuals and groups is gauged... It is the thesis of this analysis that the Anglo-Indians are (were) culturally marginal to the other Indians in India." ⁵³

Gist and Wright also mention:

"The group that represents the subject of this research, the Anglo-Indian minority community of India and Britain, is viewed from the perspective of cultural and social marginality in its varied aspects. As we have already noted, the group is culturally similar to the British in India or in England, but socially marginal to them in that they have not been accorded full social acceptance in many aspects of social life. On the other hand, they are both culturally and socially marginal to indigenous Indian 'communities' whether Hindu, Muslim, Parsee, Sikh, Jewish, or any other." ⁵⁴

However, the view that Anglo-Indians are marginal, has been contested by Nancy Brennan who says:

"The Marginal Man theory, as it focuses on the characteristics of indecision or of being poised between two cultures with ties to both, is not very useful for analyzing the Anglo-Indian... The study will show that they have a clear self-identity; they know who they are and what they want. Their conflict is not one of being torn between the two: their conflict is one of not having the means to live according to the culture which is theirs".⁵⁵

In his presidential address to the Anglo-Indian General Body in October 1998, Neil O'Brien said:

“We flew in the teeth of history against everything to be in the position we are today. From all this, we must conclude that we do exist, we do matter, and we are part of the mainstream. The question of identity crisis does not arise. We may have personal problems, but the Community as a whole has no identity crisis...

“And yet the Community retains its individuality - and it is good that all communities maintain their individualities. For instance, our Community has maintained its identity through endogamous marriages (though there are exogamous marriages now). But identity remains; social practices that are very special to our Community continue. It retains its own forums, its clubs, its social gatherings and the special *joie de vivre* that you get in Anglo-Indian circles only...

“At the same time where groups of the Community exist, it has integrated itself within the broader aspects of the society in which they live through their working places and through social interactions. We are now more conversant with local languages and we have cultivated even among our women, Indian dress... And, therefore, we accept that we are no longer square-pegs in round holes.

“Among other communities, there is at least one generation now that has studied in Anglo-Indian schools. This has helped immensely in knitting communities together; the Anglo-Indian ethos is no more the monopoly of the Community.”⁵⁶

Conclusion

Williams writes that the basic assumption is that if a community has a well- defined, strong sense of itself, it will be more difficult for it to integrate into the mainstream. Perhaps the best example of this assumption are the Jews, who have a strong sense of identity and have always had difficulty in merging into the mainstream, no matter where they lived.⁵⁷ Owing to the size of the Community, Anglo-Indians seem unable to project themselves as a united whole with a perennial debate on the real size on the actual size of the Community. A more unified approach might allow them to influence the remaking of policies related to job reservation and education thus ensuring fair opportunities for advancement. We concur with O’Brien’s view that the Anglo-Indian Community has become a part of Indian society and its community members are rapidly merging into the mainstream of the country. Future research can explore whether this merging will impact their identity as a community and whether the Community will be able to retain any semblance of ‘the Anglo-Indian ethos’ mentioned by O’Brien.

REFERENCES

1. Törnngren, S.O., Irastorza, N., & Rodríguez-García, D. (2021). Understanding multi-ethnic and multiracial experiences globally: Towards a conceptual framework of mixedness. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 47(4), 763–781. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1654150>
2. Rico, B., Jacobs, P., & Coritz, A. (2023). 2020 Census shows increase in multiracial population in all age categories. <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2023/06/nearly-a-third-reporting-two-or-more-races-under-18-in-020.html#:~:text=The%202020%20Census%20Demographic%20and,than%2066%2C000%20people%20this%20age>
3. The Constitution of India, Article 366(2) (Govt. of India Press, 1974).
4. Anderson, Valerie E.R. (2011) The Eurasian problem in nineteenth century India. PhD Thesis, SOAS (School of Oriental and African Studies), pg.95-97.
5. Lobo, A.I.G. (1994). A comparative study of educational disadvantage in India within the Anglo-Indian community: a historical and contemporary analysis. Ph.D. Thesis, Institute of Education, University of London.
6. Goodrich, D.W. (1942) The Making of an Ethnic Group: The Eurasian Community in India, Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, pg.266. Goodrich used the Census of India, 1931, Vol. I, Subsidiary Table II. The figures include only cities having Anglo-Indian population exceeding 5000. Anthony in Britain's Betrayal in India... however casts doubts on the figure and quotes the Census Commissioner who had said that Anglo-Indians were 200,00 strong. Pg.170.
7. Anthony, Frank, Britain's Betrayal in India, Allied Publishers, New Delhi, 1969, p9.

