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ABSTRACT

Between 1908 and 1938, 130 young men and women graduates of St Andrew’s Colonial Homes in Kalimpong, in the Darjeeling district of Northeast India, were resettled in New Zealand. They were the mixed-race offspring of British tea planters and South Asian women, raised at “the Homes” and sent to work as farm labourers and domestic servants for settler colonial families. Founded by a Scottish Presbyterian missionary, the Homes was established around a core belief that colonial emigration would provide a permanent solution to the familial dilemma faced by British tea planters and to the wider Anglo-Indian “problem”. Emigration of Anglo-Indian adolescents to New Zealand was carried out as a structured scheme that sent groups of migrants to prearranged situations with Presbyterian families, many of whom had existing connections to India. This thesis examines the scheme as part of the broad imperial impetus to reform marginalised colonial populations through productive labour. The scheme also enables transcolonial comparisons, as it was based upon improvement of a “problematic” population from a conquest colony through “remedial” placement in a settler colony. Moreover, emigration from the Homes provides an opportunity to analyse the application of a global wave of restrictive immigration legislation to a community that existed on the very borders of acceptability. Although New Zealand did enact such legislation, it was the only settler colony to ever accept groups from Kalimpong.

The implementation of this scheme over a thirty-year period facilitates a sustained examination of the extent to which New Zealand “opportunity structures” applied to a racially marginalized migrant group. Performance of their gendered labour roles is the primary means through which I explore the emigrants’ social integration, while careful attention is paid to their regional and occupational mobility. With a rich archive to draw upon, I prioritise giving voice to the experience of the emigrants themselves, in addition to outlining the role of the New Zealand state in allowing them to enter the Dominion during a period of heightened racial anxieties and legislative tightening of borders. The Presbyterian community in New Zealand that Graham drew into his empire-wide “web” of associates also receives sustained attention. Along with the Homes emigrants, these associates formed what I refer to as the
“Kalimpong community” – the most visible legacy of a scheme otherwise characterised by a high degree of conformity and “disappearance” into the local British population.

South Asian perspectives are crucial in this exploration of interracial “empire families”, often excluded from studies of British families in India in the later imperial period. The period over which the scheme occurred saw enormous social and political change in India. This thesis argues that the life stories of the Kalimpong emigrants reveal the impact of those broader changes in New Zealand. Indeed the chapters that follow match the fluctuations in the archival renderings of the Homes scheme to the relationship between India and New Zealand at a political, community, familial and individual level. The thesis coalesces as a collective narrative that makes a strong case for intertwining familial and academic perspectives. The silence that significantly affected the next generation of Kalimpong families in New Zealand reflected major stigmas in the early twentieth century around race, illegitimacy and institutionalisation. The willing involvement of descendants in this study attests to a fundamental shift in attitudes regarding all three in the space of one generation.
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INTRODUCTION

THE ORIGIN NARRATIVE

S.S. Janus
1st Jan 1921

Our dear Dr Graham,

We all thank you very much for your letter, which we received the first day on the Janus. We all also thank you for the lovely Bibles you gave us, we are sure to appreciate them very much as a last token of remembrance of the dear old Homes, which we all long to see once again. I suppose you all must be anxious to know how we are enjoying our voyage. George was the first to be sick and Mary followed, then Dora, and Gwen, Mavis, and ‘I’ Birdie have not had our turns yet, and hope not to either; at present we are all keeping well and having a most enjoyable time.

Mary and Gwen would like you to please remember them to the McGregor girls, and Dora and I would like you to remember us to Miss Gray, Miss Green and the Luciaites. The Three Ladies, Miss Tyler, Miss Clemance, and Miss Sutton are all keeping well, and they must have a job in keeping us in order, and we are always in various places talking to men. We really can’t help that Dr as they come and talk to us, it is only a bit of fun after all!!!

We all send our love and best wishes to you and your three dear daughters, especially to Miss Betty. We now end our very nice letter.

From your grown up cherubs of Kalimpong.
Mavis, Gwen, Mary, Dora, Birdie and George.

Lorna Birdie Peters, my grandmother, was eighteen years old when she wrote this letter onboard the S.S. Janus on New Years’ Day, 1921. The voyage took the six “grown up cherubs” from Calcutta to Melbourne, where they would tranship to Dunedin, in the South Island of New Zealand. Their journey, however, had begun in Kalimpong, a small town in the foothills of the eastern Himalayas, and the site of St Andrew’s Colonial Homes (hereafter “the Homes”). The Homes was founded in 1900 by the Reverend Dr John Anderson Graham,

---

1 Lorna Peters to John Graham, 1 January 1921, Peters file, Dr Graham’s Homes Archive (DGHA), Kalimpong.
2 In this thesis I follow the convention among former pupils and staff to refer to the Homes in the singular tense and to omit apostrophes that would usually apply. For example, “Homes scheme”, “Homes graduates”.
a Scottish Presbyterian minister and the recipient of Lorna’s letter. These six young people had grown up at the Homes in what was regarded as necessary isolation from the circumstances of their birth. They were the mixed-race children of British tea planters and Indian women, and their upbringing was designed to prepare them for a future in the settler colonies. On the ship, however, their very selfhood was in limbo. They occupied an anxious space between their collective pasts and individual futures, between adolescence and adulthood, and between their ambiguous racial status as “Anglo-Indian” and the hope of becoming “colonials”. Only through their imminent work placements as domestic servants and farm labourers with settler colonial families would the final stage of their training be complete, and the transformation of their social potential be realised.

The content of Lorna’s letter introduces aspects of the Homes scheme that distinguished it from others that enacted similar familial intrusions with the aim of productively “improving” marginalised youth in the British Empire. Her thanks for Graham’s letter pointed to his and other staff members’ continued involvement with the graduates. Gratitude for the Bibles was indicative of their Christian upbringing; however its function as a “last token of remembrance” rather than a source of religious guidance was notable. (Lorna was sceptical of Christianity, but kept the Bible for the rest of her life.) The turn of phrase “dear old Homes” calls to mind the Scottish inflection in their soft Anglo-Indian accent, a crucial criteria of racial distinction in India and a cultural marker which, like the colour of their skin, could not be concealed from the outside world. Lorna’s request that Graham pass on greetings to housemothers and friends living in cottages at the Homes sounds like school banter, and indeed this thesis will suggest that the trials and tribulations of the experience were akin to that of a British boarding school. On a more serious note, and no doubt of concern to Graham, was the mention of onboard encounters with men. The housemothers who chaperoned the parties of young women were there to protect them from precisely this kind of interaction, and deliver them into Presbyterian families that would do the same.

The act of writing a letter on the open sea itself invokes the constant motion and shifting currents that characterised attitudes towards people of “in-between” status in the colonial era. Lorna and her companions collectively embodied the British (and Indian) view
that defined and problematised them by their racial impurity. Moreover, in a period when the white Dominions tightened their borders in order to restrict the entry of non-British subjects, the Kalimpong emigrants hovered on the very borders of acceptability. Over the course of the emigration scheme from the Homes to New Zealand, it proved difficult for Graham to predict their colonial reception at any given moment. The image of them bobbing on the open sea for weeks on end in anticipation of this future is a powerful reminder that the only way to test the scheme was to carry it out with real people – thinking, feeling people, separated from real families, and placed into colonial households alive with their own dramas. This thesis prioritises the experiences of the Homes emigrants, in addition to the broader set of anxieties that their stories illuminate. Appropriately for a young woman in her teens, Lorna was preoccupied by the steady stream of intriguing events and encounters onboard, which was unsurprising considering her fifteen years isolated at the institution. Nostalgic memories of the Homes had already become part of the way she understood her place in the world, and these were no doubt matched by unrecorded imaginings of what lay ahead.

**Lorna’s Story, My Story**

Lorna was placed with a Presbyterian minister and his family in Port Chalmers, near the southern city of Dunedin. Graham arranged this employment with the Simpson family prior to her departure from Kalimpong through his local Presbyterian connections, as he did for all of the emigrants sent to New Zealand under this scheme. Lorna was with the Simpsons for five years, and retained a lifelong friendship with them. Her employment ended with another dramatic event in her life, and one that was unusual among the Kalimpong emigrants. Her father, Egerton Peters, visited New Zealand in 1926 and was reunited with his three children after a twenty-year separation. Egerton wrote to his Aunt in London of the “family party” in the tiny settlement of Arowhenua, on the bank of the Opihi River in South Canterbury. Pondering his future, Egerton wrote of his reluctance to be parted with his children once more. “I suppose I shall have to go back to tea”, he mused. In fact Egerton never left. He bought a small poultry farm in Pine Hill on the outskirts of Dunedin, and lived out his days with Lorna, her husband, and two sons.

---

3 Egerton Peters to Caroline Peters, 16 November 1926, Peters family archive, London.
Lorna’s younger son, Donald, is my father. He was born in 1941, and remembers his childhood as a busy but peaceful one. He and his older brother Bill spent most of their spare time helping with farm duties and assisting neighbouring farmers in what was a tight-knit semi-rural community. When Don was 28 years old, he met my mother, Barbara. They married and moved to Mosgiel, a small town west of Dunedin. I was the second of four children, and have strong recollections of our weekly Sunday visits to the place of his childhood. We would pile into our old white Vauxhall Cresta and drive over Three Mile Hill, bypassing the city and taking the very last turnoff before leaving Dunedin, to Pine Hill. Winding up through the suburb proper, we knew we were nearly there when we felt the transition from smooth tarseal to the crunching dusty gravel road. This was soon followed by the rattles and bumps of the cattle stop as we turned down the long driveway, in the shadow of a daunting macrocarpa hedge, towards the old cottage where my father’s family waited.

Lorna died in 1978, when I was five years old. Apart from a few fleeting memories – of her shrill voice, her thick stockings and white tennis shoes, her busy walking stick – my engagement with Lorna’s story as I grew up was only through questioning my parents. Lorna’s Indian ancestry was something that we “always knew”. She was dark skinned, as are my father and brothers. If I asked about that, there seemed nothing further to know. Lorna’s mother was Indian, therefore she was part-Indian, so was Dad, and so were my brothers and I. End of story. The legacy of her father (Egerton), however, was as alive to us as her maternal side was silent. His kindly portrait watched over us in the sitting room. To me he looked educated and sophisticated – traits that made him seem entirely out of place in the cramped, somewhat dishevelled and dark interior of the Pine Hill cottage. Egerton had been a tea planter in Assam. We knew that from his polo trophy on the mantelpiece. His forebears had been in India too; a set of war medals on display told us so. Large antlers on the wall were described as trophies from his hunting days in India. The fine china cups from which we drank tea with our scones were also part of Egerton’s English legacy. His sister, Lady Warren, had written a book called *Through Algeria and Tunisia on a Motor-bicycle*, which we would take out of the bookcase and carefully leaf through the crusty worn pages. Like Egerton’s artefacts, her tales of adventure brought the Empire into our sitting room.
From a young age I was curious about my father’s eccentric family and unusual background. Mosgiel was a very mono-cultural town. Being mixed-race was not a problem, but it was noticeable. Like the presence of colonial objects, questions from others about our heritage prompted an awareness of difference. People commented positively on our “olive” complexion, and I accepted and enjoyed being “part-Indian”. Despite his different heritage, my father was thoroughly “Kiwi” in his masculinity, working as a mechanic servicing farm machinery in the surrounding rural district of the Taieri plains. What I found unsettling was the absence of any trace of the Indian heritage at Pine Hill. I began to ask questions about how it was that Lorna and her siblings came to New Zealand. The children’s mother had died young, we were told, and they had grown up in an orphanage, which I assumed to be in New Zealand. It was only in my late teens that I was told that Lorna was eighteen years old when she arrived in Dunedin. This only prompted further, unanswerable, questions about where she had grown up. It was even later that my questions led to the disclosure that Egerton had committed suicide at the Pine Hill property when my father was five years old.

Learning of Egerton’s suicide added a disturbing element to a family history already dominated by intrigue and mystery. I knew that Lorna had not talked about her Indian background to her children, and that when my mother had married Don and directly asked her about it, Lorna had refused to answer, stating that “you wouldn’t want to know”. My mother also recalled Lorna saying that Egerton had always said that the day her mother had died was “the saddest day of his life”. These snippets became part of family folklore. In my mind, the few details we had all pointed to major scandal: an illicit relationship, the mother’s early death, the children scurried off alone to a distant colony, reunited with their father only to be re-traumatised by his suicide, and to never talk about their Indian origins. In my mind, events separated by seventy years were compressed into one dark origin story.

In 2007, while I was planning a trip to India, my father showed me a packet of early Pine Hill photographs that I had not seen before. Inside was an envelope marked “Kalimpong school” that contained two group photographs, with names listed on the reverse, including Lorna Peters (see Figures 1 and 2). My consequent visit to the Homes in Kalimpong several months later completely transformed our family narrative. Not only did I learn notable details
about the Peters’ family circumstance – that Lorna’s mother was Nepali, and was alive when she was admitted to Homes – I found that our family history was part of a bigger story. Other children had been sent from tea plantations to the “orphanage” while their parents were still alive and many had also been sent to New Zealand. When the archivist at the Homes presented me with the Peters personal file, I was suddenly transported from “knowing nothing” to viewing correspondence spanning a thirty-year period that gave me more insight into my grandmother’s and great-grandfather’s lives than perhaps many people would have. Lorna’s letter from the S.S. Janus, besides being one of many letters that told a compelling story, totally changed my impression of her. I had never really thought about what the experience of growing up in India would have been like for her, nor the transition to New Zealand. The bright, well-educated tone of her letter, which was revealed to have been preceded by a “wild upbringing” on the plantation during which she spoke “not a word” of English, were aspects of my grandmother’s life that I could never have imagined.

The process of reframing my family story has been greatly impacted by the research conducted for this thesis, especially through my conversations with descendants of other Kalimpong emigrants. Hearing resounding echoes of my family story in the narratives of others has developed my understanding of these life trajectories punctured by sudden moments of separation and trauma; at the same time it has brought the uniqueness of Lorna, and her life story, to the surface. I was astounded by the number of families who had followed an identical pathway through silence and confusion to eventually find themselves at the Homes in Kalimpong. Individually we had all followed the trail of what we believed to be a unique heritage. Imagining a vantage point from high above looking down on the geography of New Zealand, I see those journeys to Kalimpong as lines connecting discrete points in the North and South Islands to a single point in the foothills of the Himalayas rarely marked on world maps. Unbeknownst to us, we were each acting out a familial drama that many had done before and which others would follow. An important aim of this thesis is to make visible this collective story, which had been lost to us all – even those few families where the Indian heritage and Homes upbringing was known of and discussed.
The most striking similarity revealed in my meetings with other Kalimpong families in New Zealand was the way that we had constructed our narratives within a legacy of silence. The emigrants’ unwillingness to talk about their Indian heritage fuelled our curiosity, and their sensitivity about it contributed to our speculation about their early lives. Developing an understanding of the Kalimpong story requires knowledge of its three key components: the circumstances of birth, the Homes upbringing, and the scheme that brought the emigrants to New Zealand. An awareness of wider historical circumstances is crucial in order to make sense of each of these aspects of the story, and many descendants have read academic studies for this purpose. However some of the assumptions that we have made in lieu of a deeper understanding are difficult to dislodge. These assumptions comprise what I term here the “origin narrative”. The figures of the “tea planter” and a nameless “Indian” woman, and notions of life in an early twentieth century institution, have set a heavy historical tone to the family narratives we have woven from our forebear’s hidden heritage. This thesis utilises a range of archival and personal sources to bring specificity and nuance to each stage of this origin story, and from that foundation builds the first detailed narrative of the emigration scheme. In this collective enterprise I aim to extend the reach of the Kalimpong story – to create a new “end point” in the narrative that cycles back to the beginning, opening out that which was constrained and confined to allow an easier telling of an intriguing past.

**Anglo-Indian Communities in India**

John Graham opened the St Andrew’s Colonial Homes on 24 September 1900. Graham’s intervention in the Anglo-Indian “problem” was sparked by his visits to plantations in the tea districts of northeast India as part of his duties for the Church of Scotland mission in Kalimpong. In tea planters’ bungalows he noted the regular appearance of mixed-race children who were quickly ushered out of sight. They were, undeniably, products of the planters’ sexual relationships with local women. During a decade of mission work in the 1890s, Graham devised a plan to use Kalimpong as an isolated site where he might make educational and social provision for these children, with a view to sending them to settler

---

4 “Anglo-Indian” is used throughout this thesis to refer to the mixed-race community of India. The term replaced “Eurasian” in 1911 as the official name for people of mixed parentage. For a summary of the various names applied to the community see Laura Bear, *The Jadu House: Intimate Histories of Anglo-India* (London: Transworld Publishers, 2000), 287-291.
colonies as young adults. To this end he combined the discourse of child rescue in Britain with that which had developed around the problem of impoverished Anglo-Indians in cities like Calcutta. Importantly, his plan also included “rescuing” these city children, using the same institution to intervene in a very different circumstance. Remaking these distinctions between the children admitted to the Homes is a crucial first step in analysing the emigration scheme. While Graham’s rhetoric was based on the accepted trope of Anglo-Indian destitution, the tea planters’ children, whom he was most anxious to send to the colonies, had for the most part grown up in anything but destitute circumstances. My research has confirmed that the great majority of emigrants to New Zealand were born into interracial tea plantation families, predominantly in northeast India.⁵

The Anglo-Indian “problem” has received considerable scholarly attention, including several studies inspired by Ann Laura Stoler’s highly influential work on the anxieties around racial mixing in the Dutch East Indies.⁶ In India, public debate about the “Eurasian question” reached its heights in the early twentieth century, as a consequence of British colonial officials’ desire to enact a greater distance between ruler and ruled in the aftermath of the 1857 rebellion.⁷ This redrawing of cultural boundaries was based upon a new emphasis on Indian “difference”, and reinforced the historic marginalisation of the Anglo-Indian community, which had the unfortunate distinction among mixed-race colonial populations of

---

⁵ Information gathered from families I have been in contact with (accounting for 67 of the 130 emigrants) and other sources have only revealed a handful of emigrants born into circumstances other than tea plantations.
⁷ Although Durba Ghosh argues that anxieties about racial mixing in India were present much earlier, scholars generally agree that by the late nineteenth century interracial relationships were an important ground upon which to enforce physical and social distance between ruler and ruled. See Durba Ghosh, Sex and the Family in Colonial India (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), passim.
being treated with contempt by the British and Indian sides of their heritage. As Laura Bear has argued, while studies of mixed-race communities in other contexts have been used to trace “historically and morally structured links between nationalism and exclusionary practices of racism”, such explorations of British and Indian attitudes towards Anglo-Indians have been noticeably absent. In addressing this gap in the scholarship, Bear found that the treatment of Anglo-Indians in India revealed much about the “the cosmologies of the nation and the ways they have been rooted in transformed notions of kinship, natural inheritances, and descent”.

The changing social climate in British India after 1857 profoundly impacted such notions of descent, by making it practically impossible for British fathers to send their mixed-race children to England for an education and to incorporate them into their extended families. Children of interracial relationships had to be provided for within India. This meant an increasing reliance upon local institutions to educate mixed-race children, and to facilitate their containment and direction into productive employment in regulated spaces. Although the British always regarded Anglo-Indians as inferior and potentially subversive, they brought the community into the imperial project through managing their labour into a racialised workforce, with most Anglo-Indians employed by the Indian railways. Housed in railway “colonies”, they were segregated from the “white” British community and confined to working, socialising and marrying others of mixed descent. In turn, Anglo-Indians were typically concerned about protecting the distinctions between themselves and the “native” population as a whole and worked hard to maintain social (and sexual) distance from South Asians. The Homes emigration scheme was designed to provide an alternative for tea planter’s children to entering this segregated and much maligned community.
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9 Bear, Lines of the Nation, 13.
10 Ibid.
12 Caplan traces the development of these institutions in Children of Colonialism, 27-28.
13 Bear found that “even as late as 1923 nearly half of the Anglo-Indian community was employed by or associated with the railways”. Bear, Lines of the Nation, 9. On the ambiguous treatment of Anglo-Indians see Ibid., 63-90; Durba Ghosh, “Making and Un-making Loyal Subjects: Pensioning Widows and Educating Orphans in Early Colonial India”, Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History 31, no.1 (2003): 3; and Teresa Hubel, “In Search of the British Indian in British India”, 250.
The high social cost for British men who disclosed their involvement in interracial relationships in the later period has meant that studies by Laura Bear, Lionel Caplan and others have focused on the Anglo-Indian community as that defined by the presence of a distant European male ancestor. The later relationships were not legitimated and hence left no bureaucratic trail; moreover South Asian women were frequently excluded from British colonial archives. Few British men left any documentary or photographic record of their interracial families, despite the wealth of archival material generated by “empire families” as a means of maintaining kinship across large distances. Elizabeth Buettner made extensive use of these publicly archived records in her study of British families in India. While Buettner’s work is laudable for its focus on family, her exclusion of South Asian perspectives on the operation of colonial families has reinforced the historical erasure of mixed-race people from British families. This study seeks to rectify that erasure. Kalimpong descendants have already brought this about in a very tangible manner during visits to Britain to research their paternal heritage. Several have knocked on doors in Scotland and England, inking a new (but suspected) branch into British family trees. The more difficult absence to address is the South Asian maternal line. In this study I explore the dynamics of interracial plantation families with a particular interest in their domestic setting: the women’s place in the bungalows, and the circumstances from which Graham argued that the children needed to be “rescued”.

Resettling “Anglo-Indians” in New Zealand

Graham’s original stated purpose in opening the “colonial” Homes was to provide a long term solution to the Anglo-Indian problem through permanent settlement of mixed-race adolescents in “the colonies”. This aim set the Homes apart in important ways. Juvenile migration had been enacted as a means of uplifting impoverished British children, but not for

14 The official definition of Anglo-Indian in 1947 was “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”. Bear, The Jadu House, 291.
racially marginalised people within the colonies. In Australia and Canada, removing mixed-race children from their families aligned with the state policy of indigenous assimilation, and thus resolved the “problem” within the boundaries of the nation. Contrastingly in New Zealand, the policy of racial “amalgamation” was pursued within an unregulated framework that never prohibited marriage between Māori and Pakeha nor removed mixed descent children from their families, and Māori retained a range of political rights that were denied to indigenous communities in Australia and Canada.\textsuperscript{18} My exploration of the workings of the Homes emigration scheme in conjunction with these colonial developments, not only heeds Bear’s call for the treatment of Anglo-Indians to be read as revealing the racial politics of the nation, but extends the analysis to a transcolonial framework. The transfer of a mixed-race community from a “conquest” colony to a white “Dominion” in the period when these distinctions were being created, positions this study among those addressing the lack of comparative work on colonial states.\textsuperscript{19}

New Zealand was the only settler colony that ever granted entry to groups of Homes graduates. The first two young men were sent to Dunedin in 1908. The final group arrived in Wellington, the capital city, in 1938. A total of 130 adolescents were sent from Kalimpong to New Zealand over this thirty-year period. Their arrival was distributed unevenly across these years, as the scheme fluctuated in tandem with global political and economic upheavals (see Figure 3). I refer to the emigration of these young people as a “scheme” by virtue of its organisation: chaperoned groups of graduates were sent from the institution to pre-arranged employment and housing at their destinations, and managed thereafter by local committees. Despite the emigration of numbers of graduates over a prolonged period, the scheme is remembered mainly for the difficulties Graham encountered in realising his colonial vision.\textsuperscript{20} In his chapter on the Homes, Satoshi Mizutani describes the emigration scheme as a landmark

\textsuperscript{20} Simon Mainwaring, \textit{A Century of Children} (Kalimpong: Dr Graham’s Homes, 2000), 22; James Minto, \textit{Graham of Kalimpong} (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1974), 75-76. Both books were written by former staff of the Homes.
in the “Eurasian Question”, but only briefly touches on its implementation and legacy. Lionel Caplan affords three sentences to emigration from the Homes in Children of Colonialism, concluding with a statement from James Minto’s biography of Graham that the “Whites-only” policy of New Zealand and Australia “was a constant source of irritation and sadness to Graham”. Caplan’s chapter is notable for being one of the few studies of Anglo-Indian emigration, despite the exodus of over half of the population of 200,000 since 1947. Hence, in addition to being the first sustained examination of the Homes emigration scheme, this thesis makes an important contribution to the study of migrant Anglo-Indian populations.

An article recently published by Andrew May looks specifically at juvenile emigration from the Homes in Kalimpong. May, drawing upon some of the same sources I utilise in this thesis, argues that digitisation of the Homes archive would empower descendants to reconstitute their fragmented family histories. As a study of emigration from the Homes, May’s article is limited by his lack of focus on a particular period or site of settlement. There is little indication of the vital importance of Graham’s Presbyterian network in facilitating settlement in New Zealand, and May makes no distinction between the pre-1940 organised emigration of groups and later individual migrations to various destinations including Australia. Nor does he address the impact of political events in India on the construction of Kalimpong family narratives. When introducing a collection of correspondence held in the National Library of Scotland, May suggests that “from the late 1940s the old Homes boys and girls were writing back to Kalimpong reporting on their situations”. In fact the presence of these letters (written between 1947 and 1951) in Edinburgh was a consequence of a split in the Homes archive due to the institution’s uncertain future in India. Many thousands of such letters had been written in the decades prior to 1940 but were stored in the personal files at the Homes in Kalimpong.

21 Mizutani, The Meaning of White, 170.
22 Caplan, Children of Colonialism, 132.
25 Ibid., paragraph 28.
As May, Caplan and others have suggested, immigration restrictions were the primary challenge to the Homes scheme; however I will argue that the entry of Homes graduates to New Zealand enables a nuanced exploration of the workings of those raced restrictions over a crucial period in the history of global border regulation.\textsuperscript{26} Previous studies of this legislation in New Zealand have, with good cause, focused on its impact on the Chinese and Indian communities that it was designed to, and did, exclude.\textsuperscript{27} While these studies have brought Asian perspectives to a national historiography that has otherwise been ordered around the relationship between British and Māori, much work is needed to bring these communities to their rightful place at the centre of local narratives.\textsuperscript{28} This task is made difficult by the “history of small numbers” that has characterised the migration of Indians and other “foreigners” to New Zealand.\textsuperscript{29} Non-British settlers have either been excluded from national narratives, or “included” in a way that diminishes their origins and mirrors the terms of conformity that determined their acceptance in the first place. Setting the Homes emigrants within this historic emphasis on consensus is key to understanding their integration into the majority.

An important distinction between the Kalimpong emigrants and other non-British migrant communities in New Zealand was their diverse origins in India, which marks this community off, for example, from Punjabi or Gujarati migrants who share a common mother tongue, clear regional identification and a common cultural “homeland”.\textsuperscript{30} Although they
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shared the experience of growing up at the Homes, the familial break wrought by their institutionalisation meant that the emigrants did not retain cultural links to the locations of their birth. In this sense they more closely fit the description of a “diasporic” community than other migrant groups in New Zealand, given their essential loss of a homeland to which they could return. This break from their maternal cultural heritage, along with the strategy of sending small numbers of graduates and dispersing them widely, facilitated the emigrants’ immediate and thorough integration into settler colonial society. John Graham’s belief that such integration would be possible in New Zealand owed much to the Dominion’s reputed egalitarianism and enlightened attitudes towards race. His scheme thus presents a prime opportunity to bring raced migration into dialogue with studies that have tested and explored the working of this enduring reputation within the predominantly British population.

The most sustained investigation of New Zealand’s “opportunity structures” was initiated in the 1970s by Erik Olssen in his study of early twentieth century Caversham, a suburb in Dunedin. The project has since been extended to encompass three southern suburbs and the period of 1880 to 1940. Olssen’s work, and the extensive body of scholarship that it has generated, has deployed a range of methodologies and sources to examine urban social structures, with a strong emphasis on identifying residential patterns and the relationship between occupational mobility and local migrations. The project has also produced Sites of Gender, a collection of essays that addressed the exclusion of women from tropes that linked a strong work ethic to social opportunity. Race, however, has been a notable absence from the work published out of the Caversham project. Although Olssen argued that only the Chinese were regarded as “total outsiders” in Caversham, the tolerance he described largely
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32 For an outline of the historiography around the egalitarian reputation of New Zealand see Melanie Nolan, “Constantly on the Move but Going Nowhere? Work, Community and Social Mobility”, in The New Oxford History of New Zealand, 357-388.
33 A brief description of the Caversham Project is provided in the opening pages of the most recent work produced by the study. Erik Olssen, Clyde Griffen and Frank Jones, An Accidental Utopia? Social Mobility and the Foundations of an Egalitarian Society, 1880-1940 (Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2011), 9-10.
applied to religious and national differences among the English, Scots and Irish.\textsuperscript{35} As Angela Wanhalla’s work has demonstrated, mixed-race Māori families in Dunedin “disappeared” into this urban consensus by taking on the values and habits of the British majority.\textsuperscript{36}

This capacity for mixed-race populations to merge into the majority was precisely what Graham sought for his graduates. However he first had to navigate growing anxieties about “imported labour”. An undervalued work by the demographer W. D. Borrie written in 1938 argued that economic forces underpinned the implementation of immigration controls in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{37} The shortage of “ideal” British settlers who were willing to perform rural and household labour was met by assisting lower class Britons to emigrate. These persistent shortages were a key lever for Graham, in what became a quest to align Homes graduates with this category of settler. His task became one of convincing immigration officials that his graduates were not only British, but in every way that mattered, white. This intersection of economic imperatives and racial formation has brought labour to the forefront of analysis in this thesis. David Roediger’s studies of race and the working class in the United States are highly influential in this framing.\textsuperscript{38} Roediger argues that labour was a crucial arena in the formation of the category of “whiteness” that came to include new immigrants. His insistence that this formation was “worked out” by a multitude of quotidian activities aligns with my emphasis upon the lived experiences of the Kalimpong emigrants in New Zealand.\textsuperscript{39}

This study does more than bring Roediger’s framework to the New Zealand context; it extends his analysis to gender. The men’s rural labour and the women’s domestic service, I argue, was the primary means of their socialisation into “white” settler families and communities. I also contend that Graham’s difficulty in realising his colonial vision was more complex than navigating border controls. The particular versions of masculinity and
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femininity cultivated in Kalimpong were based upon Graham’s immersion in the British Indian context, where the remedial discourse applied to Anglo-Indian boys and girls centred around counteracting the lingering “native” traits of effeminacy among men and sexual promiscuity among women.\(^{40}\) The gendered training at the Homes was meant to eliminate these tendencies by inculcating a robust and disciplined work ethic that Graham believed would “fit” them to perform the labour required in settler colonies. The men’s experiences in New Zealand suggest, however, that they embodied a substantively different colonial masculinity to that of the rural labourers with whom they rubbed shoulders; while the women found themselves in the centre of the contested space occupied by domestic servants in colonial households.\(^{41}\) Situating the Kalimpong emigrants between articulations of gender formation in these distinct imperial settings highlights the primary place of gender in understanding the migration experience.

The challenging transition from an institution in British India to New Zealand households and farms was facilitated and supported by a network of Presbyterian social reformers and ex-India British settlers, many of whom had existing connections to India. While previous scholarship has examined the workings of restrictive border legislation in preventing immigration, this study emphasises the role of Presbyterian networks in facilitating the entry of Homes graduates to New Zealand. The migration history of New Zealand, for all racial and cultural groups, has been dominated by kinship and family links.\(^{42}\) Graham’s scheme hinged upon creating a network of families whose homes would be the first site of socialising adolescents who had grown up in communal “cottages” with housemothers, into colonial households comprising small family units. In this manner, there would be no


replication of the segregated Anglo-Indian communities in India. Graham perceived settler colonial populations as already “mixed” and therefore an ideal entry point for mixed-race adolescents, who could never become British, nor Indian, but who might become colonials.

One cannot write about imperial networks without crediting the work of Tony Ballantyne, whose highly influential metaphor of the “webs of empire” has underwritten my imagining of the “Kalimpong community” in New Zealand, and its growth from a single point of connection to encompass an active network of supporters throughout the Dominion. Two aspects of Ballantyne’s explanation of the metaphor are particularly useful here. The first is the “inherently relational nature of the empire” as evidenced by the multiple positions any one location could occupy in various webs. In Graham’s network, the isolated town of Kalimpong sat firmly at the centre of a community that had nodes in India, Britain and the settler colonies. Secondly, the “fragility” of the web helps to convey the impact of Indian independence in 1947, when the centre of the Kalimpong network became fragmented and consequently far less effective. It is around this crucial political event that the central argument of this thesis pivots: that India’s changing position in the British Empire incurred a deep legacy not only in the lives of the Kalimpong emigrants, but in the structure of the narratives woven by their descendants.

In his opening to Orientalism and Race, Ballantyne cites Eric Wolf’s scholarship to argue that the British Empire comprised a “‘bundle of relationships’ that brought disparate regions, communities and individuals into contact through systems of mobility and exchange”. My study adds “families” to that sentence, countering Ballantyne’s focus on knowledge circulation with a grounded exploration of the messy workings of empire families that sat outside acceptable norms. By meeting descendants and being immersed in the next generations of those families, a collective life narrative has become the nest within which the history of the emigration scheme was written. Unexpectedly, the dynamics revealed by this
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44 Ballantyne, Orientalism and Race, 15.
family involvement have become the argument that binds together the disparate archives used in this thesis. While the “Kalimpong Kids” archive is incredibly rich, the many voices and audiences it comprises can be highly ambiguous. But a high degree of consistency has been found in the relationship between the narrative structure and key political moments. The Homes archive was deeply tuned to shifts in the relationship between India and New Zealand. As Antoinette Burton’s scholarship taught me in my first excursions into the Kalimpong project, archives are “fully-fledged historical actors”. In the chapters that follow, I treat them as such.

Archives and Methods

The archival material used in this thesis falls into three broad categories. The first was that generated directly by Graham and stored at the Homes in Kalimpong. When I first visited the Homes in 2007, I was shown three historical sources: the original admissions book, the St Andrew’s Colonial Homes Magazine (hereafter Homes Magazine) and the Peters personal file. The admissions book and the Homes Magazine were on display in the Homes Museum, while the personal files were stored in the school office and administered by the school secretary. There was a personal file for every family that has sent children to the Homes. All three sources were considered highly sensitive and were hence made available only to the families of those concerned. The files have also acted as a conduit to family reconnections, and are the chief means of dealing with descendants who arrive at the Homes seeking information. Although the archivist had no prior notice of my visit in 2007, it took her only a few minutes to locate Lorna’s 105-year-old file.

Glimpsing a few pages of the Homes Magazine during that visit was enough to tell me that this was potentially a valuable historical resource. It was a polished publication, filled with debate about the “Eurasian problem”, committee reports, and appeals for funding. Most remarkable to my eyes were the numerous pages in each edition headed “For the Old Girls and Boys” which contained regular reports from Homes graduates in New Zealand. Standing

in a room in this isolated institution in the foothills of the Himalayas, I experienced an unexpected jolt of recognition as I read of young men complaining of milking cows on cold mornings in Middlemarch (a farming district close to where I grew up in Mosgiel) and saw photographs of 1920s women captioned “The Wellingtonians” and “The Aucklanders”. I found mention of Lorna’s group departing for Dunedin and took a photograph of that and two other pages, before being whisked down to the school office to view the Peters file. As I ambled down the driveway and away from the Homes, I began to imagine myself returning at some point in the future to carry out further research on behalf of other New Zealand families.

Before making that return journey to carry out research for this thesis, I needed to gather information about the individuals that were sent to New Zealand. Simon Mainwaring’s centennial history provided some details about the numbers that emigrated between 1908 and 1938. It was through Satoshi Mizutani’s work that I learnt that the National Library of Scotland housed an almost complete series of the *Homes Magazine* and a substantial collection of documents relating to the Homes in its “Kalimpong Papers”. These papers formed a sub-category of source material in that they were generated by Graham but deposited in an archive outside India, and one that is accessible to the public. The collection included private and published material relating to the emigration scheme. Aside from the *Homes Magazine*, the most useful sources were Graham’s diaries of his tours of New Zealand in 1909 and 1937, later correspondence between the Homes secretary James Purdie and graduates settled in New Zealand, brochures printed at the opening of the Homes, and notes typed by Graham in preparation for an autobiography (which was never published). So began the process of creating a file for each New Zealand emigrant, enabling me to develop a sense of individual life trajectories and to produce a complete list of emigrants and their dates of arrival in New Zealand (Appendix 1).

The second category of archival material was sourced in New Zealand and generated independently of the Homes. In the first instance this comprised a systematic search of archives and online databases for each emigrant, including electoral rolls, cemetery records, newspapers, and the government index of births, deaths and marriages. Probate files and personnel files from the First World War held at National Archives New Zealand were also
utilised. The war files were notable for being the first documented evidence of the Kalimpong emigrants’ encounters with the New Zealand state. Immigration Department records of the entry of migrants under the permit system in the 1920s and 1930s were another important source outside the Homes archive. The first major finding of the database searches was that there was no evidence that any of those who arrived under the Homes scheme were still alive. Secondly, I located a high proportion of the emigrants in electoral rolls, and this provided a consistent data set of their locations, occupations and marital status. The third key outcome was the almost incidental tracing of a number of people who I identified as descendants of these emigrants to New Zealand.

In November 2011, six months after commencing the thesis, I embarked on a month-long trip around New Zealand to gather information that comprised the third category of source material: interviews with descendants and access to their private family archives. I had written letters to six families whom I was quite sure were descended from Kalimpong emigrants, briefly outlining the project and explaining my reason for contacting them. I suggested a time to phone them and provided details should they prefer to contact me at a different time or in a different way. The morning after I posted the letters my phone rang. It was Gavin Mortimore, of Invercargill, stunned and excited at the information I had provided which in itself filled a huge gap in his knowledge of his father. Gavin’s enthusiasm for the project and generosity in sharing his own story was matched by all but one (who I never managed to contact) of those whom I wrote to. I travelled the length of the country, making new contacts along the way, and gleaned a wealth of information from family archives including photographs, correspondence, documents from the Homes and passports. Most of the families I visited had copies of their parent’s Homes files. These files, often the source of sensitive and difficult information, were made available to me with quite overwhelming generosity. There was a shared sense that it was time for this story to be told. We all wanted to know more about this heritage, and recognised that we could only further our understanding through a focused enterprise such as this thesis.47

47 By the end of the study I had been in contact with relatives of over half of the 130 emigrants to New Zealand.
In late October 2012, after a six-month delay due to political problems in northeast India, I returned to Kalimpong to peruse the full collection of *Homes Magazines* and with the hope of retrieving copies of personal files on behalf of (and with written permission from) several descendants I had met in the course of my research. I spent two weeks at the Homes as a guest of Wolseley House, a large two-storied brick residence situated a short walk from the school office, the main school buildings, and several of the girls’ cottages. My visit coincided with the *Puja* holiday, which meant that for most of my time there the only children on site were the sponsored children, who do not go home for the holidays. It also meant that there were some difficulties with access to information. The easiest aspect of my research turned out to be copying the personal files on behalf of other families, as there was an established process for this. My desire to conduct a comprehensive survey of the *Homes Magazine* caused concern to some staff. I had not realised on my first visit that this was regarded as a sensitive document, despite its availability elsewhere. On my first visit I had presented as one person in a steady procession of descendants seeking information. As such I had followed a standard route and probably exhibited the standard overwhelmed sense of gratitude for precious information kept and stored for such a long time. My desire to collect information in a more depersonalised manner was not so easily dealt with.