8. Lobo, A.I.G.(1994). (1994) A comparative study of educational disadvantage in India within the Anglo-Indian community : a historical and contemporary analysis. Ph.D. Thesis , Institute of Education, University of London.pg.240. The number excludes Anglo-Indians who lived in the Princely States.
9. Ibid.pg.240
10. Ibid.pg.240
11. Ibid pg.216
12. According to the figures collected through the various Anglo-Indian organizations by the Federation of Anglo-Indian Associations in India, there are about 3.5 lakhs Anglo-Indians in India. This figure was presented in Parliament by Mr. Hibi Eden M.P. (Ernakulam) in the Lok Sabha and Mr. Derek O'Brien M.P. in the Rajya Sabha during the discussion on the 126th Constitutional Amendment Bill, in Parliament.
13. Dias, C. (2019). The Anglo-Indians and Their Future. Pranatha Books.pg .166.
14. Ibid.pg.124.
15. See article about this situation: <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/10-states-7-uts-yet-to-constitute-state-minorities-commissions/articleshow/99540658.cms?from=mdr>. Accessed on April 17, 2023 .
16. Caplan, L. (2001). Children of Colonialism: Anglo-Indians in a Post-Colonial World. Berg.pg.6.
17. Blunt, A. (2005). Domicile and Diaspora: Anglo-Indian women and the spatial politics of home.
18. Ballhatchet, K. (1980). Race, Sex and Class under the Raj: Imperial Attitudes and Policies and Their Critics. London: Weidenfeld.pg.96.
19. Gaikwad, V. S. R. R. (1967). The Anglo-Indians: A Study in the Problems and Processes Involved in Emotional and Cultural Integration. Asia Publishing House, pg.21.
20. In 1806, a census by the reverend Claudius Buchanan took a census of the Protestant subjects of the British Government in Asia and reported some 110,000 Anglo-Indian Protestants. If the Catholics are considered, the total mixed-race population would easily be double the aforementioned figure. Compared with 7,257 European Protestants in India, including private citizens and the civil and military officials of the East India Company, 6,000 European men in the Company's armies, and 19,800 soldiers in the several units of the British Imperial Army stationed in India. As early as 1806, Eurasian Protestants outnumbered European Protestants in India by more than three to one and out-numbered the Company's servants by more than fifteen to one. Goodrich, The Making of an Ethnic Group, pg.145.
21. Gaikwad, he Anglo-Indians, pg.21.
22. Read Anderson, The Eurasian Problem, pg. 36.
23. Hawes, Poor Relations, pg.75.
24. Penner,P and Dale.R(Eds.)(1983).The Rebel Bureaucrat-Frederick John Shore,Delhi.pg.206.
25. Charlton-Stevens,Anglo-Indians and Minority Politics.pg.50.
26. Hawes, Poor Relations, pg.7
27. Saroop, N(1983).A Squire of Hindoostan, Palit & Palit, New Delhi,pp.24-5.
28. Statham, J (1832).Indian Recollections.London,pg.39.
29. Brabcova, A(2006).Marriage in Seventeenth-Century England: The Woman's Story, University of West Bohemia, Plzeň. Accessed on 1st May,2024 . https://w.ww.phil.muni.cz/angl/thepe/thepe_02_02.pdf
30. Hawes, Poor Relations, pg. 19.
31. Anthony, Britain's Betrayal, pg. 8.
32. Charlton-Stevens, Anglo-Indians and Minority Politics, pg. 49.
33. Op. cit. Gaikwad, The Anglo-Indians, pg.28.
34. Charlton-Stevens, Anglo-Indians and Minority Politics, pg. 49.
35. Bernier,F,Constable,A.(Eds.)(1891).Travels in the Moghul Empire,1656- 1668,Westminster.pg.209,404.
36. Hawes, Poor Relations, pg. 77.
37. Op. cit. Hawes, Poor Relations, pg. 78.
38. Malcolm, J (K. N. Pannikar, Ed.) (1826).The Political History of India, London, II, pg.141-2.
39. Op. cit. Goodrich, The Making of an Ethnic Group, pg.139.
40. Abel, E. (1988). The Anglo-Indian Community: Survival in India. Chanakya Publications, pg. 21.
41. Op. cit. Hawes, Poor Relations, pg.74.
42. Ibid, pg.112.
43. Ibid.
44. Otto, B. H. (2015). Navigating Race and National Identity for Anglo-Indians in the Struggle for Rights and Recognition in Colonial Calcutta, 1821-1830. International Journal of Anglo-Indian Studies, 15(1), 13-33.<http://www.international-journal-of-anglo-indian-studies.org/index.php/IJAIS/issue/view/2>
45. Hawes, Poor Relations, pg.135.
46. Charlton-Stevens, Anglo-Indians and Minority Politics, pg.53.

47. Charlton-Stevens, Anglo-Indians and Minority Politics, pg.54.
48. Charlton-Stevens, Anglo-Indians and Minority Politics, pg.55.
49. Op. cit., Hawes, Poor Relations, pg.152.
50. Op.cit., Abel, E(1988).The Anglo-Indian Community-Survival in India, Chanakya Publications,pg.185.
51. Young India, 5 November 1931, reprinted in M. K. Gandhi, Communal Unity, pg. 190.
52. Speech on National Solidarity Day, 13 May 1977, cited in The Review, May 1977, pg.2
53. Gist, N and Wright, D .R (1973),Marginality and Identity, Leiden E J Brill,pg .25-26.
54. Ibid.pg.36.
55. Brennan, N, The Anglo-Indians of Madras(1979).Ph.D Thesis, Syracuse University,pg.19.
56. Read William, B.R. (2002).Anglo-Indians-Vanishing Remnants of a Bygone Era. Calcutta Tiljallah Relief.pg 66-67
57. Ibid.pg.65.