Any disappointment about access to information was almost completely balanced (in hindsight) by the value of the immersive experience of being at the Homes for a period of two weeks. I had tea and a candid conversation with Mrs Glashen, the archivist of forty years who had assisted me in 2007 and had been moved from her role to work in the sponsorship office. Together we walked down to Lucia King, the “babies” cottage where children under the age of five are accommodated. We spoke with the housemother there, who often meets descendants as they are given tours around the Homes cottages. She spoke of numerous, regular encounters with descendants whose parents had kept their origins hidden, and recounted various ways in which the Homes background had been discovered. I also attended a picnic for the sponsored children. I visited girls in their cottages, and attended evening prayer groups in both a boys’ and a girls’ cottage. I watched a rehearsal for a music festival. In between these interactions I sat on the verandah of Wolseley House, transcribing letters from the personal files and absorbing the rhythms of life at the Homes. After several days I
wandered down the hill to the township of Kalimpong and was surprised to note my sense of a restricted feeling that lifted as the school grounds faded into the background and were replaced by the unregulated sounds and movements of the town.

Reworking the Kalimpong Narrative

The first section of this thesis reframes the narrative which originated with my own family story and crystallised as I listened to the stories of other Kalimpong families. Chapter One begins from a standpoint of the descendants’ experiences of travelling to India in order to open the previously closed stories of their parents’ pathways to New Zealand. The initial correspondence and application forms contained in the Homes personal files afford a valuable glimpse of the workings of interracial tea plantation families, and illuminate the decisive moment when the children’s caregivers sent them to Kalimpong. In Chapter Two, the focus widens to the broad imperial context within which Graham established the Homes. His use of the *Homes Magazine* to publicise the aims of the institution and to gather information left a documented trail of a developing discourse of emigration that combined theories of uplift circulating in Britain and India with experience in the settler colonies. Articles in the *Homes Magazine* are used extensively in this chapter, before returning to the correspondence contained in the Homes personal files, which renders visible the moment at which arrangements were made for the emigrants to leave India. I argue that this second major disruption in the emigrants’ lives needs to be understood as a crucial juncture, rather than simply continuing the journey from plantations in northeast India to New Zealand.

In Section Two I offer a new narrative – that of the emigration scheme to New Zealand between 1908 and 1938. The four chapters proceed chronologically and are divided according to the uneven progress of the scheme over the three decades. Chapter Three focuses on the establishment of the “Kalimpong community” in New Zealand, beginning with a correspondence archived between a supporter of Graham’s in Calcutta and a shipping manager in Dunedin, and moving to the *Homes Magazine*, which from 1908 began to include excerpts from the emigrants’ letters. No doubt affected by a desire to please Graham, they sent frequent accounts of their progress, which I interpret through the lens of gendered socialisation by focusing on their daily lives as farm workers and domestic servants. The
major interruption of the First World War is explored in Chapter Four. The men’s personal military files, generated by the New Zealand Defence Force, contain evidence of the continued operation of their dispersed imperial families. I examine the men’s enlistment and service for the New Zealand Expeditionary Force in the context of the treatment of colonised populations who served in the war, and subsequently used war service to advance nationalist aims. I argue that war provided opportunities for social advancement for the Kalimpong men not available to the women, and utilise the women’s brief appearances in the Homes Magazine to continue the narrative of their work in New Zealand households.

Chapter Five examines the implementation of new laws in New Zealand in the context of a global wave of immigration restrictions enacted in the 1920s. Using correspondence around the permit system initiated by this legislation, I contrast its application to the Homes scheme with the treatment of prospective Anglo-Indian and Indian migrants. Having outlined the continued emigration from Kalimpong, the chapter returns to the narratives of the early emigrants and follows the fortunes of the new arrivals to the North Island. The children of the case study families were among these new arrivals. Their letters provide a more candid account of adjustment to life in New Zealand than the excerpts in the Homes Magazine, and make visible the emigrants’ navigation of a place not only in settler society, but within the local Kalimpong community, and their birth families in India. Chapter Six follows a similar format but within the very different global climate of the 1930s, during which only one group of Kalimpong emigrants were granted permits. Graham toured New Zealand in 1937 to visit his former charges and appeal to the government to resume the scheme. His personal diary provides a valuable snapshot of the emigrants lives and reveals the extent to which he regarded their domestic contentment and social integration as key indicators of success.

Section Three considers the legacy of the scheme in three parts. Chapter Seven shifts the focus to India, where tea plantation families, staff of the Homes, and the many graduates placed locally had continued to keep the New Zealand emigrants connected with the land of their birth. I firstly consider the “alternate futures” described in the Homes Magazine, before moving to the correspondence contained in the Homes personal files of two families which had siblings placed in India and New Zealand. The frequency of their letters in the 1930s was
in direct contrast to the waning connection between the Homes and New Zealand in this period. The culmination of Indian nationalism with independence in 1947 links this chapter to the next, Chapter Eight, where I argue that this crucial event consolidated the emigrants’ turn towards a silent New Zealand future. A different methodology is employed to make this argument. Using a survey of electoral rolls over two decades, I present statistical data regarding the “settlements” (a term I use to indicate their stable presence) location and employment. Chapter Nine adopts the approach suggested by historian Tanya Evans, by bringing academic and family histories together. This is the collective end point, where my interviews with descendants are intertwined with a range of personal communications to give voice to the many dimensions and layers of our Kalimpong stories.

I opened this thesis with Lorna’s letter, written on the oceans between Calcutta and Dunedin, to set the transnational tone for my exploration of individual, family and community narratives that frequently moves between discrete settings across national boundaries. The Kalimpong emigrants never truly left India behind, nor did they ever fully “arrive” at their New Zealand destinations. Their existences were always mediated by that which was imagined for the future, or experienced in the past, as all life stories are. But to inhabit three such distinct social worlds as the tea plantation, the institution, and the settler colony, illuminates with great intensity the process of experiencing new places from the vantage point of the old. “The work of inhabiting space”, Sara Ahmed suggests, “involves a dynamic negotiation between what is familiar and unfamiliar.” The Kalimpong emigrants never forgot the dramatic landscapes of their upbringing, but through their initial encounters with the rural and urban spaces of the settler colony, and the later experience of raising their families in the domestic settings of their own “homes”, those landscapes became the stuff of memory, of childhood, and the unspoken beginnings of a powerful transnational story.
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Figure 1: Photograph of “Kalimpong School” group, c.1916
Lorna Peters standing, far right, with hand on hip.
(Source: McCabe family archive, Dunedin)

Figure 2: Verso of “Kalimpong School” Photograph
(Source: McCabe family archive, Dunedin)
Figure 3: Number of arrivals per annum, 1908-1938
(Source: Homes Magazines, Permanent Entry Record Books)
CHAPTER ONE

TEA PLANTATIONS FAMILIES OF NORTHEAST INDIA

There is a tendency when writing about India from afar to ascribe a certain collectivity to its people, underplaying its linguistic diversity, complex cultural texture, and localised social formations. Individuality is perceived to be of lesser consequence in traditional Indian life than in Western modes of being, and the terms “India” and “Indian” are often used with a particular set of images and circumstances in mind. These representations have been the basis from which descendants of the Kalimpong emigrants have weaved narratives of their family histories and attempted to make sense of the scarce, often confusing, information that their parents left behind. Such generalisations also underwrite the media representations and tourism promotions for travel in India that have influenced the likelihood of descendants making the journey to India to research their family history. Thus, the accepted trope of travel in India – the challenges of the heat, noise, and chaos, to be endured with the promise of personal growth through immersion in the same – is an important beginning from which this chapter traces the development of a more nuanced narrative, specific to the tea planting districts of northeast India.

Descendants’ journeys to Kalimpong to learn about their parent’s heritage were the starting point of individual reconnections to India; here they are the starting point of my exposition of the Kalimpong narrative as built upon a persistent transnational connection, albeit one that had thinned to the finest of threads prior to these journeys. All participants in this study who had visited the Homes returned with copies of their forebear’s personal file. The application forms and early correspondence contained in six of those files are used here to collectively reframe the simplified narrative that the emigrants’ silences incurred.

In doing so, this chapter not only punctures a persistent silence in the Kalimpong story, but also addresses a wider archival absence, by giving voice to the South Asian women who cohabited

---


2 I have written permission to use all personal files from the Homes cited in this thesis.
with British men in the later imperial period. The family files introduced here reveal glimpses of the dynamics of a social unit that has not hitherto been visible in any meaningful way, namely, the interracial plantation families of northeast India.

**The Tea Districts**

In 2011 I wrote to five families whom I believed to be descendants of Kalimpong emigrants to New Zealand. I provided brief information about the project and asked if they were interested in being a part of it. All were willing. In four of the five cases – the Hawkins, Spalding, Gammie and Moller families – at least one descendant had already made the trip to Kalimpong and retrieved copies of their personal file. The fifth, the Mortimore family, knew nothing about their father’s Indian background until they received my letter. (I copied their father’s file when I returned to Kalimpong in 2012.) For most of these families, the journey to India and the files from the Homes archive were the chief sources of information about their British Indian ancestry, often sought after their parent’s death. To summarise the information gleaned from the application forms and correspondence regarding the circumstances of the families: all of the fathers of the children were tea planters; all were located in either the Assam or Darjeeling tea planting districts (see Figure 4); the majority of the siblings in each family were sent to New Zealand; and all of the children were first generation Anglo-Indians – in other words, they had European fathers and non-European mothers. Table 1.1 details the parents’ nationalities and location of their tea estates.

This primary information about the circumstances into which the Kalimpong emigrants were born supports the claims made in the Introduction: that many of the children were not rescued from city slums and that most of those who were sent to New Zealand were the children of tea planters. This section interrupts the tendency to generalise about “Indian” origins by making specific the locations of the tea plantations, and by providing a platform for drawing out the implications of these geographical, political, and social specificities for interracial families. A guiding force in this concern with “place” – the ways in which places are perceived as well as inhabited – has been my conversations with descendants about their travel to these regions. It is an experience that has challenged and changed their view of the places in which their parents were born and raised. As Ron Gammie found:
When you go back there … the concept of India was nothing like what it’s like up there, in Kalimpong, it’s totally different. If you were going to put a blanket over what you think Indians are like, it’s nothing like what it’s like up there.\(^3\)

Like most visitors to northeast India, Ron’s trip began with a short stay in Calcutta. He travelled with a small group from New Zealand to attend the Homes centenary celebrations in 2000. The opportunity to travel with a group was influential in his decision to go to India. Although he expected the journey to be a challenging one, he found the experience of Calcutta “overwhelming” even by the time they reached the hotel. “I didn’t want to go outside”, he explained, “let alone go shopping”. But once in Kalimpong “away from that, and you could just talk to people, and connect with them, things were fine”.\(^4\) He enjoyed idyllic accommodation at “Orchid Retreat” and wandered at leisure around the township of Kalimpong. Others have expressed similar sentiments about the climate and the sparsely populated hills districts being a welcome reprieve after other travel in India. Richard Hawkins’ children, Gilbert and Pam, visited Kalimpong twice. On their second visit they went further afield to Assam to visit the tea plantation where their grandfather was a manager. Visiting a region that has seen serious political unrest for several decades was an education in the realities of imperial legacies that would otherwise be unknown to them.

Travel in both the Darjeeling and Assam districts is often disrupted by political unrest that is a direct consequence of Britain “handing over” these territories in 1947. Neither district was a part of India prior to British rule. Consequently, there are groups in each that continue to agitate for independence, or for greater autonomy under the government of India. Although Darjeeling and Assam were administered separately by the British government and are distinct in terms of geography, climate, and population, they were united in their categorisation in the colonial era as “Tea Districts”.\(^5\) This commonality in their commercial interest to the British had consequences in the management of land and, importantly, the
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\(^3\) Interview with Ron Gammie, Wellington, November 2012.

\(^4\) Ibid.

\(^5\) A publication by the Indian Tea Association included the following areas under “Tea Districts”: Darjeeling and Terai, Jaipalguri and Duars, Darrang, Nowgong, Golaghat, Jorhat, Sibsagar, Lakhimpur, Dibrugarh, Cachar and Sylhet. Maps of Tea Districts (Calcutta: Indian Tea Association, 1930).
direction of labour into the regions. The influx of large numbers of migrant workers from other parts of India, and from Tibet and Nepal, was to have a divisive legacy.\textsuperscript{6} For descendants whose files did not contain any information about their grandmothers, they at least learnt about the ethnic diversity of the region and the pathways that may have led to their maternal ancestor’s presence on the plantation.

Prior to establishment of the tea industry in the mid-1800s, Assam and Darjeeling shared a strategic importance to the persistent British campaign to establish diplomatic relations with Tibet.\textsuperscript{7} It is useful to think of these tea districts not simply as the far northeast of India, but rather as at the centre of a contested border region, stretching from Assam in the east to Darjeeling in the west, with Kalimpong nestled between. The medical historian Alex McKay has noted the function of the “closed lands” of Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan as buffer states between British India and Tibet on what he calls the “Indo-Tibetan frontier”.\textsuperscript{8} The Anglo-Nepalese war of 1814-1816 was successful in gaining influence in those territories. To the east, the first Anglo-Burmese war led to the annexation of Assam in 1826 and contact with the people of the eastern Himalayan region, whom had close ties with Tibet.\textsuperscript{9} British intervention and authority then developed according to the specific commercial requirements, geographies and infrastructure in each. Alongside these political and economic imperatives, the “hill stations” of Darjeeling and Kalimpong came to occupy a very different place to the “jungles” of Assam in the British colonial imagination.\textsuperscript{10}

Darjeeling developed into an important commercial and political centre after being noted by imperial officers as an ideal site for a hill station in 1829.\textsuperscript{11} Sikkim ceded the town to the British in 1835 and it soon became a site of retreat and recovery from the “dangerous” climate of the plains of India. Schools, hospitals and hotels were established to service the

\textsuperscript{8} Alex McKay, Their Footprints Remain: Biomedical Beginnings Across the Indo-Tibetan Frontier (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007), 67.
\textsuperscript{9} Marshall, Britain and Tibet, 1765-1947, xx.
\textsuperscript{10} Thomas Metcalf, Ideologies of the Raj (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 183-184; Sharma, Empire’s Garden, 43.
\textsuperscript{11} McKay, Their Footprints Remain, 67.
government of Bengal in this regard. The population grew from 100 in 1835 to over 10,000 by 1849, which apart from the British included Nepalese, Bhutia and the local Lepcha people. Although it had a strong church presence, McKay suggests that Darjeeling was never an important missionary site, as the churches administered to a Christian (European and Anglo-Indian) community. In 1866, the Darjeeling district was expanded to include new areas annexed from Bhutan, including the “Lepcha hamlet” of Kalimpong and the Duars, which would become a major tea planting district. Both developments are relevant here. Kalimpong became a centre of missionary activity, with its highly strategic location “wedged” between Sikkim, Bhutan and Nepal. South of Darjeeling the Terai, Jaipalguri and Duars tea planting districts stretched across East Bengal to link with western Assam. John Graham’s work at the Kalimpong mission in the 1890s placed him at the centre of this sphere of influence. He travelled on horseback visiting plantations across Darjeeling and Assam.

Conversely, it was solely around tea production that the infrastructure of Assam developed. Unlike the idealised images of the pristine hill stations to its west, Assam was understood chiefly as a frontier where civilization could tame the wild through the establishment of tea “gardens”. The British established a policy of “non-interference” with the people who inhabited the hill districts and in 1873 drew an “inner line” around the tea plantation valleys. From the outset, the people of Assam were seen as inscrutable and problematic by Britons, divided by colonial authorities along simplified lines of wild hill
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12 Ibid., 67-69.
13 Ibid., 69.
14 Ibid., 68.
16 Sharma, Empire’s Garden, 4-5.
17 For an evocative description of the “metaphors of redemption” these landscapes came to represent see Piya Chatterjee, A Time for Tea: Women, Labour and Post/colonial Politics on an Indian Plantation (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001), 52-53.
tribes and the “Assamese” people of the plains.\(^\text{19}\) This simplification did not assist the British in their attempts to bring the extraordinarily diverse region under bureaucratic control. Assam was not easily quantifiable and therefore not easily conquered. In letters to his aunt in London, Egerton Peters frequently mentioned the challenges of life in the “jungle” and made a clear distinction between the Assam region and India at large. “Geographically we are not India at all, climatically we are not India,” he wrote in 1926, “we belong to the large hilly and dense jungle tracts between Bengal to the West, Bhutan to the North and naturally connect up with the China hills and Burma. We’re foreigners to Bengal and treated as such. … Cachar district of Assam Province is my country and I never think of it as India at all.”\(^\text{20}\)

In both Darjeeling and Assam, politics, economy and geography intersected in the creation of ideologies that served a western understanding of the places and the people that their borders encircled. The ethnic diversity of both districts meant that British knowledge of the languages, customs and social organisation of north India (predominantly Hindu) were not broadly applicable in their intervention into this region, which had its own complex political history. Nepali is the lingua franca of the Darjeeling district, but there is wide linguistic diversity among the other, mainly Buddhist, groups. The people of Assam are now divided into 192 dialect groups, the largest of which is known as “ethnic Assamese” and includes Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Buddhists and animists.\(^\text{21}\) Addressing this legacy of the colonial desire to classify does more than provide a background to a story. It invokes the peopling of the early Kalimpong narrative, which persisted in the internal world of the emigrants for the duration of their lives and should be kept to the fore when reading concerns about “injurious native influence” and “wild upbringings”.\(^\text{22}\)
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\(^{19}\) Yasmin Saikia discusses the colonial creation of “Assamese” as an ethnic group in *Fragmented Memories: Struggling to be Tai-Ahom in India* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 20. See also Chatterjee, *A Time for Tea*, 65, 69.

\(^{20}\) Egerton Peters to Caroline Peters, 6 April 1926, Peters family archive, London.

\(^{21}\) Saikia, *Fragmented Memories*, 5.

\(^{22}\) The brochure printed upon establishment of the Homes listed the advantage of its isolated position as keeping the children away from “injurious native influence”, and Egerton Peters apologised for his children’s “wild upbringing” when he was arranging for them to be admitted. John Graham, “St Andrew’s Colonial Homes”, 1900, Printed brochure, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:15:1, National Library of Scotland (NLS), Edinburgh; Egerton Peters to John Graham, 22 April 1906, Peters file, Dr Graham’s Homes Archive (DGHA), Kalimpong.
“Planters” and “Coolies”

Descendants of the Kalimpong emigrants tend to frame their life stories against both their Indian origins embodied by their female ancestors and the figure of the tea planter, a particularly powerful colonial ancestral figure. Nostalgia around the designation of “planter” has incurred an assumption of wealth and “great romantic visions” of a social status lost to the next generation.23 These visions have fuelled the intrigue of the Kalimpong story. The terms of the relationships between tea planters and Indian women, some of whom were recorded as “coolies”, are expected to have been dictated by the women’s lack of power. Both the derogatory “coolie” and nostalgic “planter” labels communicate far more cultural and social information than the labour they performed, and mask important distinctions among the people they described. A commonality of the two roles that has an important place in the Kalimpong narrative, was that planters and coolies spent most of their adult lives labouring away from home. They were migrants on the plantations and the events that unfolded within that bounded and unusual sphere were about more than work. It was their life.

Numerous tea planters have left records of their experiences in Assam in the form of diaries, travel guides or memoirs.24 All followed a predictable narrative, conforming to a colonial ideology that painted the planters as adventurers in, and tamers, of a hostile environment. They described hunting, social activities, tea production, labour management and the life-threatening challenges of living in a “jungle” such as disease, animal attack and flooding. Unsurprisingly, none wrote of interracial relationships or the families that sprung from them. While these memoirs do little to unsettle romantic notions of planters, they do provide evidence of how and why they went to India. Frank Nicholls, whose five children attended the Homes and later settled in New Zealand, was working in the London office of a tea agency when he was offered a transfer to Calcutta. Nicholls hesitated, after which “the big man then asked me if I would prefer to go out to a tea estate in Assam, as an assistant manager. There was no hesitation in my reply this time and I was elated at the idea and by the

23 Interview with Yvonne Gale, Wanaka, February 2013.
His preference for a position that promised elevated status and a lifestyle that differed fundamentally to office work in a city – be it Calcutta or London – is revealing of the two key motivations for careering on tea plantations.

Nicholls’ employment by a tea agency unsettles the assumption that the planters were wealthy entrepreneurs. Very few owned plantations. British men who wished to work on tea plantations applied to tea agencies, were interviewed, assigned positions and transferred as the agencies required. Generic use of the title “planter” also disguised their progression through a labour hierarchy that began with the role of assistant manager and was followed by promotion to a manager, usually after ten years of service. From the position of manager there was the possibility of promotion to the highest role of superintendent, who oversaw multiple plantations. Men in all three roles, as well as those who did have part ownership in plantations, were described as “planters” in official documentation such as shipping records, marriage and death certificates, obituaries, and the application forms to the Homes. The status that the term conveyed is important in understanding the motivations for entering a career that usually meant living a great distance from family, in relative isolation from British society, and facing considerable daily risks that were not present in England.

Travelling around New Zealand in 2011 to meet descendants of Kalimpong emigrants, I also met and interviewed Peter Webster, who worked on plantations in Assam and Darjeeling in the 1950s. Webster was born in Bombay in 1926 to British parents, who followed accepted practice and sent him “home” to be educated in England at the age of six. The outbreak of the Second World War, when Webster was 13, prompted his parents to take him back to India with them. He attended Aitchison College in Lahore for two years, spending summers in the nearby hill station of Simla, before returning to England. By 1950 Webster was working as a teacher in Kent and had developed an interest in mountaineering. His career prospects were “pretty dim” and he was eager to explore the Himalayas. “The obvious place was the Darjeeling district”, Webster recalled in his memoirs, “and the only
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25 Nicholls, Assam Shikari, 11.
27 Peter Webster, The Past is Another Country: The Autobiography of Peter Webster, Part One 1926-1944 (Wellington: Peter Webster, 2008), 58-63.
He applied to various tea agencies and was offered a place as an assistant with the Dima Tea Company in the Duars. Webster became aware of the status that accompanied his new job as a “tea planter” as soon as the S.S. Strathmore departed Tilbury for Bombay:

I travelled first class and quite suddenly, my life and social status were quite changed. From being an unqualified Prep school teacher with little chance of advancement, I had been elevated to the status of an assistant manager of a tea plantation in India with every chance of advancement, even possibly to be the superintendent of a number of plantations. Travelling first class I had to wear a dinner jacket for the evening meal and joined the mixed company of Europeans many of whom were about to retire from jobs which had begun and prospered under the British Raj.

Webster spent a decade working on plantations in Assam and Darjeeling. His testimony is useful here because the dynamics of plantation life in the 1950s seem to have changed little, if at all, from the earlier period. The opportunity to ask Webster directly about social and family life was invaluable, especially given the somewhat formulaic accounts of the earlier memoirs. Webster made a crucial distinction between financial reward and status on the plantations. There was less money in tea than he had anticipated, but the lifestyle provided by the tea agencies was very comfortable. “Planters had an exceptional standard of living”, Webster explained, “but actually you didn’t get that well paid. You did compared to the workers, but you weren’t affluent. You weren’t affluent but you were well off, I mean you travelled first class and you had a big bungalow, and servants.” Webster’s assessment of the limited financial opportunities for tea planters is supported by other accounts, and by the application forms in the Homes personal files. As I will discuss further on, many planters were unable to pay full fees for their children.

28 Peter Webster, The Past is Another Country: The Autobiography of Peter Webster, Part Two 1947-1953 (Wellington: Peter Webster, 2010), 40.
29 Webster, The Past is Another Country: Part Two, 41.
30 Interview with Peter Webster, Wellington, November 2011.
31 See for example, Tony Ballantyne, “Mr Peal’s Archive: Mobility and Exchange in Histories of Empire”, in Archive Stories: Facts, Fiction and the Writing of History, ed. Antoinette Burton (Durham: Duke University, 2005), 89.
Planters, as managers rather than capitalists, were therefore part of the imperial drive to direct British emigrants to colonies where labour was needed to facilitate land development and resource extraction. While some of the fathers of the Kalimpong emigrants did profit from tea, they were a very small minority, and they did so from a position of existing family wealth. In other words, planters were not rewarded sufficiently to accumulate capital with which they might invest in the industry. Egerton Peters made specific mention of the precariousness of the tea industry in letters to his Aunt Caroline. In 1919 he complained that for the third year in a row they received no commission, remarking that it was “alright provided one does not hope to retire and is not married”. The Cachar district of Assam had endured six months of drought, “while a few weeks hence we may be a flooded swamp”. “India is famine stricken”, Peters continued, “and our coolies have suffered dreadfully from influenza”. Peters’ concern for the welfare of his workers was balanced by his acceptance of the expediency of labour on the plantations. Having “lost” 200 workers in the previous six months to illness, he planned to “replace them” with “coolies from the famine districts”.

A family background in India was a strong impetus for working on tea plantations. Of the planters who published memoirs of life in Assam, P. R. H. Longley, who later settled in New Zealand, grew up in Darjeeling and “had always longed to be a tea planter”. Likewise A. R. Ramsden, who was born in Assam in 1898 and sent to England for an education at the age of six, returned to the region to work on a plantation in 1925. Among the Kalimpong emigrants’ fathers, several followed a similar path. Egerton Peters’ grandfather worked for the East India Company and his father served in the Royal Engineers in India, Burma and Afghanistan. The father of the Gammie children, John Perrell Gammie, worked on a tea plantation in Darjeeling but had also worked in the forest service. His father was remembered as one of the pioneers of the Darjeeling district, a government scientist who developed techniques for extracting quinine from the bark of the cinchona tree. These existing familial connections to British India are important not only in understanding how and

32 Egerton Peters to Caroline Peters, 5 April 1919, Peters family archive, London.
33 Ibid.
34 Longley, Tea Planter Sahib, 13.
36 “John Perrell Gammie”, Obituary, unknown publication, Gammie family archive, Hamilton.
37 “The Late Mr J.A. Gammie”, Obituary, unknown publication, Gammie family archive, Hamilton.
why British men came to tea plantations, but also in making distinctions between those who arrived onto tea plantations utterly bereft of local knowledge and those who had previous exposure to, and understanding of, the complex social systems they were to encounter.

The daily routines of British men on tea plantations have unsettled assumptions held by descendants of the Kalimpong emigrants, particularly regarding their interactions with workers. Plantations were essentially small townships, populated by thousands of workers from various ethnicities and castes, with an extensive infrastructure of factory buildings, workers huts (known as “cooie lines”), hospitals and British bungalows. Tea planters had to be much more than opportunists in order to run a successful plantation. They had to speak local languages, and deal with sickness, death, and disputes on a daily basis.

Although the planters of northeast India have been regarded by historians as particularly flagrant in their mistreatment of workers, they were also acknowledged to have occupied a risky and isolating position. High worker mortality rates saw repeated influxes of new migrants from different regions, comprising various configurations of single workers and family groups, all of which added to the complexity of plantation life. Successful management of plantations was surely as much about ensuring a stable workforce as subduing it. As Longley suggested, “the main qualification of a successful planter was to be good with labour.”

Women on plantations were regarded as posing particular challenges to management. Longley recorded that “more understanding and experience being necessary in dealing with the women, the senior assistant controlled the plucking and all works done by the weaker
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38 Moxham cites a superintendent who suggested that a European assistant “ignorant of the language” was “worse than useless”. Moxham, *Tea: Addiction, Exploitation and Empire*, 121.

39 The Assam district is understood by historians to have been quite backward in this regard. The planters themselves speak of “clouting” women and routinely dishing out corporal punishments. As Rana Behal has observed, even those on the side of the planters agreed that the conditions of this indentured labour was akin to slavery. However Behal also acknowledges that a tea planter’s life involved physical hardships that were made more difficult by prolonged social isolation. Rana Behal, “Coolie Drivers or Benevolent Paternalists? British Tea Planters in Assam and the Indenture Labour System”, *Modern Asian Studies* 44, no. 1 (2010): 32-33.


sex”. An incident which he described as the closest he came to being physically attacked during his time in tea was sparked by an altercation with a group of women whose work he had turned back. According to Peter Webster, stories were rife of the dangers of being “set up” by locals, who would accuse them of sexual impropriety and arrive at the bungalow en masse to exact retribution. Whether or not this ever actually happened, it does provide insight into the mindset of new assistant managers. Despite their inherent power, British men arrived, often as teenagers, into complex social settings of which they had little or no knowledge – a scenario that disrupts the popular notion of distant planters lording over an estate. It was in the midst of this immersive experience of acquiring new languages, learning tea production, adjusting to the environment, managing labour and resolving disputes, that British men became involved in sexual relationships with local women.

The mothers of the Kalimpong children have been silent shadows in their family stories. Their presence, marked mainly by their absence, haunts the origin narrative. Descendants are frustrated by the solid brick walls that their archival silences have become. With only the faintest mention in written records, and without memories or information passed down by their children, these women have become almost unreachable. Decisions made a hundred years ago to omit non-European women from the documentary record have now solidified into a permanent absence. This blocking out of their existence, in the Western bureaucratic sense, has added to the sense that the women were powerless in the relationships, and perhaps as silent in life as they were in archival inscriptions. This legacy is the main source of descendants’ negative feelings towards the planters, and Graham, whose desire for discretion has deprived subsequent generations of a vital part of their heritage.

These seemingly impenetrable archival silences infer an even heavier reliance on a generalised understanding of “Indian women” and families, which in turn inflects the tendency to view the colonial influence as one that disrupted a static traditional existence.45

42 Ibid., 19.
43 Ibid., 50.
44 Chatterjee notes similar stories, A Time for Tea, 164.
45 Tony Ballantyne discusses a similar (scholarly) discourse prevalent in Sikh histories in Between Colonialism and Diaspora: Sikh Cultural Formations in an Imperial World (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 24-25.
As this chapter has demonstrated, the tea districts and plantation communities were anything but static. Furthermore, “Indian” communities across the continent were, of course, thriving, suffering and changing under a multitude of social, environmental and political influences. It is not within the bounds of this thesis to explore the enormous complexity and dynamic continuity of the many and various communities, castes and ethnicities that could be included under the heading “India”. But as Sudipta Kaviraj suggests, family life “was the theatre of some of the greatest changes in early modern Bengal.”\(^{46}\) Families and individuals living on tea plantations had likely arrived from situations already in flux. If not, they were certainly entering an arena where life was worked out by daily negotiation of unfamiliar circumstances, where family and community alliances were formed, broken and re-formed.

Reconstructing the dynamics of interracial relationships on tea plantations is hampered not only by archival absences regarding the women involved, but also the men’s silence about the existence of the relationships. While cohabitation was still common practice in Assam in the early twentieth century, the need for discretion was paramount. The rebellion of 1857 is understood by scholars to have fundamentally altered the earlier acceptance of these relationships in India. Although Durba Ghosh argues that anxieties about racial mixing were present much earlier, the salient point is that the decline in archival mention of interracial relationships reflected an increasing need for discretion rather than a halt in their occurrence. As Ghosh has also pointed out, in a reversal of standard archival readings it is the absence of names in records of this period that points to involvement with a non-European woman.\(^{47}\) The women were deprived of not only their names but their heritage, as names carried information about geographic origins and caste. When women were recorded in documents they were often reduced to descriptive phrases such as “unknown native” or “Bengali girl”, effectively cutting off future attempts at recovering this lineage.\(^{48}\) As shown in Table 1.1, the admission procedures at the Homes followed these colonial bureaucratic practices, with no space to record the mother’s names on the early application forms. For descendants seeking to reconnect to their Indian heritage, this practice has inscribed a profound void.


\(^{48}\) *Ibid.*
The high incidence of interracial relationships on tea plantations is usually attributed to the tea agencies’ policy of not allowing British men to bring a British wife to the plantation until he was a manager, which as noted required an apprenticeship of ten years. This, along with the isolation of the plantations, has been understood to have made interracial relationships “inevitable”.\(^49\) The marriage policy was still enforced when Peter Webster was in the region in the 1950s, and he made the same link between the policy and high incidence of these cohabitations.\(^50\) Webster first encountered his manager’s “mistress” on the evening of his arrival at the Duars plantation. The manager had become “aggressively drunk” at a social club, and when Webster escorted him home he saw “a saried Indian woman run out from the bungalow to help him”.\(^51\) He subsequently learned that the woman, from the local Chota Nagpur tribe, had been “installed” as his mistress some years prior. The manager had “a number of children by her and they all lived in a special house at the back”. Webster made particular note in his memoirs and in our interview that while the existence of the family was common knowledge, in three years of working at the plantation he never actually met the woman or the children and his manager never referred to them.\(^52\) It was an open secret.

When asked how it was that the relationships were enacted, as opposed to the inevitability of them happening, Webster found the question difficult to answer. While he was aware that both of his managers “kept mistresses”, he was not privy to the details of the arrangements other than the visible evidence afforded by their presence in the planters’ bungalows. Webster could only speculate as to how the relationships were initiated, suggesting that women of low caste were more likely to be taken as mistresses in order to minimise the potential social fallout. In some situations the woman lived with the planter; in others a separate bungalow was built for the woman and her extended family. According to Webster, tea companies “frowned upon” cases where “the mistress took over the bungalow

\(^{49}\) Simon Mainwaring, *A Century of Children* (Kalimpong: Dr Graham’s Homes, 2000), 5; Minto, *Graham of Kalimpong*, 53-54.

\(^{50}\) Webster felt that the policy was “purely economic”. It was simply too expensive to bring British women to the plantations and to provide appropriate surrounds for them and any offspring. Interview with Peter Webster, Wellington, November 2011.


\(^{52}\) *Ibid.*, 49.
and brought all her relatives in”.\textsuperscript{53} This presence of family suggests a degree of social acceptance, challenging the belief that the mothers were always outcaste as a consequence of their relationships with British men. It also points to the economic advantages for the women and their families through their arrangements with planters.

In order to understand the motivation of women to assent to these arrangements, we can only surmise as to the negotiations that may have taken place. It is easy to imagine planters, who managed their workers with absolute power, selecting a woman who was unable to refuse. But as we have seen, the complexity of social relations surely precluded such ease in many situations. Given the impoverished circumstances of migrant workers on plantations, these domestic arrangements may equally have resulted from negotiations with the women’s families. In her beautifully nuanced ethnography of a tea estate in Assam, Piya Chatterjee listened for “narrative traces” of these historical arrangements. She heard uncorroborated stories of both the “offering” of women by their communities and the power of a planter to “summon” a woman.\textsuperscript{54} Gaiutra Bahadur’s exploration of the life of her great-grandmother, an indentured labourer on a Guiana sugar plantation, also ventured into the territory of taboo relationships between planters and coolie women. Like Chatterjee, Bahadur found it difficult to find any “truth” about the space the women occupied, describing it as a “zone where coercion and incentive intermingled”\textsuperscript{55}

**Family Life in the Planter’s Bungalow**

Once the relationships were established many became long term, stable, family situations. Numerous descendants of the Kalimpong emigrants have recounted stories that their parents told of their early life on the plantation. Many of the emigrants were well over the expected age at admission to the Homes and would certainly have been able to remember the years preceding it (see Table 1.2). As will be discussed in Chapter Two, there were also instances of children going home to the plantation for holidays and visiting again prior to emigrating. Their recollections are revealing of their place, and in some case their mother’s
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place, in the privileged domain of their father’s bungalows. Further important testimony was
gleaned from an interview with Ruth den Boogert, a daughter of Frank Nicholls whose
memoir of Assam was cited earlier. Ruth’s older sister Sheila was in the final group to be
sent to New Zealand in 1938; Ruth and another three siblings were taken to New Zealand by
their father in the 1940s.

Ruth had no difficulty remembering plantation life. Although she was sent to the
Homes at the age of four, she went home to the plantation every holidays and spent time there
before leaving for New Zealand. She and her siblings enjoyed a “comfortable” existence in
the bungalow with their father.\textsuperscript{56} They had day servants for all domestic and outdoor tasks,
and ayahs [nursemaids] who arrived in the evening along with a night watchman. Ruth
remembered close relationships with these household workers, and recalled life outside the
bungalow with equal fondness. She spoke of adventures in the jungle and taking the dogs to
go fishing, and they had a large garden and tennis courts. When their father was working the
children were free to wander. She understood the workers’ villages to be divided according to
caste, religion and “sub-tribes”. Ruth and her siblings were not restricted in their interactions
with these workers, who would “salaam us, because they knew who we were”. Ruth spoke a
combination of Assamese and Bengali, as well as Hindi, which enabled her to communicate
with everyone on the estate. She remembered this as an idyllic childhood in terms of both the
freedom of life outdoors and their privileged existence in the bungalow:

\begin{quote}
We lacked for nothing. But that’s just something we accepted as given. And we used to play princesses ... I was Princess Margaret, June was Princess Alexandra, and Nora was Princess Elizabeth. We used to dress up in drapes and curtains [laughs]. And the servants used to laugh. They used to come and peekaboo.\textsuperscript{57}
\end{quote}

Ruth enjoyed a close relationship with her father. He and the children conversed in
English; however Ruth emphasised his fluency in all of the local dialects and his
understanding of the local “rules”, which enabled him to resolve disputes between the
different groups on the plantation. Occasionally her father would use local languages to speak
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to the children, especially to emphasise particular things, “like, jaldi jaldi, hurry up. He wouldn’t say hurry up, he’d say jaldi jaldi!” Ruth remembered her father as a “bit of a loner”. There was no town nearby to visit. Her father’s only social contact with other Europeans was with the neighbouring planter, who also “had an Indian wife” and two children; and other planters occasionally called at the bungalow. Ruth’s recollection of visiting Calcutta with her father to get a passport for New Zealand attests to this isolated existence. They only stayed one night but the whole family were “agog” at the “beggars” and crowds of the city. “On the tea gardens everybody had a job”, Ruth explained, “there were some poor people yes but nothing like what we saw – oh!” Ruth’s description of her father’s work routine on the plantation was in complete contrast to city life:

The daily thing was that he would be out and about to do his kamjari [ongoing work], which was [to] go and inspect the tea gardens. And he’d go along to the tea factory to see how the situation was in there, that everything was done correctly. … That was his usual chore for the day, and then he’d come home at about 2 in the afternoon, and have a – because it was so hot you see – he’d go and either have a rest at the front of the house on a chair with his feet up, or go to his bedroom for about an hour. And then he’d have a cup of tea and off he’d go back [to work] until about five or six and then he’d come back and listen to the BBC news. And if we were in the lounge, shhhhh, not a word, this is the BBC news, read by such and such. So we had to listen to all that.58

Ruth had only scarce recollections of her mother, who had suffered a nervous breakdown and returned to live in her village within the plantation when Ruth was three years old. She was Tanti caste, a Hindu group that originated in Bihar and were traditionally weavers. She died when Ruth was seven. Ruth knew that her mother’s family lived on the plantation because she remembered being visited by them: “Her brother was there, I know that, and his wife and children. I remember people coming in a group to see us, and they sat around, you see the bungalow has got this big entrance area, and they would sit in that entrance area, there were chairs all around, and some of them chose to sit on the floor, Indian style.”

Tales of the planter’s bungalows have also filtered through to the next generation. Ian Spalding’s father, Tom, often told stories about plantation life – an array of exotic tales of
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encountering snakes and tigers, and some recollections of life in the bungalow. Ian did not remember his father ever talking about his Indian mother’s place in bungalow life. The only story that had been passed down about the Spaldings’ mother was that she was a healer who administered to people on the plantation and in the surrounding districts. Mary Milne, daughter of Kate Pattison, a 1915 emigrant, remembered Kate telling stories about the jungle, such as “charging elephants, [and] she used to talk about leopards a lot”.

As for memories of Kate’s Indian mother, Mary knew only of one incident that occurred when the tea planter was on leave and one of his daughters fell ill. He was angry to discover upon his return that the “witch doctors” had been called in and the girls were passed around in a circle on people’s shoulders above a bonfire. Notably, Mary believed that Kate and her sister lived in the village with their extended family, rather than in their father’s bungalow.

This possibility of absorption into local families raises the first of two important questions that descendants have pondered regarding their parent’s institutionalisation: what would have become of the children if they had not been sent to the Homes? (The second question regards their fate had they been placed in India rather than New Zealand; this will be addressed in Chapter Seven.) Many descendants understand the Homes to have intervened in families that would have eventually been separated when the father returned to Britain. But did this break necessarily mean that the women and children would be stranded in India, outcaste from their families? Certainly Graham had encountered the “local policy” where planters paid a sum of money to the women before leaving India to compensate for the loss of family and community support. However, evidence of children being absorbed into their mother’s extended family presents a different scenario. It was in this situation that Graham, and the tea planting fathers, could be said to have created Anglo-Indians from children who could otherwise have been integrated back into their maternal family.

These alternatives highlight the crucial consideration of ethnic diversity in reframing the Kalimpong narrative. The likelihood of a woman losing caste by being in a relationship with a planter is not something that can be generalised about. In every case this depended on
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the social organisation and religious affiliations of her ethnic group, and local and familial practice within those customs. One example of a community that absorbed mixed-race children in the colonial period was the Khasi tribe in Shillong, a town near Cherrapunji in Assam. In her field research undertaken in 1990, Anne Selkirk Lobo found that the Khasi tribe was “located on the margins of Indian society, outside the Hindu caste system” with no established hierarchy. In this matrilineal society, land was (and is) inherited by the youngest daughter. These sociological factors meant that there was scope for productive encounters between Khasi women and British colonial men. According to Selkirk Lobo, non-heiress women took the opportunity to convert to Christianity for “vast tactical advantage”:

They crashed through the taboos surrounding their society and changed their lives. Christian schools, hospitals and churches would fit in quite well with their plan. They could send their children to learn English in the missionary schools and find gainful employment with the British. The terrors of sickness could be cured in the hospitals, and if they now had to congregate in a church instead of worshipping on their own in a field, they set out to do so. ... Conversion to Christianity, followed by marriage to a British man, altered their status of marginalised ‘losers’ to inclusive ‘winners’.

Selkirk Lobo drew key distinctions between Anglo-Indian communities in greater India and in Shillong. The latter were not dependent on jobs in the railways, police, customs and telegraph departments, nor were they segregated into the living quarters associated with those occupations. In terms of ancestry, there was consistency in Khasi Anglo-Indian parentage that distinguished it from the diffuse lineage that characterised the wider Anglo-Indian community. In Shillong, the mothers were all Khasi, and British men were brought into Khasi social structure through their relationships with the women. As a consequence, Khasi Anglo-Indians “did not suffer a crisis of identity when the British left” and there was no exodus following Indian independence in 1947. Selkirk Lobo’s exposition of the colonial workings of this community confirms the expectation that there were a myriad of ways that families, communities and ethnic groups might have integrated interracial children from
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plantations. But of course segregation was only part of the “problem” that Graham and the tea planters sought to remedy. The economic prospects of life in the settler colonies were no doubt perceived as far brighter than local communities in Assam could offer.

**Moments of Separation**

The testimony of Ruth den Boogert, along with the memories passed down to the children of Tony Spalding and Kate Pattison, suggests that tea planters’ children wandered freely around the plantation, the workers’ villages, and the surrounding “jungle”. As already noted, sending a child “home” was the accepted means of immersing children in British social and educational norms, and removing them from the interactions with Indian workers that such wanderings allowed. For the tea planters brought up in “empire families”, it was at this juncture that the difference between their lives and that of their children became undeniable. They simply could not manage their interracial families using the model of their own childhoods. While planters could have sent their children to local schools, this would equate to a public admission of their indiscretion and exposure of the families that they sought to hide from British society. Sending their children to the Homes was an acknowledgment that the domestic arrangements which had enabled them to enjoy a familial existence on the plantation were essentially limited to the early years of their offspring’s childhood.

The Homes personal files were all collated in an identical manner. A cover sheet listed the names of the children included in the file and their admission numbers. Beneath the cover sheet were the application forms, despite being predated by the initial enquiries about admission. This priority attests to the bureaucratic control exerted by these “official” forms, which declared the terms upon which the children were admitted to the Homes and the circumstances from which they were sent. The form required details of the children’s age, religion, health and education. As shown in Table 1.2, their age upon admission varied greatly. Of the 21 children in these six families, 11 were over the age of five years, and eight were 10 years or older. Despite this, only four children had attended school and none had received a British education. The Spalding boys had attained “elementary Bengali” and the
Mortimore children had attended a Khasi Mission School. Only the Mortimore children had been baptised. The responses in the application forms attest to the children’s prior lack of exposure to European norms and thus to the role of the Homes in moulding them into substantively different social beings; they also indicate the diverse range of languages, customs and experiences that the plantation children brought to the cottages at Kalimpong.

The application form requested information about the parents, but there was no compulsion to answer. As already noted, prior to 1912 the form did not require the mother’s name, only her nationality and whether she was alive at the time of admission. To the Homes credit, later forms requested both parents’ names. Despite this, Paul Moller wrote “Nepali” in the space for the mother’s name and then under “nationality” put a dot. The other post-1912 applications did include the women’s names, and some had additional information such as her caste and occupation. The planters had to state the financial terms they offered, and provide further information if their circumstances did not permit full fee payment. The form required two referees. Supporting the suggestion that the families existed as an “open secret”, most listed fellow planters as referees. Others who perhaps desired greater discretion listed churchmen. The final question on the application form asked planters whether the children were to be “trained for work in the Colonies, or for India”. All, with the exception of the mother of the Mortimore children, answered “the colonies”.

The initial correspondence from the tea planters to Graham renders visible the moment in which they acted upon the decision to send their children to the Homes. Egerton Peters wrote a brief “private and confidential” letter to Graham in 1905 from Cachar, Assam. He stated that he had two children, “a little girl of three and a half and a boy of 1½ years of age”, and asked if they were too young to be sent and if not, what the conditions of their admission would be. Peters noted that if a lump sum payment was required he would be unable to send the children. In the following months a number of letters were exchanged between Peters and Graham negotiating the terms of the children’s admission. Peters was clear in his desire that they would stay “permanently” at the Homes until being resettled in the colonies. His
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only mention of the children’s mother was several lines of frustratingly illegible writing. On the application forms she was listed as Nepali, and alive at the time of application. Peters reached an agreement with Graham to “make over” an insurance policy in lieu of an initial lump sum, to be followed by regular fee payments. He arranged for the children to journey to Kalimpong accompanied by a “reliable man” arranged by the Welsh mission. In his final letter upon the children’s departure, Peters asked that his children be treated with kindness and consideration, given that they had been raised “mostly in the hands of natives, do not know a word of English, and will I’m afraid be difficult charges.”

In 1909 Francis Hawkins, a planter in Dibrugarh in the far northeast of Assam, wrote a similar enquiry to Graham about his 15-month-old son, whom he wished to send to the Homes when he turned two years of age. Unusually, the Hawkins file included Graham’s reply, in which he stated that Richard “would be with us for at least 15 years before he could be emigrated”. Regarding fees, Graham stated that “of course we do not put the question of money in the first place”, but added that “as trustees for the money given by the public we have to be assured that the sum paid by guardians represent the amount which they can reasonably afford.” Hawkins replied that he could not afford the lump sum but would otherwise pay full fees and would arrange for payments to continue should he leave India or die “before the boy is emigrated”. Like Peters, Hawkins made repeated reference to the colonial future. The letters of both men attest to the planters’ limited financial means as they struggled to make large payments, but also to their willingness to make regular financial contributions. Graham’s concern to extract the maximum amount he could from planters, while still maintaining the charitable function of the Homes, highlights the complex task of funding this private institution that attracted significant state and public support.

Hawkins contacted Graham again the following year and arrangements were made for Richard to be met at Dibrugarh by a representative of the Homes. In an urgent letter on the
scheduled date of meeting, Hawkins wrote that the “bearer” was waiting with Richard but no one had arrived to meet them. The child, Hawkins suggested, could wait at Dibrugarh for a few days but would otherwise have to return to the plantation. He was “distressed at this unfortunate affair”, mainly because “if [Richard] comes back now I shall never be able to get him away again.” As it was, the situation was resolved and to Hawkins’ “great relief” Richard travelled to Kalimpong as planned. Hawkins’ concern that he might miss the opportunity to get Richard away from the plantation is highly suggestive of the power and the desire of his mother and possibly her extended family to prevent him from leaving. The only record of Richard’s mother was on the application form. She was listed as Bengali.

Paul Moller, a Danish tea planter in Darjeeling, wrote to Graham in 1912 from “The Club” requesting that his three children be admitted as soon as possible. “Their mother has been fighting hard against this”, he wrote, “but it must be done”. According to Moller, after learning of his impending transfer to a different plantation he had “persuaded her to send them up”. Egerton Peters had also sent his children to the Homes just prior to a transfer, which testifies to the mobility of the planters and suggests that these shifts disrupted domestic arrangements that were specific to the plantations in which they were established. A Dr Seal met the family in Darjeeling and recommended that the youngest boy, four years old, should be admitted. “About the two elder”, he wrote, “I think we should think a bit”. He was in favour of admitting the girl (Dora, aged 13) who he thought was “decently brought up”, but felt it was “a different thing to a boy of 14”, referring to the eldest boy, Charles. On this advice Graham advised Moller that only the youngest boy would be taken. Graham was willing to refuse two fee paying students rather than risk bringing the negative influence of adolescents who had grown up on the plantation into the Homes. Moller appealed to Graham and Seal repeatedly, and as a result all three children were admitted.
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In the Mortimore and Spalding families, the applicant was someone other than the father. Consequently, the description of their circumstances was much more candid than for the other families. W. Mortimore, a Scottish tea planter, had followed what Graham described as “local policy” by paying the mother of his two children a sum of money and refusing to accept further responsibility for them. The first letter to Graham on their behalf was written in 1916 by Annie Jones, the wife of a Welsh missionary in the Cherrapunjee Mission, near Shillong in the Khasi Hills. Jones opened the letter by referring to other children that the mission had sent to the Homes, apologising for her impending offer of “more children in this time of uncertainty”. She pled the mother’s situation as desperate:

There are two children here, the mother a Khasi, the father a Planter in the South Sylhet District, a W. Mortimore. The mother came up to her home not far from here when the father went on furlough about five years ago, and came under Christian influence, renounced her bad life and joined the church. She belongs to a proud family and in order to keep up the family prestige the money given by Mortimore did not last very long. … Her people are anti-Christian, very much so, so that she is handicapped now in every way. She can’t go out to earn money [as she would] have nobody with whom to leave her children.77

Jones went on to explain that she had “tried to persuade her to send the children to Kalimpong when there was money, but she would not part with them as they were ‘so young’”. Having only enough money left to care for the children for “a few months”, their mother, listed on the application form as Ka Ngelibou Marlangiang, “came of her own accord to beg of me to write to you today”. Ka, known as Nelly, wanted both of her children to be admitted to the Homes, but was particularly concerned for her son to have a place. She offered to make small payments (“2/- or 3/- a month”), which Jones doubted her ability to pay, “especially if she will be supporting the girl at home, but she may be able to [send] it – perhaps 4/- or 5/- sometimes if the two children are admitted and she could go to work.” Jones added that she had corresponded with Mortimore through a Reverend J. White, and learnt that he “washes his hand[s] of the whole concern now and that the mother has signed not to trouble him after he paid the last 500/- in 1915”. Jones made a final plea on behalf of
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the children, stating that although Nelly was “nominally a Christian”, she was “not one likely to devote herself to much self improvement or to improve her children.”

Early in 1917 Jones wrote to notify Graham of the children’s impending arrival, accompanied by Nelly. Such an arrival would have been highly unusual for the Homes. Jones showed an awareness of this, asking Graham to arrange lodgings for Nelly for several nights, adding that:

It will be a good deal of a strain for her for she is a very devoted mother and I often wonder that she has been brave enough to give them up. She is of a very respectable family in spite of her own wanderings in the past, she is not a common class coolie woman at all. I just mention this that you may judge how [to] arrange things.

She hopes to be able to earn enough money to come and fetch her children sometimes for the holidays if she talks about this to you which she may or may not do. You need have no worries about consenting to this. They keep a clean respectable house.

There was an undeniable boldness in Nelly’s life choices. Her navigation of the separate but entangled worlds of a planter’s bungalow, her “proud” family home, and the Cherrapunjee Mission brings to mind Selkirk Lobo’s image of Khasi women “crashing through taboos”, and Bahadur’s finding that coolie women used the opportunities colonialism presented to escape profoundly difficult social circumstances. Returning home for the support of her family after her relationship with Mortimore ended, she then defied them by converting to Christianity. In accompanying the children to the Homes at Kalimpong herself, she risked another negative reception. Although they were the children of a tea planter, the Mortimore family circumstance was exceptional in that their mother was the applicant. The circumstance that preceded their admission was notable for the clear evidence in the correspondence that Jones was not able to simply take the children from their mother and send them to Homes. But perhaps the most telling feature of their application form was Nelly’s choice of “India” rather than “the colonies” for the children’s future placement. Nelly’s dismayed reaction to
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this second separation (which I will return to in the next chapter) supports my contention that the departure from India needs to be understood as a distinct moment in the Kalimpong story, rather than simply a continuation of the journey from tea plantations to a settler colony.

A second case in which the applicant was not the father, and thus made greater mention of the family circumstances, was the Spalding family. W. C. Spalding, a Scottish tea planter in Sylhet in the south of Assam, died while visiting Calcutta in 1920. A year after his death the executor of his estate, James Dewar, wrote to Graham about his two sons. Dewar’s first letter included completed application forms and a lump sum of Rs 4000/-. “The boys are bright and well-behaved”, he wrote, “and, under the circumstances, well brought up.”

Although the boys were 10 and 12 years old, there was no recorded concern about their age. After short delays due firstly to issues in the settlement of Spalding’s estate and subsequently with labour unrest in the region, the boys arrived in Kalimpong in March 1922. On their application forms they were listed as Presbyterian, and as already noted, both had attained “elementary Bengali” in schooling in Assam. Their mother’s name was recorded as “Prosoni (Tanti Caste)” a “garden coolie” who was alive at the time of admission. Dewar continued to correspond with Graham about the boys during their residence at the Homes. Himself a tea planter, Dewar hinted at his own familial problems, admitting in one letter that he had “been unable to make headway with the mother of my own little girl as far as allowing the latter to go to school is concerned and I am disappointed.”

This again speaks to the agency of the women in negotiating with the planters over the fate of their children.

For the Gammie family it was the death of the children’s mother that prompted their admission to the Homes. Gavin Gammie, interviewed by his daughter in 2000, understood the shift to Kalimpong in simple terms. “I’d be about four years when Mum died. So, our father couldn’t look after us and he sent us up to Kalimpong.” The first communication with the Homes on behalf of the Gammie children was penned by U. C. Duncan, of the Church of Scotland Mission in Darjeeling, who informed Graham that:
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Gammie of Nurbong has seven children. The mother I am told is dead and the children are living in a [word illegible] with some Lepcha woman to whom Gammie pays Rs 20/ a month for their support – this is what I am told and I have no reason to suppose that the facts are otherwise. I was also told that Gammie has thought of sending the children to Kalimpong but that he had found it would cost too much.85

Duncan wanted to ascertain if Graham was aware of the family before proceeding further. He wrote again in June, exclaiming that “there are seven children!”86 The eldest was fourteen and the youngest was one year old. Gammie himself wrote to Graham several months later, asking that the children be admitted and trained for the colonies.87 Gammie offered a small monthly sum for each child, explaining his difficult financial circumstance, and offered to make the Homes executor of his will. His estate contained shares that he hoped “if anything should happen to me it might be enough for their education”.88 Like other planters, Gammie gave enough detail of his circumstance to elicit Graham’s assistance and no more. This was in contrast to the way that his familial situation was described initially by Duncan, which communicated a strong sense of the scandal and intrigue that the existence of these interracial families prompted among the European community in the towns around the plantations. Although outsiders like Duncan played an important role in promoting and facilitating admission to the Homes, the decision to send the children to Kalimpong in each of these families was ultimately taken by the children’s guardian. When both parents were alive, it was the father’s wishes that dominated.

Conclusion

Utilising the correspondence contained in the Homes personal files around the process of admission, this chapter has made an important contribution to our understanding of interracial tea plantation families in northeast India. Most importantly, the files disrupt any notion that these families can be written about as homogeneous social units that were organised solely around the unequal terms of the colonial encounter. The workings of diverse ethnic groups, in communities often established away from home, affected the way that these
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marginalised “empire families” functioned. The mobilisation of labour around the British Empire created the scenario from which these families emerged, by directing “planters” and “coolies” into an isolated social setting. Imperial labouring was also to be the solution for their children, who were admitted to the Homes on the condition that they were to be trained for work in the settler colonies and emigrated upon reaching “working age”.

In this primary setting of the Kalimpong narrative, the first connection between New Zealand and India was made. The tea planters had already begun to imagine their children’s future lives in settler colonies, far removed from the social world and geographic locations of tea plantations in Assam and Darjeeling. While the women held some sway in the decision to send their children to the Homes, they were very unlikely to have understood the long term repercussions of this second shift that would occur some ten to fifteen years later. This chapter has addressed the archival silences that have muted the volume of life in the bungalow, of the drama of sending the children away, and of the consequences for those left behind. I have also outlined the first workings of Graham’s imperial network, revealed by the actions of missionaries and planters whose prior knowledge of the Homes facilitated the children’s relocation away from their place of birth.
Figure 4: Tea Districts in Northeast India
Table 1.1: Parents’ Details on Application Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father’s name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Mother’s name</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Tea Estate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egerton Peters</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Not recorded*</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>Cachar (Assam)</td>
<td>Backola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Hawkins</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Not recorded*</td>
<td>Bengali</td>
<td>Dibrugarh (Assam)</td>
<td>Margherita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Moller</td>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>Darjeeling</td>
<td>Gamong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. M. Mortimore</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>Ka Ngelibou</td>
<td>Khasi</td>
<td>Sylhet (Assam)</td>
<td>Charkula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marlangiang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gammie</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>Bisumia</td>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>Tindharia (Darjeeling)</td>
<td>Nurbong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.C. Spalding</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
<td>Prosoni</td>
<td>Tanti</td>
<td>Sylhet (Assam)</td>
<td>Adampur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Homes personal files)

*These earlier (pre 1910) forms only required the parents’ nationality and whether they were alive at the time of admission. The father’s names were recorded under the “Applicant” section.
Table 1.2: Children’s Circumstances upon Admission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Date of admission</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Father alive?</th>
<th>Mother alive?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Lorna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moller</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Dora</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Peter*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortimore</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Rend</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammie</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Fergus</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Moira</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Gavin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Alexa*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spalding</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Homes personal files)

*Not emigrated to New Zealand by the Homes
CHAPTER TWO

ST ANDREW’S COLONIAL HOMES

The St Andrew’s Colonial Homes were opened on 24 September 1900. The first edition of the Homes Magazine, published in February 1901, announced its aims:

TO OUR READERS!

THIS Magazine will plead the cause of those Indian children in whose veins runs British blood.

THE cause is a great one and deserving the support of all who love their fellow men and especially of those who have at heart the truest intentions of our British Race and Empire. To undertake it in a worthy way will demand an army of fellow-labourers, and one of our chief aims will be to enlist a band of ready workers.

IN connection with the St Andrew’s Colonial Homes themselves, our programme is an ambitious one. We cannot rest content until we can keep open door for every child in India requiring help. And you, Our Readers, we call upon to fill our Treasury with funds, to clothe and feed our bairns, to give our Board of Management your counsel and your criticism, and to aid our efforts with your prayers.¹

John Graham’s immediate attention to publicising the newly established institution made a clear statement about the integrated role of imperial networks in his scheme. Strategically positioned supporters outside India would be crucial in realising colonial emigration, while local connections would be activated to circulate information about the Homes, assisting and encouraging families and organisations to apply for places for children. Staff sourced from Britain and the settler colonies were another important constituent of this “band of ready workers”. As we saw in Chapter One, tea planters were willing to send their children from Assam and Darjeeling to the Homes in Kalimpong without visiting the institution themselves. Their actions reveal the effectiveness and reach of Graham’s propaganda, and reflected broad acceptance of the notion that marginalised children could be productively improved through

¹ “To Our Readers”, St Andrew’s Colonial Homes Magazine (SACHM) 1, no.1 (1901): 2.
training and migration to the settler colonies. This chapter situates the Homes scheme within the wider discourses of child “rescue”, juvenile migration, and the Anglo-Indian “problem”.

In *The Meaning of White*, Satoshi Mizutani posits that the Homes emigration scheme was a landmark in the prolonged debate over the “Eurasian Question”. Mizutani does not, however, pay sustained attention to emigration, nor to the children’s experience of growing up at the Homes. I aim to build on these aspects of Mizutani’s work. Given that the Homes personal files contain letters from the children only after they emigrated, and that the *Homes Magazine* reports were invariably optimistic about the daily running of the institution, here I draw upon recent interviews with Homes graduates in tandem with these earlier sources. Correspondence in the personal files does demonstrate the tea planters’ persistent interest in their children while they were at the Homes. Their concern unsettles an important thread of the “origin narrative”, namely the assumption that planters simply handed their children over to the Homes. Though this surely occurred in some instances, descendants of Kalimpong emigrants to New Zealand have been surprised to discover correspondence that testified to paternal concern for the well-being of their children, by making financial provision for their future and in some cases quite clear expressions of affection and emotional connection.

**A Scheme among Schemes**

When Graham opened the Homes in 1900, he had just turned 39 years old and had spent a decade in Kalimpong as a missionary along with his wife Katherine. Local and global phenomena at the turn of the century involving labour migrations shaped the way in which Graham imagined and constructed the institution. In Assam, the area under tea cultivation had increased from 26,853 acres in 1872 to 204,285 acres in 1900, an expansion facilitated by the movement of 750,000 workers from Bihar, Orissa and Bengal. Many of those workers were forced to migrate by the famine of 1899-1900, which took millions of Indian lives and

---

2 Mizutani describes the Homes as being “recognized by the colonizing British as almost the only means to put an end to the Eurasian Question”. Satoshi Mizutani, *The Meaning of White: Race, Class and the ‘Domiciled Community’ in British India, 1858-1930* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 138.

fostered a greater stridency in the Indian nationalist movement. 4 A wave of debate and legislation that sought to restrict the entry of non-white migrant labour into the white Dominions included the enactment of the Immigration Restriction Amendment Act in New Zealand in 1899 and the beginning of the White Australia policy in 1901. 5 Meanwhile in Britain, migration as a means of “rescuing” impoverished children was peaking. By 1900, Barnardo’s homes had been in operation for thirty years and had established institutions in almost one hundred locations, sending thousands of British children to Canada. 6

A decade of acute awareness and first-hand experience of these phenomena furnished Graham with a unique multi-sited imperial perspective on child rescue in Britain and the Anglo-Indian problem in India. He had worked with pauper children in Scotland prior to being sent to Kalimpong with the Young Men’s Guild. After six years of mission work and intense local involvement in Kalimpong and the surrounding tea districts, Graham took three years leave in Britain, giving public lectures about his experiences in India and preaching his concern about the Anglo-Indian problem. He also visited Quarrier Homes in west Scotland, where he was impressed by the system of housing children in cottages dispersed on a large estate, intended to imitate an idealised family life. 7 William Quarrier, like other child rescuers in Britain at the time, believed in the remedial benefits of removing children from city slums to rural settings, and from ill-equipped parents to carefully chosen house-parents. In Shurlee Swain and Margot Hillel’s words, “child rescuers developed a taxonomy of space in which geography determined destiny”. 8 The cost of industrialization, as evidenced by the decay and disorderliness of large cities, could only be remedied by a return to the inherently moral rural

8 Swain and Hillel, Child, Nation, Race and Empire, 64.
life of manual labour, space and fresh air. Rural removal came to be viewed as an innovative and progressive alternative to city institutions.

This nostalgia for rural life, and the causative link many reformers believed to exist between environmental conditions and social problems, coincided with the perceived “opening” of vast tracts of vacant, unused land in the settler colonies. Not all pauperised children could be raised in rural Britain. The perceived advantage of colonial migration schemes such as those initiated by Emily Ward and Thomas Barnardo, who both sent large numbers of British children to Canada, was that they offered a permanent solution to child poverty. Moreover, the schemes could be promoted as working towards the greater imperial good, by forming mutually beneficial arrangements with the under-populated settler colonies. As W. D. Borrie has outlined, when settler colonies struggled to attract ideal (white, British) migrants willing to work as agricultural labourers or domestic servants, it was often left to charitable organisations to assist “needy” migrants into those roles.9 Graham was strongly influenced by Barnardo’s large scale movement of children to the colonies to fill such shortages.10 The difference for Graham was that his scheme was affected not only by increasing colonial resistance to being viewed as a solution to British pauperism, but also by the rise in global restrictions of marginalised labour on the basis of racial categorisation.

The similarities between Barnado’s and Graham’s propaganda campaigns were striking. Both were figureheads of their organizations, the kindly and charismatic “Dr” with an active Christian concern for the plight of children caught in circumstances beyond their control.11 Barnardo’s “open-door” policy to all needy children was directly echoed in Graham’s scheme.12 Both men were prolific writers and public speakers, and used magazines to promote their causes.13 Barnardo’s first publication was an existing magazine, Children’s Treasury, followed in 1877 by Night and Day, which promoted his work with children to an

11 Graham was the recipient of several honorary degrees including a doctorate from Aberdeen University.
12 Collie-Holmes, Where the Heart Is, 11.
13 Swain and Hillel summarise various magazines published by child rescuers in Britain. Quarrier was an exception to this trend, refusing to engage in broad publicity to raise funds. Swain and Hillel, Child, Nation, Race and Empire, 20-23.
adult audience, in a similar way that Graham would use the *Homes Magazine*. Mary Collie-Holmes found that *Night and Day* proved immediately effective in spreading propaganda around the empire and increased donor numbers in New Zealand.\(^\text{14}\) Collie-Holmes also suggests, however, that Barnardo’s use of emotive story-telling distorted “the image of the work he was doing” by “highlighting the most pitiful cases”. While his appeals were always made on behalf of “the orphaned and destitute”, Barnardo also catered for working youngsters who paid for their accommodation and others who merely required assistance finding employment.\(^\text{15}\) Graham’s propaganda in the *Homes Magazine* also simplified the range of needs catered for at the Homes in order to garner sympathy and support for his cause.

Although he was strongly influenced by Quarrier and Barnardo, Graham aimed to test their ideas on entirely new ground: British India. Graham was well-versed in the concomitant work that was being done with sectors of the Anglo-Indian community, and sought to combine discourses on rescue and uplift circulating in Britain and India. Historic concern regarding Anglo-Indians had led to the establishment of orphanages and schools in the cities where “destitute” communities were centred, and there were schools in the hill stations that accepted domiciled and mixed race children.\(^\text{16}\) This prioritisation of education in Anglo-Indian solutions incurred an important distinction between Graham’s scheme and child rescue schemes in Britain: a high standard of British schooling was a feature of the Homes programme from the outset. Education was a crucial means of ensuring that graduates placed in India would enter the workforce at the upper end of the Anglo-Indian hierarchy and would be equipped to compete with an increasingly educated “native elite”.\(^\text{17}\) In turn, by bringing the well established British theory of remedial migration to the Indian context, Graham’s scheme was heralded as an innovative approach to the Anglo-Indian problem.

\(^{15}\) *Ibid.*, 13; see also Swain and Hillel, *Child, Nation, Race and Empire*, 19, 24.
The belief in many quarters that Graham could achieve emigration for significant numbers of Anglo-Indians was evidenced by the financial support and public recognition he received. The first edition of the *Homes Magazine* listed Sir John Woodburn, Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, as Honorary President, and Sir Charles Elliot, the previous Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, as one of seven Honorary Vice Presidents that included other notable figures in Edinburgh, Assam and Calcutta. The remaining members of the board were mostly tea planters in the surrounding Duars and Darjeeling districts. Reluctant to publicly support a scheme that assisted tea planters to manage their interracial families, the Church of Scotland refused to officially support the Homes. Instead Graham was reliant on government grants, donations and public subscriptions. Much of this funding was directly associated with the rapid construction at the Homes: the Calcutta Cottage was funded by the Calcutta Committee; the water works by Andrew Fraser, the Governor of Bengal; Jarvie Hall by Major Jarvie of Scotland; the Steel Memorial Hospital by Octavius Steel (of the company of the same name) of Calcutta; and the Demonstration Farm Building by the Agriculture Department of the Government of Bengal – to name just a small selection of the more than twenty buildings constructed in the first eight years of the Homes.

Graham’s public silence over the role of tea planters in the establishment and running of the institution attests to the rhetorical quality of his propaganda campaign. Support of local tea planters was vital from the outset. Graham privately described his contact with planters as “sympathetic” and made clear in his personal writing that the Homes was established to assist them by providing a discrete facility to raise, educate and provide a future for their offspring. The emigration scheme anticipated tea planters’ desire to find a solution outside India for their children before they returned to Britain. Planters were expected to pay a lump sum followed by regular instalments, and those payments were understood to subsidise unsupported children. It has also been suggested that tea agencies made donations to the

---

19 The government of Bengal initially granted five rupees per child per month, and followed this with further grants of land and money. Simon Mainwaring, *A Century of Children* (Kalimpong: Dr Graham’s Homes, 2000), 6; Mizutani, *The Meaning of White*, 143-144.
Homes. But apart from their declared involvement on the Homes Board, and as contributors of opinions about the scheme, Graham never publicly admitted that over half of the children housed at the Homes grew up in the cosseted world of plantation bungalows, and that for them, being sent to Kalimpong represented a material drop in circumstances – though a projected rise in future prospects through colonial emigration.

Like Barnardo then, Graham consistently sought support for his work as a charity that rescued destitute children. The gap between his claims and the actual diversity of circumstances that brought children to the Homes is important for several reasons. Firstly, it demonstrated Graham’s willingness to align his scheme with existing discourse in order to get funds. As Swain and Hillel suggest, “colonial child rescuers were rarely discursively creative”. Secondly, Graham’s rhetoric left a public archive that gives the impression that the New Zealand emigrants too were rescued from dire circumstances. It is not surprising that Mizutani claims that most of the children at the Homes were orphans or from “severely impoverished families”, as his study relied heavily on articles printed in the Homes Magazine and Indian newspapers. Thirdly, Graham’s emphasis on destitution meant that he could not point to the “pedigree” of his graduates as children of tea planters when attempting to send them to the settler colonies. Environment took precedence over heredity in his scheme. Graham’s strategy was to stress the deserving nature of his charges who, from original hopeless situations, had earned their “respectable worker” status through a disciplined Christian upbringing. Looking beyond Graham’s rhetoric thus reveals an aspect of the uneven terrain he navigated that was largely hidden. Variation in familial circumstances upon admission to the Homes would have a lasting impact on the children, not only during their time at Kalimpong, but upon placement in India or abroad, and beyond.

The Homes began with a strong base of support in Britain, Calcutta, and the tea planting districts of Eastern Bengal and Assam. Committees were set up in Scotland, London,

---

22 Peter Webster described a persistent rumour that tea agencies made large donations to the Homes, and that the Homes were suggested as an option for planters that were discovered to have mixed race offspring on the plantations.
23 Swain and Hillel, Child, Nation, Race and Empire, 90.
24 Mizutani, The Meaning of White, 144.
25 Ibid., 157-8.
Kanpur and Allahabad in 1901. In addition to fundraising, the British committees sourced staff for the Homes, while those in India were charged with determining the suitability of candidates and distributing the Homes Magazine. The pressing task for Graham was to extend his support to commercial and charitable interests around India and the settler colonies, not only to raise funds, but also to set up opportunities for the employment of graduates. By 1910 there were 12 committees across British India.\footnote{These committees were located in Calcutta, the Central Provinces, Asansol, Burdwan, Nagpur, Bhagalpur, Jamalpur, Benares, Jhansi, Jubbulpore, Bihar and Orissa. Mainwaring, A Century of Children, 18-20.} Graham sought to educate and train his charges so that they could be placed in innovative positions in India, or at least among the higher echelons of the Anglo-Indian community. But the children needed to be simultaneously made fit for potential placement in the very different labour market of the settler colonies. Although applicants were asked to indicate whether their child was to be trained for the colonies or India, in reality it was impossible for Graham to predict what the employment and immigration situation would be a decade after they were admitted.

The Solution/Problem of Emigration

John Graham was not the first to suggest emigration as a potential solution to the Anglo-Indian problem.\footnote{Lionel Caplan summarises attempts by British organizations such as the Madras Emigration Society to send Anglo-Indian men to Australia in the mid- to late-nineteenth century. Caplan, Children of Colonialism, 131-132.} His scheme was unique, however, in its realisation of the systematic and sustained transfer of groups of Anglo-Indian juveniles.\footnote{Mizutani, The Meaning of White, 138.} Graham was clear about the aims of the “Colonial” Homes from the outset. The original brochure listed the “Object” as “to attempt a solution of the problem by giving such a course of training as will fit the children for emigration to the Colonies”. The “Need” was that “the only real hope of amelioration lies in Emigration”. Since it was not possible to send the children directly, they would first be made “fit” at the Homes for “very different surroundings”. The “Advantages” of the location at Kalimpong were “its healthy site” to gain physical strength for the colonies, “its isolated position” to keep the children away from “injurious native influence”, and “its tract of land”, to provide training in “the culture of the field, the garden, and the orchard”. “Children who are manifestly unfitted for Colonial life”, the statement continued, “will be
trained for openings in India”. There was no question then, of the fundamental place of the vision of emigration in the establishment of the Homes.

Early developments immediately challenged Graham’s idealised vision of colonial emigration. In the first instance, the roll grew so quickly that emigration was never going to be possible for all of the pupils. Graham initially imagined a total roll of about 40 children. The institution opened with six pupils, four of whom were domiciled European children whose widowed mother was the first housemother of the Homes. By 1902 there were 72 children in residence, and by 1910, 305. In 1922 the roll was capped at 625; even this Graham enacted with great reluctance given his original “open-door” policy. In addition to the challenge of providing for a larger student body, Graham and his supporters do not seem to have anticipated the impact of increasingly restrictive border controls upon the ability of educated Anglo-Indians to migrate to the settler colonies. As early as 1907 Graham had changed his outlook considerably, telling the Calcutta Committee that perhaps “India should get the benefit of the children she herself had trained”. In other words, placement in India became an option for not just those deemed “unfit” for the colonies. According to Mainwaring, of the first 500 pupils to leave the Homes between 1900 and 1925, 115 had emigrated, the majority to New Zealand.

Acknowledgement that colonial emigration would not be possible for the majority of Homes graduates had important ramifications for the development of the institution, not least because the rural labour that boys were trained for was organised very differently in India than it was in the settler colonies. In New Zealand it was assumed that graduates would enter a “free” labour market, earning wages that could be accrued as capital and put towards an independent existence as a land-owning farmer; while in India the rural sector was economically precarious, organised around caste, and not a pathway to Anglo-Indian

29 John Graham, “St Andrew’s Colonial Homes”, Printed brochure, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:15:1, NLS.
30 Graham, Typed notes, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:15:1, NLS.
32 Mainwaring, A Century of Children, 22.
33 Ibid., 38. According to the numbers collated for this thesis, 77 graduates had been sent to New Zealand by 1925.
respectability. Thus, the Homes training would potentially be defunct if immigration restrictions meant that its graduates would not be permitted to enter the settler colonies. Graham tried to get around this issue by stating that preparation for the settler colonies would also produce ideal citizens for Indian requirements. However the debate in the Homes Magazine reveals a persistent concern that training should be matched with settler colonial labour shortages. This discussion made a significant contribution to the Eurasian Question because it melded settler colonial experience with existing theories about Anglo-Indians. It also attests to the power of the emigration vision to capture audiences and engage support.

Uncertainty over the usefulness of the training for future employment was articulated in the second edition of the Homes Magazine in an article by John Murray, a local tea planter, entitled “The Philosophy of Colonisation”. The training at the Homes in Kalimpong was, he wrote, a “potent factor in determining results” but was “only part of a means to an end”. “What may now be found essential to the form of its development”, he suggested, “may later on be abandoned as useless or obsolete”. His words highlight the experimental nature of the scheme and the contribution to colonial knowledge it would make, regardless of the outcome. Murray went on to outline his ideas about the social integration of Anglo-Indians, referring to the suggestion by a Scottish planter that a “Eurasian Settlement” might be founded in Australia. Murray opposed the idea, arguing that it was contrary to the Homes vision which imagined its graduates “entering Colonial life, not to found a colony of Eurasia”:

A Eurasian Colony could never succeed. The idea has within it the very germ of decay. The success of social organization depends not on its exclusiveness, but on the diversity, and complexity of its members. …

---

37 Ibid.
Is it not the exclusiveness forced by the condition of circumstances on the Eurasian community that has necessitated the very existence of the Homes? And to foster a policy tending to the formation of a Eurasian Colony, would be to defeat the object for which the Homes were founded. “Forced exclusiveness” may well characterise the bar under which the Eurasian community in India is now suffering.  

The suggestion that a segregated Anglo-Indian community would be destined for “decay” highlights the belief in some quarters that social integration was not only possible for Anglo-Indians in the settler colonies, but indeed the ideal means of their improvement. Murray espoused clear ideas about where young Anglo-Indians would sit in colonial hierarchies should this integration be possible. Taking “a lower place in the scale of being than the corresponding type of British Colonial”, they would join the “struggle for existence” in Australia on the following terms:

One of two things must happen. He will either cease to exist, or he will be absorbed in the dominant race. If in the struggle an endeavour be made to retain his distinction of type, he will be doomed to failure. … At the very outset of his colonial career the Eurasian is by nature forced to take a subordinate position. His relation to the Colonial will be that of servant to master. Here, then, is the training ground, this is the starting-point, and yonder the goal, far off in the distant light.

Murray theorised a model by which Anglo-Indians might be absorbed into the settler colonies. The next step was to collect information about how this might work in practice. In the same edition of the Homes Magazine an article entitled “Fields of Emigration” proposed sending graduates to New Zealand. While the Homes was “not yet in a position to send any of our children to the Colonies”, the author (presumably Graham) advised that information was being collected wherever possible “on this essential part of our scheme”. The article cited correspondence from a farmer named James Fraser, a “sturdy Scot” who was in Government Service in India for 35 years before settling in New Zealand. Graham welcomed Fraser’s enthusiasm, which was in contrast to the “fierce” suggestions by “leading men in

40 Ibid.
41 “Fields for Emigration”, SACHM 1, no.2 (1901): 29.
other Colonies” that Anglo-Indians would not be welcome there. Fraser described New Zealand as an ideal starting point for hard-working, self-reliant emigrants, and gave details of how to acquire and manage plots of land. Fraser added that “in a generation or two Eurasian stigma of colour and helplessness would be lost, and they would be members of a visible nation.” Their offspring would be “born Britons” which he felt would be the “raison d’être of the whole scheme and an immense thing to look forward to”. Social integration in the settler colonies would thus be accompanied by racial dissolution in the generations that followed, by marrying “out” of the Anglo-Indian community and into the British majority.

Fraser’s belief in the value of “hard work”, which could be learnt by otherwise “helpless” populations to overcome the stigma of racial mixing, was supported by an Australian farmer in 1903. The correspondent, a former member of the Homes board, described farming life in the colonies as “very different to either at home or in India. Every man, it does not matter how large a scale he is, works.” The different way in which farming was indexed in the settler colonies compared to India or England was again seen as requiring elaboration in order to make a clear case for the colonies as an ideal destination for Anglo-Indians. To make the point specific to the background of the Kalimpong emigrants, what Graham’s supporters were trying to convey was that rural labour in the colonies was not equivalent to a coolie labouring on a plantation, but neither was it a means of achieving the status of their tea planting fathers. It was an in-between status that was seen as an ideal situation for Anglo-Indians. The “orphan boys”, the correspondent continued, would “depend upon themselves… A boy who was not afraid to work could, easily, by the time he was 28 to 30 years of age, save enough to start a farm of his own.” Murray, Fraser and the Australian correspondent all argued for the possibility of Anglo-Indian men progressing from the subordinate position in a “servant to master” relationship to being independent farmers.

Encouraged by these positive reports about farming, Graham established a working farm at the Homes to train the boys and provide food for the staff and students. Between

42 Ibid.
43 Ibid.
44 “Queensland as a Field for Emigration”, SACHM 3, no.1 (1903): 29.
45 Ibid.
1903 and 1905 a farm stead ing, farm house, and demonstration farm of 25 acres were established at the Homes. The farm was increased by 50 acres in 1906 and a “demonstration farm building” was added in 1908.\(^{46}\) At this time emigration was still a theoretical construct, about to be tested with the first emigrants leaving the Homes in 1908. In the meantime, Graham had continued to accept the children of tea planters on the condition that they would be prepared for colonial life and resettled in the colonies when they reached working age. While the girls’ futures were not mentioned in early discussions of emigration, their placement in the colonies from 1909 generated similar interest in the differing formations of gendered labour in India and New Zealand. In 1912, a *Homes Magazine* article profiled the Lucia King cottage for infants, which doubled as a place of instruction for “nursery nurses ... the greater number of whom look forward to making their homes in New Zealand”\(^{47}\). By this time several of the emigrants introduced in Chapter One – Lorna and George Peters, Richard Hawkins, and the Moller children – were resident at the Homes.

**Life at the Homes**

Graham’s desire to accommodate the children in something other than a typical Victorian institution was achieved, at least in geographical setting and use of space. The Homes grounds eventually covered 600 acres on a steep hillside above the township of Kalimpong. The classrooms were clustered near the entrance, but the cottages and other buildings were widely dispersed, separated by the undulating terrain and vegetation (Figure 5). The majority of the buildings still stand today, and with no new buildings added since 1920 it is possible to get a sense of the early occupants’ situation and surroundings. The unruly vegetation is an immediate contrast to what one might expect from an institution or a boarding school, conjuring an imagined idyllic life in a lush tropical valley. On my visit, however, I also gained a strong sense of the regulated lives of the children who live at the Homes today. Their existence revolves to a marked extent around cottage life. They are either at school, at their cottage, or en route to one or the other. While the daunting feel of large concrete buildings that might be usually be associated with an institution is absent, there

---


\(^{47}\) [Title not recorded], *SACHM* 12, no.2 (1912): 39.
is a strong sense that the lives of the students there are keenly regulated and monitored, despite the initial sense of freedom that the grounds communicate.

The emigrants’ reluctance in later life to talk to their children about the experience of living at the Homes is a part of the untold story that is often assumed to hide trauma. Those who did speak about their Indian upbringing usually reminisced about the scenery rather than daily life at the Homes. During their parents’ lifetimes, descendants have respected this silence, or at least tread very carefully around what was a sensitive subject. Recent public reports of neglect and abuse of children in early twentieth century institutions have no doubt affected the way their silence has been interpreted.\footnote{Swain and Hillel, \textit{Child, Nation, Race and Empire}, 3.} For descendants, there are two opposing narratives within which they might place their parent’s story: on the one hand, an idealised upbringing in the spectacular landscapes of the Himalayan region, cared for by a kindly missionary; on the other, a decade or more isolated from their family in the strict confines of a Victorian institution. The aim of this section is to provide a meaningful sketch of daily life at the Homes, in order to enable a better understanding of why many emigrants so intently put the experience behind them. This intimate lens reveals gaps between prescription and practice at the institution; notably between the desire to isolate mixed-race children from “native” influence, and the reality of multiple non-European cultural influences. These discrepancies support my argument that Graham’s idealised vision of a smooth transfer abroad was thwarted by the necessity to forge pathways between the discrete and complex social worlds of tea plantations, the institution in Kalimpong, and a distant settler colony.

Because little testimony exists from the early residents of the Homes, here I utilise more recent accounts in tandem with written sources of the earlier period to unpack their experiences. These temporally distinct sources are linked by the notion that, unsurprisingly, the Homes experience gradually improved over time. Ruth Glashen, archivist at the Homes, attributed my grandmother’s silence to her attendance in the early 1900s, when hardships such as cold, hunger, harsh discipline and bullying were most prevalent. In 2000, Anne Beckett interviewed her parents, Gavin and Isabella Gammie, about their memories of Kalimpong. Gavin emigrated with the last group in 1938 and Isabella arrived independently in the early
1940s. Throughout the interview they attributed differences in their experiences to Isabella’s attendance in a slightly later period.\textsuperscript{49} Simon Mainwaring’s history of the Homes also refers to a gradual lightening of discipline and greater attention to the extra-curricular needs of the children in the 1960s.\textsuperscript{50} Even so, graduates of the 1970s have likened their time at the Homes to military school and described being “at the mercy” of the houseparents.\textsuperscript{51} Hence these contemporary sources can be read as indicators of the Homes experience and its legacy, keeping in mind that the difficulties would have been more pronounced in the earlier period when many of the emigrants to New Zealand were in residence.

When Isabella Gammie’s daughter asked her about the moment of separation from her mother, her immediate response was that they had ayahs whom they “spent more time with”.\textsuperscript{52} Her comment confirms that it was usual for the children to have ayahs [nursemaids] on the plantation, and that separation from these ayahs was another trauma they experienced when sent to the Homes. Several descendants of Kalimpong emigrants, and later graduates, have relayed memories of the first days and weeks at the institution spent in quarantine to ensure they were free of disease. For many this was the first time they had ever slept alone. It was, in one descendant’s words, a stark contrast to the “cosseted existence” of life on the plantation.\textsuperscript{53} Ruth den Boogert (nee Nicholls) was sent to the Homes when she was four years old. She recalled being sent “straight to the isolation area. And [I] cried and cried for two or three weeks.” She remembered “sleeping in a ward, and not a soul around” and “all these nurses in white garments and being poked and prodded and inspected.”\textsuperscript{54} Of course for those who arrived as infants, there were no early memories of arrival or separation. They were housed in Lucia King cottage until they were five years old.

\textsuperscript{49} Video recording, family interview with Gavin and Isabella Gammie, 2000, Gammie family archive, Wellington.
\textsuperscript{50} Mainwaring, \textit{A Century of Children}, 85-89.
\textsuperscript{51} \textit{We Homes Chaps}, DVD, directed by Kesang Tseten (Kathmandu, Nepal: Filmmakers Library, 2001). Kesang Tseten was a resident of the Homes in the 1970s. He filmed the documentary at the Homes centenary in 2000, where he conducted a series of group and individual interviews with graduates of the 1970s.
\textsuperscript{52} Video recording, family interview with Gavin and Isabella Gammie, 2000, Gammie family archive, Wellington.
\textsuperscript{53} Personal communication with Joan Cudby-Leith and Martin Leith, Levin, 15 November 2011.
\textsuperscript{54} Interview with Ruth den Boogert, Auckland, November 2012.
As Gavin Gammie noted of his early years at the Homes, it was difficult to remember what it was like or to know what the impact might have been. Aside from the fact that the children were often very young, there was simply no time to adjust or even to realise what had happened. As one later graduate recalled, “I didn’t know what hit me to be honest. I looked for my mother and she wasn’t there … I’m falling out of the bed and she’s not there to get me … You were pushed into the swimming pool, dragged off here, dragged off there, and you just didn’t know where you were.”\footnote{Interviewee in \textit{We Homes Chaps}.} The children were immediately absorbed into rigorous work routines. Graham was reliant on the labour of the children from the outset, justified as a key strategy to keep the Homes entirely free of “injurious native influence” and to inculcate the “true dignity of manual labour”.\footnote{Graham, Typed notes, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:15:1, NLS.} It was also an overt rejection of the caste system, with every child expected to take their turn to perform a range of domestic tasks. An article in the \textit{Homes Magazine} written by a female pupil and published in 1920 described in detail the duties of the kitchen girl, the dining room girl, the lavatory girl, the lamp girl, and so on.\footnote{Mary Braid, “My Daily Life in the Homes”, \textit{SACHM} 20, no.1/2 (1920): 8.} Jane Webster, wife of the tea planter Peter Webster whom I interviewed for this study, volunteered at the Homes in the 1950s. An abiding memory of her time there was that the children were kept constantly busy with unnecessary tasks such as “picking up leaves” at 5am, in what she understood as a battle against “Indian sloth”.\footnote{Personal communication with Jane Webster, Wellington, November 2011.} Hence the children’s labour was justified as a productive method of preparing them for colonial life, but was also a means of countering any lingering “native” tendencies.

Discipline was meted out in a manner to be expected of an institution of this period. Mainwaring reported use of the “stick” and infamous housemothers who beat bed-wetting boys with iron bars.\footnote{Mainwaring, \textit{A Century of Children}, 13, 20.} Ruth den Boogert talked about getting “cuts … boys on the bum and girls on the hand”. Importantly, John Graham was not involved in carrying out such discipline. Eddie Lamb recalled an incident where a boy was caught stealing and that this was the only time he ever saw Graham beat a student.\footnote{Ibid., 153.} Although Graham looms large in any account of the Homes, he was for the most part a figure who was admired from afar. It was
James Purdie who knew the boys and girls by name, and who offered regular counsel, while Graham was known to refer to them all as “my dear boy” or “my dear girl”. Graham lived offsite in Kalimpong, and when he was at the Homes, children would follow him around excitedly trying to elicit some contact or comment from him. The only time they were guaranteed an individual audience with Graham was upon leaving, when he would offer them advice about the dangers of the outside world and present them with a Bible. Graham’s conduct is important because it inspired a sense of awe and a legacy of genuine affection for him, which existed as a counterpoint to memories of the harshness of their upbringing (see Figures 6 and 7). This affection contributed to graduates’ desire to do well, to write to the Homes reporting their progress, and to welcome Graham when he visited.

Gender separation was strictly enforced at the Homes. The boys’ cottages were all located to the north of the school buildings and the girls’ to the south. Boys and girls did not visit each other. They were schooled separately and took their manual training in different areas. The most notable consequence of this separation was for siblings. Ruth den Boogert was placed in the same cottage as her older sisters, but only saw her brother Sydney on “rare occasions like the school fete, the school sports day”. Gavin Gammie similarly recalled only seeing his sisters on special occasions like Christmas. One of Gavin’s more difficult memories of his childhood related to the death of his younger sister, Sheila, while at the Homes, and he was not informed. Others had younger siblings arrive and were not told of their relationship, which seems to have been the case when the youngest Peters’ child, Alice, arrived. When I spoke with Ruth about these separations, she understood them as the staff’s way of “keeping an eye on us”. Safety was also Ruth’s way of making sense of the high level of restriction and management of the children, contrary to the freedom that the sprawling grounds and untamed landscapes suggest:

JM: My impression was that there is this nice big area, but really your life is quite restricted.

---

61 Ibid., 20-21. Purdie was secretary of the Homes from 1908 to 1946. He was known as Graham’s right hand man and was to undertake much of the correspondence with graduates.
62 Interview with Ruth den Boogert, Auckland, November 2012.
63 Video recording, family interview with Gavin and Isabella Gammie, 2000, Gammie family archive, Wellington.
RN: Yes, kept as safe as possible. And the only funny thing that went on was the beggars, and they’d come and do their chanting, from down at Kalimpong, down at the village. Only on rare occasions did we have a walk down to the village, what was it for, I don’t know. …

JM: But that was quite rare, wasn’t it?

RN: Very rare. Oh our lives were so full and preoccupied with school and games and housework and cooking.64

Everyday life at the Homes then was much like a boarding school routine. But the broad “Anglo-Indian” categorisation disguises the uniqueness of cottage life, where children from diverse cultural origins faced major adjustments according to whether they grew up on plantations, with Anglo-Indian families in Calcutta, or in a range of other circumstances and locations. There was no segregation at the Homes according to family origins or ethnicity, and in this sense Graham was active in “creating” Anglo-Indians. This was particularly true of the tea planter’s children, who were exposed to aspects of Anglo-Indian culture – such as accent – that they would not otherwise have picked up.65 For their part, the children from the plantations brought the language and culture of their mothers, ayahs and extended families to the cottages. Their fluency in local languages and the accent that approximated the feared “chee chee” sound would both have a legacy in New Zealand. In the film We Homes Chaps, Kesang Tseten describes the first few months at the Homes as being a time when he spoke no language fluently, losing his Tibetan language and struggling to learn English and Hindi. The Homes was also known for having its own slang, which combined English boarding school colloquialisms and frequently used Hindi terms.66

On the plantations, the children ate a combination of British and Indian food. The same seems to have held true at the Homes. Ruth den Boogert remembered the diet as mostly “English” food: “porridge in the morning, maybe a fruit or two like banana and things you can add to it. And was it toast or plain bread? I’ve forgotten. And a cup of tea.” The main meal was “soup and a middle course, and pudding. I was a fussy eater of course. Didn’t like the

64 Interview with Ruth den Boogert, Auckland, November 2012.
brussel sprouts.” Although Ruth recalled the food being “English”, and based around meat and potatoes, they did occasionally have curry, which was “very mild, compared to when we went home, and had the real McCoy.” In the early period of the Homes, mention has been made of the children going hungry. Gavin Gammie recalled eating only soup for main meals, made from vegetables supplied by the Homes farm to each cottage. When I asked Ruth if she ever went hungry, she replied, “never, never”, but recalled strict observance of meal times and her enjoyment of being on “kitchen duties” when she could nibble on food. The legacy of eating hot curries that will be discussed in Chapter Nine is perhaps indicative, therefore, of a greater reliance on local food in the earlier period when self-sufficiency was not possible, or of abiding memories of the plantation.

Christianity was a dominant part of daily life at the Homes. In We Homes Chaps there is a group discussion where every participant expresses a different opinion about this. Some state that religion was forced on them, others feel that their cultural origins were never compromised, yet another remembers Christianity as a benign influence – singing nice hymns in church and learning English phrases. Ruth den Boogert remembers occasionally having multiple church services in one day and always having a service on Sunday. They said grace before meals in the cottage. She vividly recalls ministers visiting the Homes and giving sermons: “Launch out into the deep! That was one of the sermons. And hellfire and brimstone. That was do as you’re told or else you’ll go to hell you see.” Ruth found the religious training a “bit overwhelming” and life at the Homes in general to be “strict, very strict”. When I suggested that she must have looked forward to the holidays, she replied “oh yes. Freedom.” I asked Ruth if it was hard to leave the plantation and return to the Homes after the holidays:

Of course! We used to cry and my Dad had tears rolling down his face, and the dog would get into a depression, and all the servants would come. Plus, the workers on the tea plantation, quite a few of them, would have heard that babaluc, that is children, were going back to school. And so there’d be a gathering. They’d do the salaams.68

---

67 Interview with Ruth den Boogert, Auckland, November 2012.
68 Ibid.
Ruth’s case is enlightening because she moved between plantation life and the Homes, and thus her reflections bring an immediacy to the racial and cultural dynamics of the parallel childhoods the two sites engendered. Her nostalgic memories of the plantation, which she would happily talk about at length, contrasted noticeably with her difficulty remembering aspects of life at the Homes. The Nicholls family exemplifies the situation where plantation children were “rescued” from their future, rather than the present as Graham’s appeals suggested. This reinforces my argument that the planters were convinced by the Homes emigration scheme, sacrificing domestic arrangements that in at least some cases functioned without issue, in order to achieve an idealised future in the settler colonies. It is important to note, however, that Ruth’s regular visits “home” were exceptional. For most children from plantations, holidays were remembered as a difficult time, when other children would go home and they would be left behind.69 This was compounded by the generalised uncertainty about their familial circumstances. While their bodies were kept busy from moment to moment, their minds were free to wonder about who their parents were, whether they were alive, and if perhaps their father might arrive one day as other fathers did.

Evidence of the planters’ ongoing involvement after their children were admitted to the Homes further disrupts the origin narrative. Although very few children enjoyed a level of contact akin to that of the Nicholls family, the fathers from the case study families did express an interest in their children’s progress and future placement. Exploring their correspondence directs our attention back to the plantations and the continuance of life there after the children were sent to Kalimpong. The planters’ definitive action in sending the children away from their mothers does not mean that the issue was resolved. It is likely to have been a source of ongoing tension in these plantation families, especially with the arrival of further offspring. The women’s archival silence and the planters’ functional attendance to their children’s new circumstance should not disguise the fact that domestic life at the plantation was in all likelihood impacted substantially by the sudden absence of the children.

69 Mizutani suggests that the Homes directors were “almost obsessively concerned” about negative influences of visits home, to cities or plantations, and asked parents to sacrifice their desire for contact with their children by allowing them to stay at Kalimpong for the holidays. Mizutani, The Meaning of White, 150-151.
Egerton Peters’ communication with Graham evidently stopped for six years once the first two children were safely deposited at the Homes. That silence was sharply broken when Peters received a letter from ten-year-old Lorna in 1912. His response, addressed to her housemother, questioned the wisdom of putting his daughter in direct communication with him and asked “whether it was quite fair without consulting me”. Clearly rattled by the unannounced and unexpected breach of the distance between them, Peters declared that he “should be delighted to hear from and write to the child if it did not appear to me to be against her best interests”. He considered that “the atmosphere of a tea garden and close contact with natives would be decidedly objectionable for her” and worried that she would “expect later to be sent to me for holidays”. His letters betray the strange space that people of mixed race occupied in European ways of thinking. In those six years Lorna had transformed from the wild child who spoke no English to one whom Egerton Peters imagined could not bear to be in contact with her maternal family. Peters’ letters during his children’s time at the Homes suggest a man who struggled to come to terms with his decision to send them away, particularly after the death of their mother in 1911.

Letters from other planters during the term of their children’s stay at the Homes displayed less anxiety over the situation than Peters. Francis Hawkins’ letters for the duration of Richard’s residence at the Homes dealt only with fees, apart from a moment in 1918 when he wrote that “it suddenly occurred to me the other day that Richard gets no pocket money” and duly allowed an extra Rs 2/- per month. In 1919 Hawkins retired to England to care for his mother. There is no evidence that he ever visited the Homes prior to leaving India. Similarly Paul Moller’s letters dealt only with the payment of fees and sending another child to Kalimpong. James Dewar continued to check on the progress of the Spalding boys during their few years at the Homes. John Gammie wrote regularly to Graham, enquiring as to his children’s health and requesting photographs of them. Gavin Gammie later recalled that his father did make several visits to the school, but he only met with the older children. Like the

---

70 Egerton Peters to Miss McRie, 23 February 1912, Peters file, Dr Graham’s Homes Archive (DGHA), Kalimpong.
71 Ibid.
72 Francis Hawkins to John Graham, 19 September 1918, Hawkins file, DGHA.
73 John Gammie to John Graham, 28 July 1920; John Gammie to John Graham, 17 November 1920, Gammie file, DGHA.
children of other families, Gavin would have been unaware of his father’s continued interest in his wellbeing. Life at the Homes can therefore be characterised as one of monotony and routine for the children, who moved towards an unknown future with little or no familial contact or news from the plantation.

**Leaving India**

Despite the difficulties in achieving emigration, placement in the settler colonies was consistently portrayed as the most desirable outcome for Homes graduates and one that was offered as a reward for the “best and brightest” students. It is difficult to refute that achievement was grounds for selecting emigrants, but anecdotally the most influential factors seem to have been a tea planting father who desired it and was willing to finance the trip, and reaching “working age” at a time when groups of Homes graduates were being allowed to enter New Zealand. Fairer skin was also considered an important attribute for success in the colonies. The wishes of the young people themselves were afforded minimal consideration. Their futures were another uncertainty that the children lived with until emigration was arranged. When the boys reached the end of their schooling they worked on the Homes farm or were temporarily placed in India; the girls lived and worked in Lucia King cottage. I asked Ruth den Boogert if she recalled the girls discussing their possible destinations:

RN: Not a great deal. … I took it for granted that I would go to New Zealand. … Dad was a good correspondent. He wrote to us a lot. He had a plan for us and so we were comfortable.

JM: *So do you think for some of the other girls – that they didn’t know where they might end up?*

RN: Those who weren’t in touch with their parents, it must have been difficult, but I didn’t query it. Do you know what I mean? I sort of knew where I was and probably that’s how life has treated me. ... I knew I was accepted and where I was going.⁷⁴

Ruth’s regular contact with her father, holidays at the plantation, and “knowing” what her future held, differed to the norm at the Homes. But her testimony is important because she showed a strong awareness of her own good fortune in contrast to the difficult situation faced by others.

---

⁷⁴ Interview with Ruth den Boogert, Auckland, November 2012.
Letters in the Homes personal files suggest that the correspondence between the fathers and Graham was the ground upon which the decision about destinations was made. The letters provide further evidence of Graham adapting his idealised vision in response to the practical difficulties of realising emigration, by encouraging the fathers to play an active role in their children’s futures. The planters’ response to this suggestion was entirely negative. Egerton Peters was adamant that he had entered into a contract where Graham took full responsibility for his children, including sending them to the colonies when they reached a suitable age. In 1912 Peters replied to a letter from Graham, the content of which left him “much disturbed”.75 He quoted Graham as writing “as you do not feel it would be possible for you to have the children with you entirely when they grow up (etc)” and set about challenging the notion of his responsibility for them:

When I sent these children to the homes, it was after long and anxious consideration. ... since I sent them away I have regarded it as absolutely settled that they would be sent to the colonies by the St Andrew’s Colonial Homes, and but for that understanding would never have parted with them.76

Peters apparently received a reassuring response to his concerns, but raised the issue again on several occasions between 1914 and 1917. A crucial point in this correspondence was Peters’ heightened concern for “Eurasian girls” who were educated and then “turned out” to earn a living in India, which he believed could “only lead to misery of the worst description”.77 This comment attests to the fundamental change in status that the planters believed education brought about in their children, and the feared consequences of placing children who were “trained” for the settler colonies among the Anglo-Indian community in India. In 1920 an obviously frustrated Peters reiterated his concerns “plainly” in a lengthy letter, stating that “had I for a moment thought that they would be brought up at the Homes to no better future than to find such work as they may in India I would have brought them up on the native side by preference”.78 In this sentiment, Peters provides further evidence of the

75 Egerton Peters to John Graham, 28 April 1912, Peters file, DGHA.
76 Ibid.
77 Egerton Peters to John Graham, 20 October 1914, Peters file, DGHA.
78 Egerton Peters to John Graham, 27 July 1920, Peters file, DGHA.
alternatives to sending the children to the Homes, and to the utmost importance of future prospects outside India in the decision to send them to Kalimpong. His plea took immediate effect and less than a month later Peters wrote of his “great relief” that Lorna and George would be sent to New Zealand “where they will have a fair chance in life”.79

Dora Moller, the second eldest of Paul Moller’s children, was in the same group to New Zealand as the Peters’ children. In July 1920 Dora had written to Graham to thank him for allowing her to go to the plantation for a holiday. “I have arrived home safely”, she wrote, “Father was so pleased to see me. He gave me a hearty welcome.”80 Six months later, just prior to her departure for New Zealand, Paul Moller wrote that Dora was “still here and is very [lovely].”81 After she left Moller wrote again, to thank Graham “for the way you have brought up Dora, it’s a great credit to your big institution.”82 In the same letter Moller informed Graham that he had been “ordered home” (to Denmark) by his doctor and would not be returning to India. For his children still at the Homes, Moller wrote that “as already indicated, I want them all to immigrate to N.Z.”, and arranged to make annual payments to cover school fees until that time came. Meanwhile his son Charles began to write a flurry of letters concerned with joining his sister in New Zealand. Evidently he had the opportunity to sail with her group in 1920, but for some unstated reason opted to work in India instead. This he seemed to regret very soon afterwards, writing regularly to the Homes asking for assistance to emigrate, which would eventuate five years later.

In 1924 John Gammie agreed to Graham’s suggestion that his eldest children, Fergus and Betty, be sent to New Zealand (“if you think it would be a good idea”) and promised to raise the required sum of Rs1500 by the end of the year.83 Gammie expressed a desire to see his children before they left India, but had difficulty organizing a meeting in Calcutta as he was about to be transferred to another plantation. He asked that they be instructed to write to

79 Egerton Peters to John Graham, 21 August 1920, Peters file, DGHA.
80 Dora Moller to John Graham, 17 July 1920, Moller file, DGHA.
81 Paul Moller to John Graham, 14 December 1920, Moller file, DGHA.
82 Paul Moller to John Graham, 8 January 1921, Moller file, DGHA.
83 John Perrell Gammie to James Purdie, 12 March 1924, Gammie file, DGHA.
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him via the Homes, as “letters might go astray and you will always know my address”.\[84\] Gammie’s request highlights the role of the institution as a stabilising presence in an interracial empire family, which would otherwise rely on relatives in England as anchors for their highly mobile and scattered existences. As it turned out, Gammie did get to see the children, a meeting that left him satisfied with their upbringing at the Homes. His affective letter to Purdie demonstrated his concern that the ties between siblings be maintained. “They’ve kept that nice disposition they had as kiddies”, he wrote, “and from what they told me I gathered that the family still had that love for each other which is so nice to see. … It was so nice them recognizing me at once.”\[85\]

In a letter concerning his son Richard’s future prospects, Francis Hawkins wrote that he presumed that “in the course of a year of two he will be starting in life, does he show any liking for machinery as I would like him to be apprenticed to engineering if he has any inclination that way.”\[86\] The following year Francis replied to a letter from James Purdie regarding Richard’s future:

As regards Dickie’s future I note all you say re sending him to Britain. I should certainly like him to be sent out of India but my investments have not turned out as they promised and I am afraid I couldn’t afford to keep him over here but I am prepared to find £100 to start him and am quite willing to leave the manner of doing this in Dr Graham’s hands.\[87\]

Francis was apparently responding to a suggestion by Purdie that since he had returned to Britain, he might be able to assist his son emigrating there. Francis’ refusal of such direct involvement could scarcely be described as subtle. Although he could not afford to “keep” his son he was able to find a substantial sum to see him settled elsewhere, the details of which he was happy to leave to Graham. Soon afterwards Francis wrote that he was pleased that his son would “be started in something he has a liking for … I hope you will be successful in

\[84\] John Perrell Gammie to James Purdie, 29 November 1924, Gammie file, DGHA.
\[85\] John Perrell Gammie to James Purdie, 10 December 1924, Gammie file, DGHA.
\[86\] Francis Hawkins to John Graham, 9 May 1923, Hawkins file, DGHA.
\[87\] Francis Hawkins to James Purdie, 7 May 1924, Hawkins file, DGHA.
your efforts to place him in America.”

Richard was in fact sent to New Zealand in 1925 in the same group as Charles Spalding.

James Dewar had always been clear that the Spalding brothers should go to the colonies, and it was perhaps a more straightforward case given that their father had passed away and could take no further part in their lives. Dewar wrote to Graham in 1925, responding negatively to the suggestion that Charles visit his mother prior to leaving for New Zealand: “Unless Charlie particularly wishes to see his mother before he goes away, I think it would serve no useful purpose if she went up to see him. She is not a good woman.”

The same issue arose when Charles’s brother Tom was due to emigrate. In 1926 Charles wrote to James Purdie, the Homes secretary, from Te Awamutu in the North Island of New Zealand indicating an established correspondence with his mother. “I got a letter from my mother and she told me that Donald will be going to the Homes soon. She ask me if she could see me one day when I have some money and I answer the letter back, told her that I might see you some day. And she said she would like to see Tom before he goes to N.Z. I will be glad if Tom could see her before he comes here.”

Charles’s letter exhibits a lower level of literacy than other emigrants, attributable to his age upon admission (12 years) and spending only four years at the Homes. His request that Tom see their mother before emigrating, whom they would both have remembered very well, was not granted.

The correspondence in the Spalding and Moller files raises the issue of the children seeing their mothers before going to New Zealand. As explained in Chapter One, the mother of Paul Moller’s children had managed to keep the children on the plantation for some years prior to them being sent to the Homes. Dora’s extended holiday at the plantation before leaving for New Zealand could indicate that she was also successful in negotiating some time with her daughter before losing contact with her permanently. Dora’s letter mentioned her father but not her mother, which was unsurprising given Graham’s inculcation of shame regarding their native heritage. (It could also mean that Dora’s mother was no longer alive, or that their relationship was difficult.) James Dewar’s correspondence provided more direct
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evidence of the mother’s pressing concern to see her children. The narratives of both families will be continued in subsequent chapters, but it should be noted here that the Spalding file contained later correspondence from the boys’ mother, Prosoni, in the form of a typed, translated letter marked with her thumbprint. Literacy was a major limiting factor in any future contact with their children, and the women’s understanding of this must have lent urgency to the desire to see them prior to leaving India.

Ka Ngelibou (Nelly), the mother of Jean and Rend Mortimore, had become literate while her children were at the Homes. The Mortimore file contained two identical forms that preceded a letter from Nelly. The forms were declarations signed by Jean and Rend, acknowledging that the cost of their passage to New Zealand was a “debt of honour” due to the Homes, to be repaid as soon as possible in order that “the money spent on my behalf may be available for another pupil of the Homes.”

The agreed sum was £40. Six days after these statements were signed, Nelly penned a letter from Shillong in Assam. “Dear Sir”, she began, “I have learnt with much regret that my children Jean and Renrose have left Kalimpong for New Zealand on the 23rd of last month and this news comes to me like a shock and breaks my heart and I feel I cannot bear it until now I can write something to you.” Nelly did indicate knowledge of this outcome, however, referring to her previous request for a photograph of the children before they were sent away. Notably, that request was made during a visit to the Homes. She asked now that the promised photograph be sent to her along with a “full address” that would enable her to write to Jean and Rend in New Zealand.

It is imperative here to consider all that the emigrants left behind when they were permanently parted from India. They left their birthplaces, the plantations of northeast India, where their mothers and extended families continued to reside. Life in the bungalows carried on for the women and the tea planters after the children left the plantation, and then India. The danger of following the archive, or the narrative, is to lose the sense of difference between these two shifts, especially for the women who may have been unaware of the long term consequences of their children’s admission to the Homes. For many children, the shift to
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Kalimpong meant residing in reasonably close proximity to their place of birth. Although it is generally thought that mothers who attempted to visit their children at the Homes were forcefully denied doing so, being sent to New Zealand made the possibility of maternal reunion as adults even more remote. While those placed in India were also largely prevented from meeting their mothers again due to their absence from the Homes archive, it was this second separation that planted the seed of an “imagined” India into the Kalimpong narrative as understood by the descendants of the emigrants to New Zealand.

Leaving India also meant leaving the institution in Kalimpong where they had grown up. It meant leaving friends that they had lived in close quarters with for more than a decade; the spectacular views of the Himalayas that they would all speak of in later life; the food, the chores, and the daily routines; all of the drama of Homes life and all of the boredom; housemothers who would be vividly remembered for better or worse; and precious interactions with Graham or Purdie that would not be forgotten. Being sent to New Zealand was another huge shift over which these young people had little or no control, but for some it also meant the anticipation of family reunions, as remembered by Ruth den Boogert:

JM: So when you left India, were you sad to leave? To leave the plantation?
RN: Yes! Well, yes! As I say there was such a collection of people, and everybody crying and going on like that.
JM: Yes, quite sad. And did you think you’d ever go back?
RN: I didn’t think about that. It was just forward, you know. I didn’t cry when I left Kalimpong either [laughs].
JM: That’s a bit different.
RN: I was just happy to go back to the [plantation].
JM: Do you remember if you were afraid to come to New Zealand?
RN: No because we knew Sheila was here, Sydney was here, and Dad was going to buy a farm, and Sydney and Sheila were both doing part time work and waiting for our arrival.93

Conclusion

Graham’s realisation of juvenile migration to the settler colonies was credited as an innovative solution to the Anglo-Indian problem. Extending his network of support in Britain
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93 Interview with Ruth den Boogert, Auckland, November 2012.
and India to the settler colonies, Graham used the *Homes Magazine* as a forum for bringing colonial experience to this debate. However his public rhetoric masked the story of the tea planters’ children, who comprised a large proportion of residents at the Homes. My research builds on Satoshi Mizutani’s comprehensive reading of the theoretical constructs of Graham’s scheme, by tracing the experiences of the children who were sent to New Zealand. Highlighting the variety of circumstances from which they originated reveals the flattening of ethnic diversity that Graham sought upon the children’s admission to the Homes as “Anglo-Indian”. Furthermore, although I emphasise the distinction between the two moments of separation involved in this scheme, I have also demonstrated that the history of the Homes cannot be simply read as a history of “removal”, because for some of the children moving to New Zealand offered the possibility of family reunification.

These patterns of separation and reunion are fundamental to understanding both the origins and the legacy of the Kalimpong narrative. When they left the Homes, the emigrants were still embedded in complex transnational family arrangements, but were likely to have had little knowledge of this. Graham imagined their transfer to a distant settler colony as the final stage of extracting them from those circumstances, placing them instead into a network of families with no such complicated ties. The first graduates to depart Kalimpong for New Zealand did so prior to Graham ever visiting the colony. He sent them abroad on the same terms that their fathers had sent them away from plantations – with an idealised view of their destination based on knowledge gained and circulated through imperial networks.
Figure 5: The Homes school buildings (centre front) and cottages. Kalimpong township at rear.

Figure 6: Graham at the Homes

Figure 7: Graham portrait

(Source: Langmore family archive. Figures 5 and 6 were taken by George Langmore in 1924)
CHAPTER THREE
1908-1914: PATHWAY TO A SETTLER COLONY

In 1908 the first two Homes emigrants to New Zealand, Leonard and Sydney Williams, arrived at a farm in Highcliff, on the rugged peninsula that skirts the southern city of Dunedin. Another two young men, Clarence Sinclair and Eustace Boardman, followed soon after, and in 1909 John Graham visited New Zealand on a “health trip” to check for himself the progress of the first four emigrants. In addition, he accompanied the first female emigrant, Clarence’s sister Aileen, to a family in Dunedin. These five individuals formed the first tiny cluster of Homes graduates in New Zealand. In addition to these emigrants, the local Kalimpong community comprised a network of individuals connected to Graham through the Presbyterian Church, whose involvement was vital to the implementation of the scheme. In this chapter I examine the formation of this community from its inception, and argue that the connections forged between the distant sites of Kalimpong and Dunedin paved the way for future emigration. The emigrants’ presence in New Zealand also significantly extended the reach of their imperial families, although the operation of those families was not rendered visible in the Homes archive in this period.

Three levels of acceptance of the emigrants in the settler colonies were required for this scheme to work as Graham intended: crossing the border, securing employment and housing, and being integrated into the wider community. Early appeals by Graham and his supporters to New Zealand audiences made clear their expectation of finding enlightened attitudes towards race and social opportunity in all three endeavours. The response to their appeals, in written form and in active support, highlights this period as one where an absence of old class structures in the Dominion was held up by Presbyterians as affording new possibilities for social reform and charity “at home”. The Homes scheme tested the extension of these egalitarian ideals to racially marginalised adolescents. The emigrants’ awareness of the importance of these social dynamics in determining their potential to become “colonists”, led them to write letters to Graham that included self-conscious articulations of their integration and inclusion. Excerpts of these letters printed in the Homes Magazine are thus
used extensively in this and subsequent chapters. While the selection of excerpts by Homes staff and indeed the letters themselves were biased by the desire to report positively, they provide a unique commentary of the transformation that the move to the colonies was intended to realise, through gendered socialisation into the respectable working class.

An Early Approach

In the early 1900s, the *Homes Magazine* printed information sourced from associates in the settler colonies about the economic, environmental and social suitability of those destinations for its graduates. The information was used to develop the training programme at the Homes and to extend the public debate around emigration as a solution to the Anglo-Indian problem. A more direct correspondence about emigration to New Zealand was archived in the records of a shipping company. In 1905, D. M. Hamilton, a member of the Homes committee in Calcutta, wrote to Charles Holdsworth, the general manager of the Union Steam Ship Company in Dunedin. Hamilton outlined the Homes scheme and the pressing issue of placements for those residents who were beginning to reach working age, plainly enquiring as to “what chance Eurasian lads would have in New Zealand?” The letter stressed their “thoroughly sound upbringing” at the Homes, where they had “to do everything themselves without the help of servants.” Hamilton sought Holdsworth’s advice as to openings for both boys and girls in New Zealand, finishing the letter by stating:

> I sent the first boy down to Australia the other day in one of the [word illegible] boats and it was only after a great deal of difficulty that the authorities would allow him to land, because he was a little dark in color. The boy had quite an English upbringing. I believe, however, that you are more enlightened in New Zealand and are prepared to give any decent lad or young woman a chance.

Hamilton was appealing to a sentiment that has continued to be a part of the reputation of New Zealand, that of an egalitarian nation that prioritised equality of opportunity. Precisely how equal that opportunity was (and is) has been well-debated in New Zealand.

---

1 Neither correspondent appeared subsequently in the Kalimpong archive.
2 D. M. Hamilton to C. Holdsworth, 15 July 1905, Union Steam Ship Company Records, AG-292-005-004/135, Hocken Collections (HC), University of Otago, Dunedin.
historiography. Erik Olssen’s valuable work on southern Dunedin in this period has shown that in terms of class and religion there was a “general willingness… to accommodate difference.” The question here was whether this flexibility applied to people who were “a little dark in colour”, or perhaps more pointedly, whether it was denied on the basis of colour. Hamilton’s appeal implied that the colony’s immigration policy, or least the way in which it was implemented, could be read by the outsider as a direct expression or denial of this egalitarianism. Furthermore, there was an implication that experiences at the border to some degree reflected the attitudes that awaited within the bounds of the colony. In appealing to the relative “enlightenment” of New Zealand compared to Australia, Hamilton’s statement also foregrounds the fact that this period was one where the various colonies of the British Empire were taking on distinctive characteristics. As Radhika Mongia found in her study of raced migration in Canada, border contestations were a crucial and constitutive element in the emergence of national identities and indeed the nation itself.

The ways in which other settler colonies dealt with raced migration is relevant here, because the desire to regulate the movement of non-British labour around the empire was based on a common desire to keep their populations predominantly, or exclusively, white. When Graham established the Homes in 1900, he was open-minded about any of the settler colonies being suitable for Anglo-Indians. However the opening of the institution coincided with the enactment of a global wave of racially based immigration restrictions. The application of these restrictions was still being worked out at the time of Hamilton’s enquiry. Because Anglo-Indians had not emigrated in significant numbers prior to Graham’s scheme, there was no way of anticipating whether immigration exclusions would apply to them, and the likely treatment of mixed-race British subjects under laws that targeted Chinese migrants was by no means clear. Capturing this early uncertainty about the settler colonial response to the Homes scheme thus offers important insights into the application of race-based immigration laws. While it is not new to compare immigration policies around the British

---

Empire, the Kalimpong case is unique in that it places the spotlight on *colour* in racial discrimination in the early twentieth century.

In Canada, Mongia found that from 1906 the overt justification for restricting Indian immigration on racial grounds was climactic or cultural incompatibility. She argues that this “cultural” or “differential” racism appeared earlier than previous scholarship has suggested, but also that it reflected politicians’ inability to name race itself, in a biological sense, as a reason for discrimination. In Hamilton’s letter there was a similar deployment of cultural racism, but in reverse. He questioned whether New Zealanders were capable of seeing beyond colour, to focus instead on the cultural “sameness” of the Kalimpong emigrants. In other words, Hamilton did not argue against discrimination towards different races; rather he suggested that the environment and training at the Homes had moulded its graduates into people who were not a different race, at least in cultural terms. New Zealand officials would not be able to hide behind any cultural justifications for denying entry to these European-raised British subjects. As James Barrett and David Roediger have argued of the integration of the “new immigrant” class in the United States, this was a period when the difference between race and ethnicity was being worked out.

Holdsworth’s advice to Hamilton was that New Zealand law did not exclude immigrants on the basis of colour. His reply included a copy of the Immigration Restriction Act of 1899 in which he had found “no bar” to Anglo-Indian emigration. As scholars of the Indian community in New Zealand have shown, this legislation was never an effective means of preventing Indian immigration, which actually increased during the early 1900s. The Act required non-British immigrants to pass an English language test, but it was common practice.

---

8 Mongia, “Race, Nationality, Mobility”, 534, 547.
10 C. Holdsworth to D.M. Hamilton, 15 August 1905, Union Steam Ship Company Records, AG-292-005-004/135, HC.
to “cram” for the test and cross the border otherwise unimpeded.\textsuperscript{12} By contrast, the 1901 Immigration Restriction Act in Australia was highly effective in making Asian immigration almost impossible, and signalled the beginning of the “White Australia” policy that persisted until the 1970s.\textsuperscript{13} The Act was built around a similar mechanism to its New Zealand equivalent, but an anomaly saw the language test specified as “any European language” (rather than English).\textsuperscript{14} This enabled officials to easily exclude any undesirable immigrant by requiring a Chinese person, for example, to complete the test in French.\textsuperscript{15} Hence the equivalent legislation that in New Zealand acted only as a deterrent to Asian immigration, was in Australia the means of the exclusion of all “coloured races”.\textsuperscript{16}

Holdsworth’s response was decidedly less optimistic about the social potential of the Homes graduates once inside the border, owing to the attitudes of the local population and the labour they were trained for. His discussions with “several people” led him to believe that it would be difficult to secure “suitable employment” for them.\textsuperscript{17} Holdsworth continued by comparing the scheme to the “Industrial schools”, which trained children of “depraved or worthless parents” and whom he believed met the demand for this kind of remedial labour. W. D. Borrie’s demographic study of immigration to New Zealand outlined the shortage of farm labourers in New Zealand at this time, and as Mongia found in the Canadian case, for all the rhetoric about a lack of employment as the reason for restricting Indian immigration, those who did enter the colony had no difficulty in finding work.\textsuperscript{18} The question of “suitability” in Holdsworth’s letter more likely reflected concerns about what Borrie termed the “absorptive capacity” of the colony, which in the early 1900s was regulated by concerns not only about


\textsuperscript{13} \textit{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{14} Lake and Reynolds, \textit{Drawing the Global Colour Line}, 148.


\textsuperscript{16} This exclusion was reinforced by legislation enacted in the same year as the Immigration Restriction Act to deport all Pacific Island people brought in to labour on sugar plantations. See Lake and Reynolds, \textit{Drawing the Global Colour Line}, 137, 150.

\textsuperscript{17} C. Holdsworth to D. M. Hamilton, 15 August 1905, Union Steam Ship Company Records, AG-292-005-004/135, HC.

\textsuperscript{18} Mongia, “Race, Nationality, Mobility”, 534; W. D. Borrie, \textit{Immigration to New Zealand, 1854-1938} (Canberra: Australian National University, 1991), 150-157. Borrie’s study was written in 1937-1938 at Knox College in Dunedin and published in 1991 with minor editorial corrections.
race and culture, but respectability. Borrie argued that in this period New Zealand followed the lead of Canada and Australia in its “active search” for respectable white settlers to bolster its populations, rather than being perceived as a solution to England’s pauper problem.\(^\text{19}\)

These settler colonial demands influenced the way Graham publicised the scheme, seeking a delicate balance between charity, imperial responsibility and labour requirements.

Making his point more bluntly, Holdsworth further asked whether “Eurasian children, even if brought up under the improving influence of the St Andrew's Home, [are] likely to turn out well? I am not in a position to answer this myself, though from what I have read I should be inclined to say, no.” He concluded with a statement about the greater demand for the young women’s labour:

There really is plenty of opening for trained domestic servants … but the responsibility of bringing such girls to New Zealand, even if they were trained, would be too much for a private individual. Several of the churches take considerable interest in mission work in India, and it is possible that these may be able to do something. I propose to bring the matter before one of the Societies shortly.\(^\text{20}\)

This final passage signalled the importance of gender in delineating the experiences of the new arrivals and their respective avenues of integration into local communities. While all of the emigrants were seen as vulnerable to the moral dangers of the outside world after their prolonged isolation at the Homes, the need to protect the young women was greater. Holdsworth alluded to the need for an organisation to provide such protection. His reference to locally supported Indian missions raises an important question about the very sector of


\(^{20}\) C. Holdsworth to D. M. Hamilton, 15 August 1905, Union Steam Ship Company Records, AG-292-005-004/135, HC. Hugh Morrison described missions to India as the “main focus” for New Zealand Presbyterian overseas missions from the 1890s until the outbreak of the First World War, and notes the predominance of the Otago and Southland regions in both the number of committees and missionaries sent to India. Hugh Morrison, “‘But We are Concerned with a Greater Imperium’: The New Zealand Protestant Missionary Movement and the British Empire, 1870-1930”, *Social Sciences and Missions* 21 (2008): 97-127; Hugh Morrison, “‘It is our Bolden Duty’: The Emergence of the New Zealand Protestant Missionary Movement, 1868-1926” (Ph.D. diss., Massey University, 2004), 97-98, 102.
Dunedin society that Graham might enlist into his imperial “band of workers”: to what extent might the missionary impulse, fostered overseas, translate into an acceptance of Anglo-Indians into New Zealand households and communities?

A Network in Place

Our big boys are beginning to leave us. Two fine European lads sailed in the beginning of December to become colonists in New Zealand. They are the first Emigrants to be set forth by the Homes. Messrs Mackinnon and Mackenzie and Company got for us favourable terms for their passage. Miss Ponder of Waitahuna, Dunedin, is kindly arranging for their settlement.

Homes Magazine, January 1908

The first associates of Graham’s to actively assist the scheme in New Zealand were indeed connected to him through the Presbyterian Church and previous missionary work in India. According to Graham’s later notes on the scheme, it was Reverend James Ponder of Waitahuna who “received” the first two male emigrants in 1908. Ponder was educated at the University of Edinburgh and spent time in Australia before visiting his brother and sister in Kalimpong, both of whom worked as medical missionaries there. His experiences in India convinced Ponder to join the ministry, and he returned to Edinburgh to study theology. Ponder returned to Australia and then spent time ministering in Fiji, until a bout of ill health saw him travel to New Zealand to recuperate. He stayed. Inducted to the Strath Taieri (Middlemarch) parish in 1903, Ponder moved to Waitahuna in 1906 where he ministered until 1918. Both Middlemarch and Waitahuna were by the early 1900s well-established farming districts, situated to the west and south of the coastal city of Dunedin (see Figure 8). Settled by Europeans in the 1860s, large run-holders were now into their second and third generations.

---

21 “Beginning Life’s Battle”, St Andrew’s Colonial Magazine (SACHM) 8, no. 1 (1908): 5.
23 Register of New Zealand Presbyterian Ministers, Deaconesses and Missionaries 1840-2009, Presbyterian Archives Research Centre (PARC), accessed 20 March 2012, www.archives.presbyterian.org.nz/Page191.htm. Ponder’s brother was a tea planter in the district prior to studying medicine at the University of Edinburgh, and his sister was sent to Kalimpong by the Woman’s Guild to assist her brother as a “missionary nurse”. See Alex McKay, Their Footprints Remain: Biomedical Beginnings Across the Indo-Tibetan Frontier (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007), 72.
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of what were becoming notable Otago families. As a fellow Scot and widely travelled, having spent time in India and then settled in the rural heartland of Otago, Ponder was well-placed to be of great assistance to Graham.

Ponder publicised the settlement of the first two Homes graduates in Dunedin in an article in the *Otago Witness* in August 1908 entitled “‘Kim’ and his Brothers”. Expecting the readership to understand his reference to the recently published novel which “most of us have read”, he used Rudyard Kipling’s portrait of Kim as the context from which to introduce the Homes scheme. The novel was an “eye-opener” that was “alas ... far more common than is known.” Downplaying the Indian ancestry of the Homes children, the article instead aligned their circumstance with “the great flotsam and jetsam” of domiciled Europeans in India. It gave a detailed account of the Homes, and upon describing the children’s training in “industrial departments” and farming, announced the placement of the two young men on a farm near Dunedin. “This article is mainly written”, Ponder admitted, “with the view of securing similar openings for other lads”.

The girls’ training was described as “at present confined chiefly to lace-making”; however, the recently opened Steel Memorial Hospital at the Homes was to be used for nurses’ training, and thus “when a girl leaves the homes she shall be in a position to earn her own livelihood, besides being a well-equipped housewife.” No mention was made of sending these young women to Dunedin.

Ponder described the cottage system at the Homes and the aunties “who by personal example show that work and refinement are not antagonistic”, noting that “one Dunedin lady has lately become an ‘auntie’” and that other New Zealand women were likely to follow her. He concluded the article by stating that:

New Zealand has shown a splendid sympathy and generosity towards the child-widows of India and towards other Christian and philanthropic work done among the natives; but the brotherhood of race should command a quicker and more generous sympathy than that of mere cosmopolitanism.

---

25 J. S. Ponder, “‘Kim’ and his Brothers”, *Otago Witness*, 12 August 1908.
26 Ibid.
27 Ibid.
Ponder’s sentiments were underpinned by questions around the development of colonial hierarchies in a society which many immigrants chose because they wanted to create a culture where class was not “central to social organisation”.28 The perceived absence of such stratifications held new possibilities for church organisations. Indeed Olssen’s work on the Caversham suburb of Dunedin found that the cohesiveness of early Dunedin society was partly due to its solid religious infrastructure and relative lack of tensions between various denominations.29 Ponder appealed to charitable colonial elites to embrace the culture of work, while hardworking migrants were polished up to enable them to rub shoulders with those elites. These early discussions of the Homes scheme involved an increasingly blunt questioning around the issue of where the emigrants might fit in colonial hierarchies. Did employment of an Anglo-Indian farm or domestic worker reflect a genuine desire to extend opportunity to those who might otherwise miss out? Or was it an opportunity to display status in an otherwise flattened social structure? The answers to Graham’s appeals and the experiences of the emigrants did more than test the racial and imperial limits of a localised egalitarian ideal. Their presence in New Zealand families and communities was constitutive of a social structure that developed around core values of tolerance and consensus.30

One who was in the throes of philanthropic work overseas was the “auntie” to whom Ponder referred, Miss Mary E. Kennedy of Dunedin. The Presbyterian publication The Outlook had described a gathering in March 1908 to farewell her to the “Church of Scotland’s Kalimpong Mission in Northern India”.31 Among those who attended were the “Convenor of Foreign Missions and the Convenor of Home Missions, along with two foreign missionaries on furlough, who all took a prominent part in the proceedings.” One of those on furlough was “Rev W. MacKean, Kalimpong”, who spoke to the congregation about the Homes scheme

31 “Departure of a Lady Missionary for India”, The Outlook, 21 March 1908, PARC. The reference to the Church of Scotland’s mission rather than the Homes is important as it reflects the unofficial status of support given by the Presbyterian Church. No other mention of the scheme has been located in The Outlook, although Graham’s death was reported in 1942.
and the nature of the work in which Miss Kennedy would be engaged. MacKean was a missionary who was noted for his two decades of work in Sikkim, which was interspersed with several years’ service in Kalimpong. The Convenor of the newly established Foreign Missions was a notable Dunedin figure, Rev. W. Hewitson, who “gave some reminiscences of his recent visit to India.” While references were made to other missionaries who had recently gone abroad – to India and to “North American Indians” – the Convenor of Home Missions “emphasised the fact that the Home and Foreign Mission flourished together”, noting that “the distinction was, in a sense, a wrong one, for no missions should be ‘Foreign’ to the Christian Church”. This sentiment was an apt forerunner to Ponder’s appeal to charity that went beyond cosmopolitanism. To welcome mixed-race workers into Dunedin families was an equally important act of Christian work as dramatic conversions in distant lands.

The strengthening relationship between Dunedin and Kalimpong was the subject of an article in the *Homes Magazine* in January 1909 entitled “Emigration”, which informed readers that “New Zealand does not close its doors so tightly as Australia.” “A year ago we sent there the first two boys and the experiment has, as far as we can judge, proved highly successful... Two more lads left for New Zealand on 5th December.” This assessment was preceded by an admission that while emigration to “the freer and more robust Colonies” was initially one of the “chief outlets we contemplated”, the “closing of Australia to Eurasians and the better prospects apparent in India” meant emigration was now “less prominent” in the Homes vision. Signalling Graham’s relentless persistence with the scheme, the article continued that emigration was not “being lost sight of and we believe that for certain of the boys and girls it offers by far the best career”. Enquiries had been received for “mother helps”, and when the “proper arrangements” were made the Homes was hopeful of sending young women to fill these roles. The article portrayed an increasingly optimistic view of all that “awaited” in New Zealand, a view that developed as the channels of communication between Kalimpong and Dunedin became more open and more direct.

---

32 MacKean was recalled to Kalimpong in 1906 and went on furlough before returning to Sikkim in 1910. His presence in Dunedin may have been attributable to the Ponders’ presence there. See Alex McKay, “The Indigenisation of Western Medicine in Sikkim”, *Bulletin of Tibetology* 40, no. 2 (2004): 25-47; and Cindy Perry, *Nepali Around the World* (Kathmandu: Ekta Books, 1997), 92-93 (reference supplied by John Bray).

33 “Departure of a Lady Missionary for India”, *The Outlook*, 21 March 1908, PARC.

The “Emigration” article informed readers that the two young men recently sent to New Zealand had been “trained on the Farm and Mr Goodwin gave them a course of lectures on agriculture”. The Ponders had made arrangements for them and were expected to provide news of their arrival. The article concluded with a letter from one of the first men placed in Dunedin, Leonard Williams, who described long working days (3am to 6.30pm) after which he helped with household chores. Williams wrote that he enjoyed his work and that it was “just grand living near the sea”. He lived in Highcliff, a rugged area perched high on the Otago Peninsula. Williams’ employer had suggested he should ask the Homes “to let me know the name of the steamer that the two boys sailed with, for we could meet them at the harbour”. In another reference to his employer’s generosity, Williams reported that his brother Sydney had visited him and “Mr G was kind enough to allow me down to town with him”.

Employers, emigrants and interested churchmen formed the nucleus of a community that was carving out a route between two discrete imperial locales.

Consolidating the Community

Graham’s visit to New Zealand in 1909 consolidated this emergent community. Instructed by his physician to take a “health trip”, Graham took the opportunity to see for himself the colony about which he had heard such promising reports, and to visit the first four emigrants in their placements. He also brought the first young woman, Aileen Sinclair, to be placed as a domestic servant with an urban Dunedin family. Graham’s diary of the trip was brief but illuminating. Arriving in Dunedin on 24 August 1909, he was greeted at the wharf by Clarence Sinclair (Aileen’s brother, who emigrated the previous year) and David Kennedy, father of Mary Kennedy who was working as an auntie at the Homes. The presence of these two men – and the likelihood that it was Kennedy who brought Clarence to the wharf to be reunited with his sister – is evidence of the intricate connections that brought together Dunedin people who had an association with Kalimpong. Kennedy was a Harbour Board

---

35 Ibid. This focus on education will be discussed throughout this thesis as both a help and a hindrance for the young men whose acceptance into the rural labouring sector was dictated by the developing stereotype of the ideal “Kiwi bloke”. Jock Phillips, *A Man’s Country? The Image of the Pakeha Male* (Auckland: Penguin, 1996), 1-43.
37 Dr Graham’s Diary (DGD) 1909, transcribed by James Purdie, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:8:1, NLS.
official, and had written earlier in the year to the Customs Department to enquire about the possibility of emigrating girls from Kalimpong to New Zealand. While Sinclair and Kennedy shared an interest in Graham’s visit, they did so from quite distinct perspectives and their relationship was indirect. The community that evolved to support the Homes scheme in New Zealand was one that crossed many social divisions.

Upon arrival Graham set about calling on numerous individuals and their families, including Mrs Scott, a solicitor’s wife and the first convenor of the “Ladies Committee”. Although the Ponders had assumed responsibility for placement of the young men, Aileen’s arrival prompted a more formal infrastructure of protection – a move that echoed Holdsworth’s concern about the women. Graham met Dr Robert Church, an English-born physician educated at the University of Otago, whose wife was to become a key figure in Dunedin, facilitating placement and providing ongoing support for the Kalimpong women. In a report printed in the Homes Magazine after his return, Graham outlined the events that had led to Aileen’s placement in Dunedin. Clarence Sinclair had written shortly before Graham departed Kalimpong, asking that his sister be brought to New Zealand to work in the home of a “neighbouring farmer”. This request prompted Graham’s “practical consideration of the question of emigrating girls to the Dominion”. Again a matter that had been theorised about now required real life consideration. It was decided that Aileen was “not physically suited to life on a dairy farm”, but a place was found for her with a family in the city. “The care and supervision of the girls is an anxious and important matter”, Graham concluded, and the Ladies Committee was formed “for that purpose”. Mrs Scott, he added, was “already connected to Kalimpong through her brother (Mr MacKean) one of our colleagues.”

38 D. Kennedy to Customs Department, February 1909, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, Archives New Zealand, Wellington office (ANZ-W). The Department’s reply reiterated the theoretical ease of negotiating immigration controls, advising that “there is nothing to prevent natives of India who are not suffering from any physical defect from entering the Dominion so long as they can write out the necessary form of application, in any European language.” Immigration Department secretary to D. Kennedy, 17 February 1909, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
39 John Graham, Typed notes, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:15:1, NLS.
41 Ibid.
42 Graham’s diary of his 1937 visit to New Zealand reveals that Mrs Church was also formerly Miss MacKean. Both women were sisters of the missionary noted earlier as present at Mary Kennedy’s farewell the previous
The church community that Graham liaised with in Dunedin fitted the developing profile of those who would prove most sympathetic to the Kalimpong scheme. Graham first met Reverend William Hewitson, who had been present at the farewell for Mary Kennedy. Hewitson had just taken up the role of professor at the newly opened Knox (theological) College. He was one of a “new generation of creative and radical pioneers” who established the Presbyterian Social Service Agency (PSSA), an organisation whose activities Simon Rae suggests represented a clear departure from the preceding generation of church and institution builders.43 Rae argues that this group were more accepting of the need to provide social assistance along non-denominational lines, an approach which aligned with Graham’s policy at the Homes.44 At St Andrew’s Church, Graham met Reverend Dr Rutherford Waddell. St Andrew’s had its own missionary scheme and contributed generously to other missions. Waddell played a key role in innovative schemes such as prison reform and kindergarten, was an active supporter of women’s suffrage and a critic of the “sweating” system.45 Graham no doubt felt at home among this Presbyterian community which sought innovative and practical solutions to social problems.

After a stay of one week in Dunedin, which included a trip south to Waitahuna to meet the Ponders, Graham headed north. On the platform to see him off were “Leonard and Clarence, Dr and Mrs Church and Allan, Mrs Scott, Mr Nisbet, Mr Kennedy.”46 The next day, the Otago Witness carried an interview with Graham, in which he spoke of his visit to the four emigrants working on farms around Dunedin. Their employers, Graham reported, were “perfectly satisfied … finding them gentler and more refined than the ordinary work-a-day boy; perfectly reliable and trustworthy, and they never skylarked.”47 This refinement, like their education, will be shown to be at odds with the rougher version of rural masculinity that the emigrants would encounter on larger farms. The title of the article, “The Land of the

---

43 Simon Rae, From Relief to Social Service (Dunedin: PSSA Otago Inc, 1981), 21.
44 “Non-denominational” always inferred denominations other than Catholic. Graham adopted this stance at the Homes as a consequence of the Church of Scotland’s refusal to officially support the institution.
45 Rae, From Relief to Social Service, 26.
46 DGD 1909, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:8:1, NLS.
Sahib: ‘Kim’ and his Sisters”, alerted the reader to its greater concern – the desire to bring women from the Homes to fill domestic service roles in Dunedin. Referring to the growing disdain for this occupation among white colonial women, the reporter questioned Graham on the availability of “pure-blooded European girls at the homes in Kalimpong, who would have no objection to going to the colonies for domestic service”. Graham replied that indeed there were many, but was careful to emphasise the modest aims of the emigration scheme and anticipate any anxieties about race:

We shall probably begin gradually. Sticklers for the colour line need not be frightened. Only the girls of English blood will be sent. If the first batch are found suitable and the conditions of New Zealand suit them, then probably more will follow. As to the boys, I believe that if 50 came to New Zealand to-morrow all would get billets.48

Graham’s closing comments in the Otago Witness article suggest that Dunedin’s familiarity enhanced his belief that it was a good fit for his graduates. Known as the “Edinburgh of the South”, Dunedin’s high proportion of Scottish settlers made it seem “very homelike” to Graham and he was delighted “to hear the good old accent.”49 Offering his congratulations to the city for the “solidarity” it had achieved after only “sixty years in the making”, Graham’s comments gesture towards his appreciation for the youth of the colony in contrast to the weight of social and historical forces in British India. On his tour, Graham also looked for evidence of the reputedly harmonious relationship between British settlers and Māori. In the south, he noted the co-existence of Māori and Scottish place names. In the North Island, he met an “old Māori lady – tattooed face, MacKenzie tartan dress”, and visited a noted school for Māori girls run by the Williams sisters, who were part of a well known Anglican missionary family.50 Graham’s observations of these cultural coexistences contributed to his belief that New Zealand was an ideal destination for Anglo-Indians. In later reflections he would repeatedly credit the “success” of the emigration scheme to the “presence of Maori as fellow settlers with the British”.51

48 Ibid.
49 Ibid.
50 DGD 1909, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:8:1, NLS.
From Dunedin, Graham travelled to the port of Lyttleton at Christchurch and took a steamer to Wellington. He noted meeting a Mr Blair on board the steamer, who was quite likely the A. W. Blair who would become a crucial contact in the 1920s, arranging permits for numerous groups of emigrants. Graham arrived in Havelock North on the east coast of the North Island on 3 September to visit the estate of Mr and Mrs Bernard Chambers, with whom the fourth male emigrant, Eustace Boardman, was placed. This was a long distance from the southern Kalimpong community, and the link to the Chambers family is not known. Graham noted that it was a substantial estate, comprising some 40,000 acres and incorporating substantial vineyards as well as sheep and cattle. He made no mention of Boardman’s progress in his diary other than a note that he had met Boardman’s “boss”. In his report for the *Homes Magazine*, however, Graham conveyed important distinctions between the southern emigrants on small family farms and Boardman’s situation, which incurred a greater clash between the masculinity cultivated at Kalimpong and that encountered in rural New Zealand:

Eustace is but one of a number of ‘hands’ who live together in special quarters. This necessarily involves a different relationship between employer and employee from that which prevails on a small farm where the lad is practically one of the farmer’s household. On the big station, he has to gain and maintain his own position among his fellows, usually a heterogeneous collection of free and independent workmen who are not inclined to err on the side of ‘coddling’ a new [recruit].

On the 6 September, two weeks after his arrival in New Zealand, Graham boarded the S.S. *Wimera* from Auckland to Sydney. He called on a number of churchmen in Sydney before visiting Melbourne, where he met with officials to discuss the prospect of Kalimpong emigration. The result of his final meeting in Melbourne was not encouraging. Graham noted that they “will consider special cases. Thought ½+½ couldn’t be received but anything less than ½ native [would be].” Graham was no doubt aware of a newspaper article that appeared just a few months earlier in Australia, when a Dr Hope, who had worked at Kalimpong, raised the prospect of Homes children emigrating there. When the interviewer

---
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asked about the “exclusion of alien races”, Hope responded that there was “certainly opposition” to the “St Andrew’s inmates” settling in Australia.\(^54\)

Graham’s post-trip report in the *Homes Magazine* ended with pieces on “A White Australia” and “Immigration Restriction Acts”. While he found “the cry for more people for the land is even louder than in New Zealand”, the issue of raced labour was more complex in “tropical Australia”.\(^55\) This environmental difference meant that “some advocate the introduction of coloured labour”, while others “argue that the difficulties and dangers of a mixture of the races, as, e.g., in the United States, are too serious to risk”. Graham protested the attempt “to include Eurasians in the category of prohibited emigrants”, which he saw as evidence only of “ignorance and misunderstanding”, and a “nervous fear of letting in what may be the thin end of the wedge”. By visiting the settler colonies, Graham was able to more realistically assess the prospects for Homes graduates, taking into account the particularities of the environment and economic development of each site rather than relying on generalised representations of social opportunity that “new world” societies promised. Politically too, Graham was made aware of the growing distinctions between the colonies in their management of population and labour shortages.

Graham’s visit to Australia is likely to have affected his positive assessment of prospects for sending further emigrants to New Zealand. While both settler colonies held the great promise of “LAND”, Graham believed New Zealand to be exempt from the environmental complications that he noted in Australia. Two days after returning to India, Graham noted in his diary: “Magazine to Leonard, Clarence, Sydney, Eustace and Eileen, NZ.”\(^56\) They were the nucleus of the New Zealand community and Graham’s continued contact with them would enable him to publicise the emigration scheme through reports of their progress. Although Graham’s visit to Boardman gave him an inkling of the challenges the men would face on large farms, this in no way deterred him from sending more. Table 3.1 summarises the groups sent between 1908 and 1914. Five men arrived in Dunedin in 1910, among them Eric Boardman, who joined his brother in the North Island. The remaining four


\(^{56}\) DGD 1909, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:8:1, NLS.
were dispersed around rural Otago and Southland. In 1911 a second female emigrant, Jean Mackay, and her brother John, were placed with farming families in the southern town of Owaka. A group of three men were placed on farms around Dunedin later that year.

1912: The First “Batch”

In 1912 a full page article appeared in the *Homes Magazine* describing “the biggest farewell we have ever had” for a group of thirteen emigrants bound for New Zealand.\(^{57}\) It gave the names of the party and described a social event to farewell them in Calcutta. The emigrants were to travel to Dunedin via Melbourne escorted by Mary Kennedy. In the accompanying photograph of the group, the girls wore nurses’ uniforms and the boys were attired in suits and knee-high boots. By January 1913, the Homes had received news of the safe arrival of the group. James Ponder wrote that the boys had been successfully placed in the South and North Islands, and Mrs Scott had “no difficulty in arranging places for the six girls who, she reports, have made an excellent impression.”\(^{58}\) The *Homes Magazine* article included excerpts of letters from several of the young women. “I must say we are enjoying ourselves immensely”, one wrote from the ship, mentioning the kindness of “the friends we have had in Calcutta, Rangoon and Penang all ready waiting to take us out to see the different places.” Networks, then, were not only utilised at their destination, but at every point of their voyage. This was particularly true of Australia, where all Kalimpong emigrants to New Zealand would be required to “tranship” and stay for several days (or more) awaiting their departure. This large group proved highly visible, generating media attention and encountering difficulties at Melbourne and Hobart as one of the emigrants detailed:

> The Customs officers came on to the ship and would not allow us to land because we were Eurasians, but Mr Steel and Miss Kennedy got us ashore. It was partly through Lady Carmichael’s letter of introduction that we were allowed in. … We reached here (Hobart) early this morning. This time we were not allowed to go ashore because the man who started all this fuss wired to the officers here not to let us ashore. We hope everything will be alright when we land in Dunedin.\(^{59}\)

---

\(^{57}\)“Farewell to our New Zealanders”, *SACHM* 12, no. 3/4 (1912): 38.

\(^{58}\)“News from our Emigrants”, *SACHM* 13, no. 1 (1913): 12.

Local media alerted the New Zealand public to the impending arrival of the group. The *Ashburton Guardian*, a small South Island newspaper, picked up the story from the *Calcutta Statesman*, and offered a sympathetic reading of these “Orphan Immigrants” and the Homes scheme. It listed their names and ages, and stated that the boys would be engaged in farm work, while the girls would become “lady helps ... for domestic servants are almost unknown in New Zealand, and the ‘lady help’ is treated as one of the family.” The article noted that others had already been sent to the Dominion, but that the progress of this first “large batch” would be watched with “keen interest, for the Kalimpong training of self-help and self-reliance is just what is wanted in the colonies, and the demand in Australia and New Zealand for suitable emigrants is unlimited at present.” The detail of this report suggests a Kalimpong influence in its authorship, and it echoed Graham’s approach to the media – a tentative balance between the need for discretion and the desire to garner public support. Three days later the same publication noted the arrival of a “batch of Eurasian immigrants” in Melbourne. No mention was made of the difficulties disembarking the vessel, but it did state that the group was accommodated “under the superintendence of the Presbyterian Immigration agent”. Their arrival in Dunedin was reported in the *Wanganui Chronicle*, a North Island newspaper. The *Chronicle* stressed the structured nature of the scheme and the organisational committees that would oversee their efficient work placements:

> Amongst the arrivals by the Warrimoo was a batch of 13 European and Eurasian girls and boys … under the charge of Miss Kennedy, of Dunedin, to be settled in situations secured for them in New Zealand by the Dominion Committee of the Homes. The party was met on arrival by the Rev J.S. Ponder (the honorary secretary for New Zealand), and Mrs W.L.Scott (convenor of the Dunedin Ladies’ Committee) and the young immigrants were promptly forwarded to their respective destinations.

Although this group tested the borders with larger numbers, their visibility was immediately reduced upon arrival when they were indeed “promptly forwarded” to their employers and widely dispersed geographically. Mary Ochterloney’s letter in the *Homes*

---
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Magazine described being met by “Mrs Scott and Mr Ponder, Patrick, George and Aileen” at Dunedin, where half of the group disembarked and were met by their respective employers.64 The remaining six, Mary among them, “stayed on the ship” and journeyed to Wellington, where two of the young men were “dropped off” along with Evelyn Fullerton, who was the only female emigrant to be placed in nurses’ training rather than domestic service. The remaining three ferried to Picton where Ernest Hughes stayed, while Mary and her brother Robert took the train to Blenheim. “This is a very nice place and I am very happy here at present”, Mary wrote, “everyone is very kind to me.”65 Although these six were isolated from the Dunedin group, they formed the beginning of a cluster in central New Zealand. Wellington, in the far south of the North Island, and Picton, the port of the Marlborough region in the northeast of the South Island, were connected by regular ferries, and the distance from Picton to Blenheim was less than twenty miles. Graham’s contacts in Marlborough may have been related to post-India careerists who were known to settle in this area.66

The Ochterloney siblings were placed with different employers but saw each other regularly. Both had letters published in the Homes Magazine in the year following their arrival. Their letters displayed their awareness of the transformation they were undergoing. Mary wrote “as an enthusiastic and proud New Zealander” of their visit to the Dominion’s new battleship at Picton.67 Some months later Robert wrote a detailed report of the local landscape, climate, crop farms, and his work at “Marshlands”, a large sheep farm. He and Mary spent a day at the local “Agricultural and Pastoral Show” (known as the A&P show and an enduring important part of rural social life), which he enjoyed but which they regarded as “not a very big affair” compared with the “Kalimpong Mela”.68 This is a vivid reminder of the dominance of their Indian background in the minds of the Kalimpong emigrants. Fitting in was not just about outward appearances and performing work duties; it involved an internal melding of all that they had known before with their new experiences. Robert joked about hunting “not tigers, but wild sheep”, which, he quipped, was fortunate, as he managed to
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shoot only one out of fifteen. This normative masculine activity speaks to the greater opportunities for social integration available to the men than the women. Just a few months after arriving in Marlborough, Robert’s name began to appear in newspaper reports of the local football league, and by 1914 he was representing his province.  

In Dunedin, the early women emigrants wrote of regular social gatherings with the new arrivals of the 1912 group. Aileen Sinclair, the first woman emigrant, gave a “happy picture” of the Dunedin women, writing that “May and Dolly and Nellie came up here to-day and stayed for tea. We had a very nice time together telling of olden days. … All three of them like their places and seem to be getting on fine, and look very bright and happy. … I am quite a Colonial now.” Jean MacKay, who was originally placed in Owaka in 1911 with her brother John, had by 1913 shifted to Dunedin and wrote “happily” of her situation there. Letters from two of the 1912 arrivals portray the growing local awareness of the Kalimpong women. Nellie Savigny wrote that there was “such a demand for girls. Mrs Scott has about fourteen names down for girls.” Dorothy Higgins wrote that she was doing well, and that “most of the people would hardly believe I come from India; they say I look more of a home girl.” Her “mistress” was “very pleased with the way I work; she said I am very tidy in the way I dress.” Higgins was the subject of overt assessment by not only her mistress but the wider community, and her words convey the interplay of expectations, appearance and cultural markers in the process of acceptance.

The size of the 1912 group indicated a growing confidence in the emigration scheme, and the numbers being sent seemed to match the “absorptive capacity” of the Dominion. Reports printed in the Homes Magazine signalled the emphasis on social integration as a marker of the emigrants’ success, and addressed any concerns about the provision of ongoing support by publicising their community involvement, and printing letters from supporters and supporters.

---
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employers. Pragmatically it made sense to send larger numbers, as each journey required considerable organisation. However the 1912 group would be the largest sent until the 1920s, and this likely reflected the persistent strategy of sending small numbers and scattering the emigrants widely in order to keep their visibility to a minimum. Two smaller groups were sent in 1914, the first comprising two women, the latter a group of three unaccompanied men (see Table 3.1). This brought the total number of Homes graduates settled in New Zealand between 1908 and 1914 to 33. The large gender imbalance at this stage (24 men and nine women) indicated the greater concern over the careful placement of the young women.

**Kalimpong Women at Work**

The women’s working lives in New Zealand are of particular interest given the paucity of scholarship examining the labour of migrant Anglo-Indian women. Satoshi Mizutani’s discussion of emigration from the Homes makes no reference to the women who were placed abroad. He does, however, discuss their placement in India as nursery and hospital nurses.74 This is another important context from which to consider both the men’s and women’s labour in the Dominion. Their reports were read not as objective assessments of a settler colony, but of the relative advantages of that site as compared to employment in India, which did not involve all of the complexity of crossing borders.75 Hence developments in the Anglo-Indian situation in India, and indeed the place of India in the British Empire, were of continuing relevance to the unfolding emigration scheme to New Zealand. When examining the work of the emigrants it is important to be mindful too of the simultaneous development of the infrastructure and training at the Homes. In addition to attesting to their acceptance into families and communities, the emigrants’ reports provided details about the work that they performed and the demand for it, so that the training at the Homes could continue to be matched to settler colonial requirements.

---


Prior to Aileen Sinclair’s placement in Dunedin, work prospects for the female graduates of the Homes were referred to in vague terms. In 1908 Graham articulated that their “training” was intended to fit them for domestic, nursery and hospital positions in India, which would match the Homes women with the “constant demand” for Anglo-Indian women’s labour in such roles.\(^{76}\) Despite their fathers seeking admittance to the Homes on the proviso that they would be trained for “the colonies”, the particularities of the girls’ eventual work and social situations there were absent from the early *Homes Magazine* debates and knowledge gathering exercises. As Ponder noted in the *Otago Witness* article, it was upon opening the Steel Memorial Hospital in 1908 that the first opportunity for formal nurses’ training became available, and it was only Aileen Sinclair’s emigration that prompted Graham’s active consideration of the women’s potential place in settler colonies. In 1910, the year following Sinclair’s successful emigration, Lucia King cottage for infants was opened at the Homes. The cottage was used as a site for instructing prospective “nursery nurses”, most of whom were expected to emigrate to New Zealand.\(^{77}\) A dedicated domestic science wing and a specialist teacher were added in 1916.\(^{78}\)

Until the arrival of the 1912 group, only two women had been sent to New Zealand. The addition of five women was thus a significant test of the scheme and the workings of the Dunedin committee. An update from an anonymous member of the committee upon the arrival of Gertie Plaistowe and Molly Roberts in 1914 gave details of its responsibilities. Although both Plaistowe and Roberts were bound for placements further north, they were given a “small reception” at “Mrs C’s place” in High Street, Dunedin, where the Kalimpong women gathered to spend the evening with them.\(^{79}\) “Mrs C” is likely to have been Mrs Church, wife of the Dr Church that Graham met on his visit, who had a practice in High Street.\(^{80}\) The letter also mentioned a “Mrs S”, presumably Mrs Scott. Protecting the identity of the employers and associates was common in early editions of the *Homes Magazine*, and indicated again the competing requirements of discretion and publicity. “Anon” mentioned
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her reluctance to send the young women so far from Dunedin, commenting that Plaistowe “will be lonely I’m afraid … but I shall send her a companion next year.” Later reports revealed that Plaistowe was sent to Christchurch, a city 250 miles north of Dunedin which to date had not received any Kalimpong emigrants. Molly Roberts was placed in Blenheim, but there was less concern for her as she would be close to Mary Ochterloney. 81

As for the women already settled, the committee reported that Evelyn Fullerton, who had been sent straight to nurses’ training in Wellington, was to return to Dunedin. “Anon” would be “glad to have her near me”. 82 Another unnamed emigrant “did not shine in her first place but we brought her back to Dunedin and she has done so well since that a lady appealed to me to get her a girl like her” – evidence of the continued involvement of the committee after placement and the ever-present concern for those placed at a distance from the urban centre. The committee member’s open acknowledgement that an emigrant “did not shine” in her first placement confirmed the need for a “safety net”, but does not seem to have caused any great concern. The problem was understood as a mismatch between employer and employee, rather than a mismatch of Kalimpong women and New Zealand families. Another unnamed girl had “done very well. The mistress asked me to find out if she meant to stay on with her after her two years were over because if she (the girl) intended leaving – she (the mistress) would like to put her name down now on my list of applicants for next year. That is complimentary, isn’t it!” 83 This comment revealed the length of the contracts the women were bound to, of which there was no equivalent for the men. It also supported Nellie Savigny’s claim about the demand for the Kalimpong women, which saw the committee managing “applicants” rather than actively seeking suitable families.

The demand for the labour of the Kalimpong women needs to be understood in the context of the market for household workers in New Zealand in this period. As Charlotte Macdonald and other historians have demonstrated, the appeal of the role fell markedly from

81 “For the Old Boys and Girls”, SACHM 14, no. 2 (1914): 27.
82 Ibid., 28.
83 Ibid.
the 1880s to the early 1900s. Demand, however, had not fallen at a similar rate, though it was affected by what Macdonald has termed the uncomfortable presence of “strangers at the hearth”. In other words, colonial women still required help in the home and to some extent desired the status of being able to afford “help”, but their households became an important domain for contesting “old world” class structures. The shortage of domestic servants empowered those who were willing to take on the role to demand better wages and conditions, termed by the media as “servantgalism”. Assisting women from Britain into domestic service was a common strategy to meet this shortage. Borrie outlined drastic reductions in the cost of passage offered to domestic servants during the early 1900s, which about 1000 British women took advantage of each year. But as Barry Higman has shown in the Australian context, assisted migrants tended to view domestic service as a transitional role, a means of entry rather than a career. Upward social mobility, Higman argues, was more likely to be achieved through marriage or alternative employment.

Higman’s findings are important because they raise the question of the futures of the Kalimpong women, which at this point in the scheme were unknown. While Graham had successfully placed women with families in the South Island, it was still unclear where these positions would take them. In his post-trip report to the Homes Magazine in 1909, Graham was encouraged by the “great dearth of girls to help in household work”, stating that “after a few years’ experience, they [the Kalimpong women] could easily earn from £40 to £50 a year,

---
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with board.”

The title of this section of his report, “Our Girls as Colonists – Their Prospects”, reveals Graham’s vision of the women’s eventual place in the colonial majority. It also positions the Kalimpong scheme as an important ground for addressing the “writing out” of Asia in New Zealand historiography, by including Anglo-Indian women in the binary of “coloniser” and “colonised” – categories which have historically excluded Asian communities. Graham’s description of the favourable terms of employment for the women echoed his claims about the male emigrants: that the primary purpose of the scheme was the provision of labour, and that it was not built around a dependence on expressions of colonial charity. But this focus begged the question of what the women might do with the capital they accrued, and how it would assist them to finding their “settled” place in the Dominion.

It is useful to consider here the numerous schemes that directed indigenous and mixed-race women into domestic service positions in Canada and Australia. Such schemes aimed to meet labour shortages while socialising the young women into “white” households, which numerous scholars have identified as a key site of racial and cultural assimilation. The Kalimpong women’s employment performed a similar purpose, and certainly Graham was explicit in his hope that the emigrants would be completely integrated into the colonial majority. Notably, however, there was never any large scale movement of Māori, or part-Māori, women into domestic service. Thus the Kalimpong women were a small but significant exception to Macdonald’s finding that domestic service in New Zealand was almost exclusively European. Despite having names like Gertie Plaistowe and Dorothy Higgins, many of these women were noticeably brown-skinned, and their place in the household was communicated by this marker of their Indian ancestry that Graham could not remove. This was especially pertinent considering that part of the colonial “servant problem”

---

was that it was difficult to distinguish “help” from family members, since uniforms, and the subservience they represented, were rejected. Thus when the Kalimpong women describe being treated as “part of the family”, we should remember that their place in familial hierarchies and indeed local communities was framed and communicated not only by their labour but also by visible and audible cultural markers such as skin colour and accent.

Very few of the excerpts printed in the *Homes Magazine* described the women’s domestic duties. The 1912 *Ashburton Guardian* article referred to the women as “lady helps”, a term that was used in Australia to attract a higher class of women to a lighter form of domestic work. However in the Kalimpong case it was most likely used to ease the stigma around the “servant” terminology in both India and New Zealand, and to reinforce the public image of the emigrants as respectable, and indeed “refined”. The women’s letters often mentioned inclusion in family life, and most reported caring for children as their primary role. Nellie Savigny wrote in 1914 that her family had moved to a suburb five miles outside Dunedin, which she worried would prevent her from seeing the Kalimpong women. Savigny sent a photograph of herself with the child she cared for, writing that although they lived in a “lovely house” she did sometimes feel like “throwing the baby out the window”. Apparently she shared a room with the child and seldom had an undisturbed sleep. Sharing such close quarters with the infant invites a connection with Savigny’s early years on a tea plantation. Like many of the Kalimpong women, she had in the short span of her life moved from being attended to by numerous servants and one devoted ayah, to being “self sufficient” at the Homes, to performing household work and child care for New Zealand families. At this point any upward social mobility for the women emigrants was yet to be realised.
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Kalimpong Men at Work

The information gathered by the Homes in the early 1900s encouraged Graham to train the boys in agricultural work as preparation for colonial emigration. But the possibility that they might have to be placed in India meant the programme at the Homes prepared them for either outcome, by incorporating a variety of manual skills and a high level of education. Indeed, the letters printed in the *Homes Magazine* display a high level of literacy, wit and knowledge. The male emigrants had thus been moulded into a unique combination of respectable, educated, Anglo-Indian youths, who had experience in farm work and aspirations to become farmers in New Zealand. The particular version of masculinity that they embodied reflected Graham’s belief that refinement and hard work could be complementary, co-existent traits rather than opposite ends of a spectrum that separated one type of man (or woman) from another. However the men’s experiences on New Zealand farms demonstrate the limitations of Graham’s belief that they could be smoothly integrated into, and progress through, the rural labouring sector by transferring a model of Anglo-Indian respectability to the settler colonies.

Like the women in their domestic service roles, the men’s aspirations were influenced by their upbringing in Kalimpong and early years on tea plantations. While initial reports of the first four men portrayed them as settled and stable, letters from all four printed in the *Homes Magazine* in 1911 reveal their highly mobile adjustment to the rural labour market and a different path to advancement than that envisaged by Graham. Leonard Williams, who in 1909 was at his original farm placement in Highcliff, wrote on behalf of himself and his brother Sydney in Central Otago, some distance west of Dunedin. While he was “very sorry in a way” to leave his previous “master”, Williams described with optimism the life they were attempting to make as “rabbiters”, which they had read was a “great money making” venture. The capital they had accrued was enough to buy meagre tools, a few essentials and tents to sleep in. During the off-season, the men planned to take up contract farming work in the area. This lifestyle was a stark contrast to the protected setting of Presbyterian family

farms into which Graham had placed them. Leonard ended his letter with “many salaams”, noting that they often thought of “those charming times we passed at Kalimpong”. His letter, well written and delicately phrased, reads as a contrast to the rough life that he described. A portrait of Sydney accompanying the article showed a well-groomed young man in a three piece suit, complete with a high buttoned waistcoat and watch-chain on display.

In the North Island, Eustace Boardman wrote of the many and varied situations he had held since Graham visited him in Hawkes Bay. The title of his article, “A Rolling Stone in New Zealand”, along with the introductory note from the editor, communicated the Homes emphasis on geographic and occupational stability as a fundamental requirement for becoming a settler. “The following letter from an Old Homes Boy has at least the merit of frankness!” the editor noted, adding that “once he gets anchored” they believed he would become “a successful colonist”. Boardman had moved numerous times since Graham’s visit. Initially he took on contract work, but was only being paid 15 shillings a week, while other men were being paid a shilling an hour. “I asked for an increase”, he wrote, but “the master refused and I left.” He detailed his frequent movements after leaving that position:

Since then I was harvesting for a month with a shilling an hour and then a gardener for a private family. I did all I had to do in the garden and I left. Then I went to the mills where you get a shilling an hour and a shilling and threepence an hour over time. I stayed there for two weeks. I then left through an accident. Then I joined for another two weeks after and stayed there five days and then I left through the food not being good. I then went as a second cook in a hotel at 35s a week, stayed there two weeks, had a fight with the chief cook and left.

Boardman described another four positions he had held and “left” (one of which he admitted that he “got the sack” for being “too greedy”) before working in a hotel for five months. From there he had moved to a position on a farm where he had “the best boss to work for and I am still with him. That is my career since our parting”.
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Boardman’s description of his itinerant lifestyle was a forerunner to the future experiences of many Kalimpong men, and was a truer reflection of the organization of the rural labouring sector in New Zealand than Graham’s antiquated vision of farming families who would take responsibility for his graduates.\(^{100}\) The Kalimpong men faced an interesting dilemma as a result of this colonial reality. The purpose of placing them with respectable farming families was to facilitate their integration into rural communities from a place of protection. But as single migrants, the clearest way for them to take on the values of local single (white) men was to display resourcefulness and enterprise, and to refuse poor wages. In a move that supports Roediger’s argument that the process of becoming white often involved the strategic exclusion of other minority groups, the Kalimpong men essentially distanced themselves from other Asian migrants, about whom one of the great anxieties was acceptance of a low standard of living.\(^{101}\) At the same time they entered the questionable category of “self-seeking” single labourer at a time when settler families were held up as the model by which economic and social progress in the colony might be achieved.\(^{102}\)

The experiences of each of these men also reflected their individual responses. In Boardman’s letter there was an almost comic irreverence to all that Graham might have expected of him. This was in contrast to Leonard Williams’ letter, which expressed his desire to “ask your opinion if we have done right by taking on what we have”.\(^{103}\) The other early emigrant, Clarence Sinclair, wrote an even more deferential letter that the editors headed “In Praise of Farming”.\(^{104}\) This letter reads as an intentional contribution to the ongoing discussion in the *Homes Magazine* regarding the relative prospects for Anglo-Indian men in various destinations. Sinclair openly addressed the debate about the worthiness of farming as a career, stating that with his experience thus far, he could “stand up to those who condemn
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Farming”. Rather than being an uninteresting profession, Sinclair cited the reliance on “Providence” and the process of planting and harvesting as cause for his belief that “there is no other work like Farming after all, don’t you agree with me Sir?”

Sinclair’s effort to justify his continuation in farming illustrates his awareness of the differing regard in which such labour was held in India, and concern about what his counterparts in India thought of his situation. At an individual level, Clarence’s transnational pathway affected the way he made sense of his own progress in the colony and his place in local hierarchies.

After the arrival of the 1912 group, articles in the *Homes Magazine* about individual New Zealand emigrants were superseded by full page items about their collective experiences, collating many short excerpts rather than reprinting letters in full. Like the women, the men’s reports about other Kalimpong emigrants became more frequent as the community grew and the likelihood of seeing an “old boy” or an associate of Graham’s increased. Hamilton Melville, who along with Adrian Hall was working on the Gladbrook Estate in Middlemarch, wrote that he did not “find NZ bad at all”, that he and Hall were having “splendid times”, and that two other Homes men were on a farm only six miles away. Stuart Lemare, who was working on a farm 30 miles south of Dunedin, wrote of seeing Jean Mackay “in town” and reported her impending marriage. Another Kalimpong man, James Bishop, met Miss Ponder at the “Winter Show” (an agricultural event) in Dunedin. “I did not know her but she guessed that I was one of the Kalimpong boys. We had a long chat concerning the Homes … I intend staying here till October.”

Ponder’s “guess” that Bishop was from Kalimpong highlights the visibility of the emigrants amongst the predominantly “white” population of Dunedin at this time. While this difference was likely explained by the families of the women on their behalf, or at least mitigated by their relative confinement within the home, the men were afforded no such protection. None of the men ever wrote of being treated as “part of the family”. Instead they frequently reported having a good “boss”, which indicated that most were placed on large

---
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farms. They nevertheless wrote reassuring letters to the Homes. Harry Hall, for example, was “working on a Dairy Farm here; and they are so good to me, I am going to stay with my Boss for five years.” Hamilton Melville noted that there were fifteen other (non-Homes) workers at Gladbrook, who were “all good sensible chaps as none of them drink but rather all are more or less athletes.” This large estate was established in 1872 by John Roberts, a Scot who fitted the profile of a Graham supporter. A staunch Presbyterian, Roberts gained a reputation for his innovation in farming and is remembered for his use of farm employment as a means of assisting marginalised youth. This explains Roberts’ support of Graham’s scheme; however his contact with individual workers from Kalimpong would have been minimal. The estate was run by a manager, and Roberts did not even live on the property during the period that Kalimpong men were working there.

The men’s distance from the individuals and families connected to the scheme was an important difference between the situations of the men and the women. While Graham’s network facilitated the men’s entry into farm work, once on the farm they immediately encountered the rural population at large. The advantage was that they were more fully and freely integrated into the colonial labour market than the women were. Geographically, the men’s situations were vastly different from the women’s. Their letters showed an unsurprising preoccupation with landscapes, and they described sparse living conditions and long days labouring in the cold climate. Melville’s comment that Brooks and Hall were “only six miles away” is revealing in comparison to Nellie Savigny’s fears about her big move “away from Dunedin” to St Leonards, which was just five miles out of town. In distinctive ways, both the men and the women were isolated and faced difficult transitions to their new lives. The women moved in controlled channels within the confines of walls and doors, brushing closely with their host families. Contrasting, the men’s experiences were characterised by open land, a lack of enclosure, and the freedom and challenge of negotiating
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a place for themselves. All faced the difficult task of living up to Graham’s expectations in what was envisaged as a step up from the Anglo-Indian enclaves of British India.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has traced the transformation of the Homes emigration scheme from a grand and well-publicised imperial vision to its realisation on the smallest of scales. Setting out from Kalimpong in twos and threes, young men and women were received in a discrete manner by Graham’s contacts in Dunedin. The men were distributed to farms large and small, which usually meant isolation from anything but tiny local settlements. While the women clustered in colonial towns, theirs too was an isolated existence. The contrast to the crowded and busy life at the Homes must have made this transition extraordinarily lonely. No wonder then, that the emigrants eagerly anticipated new arrivals, and wrote brightly to Graham of their individual and collective progress. The arrival of the 1912 group was a landmark in the scheme, but as outlined above, these larger numbers did not persist.

One aspect of the scheme that did develop in a cumulative manner was the growth of Graham’s network. This too began with very small numbers – the Ponders of Waitahuna and the Kennedys of Dunedin – and expanded to include the Presbyterian families who employed the graduates and the wider community of social reformers that Graham met during his visit in 1909. As the emigrants gained experience, they too became part of this support network. Their reports made a key contribution to Graham’s ability to build on the scheme’s cautious beginnings and to continue the Homes gendered training for labouring in settler colonies. However the men’s reports also demonstrated that their socialisation was often occurring outside of their original placements, while the women’s futures beyond domestic positions in Presbyterian households remained uncertain. Hidden from the written record at this point was their continuing place in dynamic and active transnational families.
Figure 8: Map of New Zealand
Table 3.1: Arrivals by Gender, 1908-1914

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group #</th>
<th>Year of Arrival</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: St Andrew’s Colonial Homes Magazine)
CHAPTER FOUR
1915-1919: ARCHIVES, CITIZENSHIP,
AND THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The object of our scheme is to develop grit and resource, and the girls are educated to earn their own living and to become well qualified housewives. Yes, there is a probability of our boys developing into fine fighting material. Even now some go into the army and others into the navy, besides a large percentage being trained for the mercantile marine. Gratifying reports have come to hand concerning them.

John Graham, *Otago Witness*, 1909

War service, like farm work and domestic labour, was a means by which marginalised populations sought transition to a higher place in settler colonial society. While the pathway out of rural and household labour was as yet undefined for the Kalimpong emigrants, war service held a new opportunity for social advancement. The rate at which the Kalimpong men signed up for the First World War suggests that they had plenty to gain and perhaps little to lose, in a move that interrupted any momentum that they had gathered in the rural labouring sector. Graham’s 1909 promise that they would be fit for war was realised with the men’s voluntary enlistment for the New Zealand Expeditionary Force (NZEF). The Homes archive followed their fortunes in a new column entitled “The Homes and the War”. The celebratory imperialist reports printed in this column nevertheless left a telling record of the Kalimpong men’s increasing identification as New Zealanders. Initially, they wrote of imperial loyalty to the “Motherland” in their desire to serve for the NZEF, and there was a detectable hint of superiority in the way they wrote of the New Zealand response. However, the Kalimpong men soon began to identify strongly with their colonial counterparts, referring to themselves as ANZACs and writing of New Zealand as the “home” to which they would return.

This chapter makes substantial use of the New Zealand Defence Force personnel files. These files contain extensive documentation describing the soldiers’ situation on enlistment, service overseas, and post-war information such intended addresses, continuing medical problems, benefits received and notifications of death. Several forms filled out upon
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2 ANZAC is the acronym for the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps.
enlistment were particularly useful in making visible aspects of the Kalimpong men’s prior circumstances: the “Attestation Form”, the “History Sheet”, and the “Description Upon Enlistment”. Together these records provide a useful snapshot of the men’s locations and occupations prior to war. Even more valuable is the documented evidence of persistent links to their extended families in India and Britain, which challenges Graham’s assertions that the emigrants he visited in 1909 had turned completely towards New Zealand. Exploring the continuing operation of these empire families is an important way of unravelling the emigrants’ flat categorisation as Anglo-Indian from the time they were sent to the Homes.

War had a major impact on global mobility, both prompting and limiting movement, and the Homes scheme was not exempt from these forces. While the servicemen experienced international travel that they would not otherwise have been able to undertake, wartime shipping restrictions put a halt to the emigration scheme soon after war broke out. Two groups of five emigrants (one all men, the other all women) were sent to New Zealand in 1915, beyond which there was no further emigration for the duration of the war. This left the women in something of a stagnant position in New Zealand. The final section of this chapter uses the few references in the *Homes Magazine* to their situations to sketch their continuing work, mobility and engagement with the Kalimpong community. Analysis of the men’s war service and the women’s employment in domestic service continues the examination of the gendered workings of their social integration. In addition, an important landmark in their socialisation will be introduced in this chapter, namely marriage. It represented the most permanent and meaningful form of social citizenship available to the Kalimpong emigrants.

**Encountering the State**

We have been profoundly disappointed by the obstacles put in the way of Anglo-Indian lads joining the fighting forces in India. There seems to be some antiquated Army Regulation blocking the way. Had our lads gone to New Zealand or Britain, they would have been enlisted at once as their comrades have been.

*Homes Magazine, January 1916*

---


4 “Obstacles to Enlisting Anglo-Indians”, *St Andrew’s Colonial Homes Magazine (SACHM)* 16, no. 1 (1916): 3.
When war broke out in 1914 there were 23 Kalimpong men resident in New Zealand. Another four arrived in 1915. Of those, 22 men (which Graham later claimed was the total fit to fight) served for the NZEF.\(^5\) As the above quote suggests, however, the possibility of mixed-race British subjects enlisting for service in other colonies was by no means guaranteed. Neither the debate about the right of Anglo-Indians to enlist in India, nor their subsequent inclusion in the British Army and contribution to the Allied cause, have received any scholarly attention. The matter was resolved soon after Graham aired his concerns in the *Homes Magazine*. Within several months the “great boon” had been won and Anglo-Indians were permitted to enlist in India.\(^6\) Subsequent issues of the *Homes Magazine* described graduates’ enlistment for a separate Anglo-Indian force within the British Indian Army.\(^7\) While such segregation was accepted in the Indian context, it was not what Graham was seeking for his graduates in New Zealand. Full social integration was the primary reason for emigration to the settler colonies, and registering for war service was an important test of the boundaries of that ideal.

The relative ease of enlistment in New Zealand was perceived and publicised by Graham as proof of the Dominion’s suitability as a destination for Anglo-Indians. From a broader perspective, it highlights another realm in which in the race-based application and development of British citizenship differed in settler and non-settler colonies, as did the divergent claims for autonomy that unfolded in each during the war.\(^8\) The position of the Kalimpong men highlights two crucial imperial dynamics of the First World War. On the one hand, they were a racially marginal group who hoped for improved conditions by proving their loyalty to empire. On the other, with their desire to be integrated into the colonial majority, they were implicated in the (contested) notion that the battlegrounds of the First World War were a formative site in the development of a distinctive New Zealand identity.\(^9\)


\(^9\) Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds critically evaluate the “nationalist myth” around ANZAC in *What’s Wrong with Anzac? The Militarisation of Australian History* (Sydney: University of New South Wales Press, 2010).
Important distinctions between the treatment of indigenous and migrant populations need to be drawn here. Māori men in New Zealand, in a similar way to Anglo-Indian men in India, were “somewhat grudgingly” enlisted in the separate Pioneer Battalion in the NZEF in what was supposed to be a “white man’s war”. Quiet inclusion in the regular forces therefore suggests that the Kalimpong men were being included in the white majority, at least on paper.

Enlisting from various locales around New Zealand, the Kalimpong men were reunited by war service. The first to enlist were Leonard and Sydney Williams, the first two emigrants sent to Dunedin. Sydney had registered for military training in January 1913; hence his previous occupation was listed as “soldier” and his address as “RNZA depot, Invercargill”. The brothers embarked on their overseas service on the same vessel, bound for Egypt, in October 1914. They were closely followed by Clarence Sinclair, another early emigrant, who left New Zealand in December. Sixteen more embarked during 1915 and 1916 (see Table 4.1). The final three who served for the NZEF enlisted towards the end of the conflict. While it is difficult to make any claims about such a small group of servicemen, the emigrants did volunteer at a higher rate than the colonial population generally. Their motivations for doing so aligned with men of a similar demographic. War was viewed as an opportunity for adventure and social advancement by single labourers, and the Kalimpong men’s placement into the heart of rural communities would have seen them subject to the same social pressures as any young man to enlist.
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11 Eustace Boardman, the other of the “first four”, did not serve in the First World War. Boardman was married in 1913 and likely had children by the time war broke out. Jock Phillips suggests that of the various social obligations that ruled out potential volunteers, being married with children took priority in making it “difficult to rush off to war, however keen they may have been”. Jock Phillips, A Man’s Country? The Image of the Pakeha Male (Auckland: Penguin, 1996), 160.

12 Ibid., 159.

13 Ibid, 159, 163.
On paper, there was little to indicate the mixed-race status of the Kalimpong men as they enlisted. There was no requirement to declare racial identity or nationality in any of the documentation. They simply answered “yes” to being British subjects. The men had anglicised names and were not asked for details of their parentage. Their Indian connections were made visible in three responses: place of birth, previous military experience, and next of kin. There was no attempt to disguise these connections. It was the in-person assessment that made visible their racial heritage, a moment that has echoes of the reactions of border officials when the 1912 emigrants attempted to alight in Australia. Like the immigration process, the regulations for war service did not give grounds for refusal – but the reaction of officials could not be anticipated. The “Description on Enlistment” form was filled out by a medical officer and included a physical examination. The form recorded “apparent age”, height, weight, chest measurement, complexion, colour of eyes, colour of hair and religious profession, after which a physical examination tested eyesight, hearing, the movement of limbs and joints, the normality of heart and lungs, and freedom from specified diseases and physical defects. The medical officer was required to assess whether the subject was “in good bodily and mental health” and make any additional remarks.

This moment of examination brings to mind Sara Ahmed’s work on orientation, and the many different ways of viewing a historical subject. Archival information has thus far provided a third-person view of the Kalimpong men, mediated by Graham, as members of a particular community and graduates of a particular institution. The emigrants’ own words were generated by their desire to provide reassuring reports of life in the colony. The army examinations afford a different perspective, as the first archived “sizing up” of Kalimpong emigrants by officials outside the Homes network. We might imagine the raised eyebrows of the medical officers as they encountered these dark-skinned men, and the accompanying features they scanned for signs of difference – stance, movement, gesture, and accent. The
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15 This imagining was also influenced by Craig Robertson’s description of early methods of forming identities in the U.S., where he relates a scene from Dickens involving several officers intensely scrutinizing the physical features of a suspect in lieu of more “scientific” methods such as photography. Craig Robertson, The Passport in America: The History of a Document (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 5.
moment also highlights the active role of tabulated forms in creating subjects of any given bureaucratic circumstance. Military officials were restricted to recording that which the forms would allow, and the forms here show a marked disinterest in race. This is suggestive of the desire to exclude non-white men from the war, which itself would have called attention to the distinctive features and skin colour of the Kalimpong men. The large “remarks” field at the end of the form could have been used for comments about their recorded “dark” complexions. However in every case other than Richard May, for whom the note “full-blooded Parsee (Indian)” was entered, this final space was simply completed with the word “fit”.16

The details of the Kalimpong men’s Indian background declared in this documentation enable several key observations to be made. Firstly, the open declaration of their paternal Indian connections indicates the normative existence of such imperial careering at a time when India was still very much a part of the British Empire. Secondly, the files reveal specific information about the emigrants’ Indian background that would otherwise only be located in their personal files at Kalimpong, which are not publicly available. Ten of the servicemen listed their place of birth as “India”, two Assam and two Darjeeling. The remainder recorded surprisingly diverse birth places such as Mussoorie, Travancore, Dum Dum, Lucknow, Meerut and Hyderabad. Thirdly, listing their religion as “Presbyterian” or “Church of England” appears to have been an important means of easing any potential concerns about their racial heritage.17 Finally, the files that contained detailed information about the whereabouts of next-of-kin in India attest to continued correspondence with family there. Overall the men’s responses portray a widened sense of home and family, drawing new associates and Homes graduates in New Zealand into empire-wide kinship formations.

Providing information about their next of kin was the most problematic part of the form-filling process for the Kalimpong men. Many crossed out and amended their initial
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17 The field for “religion” on the front page of the Kalimpong men’s History Sheet was in every case annotated with “Indian”, giving a sense of the role of religion in defining race. In other words, they were Presbyterian but Indian, and vice versa. Lachy Paterson discusses the importance of religion in shaping the response of New Zealanders towards Indian troops in “‘The Similarity of Hue Constituted No Special Bond of Intimacy Between Them’: Close Encounters of the Indigenous Kind”, Journal of New Zealand Studies 14 (2013): 27.
responses. The “History Sheet” specified that if next of kin was not local, soldiers should list their “nearest relative” in New Zealand. Table 4.2 shows the responses of all 22 men, with next of kin tabulated according to the order in which they were listed. For those who had siblings in New Zealand, only one person was required. For those who did not, a common and satisfactory response was to list family in India (usually a sister, occasionally a father) followed by a “friend” in New Zealand (usually their employer or another Homes graduate). The level of information they gave about their fathers varied. One listed his father’s address as simply “Assam, Bengal, India”, while others named the tea estates where their fathers still resided. Several men had no family members listed as next of kin, only New Zealand associates. These varied responses signal their persistent “in-between” status. While racial status passed unrecorded in the enlistment documentation, the emigrants’ familial status, viewed collectively, bridged an awkward and formative stage between new settler colonial ties and persistent connections with paternal relatives in India and Britain.

The enlistment process made visible aspects of the men’s training and experience in India which positively differentiated them from other farm labourers. Educated at the Homes until the age of 15 or 16, many had attained high standards in the British examination system. All answered “Yes” to having passed the “fourth educational standard”. As Jock Phillips has suggested, the developing colonial stereotype of the Pakeha male made a negative association between masculinity and intellectualism, and the Kalimpong men had likely encountered such attitudes in their farm work. Previous military experience was another advantage that became visible upon enlistment. Eight of the Kalimpong men listed service with cadets or volunteer forces in India, as well as training in local regiments in New Zealand. Sydney Williams, for example, listed “about 3 years Northern Bengal Rifles” and “about 1½ years in 10th (N.O.) Regiment”. The enlistment process was thus an opportunity to positively frame previously hidden aspects of the emigrants’ backgrounds: British fathers who were tea-planters in India, a high standard of education, and military experience.

19 “N.O.” stands for North Otago. Attestation of Sydney Williams, 27 January 1913, NZDFPR: AABK 18805 W5557 0123010, ANZ-W.
The war files provide a valuable snapshot of the work and locations of the men immediately prior to enlisting (Table 4.3). Eleven were farm (or unspecified) labourers. Others listed diverse rural occupations such as cheese-maker, creamery manager, shepherd, and poulterer. The remainder had moved away from their rural beginnings, suggesting a continuation of the mobility exhibited by the early emigrants in their search for better conditions. Patrick Savigny was a “printer”, Eric Boardman an electrician, and John MacKay a clerk. Regarding location, most were working in the region of their first placement. The majority listed addresses in the Otago and Southland provinces, two enlisted in Canterbury, two in Marlborough, and two in Napier. In Marlborough, Ernest Hughes and Robert Ochterloney were still working for the employers they were placed with in 1912. Likewise William Hall and Hamilton Melville were still at Gladbrook Station in Middlemarch. Those who had moved to different occupations gravitated towards urban centres, and some enlisted from boarding houses, such as “100 McLaggan Street” in Dunedin. From these discrete locales they were to regroup in the very different environment of battlefields abroad.

“The Homes and the War”

Thanks ever so much for the Magazine which I received last night. I was very pleased to get it, and to see how well the Homes are progressing. All the old Homes boys are doing well by the looks of things, so the Homes may well be proud of her sons.

Ernest Hughes, *Homes Magazine*, July 1916

In January 1916 the *Homes Magazine* carried the first news of the Kalimpong men serving with the NZEF. Their reports were immediately suggestive of the multiple ways in which they related to other soldiers. They exhibited close bonds with others who grew up at Kalimpong, a desire to be included with their colonial counterparts, and a strong sense of imperial loyalty. Llewellyn Jones wrote from Trentham Camp of rigorous training and his pride at the hearty response of both the “young men of New Zealand” and the “Homes boys” to the “call of the Motherland”. Jones acknowledged their upbringing at the Homes as the reason that “now we lack nothing and we are not ashamed to do things for ourselves”. In the

---

same issue Mary Ochterloney wrote that her brother Robert was also at camp. Her letter of 1916 suggested that Robert had been well integrated into the Marlborough community:

Robert is now at camp. He has been there now for about three weeks. He is very happy and likes camp life. The men of the Cricket Club held a social for him and presented him with a wristlet watch. The evening before he left, the National Reserve of Spring Creek made him a presentation of a pair of Military brushes, and Mr Clayton, under whom he worked, gave him £5. He spoke so highly of Robert.22

The editor found it “gratifying” that Robert had already made such a “fine mark” in Marlborough, noting that he had spent some years in the Madras Light Horse Service “after leaving the Homes and before going to New Zealand.”23 This confirms anecdotal evidence that a number of the men spent time elsewhere in India prior to emigrating. This life experience in greater India is an important point of difference with the trajectories of the women, who in every case were sent directly from Kalimpong to New Zealand. The men’s greater mobility, and the different perspective on life in the Dominion afforded by it, was to become even more pronounced through their overseas war service. Highlighting the intricate transnational networks operating between India and New Zealand to support the Homes scheme, the editor further noted that “Mary’s account of Robert’s popularity and splendid send off is more than borne out by a letter from her mistress and another from the sister of her mistress – a lady in Cachar – who recently saw Robert and Mary in New Zealand.”

In the same issue of the *Homes Magazine*, the first reports from the men serving overseas were published. In Egypt, Hamilton Melville reported from Zeitoun that he had “met no Homes boy there” but had heard that Leonard Williams was wounded and recovering in England.24 This was about to change. Melville was soon joined by Patrick Savigny, who wrote firstly from the Dardanelles and then from Zeitoun, where he met Melville and “had a good long yarn with him and was not surprised at all to see the boys turning out to do their bit”.25 His comment was a forerunner to others that would attribute their ability to cope with the challenges of war to the disciplined upbringing at the Homes. Richard Hall wrote from a
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22 *Ibid.* Note that Robert’s employer was actually John Chaytor, incorrectly printed here as “Mr Clayton”.
Convalescent Home in Alexandria about his recovery from illness and frostbite suffered “after the snow came on when I was in the trenches”. Hall had seen Melville, who was to become the chief reporter on the Kalimpong men. In the April 1916 issue of the *Homes Magazine*, Melville wrote from Egypt that there were “at least ten of us around here”. His report was listed in a new column, “The Homes and the War”, which replaced “For the Old Boys and Girls” and signalled the Homes prioritisation of the graduates’ war effort as a means of publicly proving their worth as imperial citizens.

By the time the next edition of the *Homes Magazine* went to print, the men were mostly in France and had formed a well-established chain of communication. Patrick Savigny, Hamilton Melville, and the Hall brothers sent joint “birthday greetings”, as was the custom for Homes graduates for the September edition, noting that “if any of us are spared we will be right in Kalimpong without a second thought”. In the same edition of late 1916 Melville gave his first update on the men in France. He had seen Robert Ochterloney and Patrick Savigny, Bill Hall was “here somewhere … and Dick Hall is in the same battalion as me”, Henry Holder and Edward Snelleksz were together, and they were “all looking well”. He also noted that John MacKay and Ernest Hughes were together in the Rifle Brigade. A triangle of correspondence between New Zealand, Kalimpong and the soldiers was revealed by reports from Dr Harold Mann, a Homes associate in India, who wrote that Edward Snelleksz had been wounded but was going back to the trenches. “He still writes me very cheery letters, and is in excellent spirits”, wrote Mann. Thus the fortunes of those who did not write letters to Kalimpong were nevertheless brought to the attention of the *Homes Magazine*, demonstrating the comprehensive reach of this active imperial network.

The hardships of war prompted reflection in the Kalimpong men just as it did for other soldiers. In these reflections, many of the servicemen echoed the collective desire cited above, to visit Kalimpong “if spared”. These sentiments and their regular correspondence

26 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
with the Homes further challenge the likelihood that their later silence was due to traumatic memories of their upbringing. Of course it also serves as a reminder that many of the men had no other family to write to and no other home to be nostalgic about. Richard Hall wrote a letter to Graham the night before going “over the top”, in which he promised to “let you know as soon as possible how I am getting on if I am lucky enough to get through it”. He closed the letter, “well, good-bye for the present, Sir, and love and good luck to you and the Homes. I am an old Boy, Dick.” Some were specific in their gratitude to housemothers, who were otherwise remembered as harsh disciplinarians. Clarence Sinclair wrote of visiting a housemother in England, whom he took the opportunity of telling that “just because she was hard on me I have done so well in NZ. I am not frightened of hard work, and in NZ the man who is frightened of hard work has not the slightest hope of getting on.” Sinclair thus credited the outcome of the gendered Homes training – both in his physical capabilities and internalised work values – for his success in both rural labour and war service.

War service facilitated mobility beyond occupying the battlefields of Egypt and France. After all of the effort to direct the men into rural New Zealand communities, partly because they were not welcome in Britain, war enabled them to experience the place that Anglo-Indians regarded as a distant and usually unreachable “home”. As Sinclair’s letter hinted at, former housemothers supported men on leave and in hospital in England. Indeed upon their return to Britain and the settler colonies these women were an important constituent of the dispersed Kalimpong communities. Miss Fowles, for example, sent news of men recovering in England and had visited Stuart Lemare in Scotland. Robert Ochterloney stayed with a Homes associate, Mr Pirrit, while on leave. Pirrit showed him around Edinburgh, after which Robert decided he preferred the Scots to the English. Hamilton Melville also enjoyed the hospitality of the Pirrits, as did James Bishop, who had a “happy

time” with them and the two aunties he met during the visit.  

Patrick Savigny wrote in 1918 that he had “taken quite a fancy to the Old Country, especially Bonnie Scotland”, proving this affection with the news that he had married a “Scottish girl”.

Although the men wrote of close bonds with others from Kalimpong and showed themselves to be thoroughly embedded in the Homes imperial network, they increasingly identified, and were referred to, as “colonials” and “New Zealanders” in the Homes Magazine. In 1918 Richard Hall wrote from hospital in England of “enjoying myself thoroughly here. The hospital is full of New Zealanders and the Medical Staff are all from New Zealand, so we make a happy family.” In the same year, greetings were sent from “Four Anzacs in France: Dick Hall, Hamilton Melville, Adrian Andrews and Tom Brooks.”

Melville wrote that he got through Messines and Passchendaele “without a scratch, though many of my mates were killed … I will now close with best wishes to all in Kalimpong and a carry on to the boys in Mesopotamia from the Anzacs in France.”

Family, mateship and ANZAC allies were important new terms in making sense of the war experience.

Social acceptance came at a cost. Several of the Kalimpong men were seriously wounded and two were killed. In 1917 the Homes Magazine reported that “more of our New Zealanders have been wounded and invalided home.” “Home” had come to mean New Zealand, where all but one of the Kalimpong men would return upon completing service.

Among the wounded was Robert Ochterloney, who according to his medical report had sustained a gunshot wound “in the left lumbar region size of palm of hand, going through the lateral abdominal muscles and showing iliac bone, part of which has been shot away”.

Classified unfit, Robert spent only six months in New Zealand before returning to the front. In the same 1917 report, Miss Fowles wrote that Stuart Lemare was “seriously hurt” and

37 Ibid.
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43 Medical Report of an Invalid, Robert Ochterloney, 23 June 1917, NZDFPR: AABK 18805 W5549 087538, ANZ-W.
Henry Holder “had received no less than 40 wounds”, while Hamilton Melville reported that Charlie Lawless was missing.\textsuperscript{44} Lawless was later located alive but wounded, and Llewellyn Jones was invalided back to Dunedin. Eric Stuart wrote from Egypt that he had “had two years out here … but at the present I have been laid up with illness which has ended my fighting days as I am going to be sent back to New Zealand.”\textsuperscript{45}

These life-altering costs of inclusion were balanced by opportunities for decoration and promotion. Just as there is no evidence that race impacted their enlistment, the war records suggest that the Kalimpong men were not excluded from advancement within the NZEF. Robert Ochterloney and Henry Holder were promoted to Corporal, Ernest Hughes to Lance Corporal, and Sydney Williams and Patrick Savigny to Sergeant. In 1917 James Bishop wrote that he was “proud of Pat Savigny’s Military Medal”.\textsuperscript{46} Savigny was the first of four Kalimpong men to receive the Military Medal, and his good reputation apparently went beyond the Homes network. Bishop wrote that in Dunedin he had met “a N.Z. returned soldier who was in the same camp as Pat of whom and his doings he told me a lot. He said that Pat was a non-smoker, non-drinker, and jolly decent fellow”.\textsuperscript{47} There was, then, a place to be found in colonial hierarchies that did not require conformity to stereotypical masculine behaviours such as drinking alcohol. Hamilton Melville, the most frequent correspondent of the Kalimpong men, was awarded the Military Medal in May 1918 for “acts of gallantry in the field”, and three months later received the Distinguished Conduct Medal (DCM) for the same.\textsuperscript{48} These rewards for service were used repeatedly by John Graham as testament to the success of the emigration scheme, and he held high hopes that the individuals and the community at large would receive further tangible benefits as a result.

**Post-war Impact and Legacies**

Every one of our boys who were in New Zealand before the days of conscription and who were physically fit volunteered for the war and … no

\textsuperscript{44}“The Homes and the War”, *SACHM* 17, no. 3/4 (1917): 15.
\textsuperscript{45}“The Homes and the War”, *SACHM* 18, no. 1/2 (1918): 2.
\textsuperscript{46}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{47}“The Homes and the War”, *SACHM* 17, no. 3/4 (1917): 15.
\textsuperscript{48}Statement of the Services of Hamilton Melville, 15 November 1918, NZDFPR: AABK 18805 W5549 0080084, ANZ-W.
less than four gained Military Medals and one of them in addition a D.C.M.
and our boys fill New Zealand graves in Europe. Surely these have won the
rights of equal citizenship in the Dominion.

Homes Magazine, June 1921

The period following the First World War saw a surge of nationalist claims around
the British Empire based on the contribution of non-white British subjects. Colonised
populations used war service as a vehicle for substantiating claims for independence, or at
least better conditions under British rule. The perceived “broken promises” in the wake of
war were a catalyst for a rise in nationalism across the British Empire. In India, post-war
heavy-handedness by the British was an unacceptably bitter pill given the war service of over
a million Indians. These claims were echoed in Graham’s calls for “equal citizenship” for
the Kalimpong men in New Zealand as reward for their exemplary war service. Contrary to
claims elsewhere, Graham imagined this elevated status in the Dominion as the further
blending of individuals into the white majority, rather than seeking political or legal rights for
an entire community. It is important to note here that there was no way of formalising New
Zealand citizenship at this time. Instead Graham sought the expression of colonial
authorities’ acknowledgement through permission to resume the emigration scheme, and
award of the same compensation and benefits to the Kalimpong men as would be available for
other returned servicemen.

The two Kalimpong men who did not return were memorialised as their New Zealand
counterparts were. Ernest Hughes and Richard May were both buried in France and recorded
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on memorials there (see Figures 9 and 10).\textsuperscript{53} The men had differing degrees of connection to next of kin in India. Hughes’ History Sheet made numerous references to India. He listed both his father’s and sister’s contact details in India, and additionally recorded Graham as his “trustee”. It was Hughes’ sister, working as a nurse at the Homes in Kalimpong, who was ultimately informed of his death and received his medals. Conversely, the only references to India in Richard May’s documentation were his birthplace of Assam, and the note previously mentioned that he was a “Full Blooded Parsee (Indian)”.\textsuperscript{54} May listed his next of kin as his former employer, “W Harrison (friend)”, of Dipton, in Southland, and his medals and effects were forwarded to Harrison, a well known farmer in the district. Hence the remnants of May’s remarkable 24-year life, which began on a tea plantation in Assam, was dominated by the sustained intervention by the Homes in Kalimpong, took him all the way to New Zealand and ended on the battlefields of France, came to rest with a farming family in a tiny rural town in southern New Zealand whom he had known for a few short years.

A chance meeting with Michelle Sim, William Harrison’s great-great-granddaughter, enables a rich telling of May’s relationship with the Harrison family. Sim came across documents and photographs relating to May while organising her forebears’ archive. Her queries to older family members brought a persistent familial memory to the surface. May was remembered as an Indian farm worker whom William’s daughter Carrie was “quite keen on”.\textsuperscript{55} According to the family story, any romantic relationship was discouraged due to his Indian ancestry.\textsuperscript{56} A letter from May to Mary Harrison, William’s wife, provides an intimate glimpse into the strength of his relationship to the farming family. Written shortly after his arrival at Zeitoun, the lengthy letter gave a detailed account of life as a soldier in a foreign land. “You do not know how grateful I am”, he wrote, “for all you have done for me, and the thought of you and Mr Harrison, Carrie, Jean, Bob and Jackie and all Grassmead in general is proof against every temptation in this city.”\textsuperscript{57} Criticising the drunken behaviour of the

\textsuperscript{53} Hughes was memorialised on the Grevillers (New Zealand) Memorial at Pas-des-Calais and Richard May on the Caterpillar Valley (New Zealand) Memorial at Somme. Commonwealth War Graves Commission database, accessed 27 June 2013, \url{http://www.cwgc.org/}.
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Australian troops in the town, May admitted there were also “a few New Zealanders … who carry on something damnable”. For this young man, the protective bonds of a colonial farming family gave continuity to the values he grew up with in Kalimpong.

May’s letter also revealed the cultural encounters that the Kalimpong men experienced during overseas service. His fascination with the towns he visited is a reminder of the isolated circumstances of his life prior, in Kalimpong and in rural Southland. “The towns over here are very pretty”, he wrote, “and the people of many nationalities rushing about the streets in all sorts of costumes, make it very interesting”.58 Despite the presence of Europeans, he noted, “everything is carried out in an Eastern fashion”. Gesturing towards his own cultural background, May enclosed with his letter some trinkets from an “Indian curiosity shop”. He then described at length an intriguing encounter with some Indian troops. Upon noticing some “stalwart Rajputs”, he approached and “spoke to them in Hindi”. After recovering from their initial shock, they responded with salutes and “plenty of hand shaking”. Encouraged, May wrote that “it was wonderful how that language came back to me, and I waxed very eloquent”. A crowd of officers and men of his squadron gathered around and May was soon acting as interpreter. Again it was through war that the cross-cultural heritage of the Kalimpong men became visible and was valued.

“What a lot I’ll have to tell you when I get back”, May wrote, “but then that’s only a chance”.59 His death had a lasting impact on the Harrison family. William’s daughter Carrie kept two photographs of him, the letter to Mary, and newspaper clippings reporting his death.60 One of the clippings noted that he was “born at Assam, and was educated at Darjeeling, Northern India” and was “offered the position of interpreter to Indian troops, with the rank of Sergeant, but declined promotion and went on to France with his unit”.61 In celebrating May for prioritising colonial loyalty over personal gain, the clipping also communicated his acceptance as a New Zealander. The persistence of his story through five
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generations of the Harrison family speaks not only to the relationship between May and his employers, but also to the power of the war experience. The tragedy of a lost love, or simply grief for a young man who had become part of a colonial family, was enough to ensure that this connection between New Zealand and India persisted in the form of a paper legacy and a family tale still remembered almost a century later.

For those who did return, there is evidence that their war efforts were recognised. In her 1949 history of the Strath Taieri, a farming district west of Dunedin, Helen Thompson wrote that it was “pleasing to be able to place on record particulars of awards to men of this district for distinguished service with the Forces”. Hamilton Melville was one of nine men listed. There was no mention of his Indian background – he was as much “of” the Strath Taieri as any other. Thompson listed Melville’s DCM and Military Medal, and noted that he was a member of the famous “Travis Gang”. This was a group of soldiers who, under the leadership of Richard Charles Travis, became known for their “nocturnal scouting activities in no-man’s land.” Comparing Travis’ pathway to war to that of the Kalimpong emigrants helps to tease out the distinct yet overlapping factors of race and marginality. Travis had volunteered for war after shifting south from his birthplace in Gisborne. Trouble with his family had led him to break off “all communication” with them, change his name and tell various tales about his origins. War was likely an appealing prospect after more than a decade of acquiring a range of rural skills, yet still labouring as a “farmhand”. Travis was the recipient of numerous decorations, including the Victoria Cross after he was killed in battle in 1918. It is not surprising that Melville teamed up with a spirited colonial like Travis, both of whom were remembered for their war efforts after modest and mobile beginnings.

The immediate impact of the war on the men’s everyday lives is difficult to assess. Few of the returned servicemen ever had letters published in the Homes Magazine. More
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detail of the war legacy will be discussed in Chapter Six using Graham’s diary of his 1937 visit to New Zealand. One notable point revealed by their personnel files was that at least six of the men served again in the Second World War. A likely consequence of their war service, and one which is on public record, was the rate of marriage after they returned. Prior to war, only one of the emigrants, Eustace Boardman, was married, and as noted earlier, Pat Savigny married in Scotland in 1918. Eric Boardman married in the same year, followed by James Cruden in 1919 and five others in the early 1920s. Several more married in the late 1920s and one as late as 1940. Although the post-war period coincided with them reaching a marriageable age, they did marry in greater numbers than the women at this time. Thus it does seem plausible that war service enhanced their chances of being accepted into New Zealand families in this fundamentally different way to the provision of employment.

The Home Fires

Our N.Z. boys are giving a good account of themselves in France. The girls are doing just as well in their task of keeping the home fires burning. The question has been raised as to whether the girls were happy in the Colonies. Here is what one of them writes on the subject after five years’ experience:

‘Anyone with a little grit couldn’t help but make a success of life out here. The advantages are many and I for one am in favour of New Zealand. ... Everybody has been very good to me and I feel quite at home. I am a real Colonial now.’

_Homes Magazine_, June 1918

The opportunity for social advancement that war held for the men did not have a parallel for the women. Publication of their letters waned as the _Homes Magazine_ focused on the servicemen abroad. There was some interest in their fortunes, demonstrated by the citation above which addressed the question of their happiness. The emigrant’s response, that she felt at “home” in New Zealand and was a “real Colonial”, suggests that advancement for the women was sought on the same terms as the men. The burgeoning sense of national identity that the men had direct involvement in through their war service could therefore be
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said to have affected the women too, by clarifying the kind of social citizenship that they aspired to. The most tangible advantage for the women of not being directly involved in the war was that they did not suffer the physical and psychological scars of battle that affected the daily lives of returned servicemen. However the question of how they might move on from their domestic service roles remained unanswered.

News of the departure of five women emigrants bound for New Zealand in 1915 was reported in the “For the Old Boys and Girls” column, as this event occurred prior to its replacement with the “Homes and the War”. The women spent eleven days in Melbourne awaiting their ship to Dunedin, where Graham’s network had apparently grown. “The Melbourne friends gave them a good time,” the Homes Magazine reported, and “the wife of the Governor General who had heard of them from Lady Carmichael invited them to see over Government House.”69 Two of the women were placed in Dunedin and one in Christchurch, while the Pattison sisters, Mary and Kate, were bound for the township of Greymouth on the west coast of the South Island. Mary Pattison wrote that they travelled by train to Greymouth where they were met by their respective employers, who lived on the same street. Kate was placed with a lawyer’s family, and Mary looked after two children, writing that the family were “so kind to me … they treat me like their own child.”70 One of the women in Dunedin wrote of her employment with Dr and Mrs North and their five children. “Do you remember meeting my mistress and her husband when they were out in India?” she enquired, “they often talk about you and are always anxious to hear about the Homes.”71

The following year the Pattison sisters wrote of a “glorious summer” in Greymouth, during which Kate had been to Dunedin to visit the Kalimpong women.72 Rose Cooper had moved from rural Otago to join the two women in Christchurch, with whom she sent birthday greetings as “the trio”. Cooper’s movement from a small town to an urban centre was emulated by the Pattison sisters the following year. Kate Pattison left Greymouth to join the small cluster in Christchurch and Mary went to Dunedin. Molly Roberts, who was placed
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even further north in Blenheim, had also settled in Dunedin by 1918. The degree of choice
the women had in this movement is difficult to gauge; however there is certainly evidence of
a persistent gravitation towards urban centres where other Kalimpong women lived.

The women’s work in keeping the “home fires burning” was by all accounts still being
carried out in the homes of others. Their active participation in the Kalimpong community
featured in the few excerpts that were printed from their letters. In 1918, the five women “in
situations in Dunedin” wrote that they were “thinking of having a small sale of work for our
old school” about which they had had “much discussion”. Mary Pattison wrote that two of
the Christchurch women and one from Central Otago joined them for a gathering in
Dunedin. Pattison also mentioned Evelyn Fullerton, the emigrant who was sent straight to
nurses’ training upon arrival in 1912. While reports in the interim noted Fullerton’s return to
Dunedin, according to Pattison she was continuing her training in Christchurch. This excerpt
also made the first mention of gathering in Dunedin homes other than those of their
employers. The women received a “warm welcome” into the home of the first Kalimpong
woman to marry, the 1911 emigrant Jean MacKay, who married John Henderson in 1914 (see
Figures 11 and 12). Henderson’s example of providing a place for the emigrants to meet was
one that many Kalimpong women would follow in the ensuing decades. Another who hosted
gatherings was Mary MacDonald (nee Kennedy), the returned housemother.

My conversations with Kate Pattison’s daughter, Mary Milne, provided some key
insights into the nature of the women’s work and the relationship with their employers. Kate
was a central figure in the southern Kalimpong community and the women frequently met at
her home. Mary knew them all as “Aunty”, and had vivid memories of the way they would
“let fly” with their opinions when they were together. Mary thought they would have been
aghast to be referred to as “domestics”. She thought of them rather as “nannies” for the
children of professional families, who had been trained in this capacity at the Homes. Mary
remembered well the “silver service” afternoon teas that were part of the Kalimpong women’s
work, which she believed required a level of refinement. Mary also testified to the continued
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support received from their former employers once the women had married and were caring for families of their own. She remembered her mother receiving parcels from a previous employer when they were living in Gore and struggling financially during the Depression, and celebrating Christmas Day on more than one occasion with the same family. Hence the level of commitment that Graham and his supporters had hoped for at the outset of the scheme was being met not only by the local committee but also by at least some of the employers.

Conclusion

War interrupted the steady emigration of graduates from the Homes to New Zealand. In addition, men who had been directed to the Dominion as farm labourers through very specific channels were suddenly internationally mobile, and on the battlefields they were distanced from the Homes networks of protection. Ultimately, however, the war experience reinforced Graham’s belief that New Zealand was an ideal destination for Homes graduates. The men were allowed to enlist in the regular forces, they were decorated and promoted, and they exhibited a strong camaraderie with their colonial counterparts. Their war service would be repeatedly used by Graham as leverage with New Zealand officials and settler colonial audiences. His focus on their contribution underplayed the serious physical and psychological scars that those who returned would bear for the rest of their lives. Graham would also make a point of noting that all but one of the servicemen returned to New Zealand – further evidence in his view that they had been cured of any desire to return to India.

But as their war files revealed, to varying extents the men’s connections to India were still active. This did not preclude their integration into life in New Zealand, although it did mean that their search for a place in local communities was navigated from their particular place in widely dispersed and largely invisible imperial families. Their sense of family must also be acknowledged to have included staff at the Homes. In times of reflection their thoughts turned to Graham, their housemothers, and of a return to Kalimpong. As I argue throughout this thesis, the threads that connected the emigrants to India were activated at key junctures, and at other times left dormant. In the war years, it was the call to imperial unity that sparked the men’s contact with the Homes and generated archival renderings of their Indian connections, while post-war this contact just as quickly faded. Graham’s use of the
*Homes Magazine* to publicise Homes graduates’ war service reflected and reinforced imperial priorities, and relegated the women emigrants’ perspectives. The women continued to perform domestic labour within the confines of colonial households and to socialise with others from Kalimpong. Earlier than the women, the first generation of men began to marry and to enter a new phase of settled life; a phase that furthered their integration into New Zealand families and turned their focus away from the Homes in a more sustained manner.
Table 4.1 Dates of War Service and Reason for Discharge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Arrival</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of Enlistment</th>
<th>Year of Discharge</th>
<th>Reason for Discharge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Williams, Sydney</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, Leonard</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Sinclair, Clarence</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Unfit: war wounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Boardman, Eric</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Unfit: disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cruden, James</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Unfit: illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May, Richard</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Killed in action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop, James</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Unfit: illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooks, Thomas</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Savigny, Patrick</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McKay, John</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Jones, Llewellyn</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Unfit: war wounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall, William</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Unfit: war wounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hughes, Ernest</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Killed in action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ochterlony, Robert</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snelleksz, Edward</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart, Eric</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Unfit: illness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Holder, Henry</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawless, Charles</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lemare, Stuart</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Hall, Richard</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melville, Hamilton</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrews, Adrian</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>End of service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Defence Force Personnel Records)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Next of Kin</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, A</td>
<td>Rev J Ponder</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Waitahuna, Southland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Jane Birkett</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Western Super Mare, England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, J</td>
<td>G Bishop</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Assam, Bengal, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J McDonald</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Dawson’s Hotel, Central Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardman, E</td>
<td>E Smith</td>
<td>Fiancé</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Killenchy, Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, T</td>
<td>T.H. Pugh</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Dukes Road, Mosgiel, Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miss May Brooks</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>c/o Mrs Hickman, Dwarbund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruden, J</td>
<td>J.S. Cruden</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>63 Woodville Gardens, Glasgow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Haggit</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>100 McLaggan St, Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, R</td>
<td>William Hall</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Ngapuna, Central Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Hall</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Darjeeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, W</td>
<td>Miss Mary Hall</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Darjeeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr T Brooks</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Ngapuna, Central Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder, H</td>
<td>Henry S Holder</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Paramada, Travancore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miss I.G. Fowler</td>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>67 Argyle Rd, West Ealing, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, E</td>
<td>E A Hughes</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Letehmi Estate, Travancore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev J A Graham</td>
<td>Trustee</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Kalimpong, Bengal, North India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, L</td>
<td>Mrs M Jones</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>18 Peterson St, Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Chatfield</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>c/- Evening Post, Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawless, C</td>
<td>Minnie Lawless</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>c/- Dr North, Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemare, S</td>
<td>Rev Ponder</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Waitahuna, Southland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay, J</td>
<td>Jean Henderson</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Clyde, Central Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, R</td>
<td>Mr Harrison</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Dipton, Southland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville, H</td>
<td>Thomas Brooks</td>
<td>Cousin</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>100 McLaggan St, Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochterlony, R</td>
<td>Mary Ochterlony</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>c/- Miss Woods, Spring Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savigny, P</td>
<td>Albert Wendlebier</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>5 Baker St, Caversham, Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair, C</td>
<td>Robert Sinclair</td>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Assam Bengal Railway, Tippera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snelleksz, E</td>
<td>Mr Hunibal</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, E</td>
<td>Phyllis Stuart</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, S</td>
<td>Miss G Williams</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Mission Girls School, Moradabad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, L</td>
<td>Gladys Williams</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Mission Girls School, Moradabad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Defence Force Personnel Records)
Table 4.3: Servicemen’s Location and Occupation on Enlistment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lemare, Stuart</td>
<td>Southland</td>
<td>Menzies Ferry Dairy Factory</td>
<td>Cheese maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay, John</td>
<td>Southland</td>
<td>Balclutha</td>
<td>Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, Richard</td>
<td>Southland</td>
<td>Mossburn Station, Mararoa</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, Thomas</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>Mosgiel</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruden, James</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>100 McLaggan St, Dunedin</td>
<td>Factory worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Richard</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>Longslip, Oamaru</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, William</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>Gladbrook Station, Middlemarch</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews, Adrian</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>100 McLaggan St, Dunedin</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Llewellyn</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>Northeast Valley, Dunedin</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melville, Hamilton</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>Gladbrook Station, Middlemarch</td>
<td>Farmhand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savigny, Patrick</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Printer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair, Clarence</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>Concord, Dunedin</td>
<td>Farmhand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, Eric</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>Waitati, Otago</td>
<td>Self-employed cheesemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Sydney</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>Dunback, Otago</td>
<td>Creamery manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Leonard</td>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>Mount Ross, Sutton</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, James</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Amberley, Canterbury</td>
<td>Farmhand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snelleksz, Edward</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Traveller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Ernest</td>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>Murchison</td>
<td>Farmhand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochterlony, Robert</td>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>Marshlands Estate, Spring Creek</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardman, Eric</td>
<td>Hawkes Bay</td>
<td>Napier</td>
<td>Electrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holder, Henry</td>
<td>Hawkes Bay</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>Poulterer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawless, Charles</td>
<td>Hawkes Bay</td>
<td>Napier Hotel, Napier</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Defence Force Personnel Records)
Figure 9: Ernest Hughes, *Auckland Weekly News*, 29 August 1919
(Source: George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, AWNS-19180829-41-7)

Figure 10: Richard May, *Otago Witness*, 8 October 1916
(Source: Onward Project, details at www.fairdinkumbooks.com)
Figure 11: Jeannie (nee Mackay) and John Henderson, 1914
(Source: Gale family archive, Wanaka, Otago)

Figure 12: At home in Dunedin: Siblings Jeannie Henderson (far left) and John Mackay (far right) with spouses and children, c.1920.
(Source: Gale family archive, Wanaka, Otago)
CHAPTER FIVE
1920-1929: WORKING THE PERMIT SYSTEM

The 1920s saw the most concentrated emigration from the Homes in Kalimpong to New Zealand. This chapter tracks the flow of that emigration within the imperial post-war context. The First World War had a significant impact on notions of foreignness and citizenship in Britain and the Dominions, and this was expressed in restrictions on mobility both during and after the war. In New Zealand, it was the Immigration Restriction Amendment Act (IRAA) of 1920 that was part of this wave of global border tightening. The Act required all non-British subjects to be in possession of a permit before being allowed to enter the Dominion. This caused immediate consternation at the Homes, raising fears that its enforcement would see New Zealand follow Australia’s example and halt Anglo-Indian immigration. Indeed, scholars of the Indian and Chinese communities in New Zealand have argued that this legislation was prohibitive to new Asian immigration. Thus, the resumption and continuation of the Homes emigration scheme in the 1920s offers significant new insights into the workings of the IRAA. In addition, evidence that very few Anglo-Indians other than the Homes graduates were successful in gaining permits strongly supports the contention that the scheme acted as an effective vehicle of emigration, which was successful in negotiating pathways through and around this legislative tightening.

Like the First World War documentation, an important legacy of the permit system was the creation of a new set of archival records which help to reframe the Kalimpong narrative. Prior to 1922, when the IRAA came into force, the only documented evidence of the Kalimpong arrivals were names on shipping lists. From 1923 onwards, all non-British subjects who entered New Zealand were recorded in permit registers separated into sections according to race and nationality. The Kalimpong emigrants were categorised as “Eurasian”. Copies of the permits were collated by year, and a separate file stored correspondence around applications. These documents facilitate an examination of the actual workings of migration policy, rather than focusing only upon the legislation. Moreover, the small numbers of non-British migrants who entered New Zealand enables close analysis of the different groups that
drew attention from the Immigration Department. As bureaucratic instruments, the files reconstituted the Kalimpong emigrants from being the subject of imperial theories about Anglo-Indians to situating them among other communities who were regarded as marginal in this settler colony. Hence the narrative of the Kalimpong scheme is about more than the Homes, Graham, and the emigrants – it is also a story about the New Zealand state.

Moving inwards from this broad context the chapter picks up the narrative of the growing Kalimpong community in New Zealand. The most notable consequence of the new legislation for the Homes scheme was a move northwards. Gender continues to be an important analytical lens through which I explore the integration of those who arrived in the 1920s and continue to follow the fortunes of the earlier emigrants – who were moving into the next phase of life through marriage and settled work. Based on the reports of the earlier arrivals who wrote of settled married life, the Homes Magazine began to promote marriage as the ideal means by which its female emigrants could become established in the Dominion. For the men, increasing unemployment in the rural sector affected new arrivals and halted further male emigration from 1926. The Homes Magazine reports are fleshed out by revisiting the life narratives of the case study families, many members of which were among the 1920s arrivals. Letters in the Homes personal files reveal the intimate working out of the emigrants’ place in their extended families, which was navigated around and mediated by the steady presence of Graham, and James Purdie, at the Homes in Kalimpong.

**New Legislation**

The IRAA, passed in late 1920, was part of a global wave of restrictive immigration legislation in the post-war period. In New Zealand, parliamentary debates revealed the overriding local issue to be a perceived influx of Chinese and Indian immigrants whose visible presence in the cities of Auckland and Wellington was creating public concern. The issue under debate was *how* to restrict numbers, rather than *whether* to do so or *why*: this was referred to with an oblique statement that “everybody knows” the reasons for wanting to keep

---

the Dominion “white”.

The question of exclusion on the basis of race, nationality and colour was nevertheless agreed by politicians to be a complicated one. China was a close neighbour with whom the Dominion “could not afford to quarrel” and India’s status as part of the British Empire entangled the categorisations of race and nationality, precluding a simple resolution to exclude all non-British subjects. The imperial war conferences of 1917 and 1918 had endorsed a principle of reciprocity between India and the self-governing dominions, which as Jacqueline Leckie notes saw the British Colonial Office applying pressure to the New Zealand government to make special provision for Indians in the new legislation. Debate around the proposed amendment was peppered with references to this imperative and to the need to differentiate between British and non-British “coloured races”.

Reiko Karatani’s study of the development of British citizenship within an imperial context, and alongside that of settler and non-settler colonies, provides key insights here. Karatani clarified the development of imperial, British, and colonial citizenship, which she argues came to be defined on multiple levels. Following the First World War, legislation in the settler colonies reflected a desire to retain British subjecthood, known as the “common code”, while taking measures to increase their autonomy in managing the composition of their populations. Karatani distinguishes between British immigration policy, which was historically intended to exclude “undesirables”, and the impulse of the settler colonies to attract the “right type” of emigrant. Population balance was crucial in this distinction. Britain’s white population was the overwhelming majority in this period and the rate of immigration was relatively low. Settler colonies on the other hand, had developed tropes

---

3 Ibid., 911.
5 “Undesirable Immigrants Exclusion Bill”, 14 September 1920, NZPD, Vol. 185, 920.
7 Ibid., 77-78. W. D. Borrie argues somewhat contrastingly that New Zealand’s immigration policy in the twentieth century was “for the express purpose of restricting” large scale immigration rather than promoting it. However he also discusses the settler colonies’ “active search” for the “ideal” immigrant. W.D. Borrie, Immigration to New Zealand, 1854-1938 (Canberra: Australian National University, 1991), 149, 155.
8 Karatani, Defining British Citizenship, 77.
regarding the amalgamation of non-white indigenous populations, which influenced the terms upon which immigrants from Europe and Asia were allowed to enter and the expectation that they would conform to local majorities.9

The “alarming rate” of Asian immigration that provoked the enactment of this legislation in New Zealand was in fact evidenced by very small numbers: 174 Indians had entered in the six months to September 1920, compared with 193 in the 12 months prior.10 Indian immigration into New Zealand has indeed been labelled “A History of Small Numbers”, and as Sekhar Bandyopdhyay has argued, it took only small numbers to generate substantial debate and alarmist reporting of an Asian influx.11 This attests to the significance of the Kalimpong scheme, despite its minimal numerical impact when measured against the total colonial population. In parliamentary debates, the visibility of Fijian Indians in Wellington and to a lesser extent Auckland was cited as a problem, indicating that the mere presence of any coloured foreigners was an issue.12 The presence of Indian settlers in these North Island cities was significant given the move northwards of the new Kalimpong arrivals. It is also worth noting here that the White New Zealand League, an anti-Asian pressure group, was formed in Pukekohe, south of Auckland, in 1925.13 There is no doubt, therefore, that the arrival of groups of Anglo-Indians would have been noticed in the climate of heightened racial anxieties in 1920s New Zealand.

Scholars of the Indian community in New Zealand are in general agreement about its pattern of immigration. Until 1921, Indians found it “relatively easy” to enter the

---

9 David Roediger makes a related point regarding immigration in North America, when he cites anxieties regarding new immigrants from those who would assert that the assimilation of the current “other” should be achieved before allowing further “foreign” immigration. See Roediger, Working Towards Whiteness: How America’s Immigrants Became White (New York: Basic Books, 2005); 149-150. On the discourse that developed around racial mixing in New Zealand among settler colonies see Damon Salesa, Racial Crossings: Race, Intermarriage and the Victorian British Empire (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 235-244.


12 “Undesirable Immigrants Exclusion Bill”, 14 September 1920, NZPD, Vol. 185, 926.

Dominion.\textsuperscript{14} The second phase, during which the IRAA restricted Indian entry to relatives of existing residents, persisted until 1945. Permit records demonstrate this distinctive treatment of Indian migrants under the new law. While other nationalities were issued a permit, Indians who were successful in their applications received a letter of permission that outlined specific conditions of entry and gave details of their relatives in New Zealand. According to the way permits were granted (and collated) in the 1920s, the treatment of Homes emigrants was closer to that of southern and eastern Europeans than to Indians. This aligns the Kalimpong emigrants with the category of “new immigrants” in the United States who were the focus of a study by James Barrett and David Roediger, and renders their examination of the process by which such immigrants became “white” under similarly restrictive legislation (passed in 1924) highly pertinent here.\textsuperscript{15} Barrett and Roediger’s statement that the processes of “becoming white” and ‘becoming American’ were intertwined at every turn” could equally be applied to the transformation of the Kalimpong emigrants into “New Zealanders”.\textsuperscript{16}

Prior to enforcement of the IRAA, the Homes graduates’ entry to New Zealand proceeded unnoticed at the state level, as evidenced by an official’s later admission that “no information is available as to the number [of Anglo-Indians] admitted prior to 1922.”\textsuperscript{17} Three groups from Kalimpong arrived in relatively quick succession prior to the new legislation coming into effect: a group of seven in January 1920, six in June 1920, and six in early 1921 (see Table 5.1). The 1921 group was the last to land in the South Island. The next edition of the \textit{Homes Magazine} carried an article entitled “New Zealand and Our Emigrants: Will There Be Exclusion?” which began by expressing concern at news of the IRAA:

\begin{quote}
We learn from our friends in New Zealand that there was considerable difficulty in getting our last party of emigrants landed at Wellington. There has evidently been fresh legislation passed on the line of what obtains in Australia. … Our friends are afraid the door has been closed to us. That
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Ibid}, 6.
\textsuperscript{17} Controller of Customs to Minister of Customs, 13 September 1937, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, Archives New Zealand, Wellington Office (ANZ-W).
would be a big disappointment. We are making a representation on the subject to the New Zealand government.\textsuperscript{18}

The article made a case for continuing the scheme on the grounds of imperial reciprocity, stating that the Homes was “prepared to be judged by the record of those children”. The women’s success was proved by the “urgent demand for more” and the “splendid reports of their mistresses”; while for the men, farmers reported that they had been “as successful (if indeed not more so) as the native boy of New Zealand”, and the article described their war service as the most “eloquent and conclusive” proof of their worth. The emigrants’ own satisfaction was evident in that they felt “at home in New Zealand and on a whole prefer life there to that in India”. The editors were cognisant of the imperial issues at stake, expressing their certainty “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”.\textsuperscript{19}

The main fear was that New Zealand would follow Australia in requiring “more than 50 per cent of European blood.” If New Zealand would not continue its “past generous policy”, the editors “pleaded” that the Dominion at least modify the rule to be “not less than 50 per cent of European blood”, thereby allowing Homes children to emigrate.\textsuperscript{20}

In the same article, under the subheading “A Visit to Our New Zealanders”, excerpts from a letter from a Homes teacher, Miss McFarlane, were used to “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”. In Dunedin, McFarlane visited each of the Kalimpong women in their employers’ homes and they all gathered together one evening. She found them “treated with the utmost kindness and consideration. They all spend Thursday afternoons together or in pairs.”\textsuperscript{21} McFarlane’s visit to Wellington revealed that at least seven women emigrants were living there. They talked “most about Kalimpong, naturally. The girls seem experienced and self-reliant.”\textsuperscript{22} Regarding “The Colour Question”, McFarlane relayed a conversation with

\textsuperscript{18} “New Zealand and Our Emigrants: Will There Be Exclusion?”, \textit{St Andrew’s Colonial Homes Magazine (SACHM)} 21, no. 1/2 (1921): 6.

\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{21} “A Visit to Our New Zealanders”, \textit{SACHM} 21, no. 1/2 (1921): 6.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Ibid}.
a Presbyterian minister in Dunedin. Reverend 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”. While he felt that it was feasible “the Anglo-Indian coming in small numbers … 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”. The article thus drew direct connections between public opinion and the new legislation, implying that these attitudes might not only affect further emigration, but also hamper the full social integration of Kalimpong graduates already settled in New Zealand.

**Arrivals under the Permit System**

The period immediately following the First World War was a challenging time for the Homes. In 1922 it was forced to end its “open door” policy, for the first time limiting its roll (to 625) until “the dislocation due to war is mended and the financial position is once more stabilised.” In fact the roll would never again be lifted beyond this number in Graham’s tenure. In his annual review of 1922, Graham reported that uncertainty over the new immigration rules in New Zealand had prevented sending any graduates there, and that this “made the task harder to get suitable openings for some boys who would have found their most likely sphere in farm work.” The potential loss of a destination for ten graduates a year would have a major impact on the Homes, not only in losing placements for a significant proportion of graduates, but also affecting its ability to use Graham’s “grand” vision of emigration as a way of publicising the institution.

Emigration resumed in late 1923 with a group of three young men sailing unaccompanied into the care of a Mr P. E. Suttie, a “good friend of the Homes in Narayanganj and Calcutta … now settled in Auckland”. Suttie had been employed by a jute company in Narayanganj and is likely to have used his position to facilitate placements for Kalimpong

---

23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.

155
graduates there. His involvement continued through securing employment and entry permits for this group of emigrants in Auckland. 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”. Permits for this group were secured a full year before their arrival at Auckland. They were recorded in the “Eurasian” section of the permit register, which listed permit number, name of emigrant, date of permit, port of arrival, vessel, and date of receipt of permit. In 1924 Suttie reported on the new arrivals, for whom he had arranged employment “scattered on different farms but on the same line of Railway”, presumably mentioned to note that they would be able to visit each other. Suttie informed the Homes that “on the farms, it is not difficult to find employment for suitable lads … but the supply of labour in the towns is far greater than the demand.”

The next group of six emigrants arrived in Wellington in February 1925 (see Table 5.1). In the intervening time only one other Anglo-Indian emigrant had been recorded in the permit register. They were followed by a group of 17, whose departure in November 1925 signalled a return to the celebratory reporting that had not been seen since the 1915 group of six women. A full page of the Homes Magazine was 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 13). Full details of the vessels, chaperones, and route taken were given in the article, which reported that:

Our good friend, Mr A.W. Blair, Barrister, Wellington, had secured beforehand situations for all the party (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.

---

28 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: Thacker, Spink and Co, 1918).
29 “New Zealand Emigration”, SACHM 24, no. 1/2 (1924): 11.
30 Permanent Entry Record Books, 1921-1926, Department of Labour, R19007319, ANZ-W.
32 Ibid.
A less formal photograph, stored in a private family archive, was taken en route to New Zealand (Figure 14). 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 were recorded as entering New Zealand during 1925 and 1926. A full page article was printed in the *Homes Magazine* upon their departure, with a photograph that was notable for the less uniform appearance of the graduates, in their dress, pose, and outdoor setting, as opposed to the formal setting of the studio (Figure 15). Arrangements for “settlement” of this “fresh band” were made by Blair.

Compared with the immediate dispersal of the earlier groups, the 1926 emigrants made a highly visible entrance to New Zealand. They alighted at Invercargill and from there toured around the South Island on their way to Wellington, visiting noted scenic spots such as Milford Sound. The article in the *Homes Magazine* that reported their departure included snippets of letters which described their arrival. Roland Spencer, already in New Zealand, had heard from one of the new emigrants, who was staying at the Wellington “Salvation Hostel” and seems to have been 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”.

Spencer’s actions evidence two important dynamics of the scheme in the 1920s: firstly, the involvement of the men in finding employment for others, whether they were new arrivals or already in the country; and secondly, what appears to be special treatment in granting permits to Kalimpong emigrants, given that at least one of the 1926 group arrived without pre-arranged 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 (see Table 5.2).\(^{36}\) The sense is, however, 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” with the Mayoress of the town. 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”.\(^{37}\) 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 that the group had “arrived temporarily 15.1.29 at Wellington and permitted to remain 20.6.30”.\(^{38}\) The fact that no male emigrants were admitted after 1926 (aside from Charles Moller) and that the final group of women entered on a temporary basis reflected the worsening economic situation. The women who did emigrate were all placed in affluent households connected to the Kalimpong scheme – households that were not as seriously affected by the economic depression as the working classes were.\(^{39}\)

**Broader Application of the New Regulations**

Strongly supporting the contention that the Homes scheme received special consideration from immigration authorities, 53 of the 64 “Eurasian” arrivals in the 1920s were Kalimpong emigrants. The role of Graham’s Presbyterian network in facilitating their entry fits the scheme within the wider characterisation of New Zealand migration history as one that

---

\(^{36}\) 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.


\(^{38}\) Permanent Entry Record Books, 1921-1926, Department of Labour, R19007319, ANZ-W, 160.

has been defined by kinship, family, and local connections.\textsuperscript{40} Although anxieties about race undoubtedly had a major impact on migrant inflows, the desire to attract “respectable” persons who had ties to existing residents regulated all immigration, including that of lower-class British settlers. This section looks at the enquiries fielded by the Immigration Department on behalf of Anglo-Indians outside the Homes scheme who wished to emigrate. These requests were framed in very similar terms to Graham’s public appeals to colonial audiences, and the responses they elicited are useful here given the absence of archived correspondence between Graham and the New Zealand authorities in the 1920s.

In June 1925, Jean Porteous wrote on behalf of her brother who was 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.\textsuperscript{41} Porteous sought information about the permit system and received a standard reply, which stated that the prospective emigrant would need to complete an application form accompanied by “the certificates and photographs required thereby”.\textsuperscript{42} 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”.\textsuperscript{43} 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?”\textsuperscript{44} Briant enclosed a postal order requesting pamphlets that would provide such information. He

\textsuperscript{40} Borrie, \textit{Immigration to New Zealand}, 151-152; Angela McCarthy, \textit{Scottishness and Irishness in New Zealand since 1840} (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011), 48-51.
\textsuperscript{41} J Porteous to Minister of Internal Affairs, 23 June 1925, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
\textsuperscript{42} Controller of Customers to J Porteous, 1 July 1925, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
\textsuperscript{43} S. W. Briant to Minister of Customs, 11 March 1926, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Ibid.}
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”.  

Two weeks later another letter from India, on this occasion Calcutta, queried the immigration rules.  D. C. Stewart-Smith wrote on behalf of “European and Anglo-Indian boys in our Schools here regarding employment on farms in New Zealand” and, like Briant, requested pamphlets. The persistent belief that farm work was an appropriate starting point for immigrants was notable. 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:

The passport and shipping authorities here are 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. Here 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 highlights the benefits of the Homes 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 Under-Secretary of the Immigration Department replied to Stewart-Smith that he was “deeply interested in a couple of cases at present in the Dominion”, but was of the opinion that the nature of the work and climate made it “problematical that these boys will turn out a success”. The Under-Secretary was, however, “prepared to lend a helping hand”, although he was “not in a position to accept the responsibility of guardianship”. His comments echoed the sentiment of Charles Holdsworth in 1905, who also expressed empathy for the plight of Anglo-Indians, but doubted their potential and

---

45 Controller of Customs to S. W. Briant, 21 April 1926, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.  
46 D. C. Stewart-Smith to Immigration Officer, 3 May 1926, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.  
47 Ibid.  
48 Under-Secretary to D. C. Stewart-Smith, 21 June 1926, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, ANZ-W.  
49 Ibid.
stressed the need for some person or organisation to take responsibility for them. The Under-Secretary referred to the 1920 legislation, stating that “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.” He enclosed a copy of the IRAA and informed Stewart-Smith that he had “asked the Publicity Officer of New Zealand to forward … a complete set of pamphlets concerning life in this Dominion”.

Stewart-Smith was encouraged by this reply from the Under-Secretary and wrote again in November 1926 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, even though they were “the sons and/or grandsons of fathers born in the British Isles.” Most pointedly, he asked for “a clear definition of a European boy? I take it boys born of European parents in India would be acceptable.” His query makes apparent the difficulty of navigating immigration restrictions in a period of fluid categorisation of people of mixed race. Stewart-Smith requested application forms for permits for “two or three boys”. In January 1927 the Controller of Customs sent a memorandum to the Under-Secretary regarding the Stewart-Smith case, recommending that the standard reply should be despatched. 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. Only three of the eleven non-Kalimpong Anglo-Indian entries in the permit register were single men, the remainder being single women or family groups.

Other papers in the Immigration Department file demonstrate that the presence of the Kalimpong emigrants did not go unnoticed. In 1928 Mrs G. Kelly from Ashburton, south of Christchurch, wrote to the Department to express her interest in recent press articles regarding
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“Eurasian servant girls and their arrival in New Zealand”. 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 handwritten note on her letter further stated that “applications are received by us through Mr A.W. Blair of Chapman, Tripp, Blair, Brooke and Watson, Solicitors of Wellington”. Kelly’s enquiry indicated the effectiveness of publicity about the scheme as a means of “advertising” the availability of the Kalimpong women to take up domestic situations, and the response she received implied an established relationship between the Immigration Department and Blair, Graham’s associate.

That 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”. 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.” “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 charitable element of the scheme was being publicly challenged, as were the limits of Graham’s strategy of positioning the emigrants as reformed children of destitute families, rather than the children of tea planters. The *Auckland Sun* article concluded by asking “who is responsible for these
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workers, once they have landed in a strange country?"\textsuperscript{58} Alongside the \textit{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. In fact their silent presence seems to have left these authors with a marked sense of disquiet.

The \textit{Wanganui Chronicle} brought the labour market into the debate, stating that “at the present moment there is no shortage of female labour in the Dominion” 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”.\textsuperscript{59} This connection of the Kalimpong scheme to fears of cheap Asian immigrant labour is important because it was prefaced on a dismissive approach to the charitable element of the scheme. Furthermore, it questioned Graham’s repeated claims that the emigration scheme was about providing labourers to meet colonial shortages. Both the \textit{Auckland Sun} and the \textit{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 prevented them from becoming fully socialised and integrated into the free labour market. This public debate had been brought to the attention of the Immigration Department. The article was filed with the correspondence regarding permit applications, and was annotated with a note that “since Dec 1922 permits have been granted for 40 Eurasians to enter NZ. Of that number 33 have arrived”.\textsuperscript{60} This indicates that staff had been directed to acquire figures relating to the Homes scheme, though it was not directly named in the note.

Overt mention of the scheme was made in the final archived enquiry on behalf of Anglo-Indians to the Immigration 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 entitled \textit{New Zealand: Its People and Resources}. He began his letter by noting that the object of such publicity was to “set before prospective migrants the advantages of settlement in New
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Zealand.”  Clay described Anglo-Indians as the descendants of British settlers and “daughters of the soil … essentially British, with an equal standard of living”. While many chose to “spend the evening of their lives” in England or France, Clay suggested a country like New Zealand would be a better option if more were aware of its benefits:

> It is unfortunately true however, that in [India] … very little is known of New Zealand, its salubrious climate and promising future, though I must say 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.  

Clay couched his appeal as an offer to assist the New Zealand government by publicising the advantages of migration there. In making this point, his words attest to the widespread and influential circulation of information about the Homes scheme. As previous applicants had done, Clay demonstrated an awareness that small numbers were crucial, assuring the Department that emigrant families of “attested worth” would number “not more than half a dozen a year”. Clay received the standard letter in reply and it is assumed he was unsuccessful as no Anglo-Indian families were admitted between 1928 and 1931.

Like the other cases presented here, Clay was reliant upon official provision of information about immigration, which he found difficult to obtain in India. As Reiko Karatani suggested, the distinctive development of immigration restrictions among the settler colonies made it difficult for applicants to know which categories of immigrants were regarded as the “right type”. Thus, Graham’s network allowed him to bypass what was effectively the first screen for potential immigrants from Asia to New Zealand – a scarcity of information about the entry process and prospects thereafter. The Immigration Department’s responses to Anglo-Indian applicants outside the Homes scheme highlight that the circulation of information around the British Empire was not accidental, and nor was it even.
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Working Towards Full Integration

Despite the implementation of this new legislation, the 1920s was in numerical terms the “heyday” of the Homes emigration scheme, with 73 new arrivals: 40 women and 33 men. The lower proportion of male emigrants was largely attributable to increasing unemployment in the rural sector, in contrast to the women’s relatively secure employment in professional households. This reversal of the gender imbalance of the previous decade brought a more even distribution to the total number of 116 emigrants, comprising 62 men and 54 women. The shift northwards brought about by the placement of new arrivals in the North Island was reinforced by a number of earlier emigrants gravitating towards northern centres. As will be traced in this and subsequent chapters, the Kalimpong communities in Wellington and Auckland developed and retained more active connections than those in the South Island. Various reasons could account for this difference: the arrival of several large groups, who had better access to transport around the cities in this later period; close ties between the Wellington families that employed the women; and the higher numbers of brown-skinned people, including Indian settlers and Māori, in the North Island than the South.

The men who had served in the First World War returned to the southern communities from which they had embarked. Patrick Savigny was mentioned in a letter to the Homes from his sister Nellie in 1920. The siblings were settled in the same neighbourhood in Dunedin and each was married with one son. Nellie had married Norman Thomson, and their house, set on half an acre of land, was bought “by the aid of government”.65 Thomson was himself a returned serviceman, and his marriage to Nellie brings to light the legacies of war for the Kalimpong women, not only through siblings who had served but also through their marriages to ex-servicemen. Mary Ochterloney reported that her brother Robert had maintained his interest in football and was enthusiastically following South Africa’s rugby tour of New Zealand.66 He had returned to the Marlborough district and although he was seriously wounded in the war, he had by Mary’s account resumed his former life. A notable feature of the post-war Homes Magazine was the scarcity of reports from the ex-servicemen themselves,

many of whom returned home with serious disabilities. Graham’s 1937 diary will be utilised Chapter Six to give a clearer picture of the legacies of war service.

In contrast to the scarcity of reports from the early male emigrants, the women continued to correspond regularly with the Homes. They wrote most frequently about marriage, children, and establishing their own homes. Marriage for some meant greater mobility than when they were in domestic service; however, both single and married women moved northwards and reconnected with others from Kalimpong. Mary Ochterloney, who was originally placed in Marlborough, wrote in 1921 of meeting regularly at Rosie Duck’s (nee Cooper) Wellington home with Molly Chambers and Gertie Plaistowe. It was “so nice to go to her house and to have somewhere which we feel like home”, she wrote, adding that “Thelma, Rosie’s little girl is lovely.”67 These women had previously comprised “The Trio” in Christchurch. Another emigrant who moved northwards, to Napier in the Hawkes Bay province, was Mary Roberts, who wrote of her impending marriage to Walter Ireland in 1922:

I can hardly realise it’s nine years since I left the old homestead … Now I’m going to take another plunge. At the end of this year I am to be married. You may be sure I am looking forward to having a little home of my own, and some day when you can come and visit your old boys and girls, you will have to make your home with us.68

Winnie Lawless, who was initially placed in Dunedin and settled in Wellington, announced her engagement on the same page of the Homes Magazine. Lawless suggested that a wedding veil made in the Kalimpong Lace School “would always come in handy for Kalimpong girls”.69 Her comment is a reminder of the isolated familial circumstances in which these young women navigated the process of meeting and marrying New Zealand men. Siblings and other Homes graduates were their only local family. Many of the women were bridesmaids at each other’s weddings. Lawless’ engagement was to be a prolonged one – she finally married William ‘Batey’ Batchelor, a civil servant, in 1926.
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In January 1924 Kate Pattison sent news of the Kalimpong women in Dunedin. She mentioned six early emigrants that she had regular contact with, most of whom had been in the city for a decade. None were married and all were working in domestic service. Pattison also wrote of seeing the most recent arrivals to Dunedin, including Dora Moller and Lorna Peters, and had remained in contact with those who had moved northwards. “Molly Roberts”, she wrote, “seems to like married life. She has asked me to go over to Napier to spend my next holiday with her.” Also married was Minnie Savigny, to a labourer in 1921. Kate herself was to marry a Southland labourer the following year. Mavis Haslett had worked for four years for a Mrs O’Dowd at a boarding house in Tapanui, a tiny rural settlement southwest of Dunedin, when she married Albert Gordon in 1928. Gordon was a rural labourer. The demographic occupied by the husbands of the Kalimpong women will be explored more fully in Chapter Eight; however it is worth noting here that their economic status was similar to the Kalimpong men, and many were rural labourers who were affected by the encroaching economic depression.

Articles published in the *Homes Magazine* in the 1920s heralded marriage as an achievement. Women emigrants were strongly encouraged to follow the example of those who had already established “homes of their own”. The editor’s remarks on the content of two letters printed in 1929 illustrated this pressure. Annie Brown wrote that while she occasionally saw the new arrivals, she had more frequent contact with the older emigrants, who had “lovely comfortable homes”. She speculated that “maybe I’ll be the next to change my name after thinking I was a confirmed spinster! For is it not the best thing for us to do?”, after which the editor inserted “Quite right. – ED”. Printed beneath Brown’s excerpt was a letter from Dora Moller, headed “Marriage Bells”. On a visit to Dunedin, Dora found that “nearly all the girls are married” and those who were not, herself included, were considering it. To this news the editor commented, “We rejoice to hear those Marriage Bells”. The increase in the numbers of women sent to New Zealand in the 1920s would have engendered a greater interest in their fortunes. The *Homes Magazine* sent a clear message to them, that
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marrying a New Zealander and creating homes and families of their own was the best pathway to economic and social prosperity. As Martha Gardner found in the United States, marriage was an important strategy for migrant women to achieve citizenship.\(^{74}\)

While the earlier women emigrants had numerous excerpts printed in the *Homes Magazine*, it was correspondence from the new arrivals that dominated the 1920s columns for those settled abroad. Of the large 1926 group, several of the women wrote about their situations in Wellington. Connie Walker had “a good mistress and a darling child to look after”, Margie Smith was in “a beautiful home at Mr and Mrs Bobbingers”, and Violet Allcard was living with the family of one of the barristers who arranged the permits.\(^{75}\) Eva Masson wrote that the Mayoress of Blenheim was “just like a mother to me. Every day she lets me go to the swimming baths and that always reminds me of Kalimpong”.\(^{76}\) Margaret Fox wrote from Wellington that she was “getting on very much better now since I came over into the big town and I absolutely adore the two wee children I look after. Yesterday we gave a dance. I polished the floor of the dining room, which was used as the ballroom, in the Kalimpong style with bare feet.”\(^{77}\) It was in these affluent surroundings that the women who arrived from sparse interiors and communal living at the Homes cottages were socialised into New Zealand families and learnt their place in colonial hierarchies.

Reports from the recent male emigrants echoed those of earlier men. They encountered similar climatic and working conditions as their predecessors had in the south, with instant induction into long days of work, undertaking a variety of manual tasks, and enduring cold winters and basic living conditions. The men sent frequent news of others from Kalimpong, who clustered in rural areas around Auckland, Wellington and the central North Island. Clarence Bayley wrote in 1926 of joining a football league in Waiuku, south of
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Auckland, with Fergus Gammie.78 Charles Spalding and Richard Hawkins wrote from the Auckland district on behalf of the men there, and made special comment about doing their own washing, cooking and cleaning. “Tell the Fraser chaps to learn how to darn stockings”, Spalding quipped.79 In the Wellington region, Tom Watson described farm labour as “healthy and hardy”, and wrote that he liked to “jump up at 5 o’clock on a cold frosty winter morning, take a minute’s run round and commence milking the four cows”.80 Roland Spencer coped with early starts by focusing on the food that followed – “a huge slice of bacon and egg, etc. Nothing to beat a farmer’s grub.”81 The next year Spencer wrote of hunting “up in the bush” and bringing home “a good dinner which consisted of five rabbits and one wild boar … It’s great fun”.82 Their colloquial language, hardy attitudes, and humour, highlight the aspects of their upbringing at the Homes that assisted their immersion into rural life.

These traits were illustrated by photographs of the men printed alongside their letters. In 1927, Spencer sent a photograph of four Kalimpong men fishing on the Hutt River. Like other photographs supplied by the men in this period, the image was a marked departure from earlier portraits that featured impeccably groomed individuals, posing seated in indoor studios. Photographs of the 1920s men were taken in groups, outdoors, in casual dress and relaxed poses which gestured towards their manual labour. Some sat astride horses. In one image Spencer reclines on a cane armchair on the porch of a small wooden hut, with a small dog in his arms, sleeves rolled up to his elbows and a large grin on his face. Kneeling beside him is another Kalimpong man (Horace Brooks) similarly dressed, sleeves rolled up, with one hand resting on a working dog. Rural landscapes were visible and often dominant, and the trappings of rural life were demonstrably integrated into their everyday lives. The open identification with rural labour marked by the publication of these photographs in the Homes Magazine suggests that there had been a marked shift in the stigma around farm labour in India that had been a notable preoccupation of articles printed in the 1910s.
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Unemployment began to impinge upon immigration policy from 1926.\textsuperscript{83} This had consequences for the continuance of the Homes scheme to New Zealand and the daily lives of the young men already placed there. Roland Spencer wrote of a recent drought, and that he was “trying to get jobs for a new batch of Kalimpong boys … I have hunted up and down to secure jobs but alas!”\textsuperscript{84} If they were in the country, Spencer believed, “we would easily lump them into work but the difficulty is to keep a job open till they come out”.\textsuperscript{85} The fluctuating fortunes of agriculture due to environmental and economic conditions, combined with the time lag between training and emigration, meant that farm work was always less secure than its domestic equivalent. Horace Brooks described his employer’s efforts to “secure billets for our boys who are ready for emigration” and his approach to “Government Officials with a view to [securing] permits and commending Kalimpong boys to other farmers”.\textsuperscript{86} Attempts by employers and emigrants to source new placements met negative responses as unemployment became a significant social problem, and one that Graham’s connections to the Immigration Department could not overcome.

The 1928 edition of the \textit{Homes Magazine} carried the first report of Kalimpong men working as “foresters”, a role that was particular to the North Island. Clarence Bayley wrote that there were five Kalimpong men living in a “Forest Camp” at Putaruru in the central North Island.\textsuperscript{87} The men resorted to this work due to the difficulty of finding and retaining steady employment on farms, and it represented a marked departure from the notion of being “billeted” with farming families. The forest workers reported again in 1929 on the work that many Kalimpong men were now engaged in. Emphasising the strenuous and seasonal nature of the labour, Bayley described the working and living conditions:

The men camp in tents and assemble at the mess house for meals (breakfast and dinner) ... It is a far better paid job than farming, but as it is not a permanent job one does not fancy it much. The majority of those employed are Maoris and I must say they \textit{can} plant. Most of them could plant three to four thousand a day if they really wanted to. I thought I was pretty good.
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when I passed the test (800 plants a day), but I soon stayed cool when I
heard the foreman recounting the tallies for the day.88

Living in “camps” and eating in a “mess house” was surely a long way from Graham’s vision
of the stabilising influence of rural Presbyterian families. Bayley’s description of working
with Māori calls to mind David Roediger’s assertion that the “world of work” taught new
immigrants in the United States the importance of being “not black” and “exposed them to
frequent comparisons to African Americans and at times to close competition with them”.89
In New Zealand, Māori had played a crucial role in itinerant rural work since the late
nineteenth century.90 The number of Māori employed in forestry fell significantly between
1926 and 1936, which may explain the apparent competitiveness among the workers.91

Though not mentioned in the *Homes Magazine*, forestry work would also have
brought the men into contact with “gangs” of Indian settlers employed in this industry. While
W. H. McLeod argues that Punjabi men preferred this kind of work because it was remote
from white New Zealanders, whom he suggests were unwilling to do it, Jacqueline Leckie
found evidence that it provided relatively lucrative and enjoyable work, which occasionally
saw Punjabis labouring alongside Māori and Pakeha gangs.92 The key difference here is that
while Māori and Indian workers were historically engaged in this type of employment and
then pushed *out* (by white men) as unemployment grew, the Kalimpong men were pushed *into*
this type of work as opportunities for steady employment declined. These economic forces
are highly suggestive of the Kalimpong men’s place in racial hierarchies – that is, their
inclusion with the white majority, albeit at a lower working class level. Fergus Gammie was
blunt in his assessment of this temporary work, bemoaning the required mobility:

> I am such a wandering Jew; half the time I don’t know where I am. I am on
> these jobs that last for a few months, then I go to another. It’s like that all
> the time. Most of the last three years I have been in this forest planting pine
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trees. … It’s a terrible place this New Zealand for work at present; of course it has been bad for several years. It seems to be getting worse … 93

These increasingly negative reports by the men were printed directly alongside bright accounts by their female counterparts, which had titles like “Marriage Bells” and “Making Homes of Their Own”. Recent women emigrants wrote of their employers’ “delightful” homes in seaside suburbs in Wellington and did not refer to difficulties securing or retaining employment. Overall, however, the new arrivals (men and women) enjoyed a high degree of social contact with each other. While such contact attests to a strengthening of the community, and a burgeoning visibility, it also raises the question of their willingness, or ability, to socialise and integrate with “colonials”, as Miss MacFarlane suggested in her 1920 report. Both the single men and the single women had limited time away from their work duties and hence limited time for social activities. Their letters suggest that the majority of this time was spent with fellow graduates of the Homes. Marriage, therefore, came to be regarded as an important means of realising full social integration for both men and women.

Case Studies

Numerous children of the tea plantation families introduced in Chapter One arrived in New Zealand in the 1920s. 94 Their Homes personal files enable a deeper examination of the dynamics of social integration described above. The files each contain correspondence from the emigrants to the Homes upon arrival, representing another major nub in the archival structure of the Kalimpong life narratives. The letters include many observations that were not published, and the marking out of some paragraphs for inclusion in the Homes Magazine evidences the workings of that selection process. This phase of correspondence illuminates the less visible difficulties of adjusting to daily life in New Zealand, which involved not only their encounters as they transitioned to a new social world, but also finding their places within the local Kalimpong community and their widely dispersed families. Their correspondence with Graham and Purdie lessened as they found their feet, but contact with the Homes was
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often retained to connect with siblings and parents. The 1920s correspondence from the emigrants thus further reveals the complex workings of interracial empire families.

Dora Moller, the eldest of the Moller children, spent time on the plantation before leaving for New Zealand in 1920. Her brother Charles turned down the opportunity for some unspecified reason, which he later wrote was a “foolish idea”.95 By late 1921 Charles had changed his mind and wrote monthly letters for the next two years imploring the Homes to assist his emigration. Caught in the period between 1921 and 1923 when uncertainties over the new permit system meant that no Homes graduates entered the Dominion, he spent those years working for the railways in various parts of India. Charles’ correspondence indicated a high level of awareness of the racial, political and economic issues that fuelled debate over immigration rules. He read and gave his interpretation of the 1920 IRAA to Graham, and was aware that he would need to work through Homes channels to secure a permit and to emigrate.96 Charles relayed information from his sister Dora, who told him that her employers, the Maunsells of Dunedin, would be willing to take responsibility for him.97 Charles eventually gained passage alongside, though not officially a part of, the group of five women who arrived in 1928. Dora was at the port in Wellington to meet him.98

The first correspondence from Dora in the Moller file was written in 1925, by which time she had been away from the Maunsells for two years and had evidently been highly mobile. “I don’t know where I have not been and seen since I’ve left them”, she wrote from central Otago. “I’ll be here only till Easter, am going to the Lakes near Queenstown. I’m going to be working with an old couple as a companion help.”99 Along with a friend she was hoping to take up business: “We are going to have fruits, sweets and tea, so when you happen to come out to New Zealand you will have to come and have afternoon tea at our place.”100

95 Charles Moller to James Purdie, 2 August 1922, Moller file, Dr Graham’s Homes Archive (DGHA), Kalimpong.
96 Charles Moller to John Graham, 21 January 1922, Moller file, DGHA.
97 Charles Moller to John Graham, 14 July 1922; Charles Moller to James Purdie, 2 August 1922, Moller file, DGHA.
99 Dora Moller to James Purdie, 8 March 1925, Moller file, DGHA.
100 Ibid.
Dora’s letter gives a quite different impression to the *Homes Magazine* accounts of young women stable in either their employer’s or their own homes. Over the next three years she wrote several letters from the Jenkins’ “homestead”, the elderly couple that she had referred to earlier. Dora wrote of her desire to visit Kalimpong again, relaying a conversation on the subject with her employers which conjures an intimate domestic scene and indicates the importance of even minor Indian connections with these host families:

> Mr and Mrs Jenkins and I were just talking about sea trips. Mrs Jenkins doesn’t think she would like the sea, Mr Jenkins thinks that a sea trip is not bad at all. Mr Jenkins has a great desire to see India. I told him if he ever took a trip to India not to forget to call at Kalimpong. He was at Bombay on his way to the front during the war. I love Mr and Mrs Jenkins, they are just like a father and mother to me.\(^{101}\)

Letters from Charles and Dora expressed their continued emotional investment with their dispersed family. Each requested photographs and updates on the progress of their two siblings still at the Homes, and took an interest in whether they would be sent to New Zealand. Neither Charles nor Dora ever received any correspondence from their father after leaving India, which caused great confusion and frustration. “I cannot understand why father should treat us like this”, Charles wrote to Graham in 1921, “and also it is so strange that you should not know as to his whereabouts knowing he has left you in charge of his children, his flesh and body.”\(^{102}\) Charles’ implication of the Homes in his father’s behaviour raised the sensitive issue of the continued responsibility of the institution, which continues to the present day. Many graduates and their descendants have looked to the Homes as a first point of reconnecting broken families and a disrupted heritage. Charles insisted that Graham should assist he and Dora in their efforts to force their father to communicate with them, describing himself and his siblings as “unfortunate God’s creations”\(^{103}\). Dora wrote to the Homes in 1929 describing her hurt over their father’s abandonment of them, after learning that two Kalimpong women in New Zealand were to be visited by their father:

> By the way is my father still alive? I have written to him several times but I’ve had no reply yet. I wrote to him four months ago telling him of my
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intentions [to be married], even then I have had no reply. Mr Purdie can you explain to me why he does not write to us? I feel terribly hurt about it. When he said goodbye to me, he promised faithfully that he would write to me, and here I have been in New Zealand over eight years and I’ve had not even a line from him. I think he is evil.  

Paul Moller had continued to correspond with the Graham, mostly about practical matters such as fees for the children still at the Homes, but he did enquire about Charles and Dora. He had received their letters and told Graham that he was glad to hear of their progress. The impression from Charles’ and Dora’s letters is that Graham denied knowledge of his whereabouts, or at least refused to act on their behalf in ascertaining his circumstances or the reasons for his silence. The scenario points to the delicacy of these familial arrangements which had been permanently altered by the physical and bureaucratic intrusion of the institution. With two of his children at the Homes, and a planter who paid the bills on time, Graham and Purdie would be reluctant to upset Moller. The systematic filing of all such correspondence demonstrated the way in which deeply personal matters were integrated into the Homes bureaucratic management of these families. The letters were stored flat in the “file” with the graduate’s student number written at the top of the page; notes were written between staff about how to deal with the enquiry and the date of reply was recorded. The practice of interleaving the letters of what was essentially a blind conversation has left a vivid paper trail of the Homes disruptive influence. While retention of the files has facilitated otherwise impossible family reconnections many years later, their contents also lay bare the active part the Homes played in prising and keeping families apart in the first place.

After all his imaginings of a better future, Charles was initially disappointed with the situations he encountered in the North Island of New Zealand. Upon learning of his younger sister Elizabeth’s impending emigration in 1928, he wrote to the Homes to dissuade them from sending her, stating that he and Dora were “absolutely helpless as far as assisting her goes.” The “Colour Distinction”, he wrote “is worse here than in India, and we are all
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treated as “oh! only half-castes”, or Indians.”107 Charles had encouraged Dora to leave her domestic employment as the wages were too low, stating that “after all, we are not working for a name, but for wages – and will go where we are offered more wages”.108 In effect he pulled his sister into a male mindset regarding the labour market. While the women wrote of respectful treatment and inclusion in family routines as the markers of a good domestic situation, the men explicitly sought the fairest combination of work output and financial reward. Dissatisfied also with his own situation, Charles convinced Dora to combine their savings and initiate the process of opening a confectionary shop in Auckland. It was only through assistance from A. W. Blair (the former Wellington barrister, by then a judge in Auckland) that they gained consent to lease their desired premises. Despite accruing enough capital to start a business, the Mollers were reliant upon the support of the Homes network to branch out from the employment into which they had been placed. Presumably this plan did not eventuate as Dora was back with the Jenkins’ the following year.

A copy of Graham’s reply to Charles’ pessimistic letter was stored in the Moller file. Graham wrote that “in the same mail I had several other letters and I think in almost all cases the outlook was completely different”.109 He suggested Charles was being too sensitive about the “colour bar” and needed to adopt a hardier approach to racial prejudice, which was merely evidence of ignorance and would be encountered anywhere. Graham offered evidence of his belief that “New Zealand offers for the future a very much superior chance to India” by informing Charles that “a Maori has just been appointed a Bishop” and that in 1909 “one who was of mixed race was acting as Premier of the Colony”.110 As for Elizabeth, the younger sister, Graham advised that their father was strongly in favour of her emigration – further evidence of ongoing contact with Paul Moller. The following year a more upbeat Charles wrote to Graham expressing optimism about his future and real hopes of eventually owning a farm. He offered suggestions about how to better equip the boys for farm work and provided information (as requested by Graham) about forestry work. This letter was the first of Charles’ from which an excerpt was printed in the Homes Magazine.

107 Ibid.
108 Ibid.
109 John Graham to Charles Moller, 24 August 1928, Moller file, DGHA.
110 Ibid.
Emigration to New Zealand had the opposite effect for the Peters’ family as it did for the Mollers. After more than a decade of refusing to have any direct communication with his children, Egerton Peters wrote to the Homes within weeks of their departure from India, asking for an address for them at their destination.\footnote{Egerton Peters to John Graham, 18 January 1921, Peters file, DGHA.} For Peters, their settlement in a distant colony paved the way for re-establishing a relationship with them. The Homes, however, still played a role in managing the physical and social distances that separated them. Upon receipt of a letter from Lorna which described difficulties with her work, Peters wrote to Graham on her behalf, and later gave updates of her favourable progress.\footnote{Egerton Peters to John Graham, [undated] c. October 1921, Peters file, DGHA.} George, on the other hand, apparently needed “a strong hard hand over him”, and his father felt that “some hardship will do him a lot of good”. Peters continued to correspond with the Homes regarding his third child Alice who was still in residence there.

Alice emigrated in 1926, soon after Peters himself travelled to New Zealand. As outlined in the introduction to this thesis, Peters purchased the farmlet in Pine Hill where he planned to run a poultry farm. Both daughters lived with him initially, but Alice only stayed at Pine Hill for one year before taking up a domestic position with a family north of Dunedin. George and Alice each wrote letters to Graham in the 1920s describing their enjoyment of working in rural Otago. Both were published in the Homes Magazine.\footnote{Winkie (Alice) Peters, “Daylight Saving Bill and Cow’s Tails”, SACHM 28, no. 3/4 (1928): 44; George Peters, “New Zealand Shepherd”, SACHM 30, no. 3/4 (1930): 45.} In 1927 Egerton Peters replied to a letter from James Purdie asking whether he could offer employment for Kalimpong boys. Peters reluctantly informed Purdie that he could not “employ a hand, except for some team work to put in coops we do everything ourselves and a very hard life it is too. … Birdie and Alice are both well and great workers”.\footnote{Egerton Peters to James Purdie, 22 November 1927, Peters file, DGHA.} This was not the last time Peters would respond to such requests for assistance, either directly through employment or indirectly with information about economic conditions in the colony.

John Gammie retained regular contact with the Homes after his two eldest children were sent to New Zealand in 1925. This is not surprising considering he had five children at
the Homes. Gammie wrote several letters organising the emigration of Moira and Helen, who arrived together with the large 1926 group. The first letters in the file from his offspring were written by Betty, who told of her initial loneliness in Auckland where there were few other Kalimpong emigrants. She waited until this phase had passed before writing to Graham, expressing gratitude for her upbringing at the Homes and stating that although “when I first arrived I thought that I would never be happy … now I have changed my thoughts”. Fergus, whose report on forestry was included in the *Homes Magazine*, had written earlier of his first placement and the reasons that he and Richard Hawkins had left:

> At the time I was working for him, he only gave me £4 a month. At that we used to get up at 2.30 in the morning summer and winter. … You can see for yourself he was not paying us fairly. One would think it is good to stick to one master, but we cannot when he does not pay us the right amount. I’m getting £7-10 a month at present, and I might get more later on. We get up at 6 in the morning.\(^{116}\)

Fergus’ words and actions demonstrated a sense of duty to be a loyal and reliable employee, but like Charles Moller, he was also aware of his right to seek fairer conditions. Both men were exhibiting their socialization into an important aspect of rural masculinity and culture, namely the right to a “fair deal”, which Erik Olssen has argued was more important in the Dominion than its American equivalent of “freedom”.\(^{117}\) Their desire for better wages distanced them from the fear of cheap immigrant labour in the press debates noted earlier. Gammie and Moller also prioritised wage earnings over an outmoded and dependent relationship of landowner to labourer.\(^{118}\) Although Gammie was aware that it was precisely this traditional form that Graham hoped would support their adjustment to life on a rural “frontier”, the reality bore little resemblance to the musings of Graham and others in their search for solutions to the Anglo-Indian “problem”. Regardless of the suitability of these letters for inclusion in the *Homes Magazine*, they were an invaluable source of candid information for Graham about the developing situation in New Zealand.

---

\(^{115}\) Betty Gammie to John Graham, c. August 1925 [undated], Gammie file, DGHA.

\(^{116}\) Fergus Gammie to James Purdie, c. May 1926 [undated], Gammie file, DGHA.


The Spalding brothers were sent to New Zealand in close succession, Charles in 1925 and Tom in 1926. Charles wrote from a Te Awamutu farm one free afternoon, describing the celebration of Christmas Day and concluding that “I like New Zealand very much, hills all around us, some like Kalimpong and I like the farming too”.¹¹⁹ Both men wrote in upbeat tones, in letters that revealed a fascinating coexistence of social worlds. Their reminiscences of India informed and were remembered alongside life in the North Island, and they ended their letters with “best Salams” to the Homes. They worked in close proximity to each other, and socialised with the same Kalimpong men. Thomas wrote in 1927 of joining a hockey team with Richard Hawkins and Charlie Watson, and of their hope “to win the cup for Aka Aka”.¹²⁰ The Hawkins file contained no correspondence from the 1920s. Richard was an only child and retained contact with his father independently of the Homes.¹²¹ However Richard’s arrival in the same group as Charles Spalding saw him included in many of their letters. At one time Tom Spalding, Fergus Gammie and Richard were all working in Kaitaia in the far north of the North Island (see Figure 16). Tom and Richard were to remain lifelong friends, and their children were still in contact with each other some 90 years later.

The Mortimore siblings arrived together in the large group of late 1926. Rend wrote to James Purdie several weeks after arrival, having just started work near Wellington after “two weeks holiday” during which their placements were organised. This supports my contention that Blair’s influence with the Immigration Department had led to some loosening of the requirement to have such arrangements in place prior to the emigrants leaving India. “Mr Blair was going to send me to Auckland to work there”, Rend wrote, “but I told him that my sister was working in Wellington”. Arrangements were thus made for Rend to be placed locally.¹²² Jean wrote a long letter some months later of her placement in a Wellington suburb where she lived in a “sweet little cottage” and had an “awfully kind mistress”.¹²³ Like the Spalding brothers, Jean sent her “best salaams” to all at the Homes, and her letters reveal

¹¹⁹ Charles Spalding to John Graham, c. March 1926, Spalding file, DGHA.
¹²⁰ Thomas Spalding to John Graham, c. 1927 [undated], Spalding file, DGHA.
¹²¹ Personal communication with Pam Gardiner, Auckland, November 2011.
¹²² Rend Mortimore to James Purdie, 23 January 1927, Mortimore file, DGHA.
¹²³ Jean Mortimore to James Purdie, 3 March 1927, Mortimore file, DGHA.
vivid memories of her former life. Nostalgic thoughts of Kalimpong were intertwined with her descriptions of the scenery and climate of Wellington, and were also present in her daily tasks: “You should just see me doing shopping, not like how you do shopping in India. You see we have to carry our own parcels, no coolies to carry them for us.”

Interleaved with this correspondence from Jean and Rend were several letters from their mother, Nelly, written from Romai tea estate in Assam. She thanked the Homes for sending photographs of her children, but was dismayed that she had not received letters from either of them since their arrival in New Zealand. Nelly pleaded for the Homes to continue to assist her now that “Mrs R. Jones frm Cherrapungee is away to Wales” and she could “find no other [word illegible] who can help me in bringing my children and me closer together.”

Almost a year later Nelly wrote with the same complaint about the absence of direct correspondence with her children. In letters to the Homes written soon after this, both Rend and Jean referred to miscommunications with their mother after sending letters to her that she never received. Nelly’s letter is the closest glimpse afforded in the Homes files utilised in this study of the emigrants’ continuing presence in their mothers’ thoughts. Despite being relatively empowered by her literacy, Nelly existed, in fundamental ways, outside of the structured web of communication that might put her in direct contact with her children. Her dependence on the Homes to assist her, which the letters show they were doing, is another way in which the institution was embedded at the very centre of these transnational families:

Romai T.E.
P.O. Dikom
10th Feby 1928

I am very glad to know that both of my children are keeping good health, by god blessings, as the same attends me up here thank god. But, the thing is, I feel rather uneasy of having no news from my children, anyway I leave it to you, as I have nobody to do on my behalf but I hope that god will bring them back to me again. How long to see them, but god himself know the thing best. I am poor and helpless and I have no way to do a search them such everything I depend upon your honour as I know fully well that you will not fail to send my address to them.

124 Ibid.
125 Ka Ngelibou to St Andrew’s Colonial Homes, 14 March 1927, Mortimore file, DGHA.
Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the application of the IRAA to the Homes emigration scheme. In doing so, it has brought attention to the broader implementation of the permit system, which aside from being discussed as a means of excluding Chinese and Indian settlers has received little attention in New Zealand historiography. By linking the treatment of the Kalimpong emigrants under the permit system to Barrett and Roediger’s study of the integration of “new immigrants” into the white majority in the United States, I have not only illuminated the workings of the Homes scheme, but also signalled the need for further study of other “in-between” groups that migrated to New Zealand during this period. I have also presented strong evidence that Graham’s local connections put the applications of Anglo-Indians from the Homes above other prospective migrants from the same cultural group. The historic strategy of emigrating small numbers and dispersing them widely no doubt assisted claims that Homes graduates could be quietly absorbed into local communities.

Gender distinctions continued to structure the integration of the Kalimpong emigrants. Domestic service was accepted as a site of socialization and containment rather than a means of achieving upward mobility through work. Concurrently, marriage was identified by the Homes as the pathway to full social integration and advancement for the Kalimpong women. Although many of the men married in the 1920s, this was not reported in the Homes Magazine, nor is there any evidence that their newly established family homes became places for the emigrants old and new to gather. For the men, the legacy of war experiences and the encroaching economic depression were the dominant forces in this period. While in the preceding decade it was the male graduates who were more freely accepted into the colonial labour market, in the 1920s rural labour shortages disappeared and this led to a marked decline in the number of men sent relative to the women. Furthermore, the Homes Magazine reports demonstrated that despite being placed in employment upon arrival, many men soon joined the ranks of itinerant workers in the central North Island.

126 Ka Ngelibou to St Andrew’s Colonial Homes, 10 February 1928, Mortimore file, DGHA.
Family is the thread that brings together the range of sources and voices presented in this chapter. While Graham’s supporters were not directly related to the emigrants, his network of respectable families greatly assisted his navigation around the permit system. Charles Moller was aware of the need to (re-)attach himself to the Homes in order to secure a permit to enter New Zealand, and his connection to his sister Dora is very likely to have influenced Graham’s decision to assist him in doing so. Without being part of a group, Moller would have applied as a single male mixed-race migrant, very few of whom were permitted to enter New Zealand in the 1920s. Attachment to a place and an institution is another important consideration here, as the emigrants’ shared origins from a single specific location in India surely helped Graham’s cause. But the evidence presented here has also revealed the role of the Homes in Kalimpong, the stable central node in Graham’s network, in managing families that sprung from and continued to inhabit a diverse range of locations and circumstances in India, many of which now had lasting ties to New Zealand.
Table 5.1: Arrivals by Permit Date, 1920-1929

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Permit</th>
<th>Date of Arrival</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Number in Group</th>
<th>Men (n=)</th>
<th>Women (n=)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Jan 1920</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Oct 1920</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Jan 1921</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1922</td>
<td>Nov 1923</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1924</td>
<td>Feb 1925</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1925</td>
<td>Dec 1925</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1926</td>
<td>Dec 1926</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1927</td>
<td>Jan 1928</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Jan 1929</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total          |                |             | 73              | 33      | 40        |

(Source: Homes Magazine, Permanent Entry Record Books)
Figure 13: November 1925 Group to New Zealand
(Source: Slater family archive, Wellington)

Figure 14: November 1925 Group En Route to New Zealand
(Source: Kalimpong Album, Slater family archive, Wellington)
Figure 15: November 1926 Group to New Zealand
(Source: Gammie family archive, Hamilton)

Figure 16: Tom Spalding, Fergus Gammie and Richard Hawkins, c. 1930
(Source: Spalding family archive, Auckland)
NEW ZEALAND CUSTOMS.

PERMIT TO ENTER NEW ZEALAND
(Under the Immigration Restriction Amendment Act, 1920)

Permission is hereby granted to ___________________________________________, to enter New Zealand, accompanied by ___________________________________________.

provided that he/she can satisfy the Collector of Customs at the port of arrival that the particulars inserted hereunder concerning himself are correct.

1. Full name: ___________________________________________.
2. Last place of permanent residence: ___________________________________________.
3. Born at ___________________________________________.
   Of ___________________________________________.
   On the ______ day of __________, ______.
4. Marital state: ____________________________ (single, married, widowed or divorced)
5. Nationality: ___________________________________________.
6. Occupation or business to be undertaken in New Zealand, or purpose in coming to New Zealand: ___________________________________________.
7. The amount of money in English currency which is possessed by him/her on arrival is ___________________________.
8. That the condition of mental and physical health of himself/herself is ___________________________.
   and the condition of health of those accompanying him/her is ___________________________.
9. That he/she is a person of good character and reputation, who has never been in prison or in a mental hospital or the recipient of charitable aid, and that he/she is not a disaffected or dangerous person or one who advocates the overthrow by force or violence of constitutional Government.
10. That he/she is able to read and write fluently in the following language, namely: ___________________________.

Dated at Wellington, New Zealand, this ______ day of __________, 19____.

__________________________
Controller of Customs

[PLEASE SEE OVER]

Table 5.2: Blank Permit Form
(Source: Permanent entry permits to enter New Zealand, ANZ-W)
CHAPTER SIX
1930-1938: DOWNTURN, DECLINE AND DISCONTINUANCE

The final group of Homes graduates sent to New Zealand arrived in Wellington in 1938. Aside from this group, the 1930s was otherwise notable for the closing of the border to any new arrivals from the Homes. The debate around the desirability of the Kalimpong emigrants in the 1920s was silenced by the widespread and shocking impact of the global economic depression. The absence of any correspondence about permit applications in the Immigration Department files between 1930 and 1937 makes a compelling statement about the dominance of economic considerations in dictating immigration policy. The issue was reignited by Graham’s visit to the Dominion in 1937 and the consequent arrival of the 1938 group. This chapter begins and ends by examining the contents of the Immigration Department file on Anglo-Indians, which narrates the 1930s cycle that began with closing the border for economic reasons, was interrupted by a brief reconsideration of the Kalimpong scheme, and ended with the final halt to the scheme in 1939. This closure was justified on the grounds of excluding people of mixed descent, which represented a marked shift from earlier preoccupations with the social and economic absorption of Asian migrants.

In addition to economic downturn, this period was marked by the decline of British imperial power. The Dominions assumed greater autonomy in governance; and in non-settler colonies, nationalist movements that had made strident demands of Britain following the First World War continued to gain momentum. Indian nationalism had reached a degree of influence by the 1930s that meant the place of India in the British Empire was extremely uncertain. Any shift in power would impact the position of the Anglo-Indian community in India, which was of concern to both British and Indian officials.1 Such a change would also have immediate ramifications for Indian or Anglo-Indian migrants to New Zealand, who would no longer enter as British subjects. Economic depression and the indefinite removal of New Zealand as a destination made John Graham’s search for employment for Homes graduates even more difficult; and crucially, the uncertain future of India challenged the

institution’s very existence. These forces led to shifts in the relationship between Kalimpong and New Zealand that highlight the multiple levels at which Indian nationalism impacted other parts of the British Empire. To invoke Tony Ballantyne’s metaphor, the fragility of the Homes web of influence would be exposed should India gain independence and the central node of Kalimpong be lost. Graham’s public statements about India’s place in the British Empire in this period communicate his deep concern about this eventuality.

The Kalimpong emigrants’ later silences regarding their Indian heritage have led to speculation that they received a specific directive to be discrete about it. Graham’s 1937 visit would seem to contradict this possibility. He spent six weeks in New Zealand, with two aims in mind: to petition the government to allow emigration from the Homes to resume and to visit graduates already settled there. Graham visited Kalimpong emigrants in their homes and met their friends. He gave numerous press interviews throughout New Zealand and advertised his presence in local newspapers. He broadcast twice on National Radio and addressed schools, church groups, rotary clubs and a Women’s Temperance Union meeting. In his public appeals for the scheme to resume, Graham spoke candidly about those who had already emigrated, publicly naming individuals and employers. His personal diary of that trip, entitled “Pour Les Intimes”, recorded relatively candid assessments of those he met and provided a valuable snapshot of a large proportion of the community at one point in time. In his diary and in the many public accounts of his tour, there is no sense of a desire to conceal the emigrants’ Indian heritage nor the terms upon which they had entered the colony.

**Economic Depression and the Emigration Scheme**

In the 1920s the overarching concern of Immigration Department officials regulating Anglo-Indian immigration was a perceived threat to social and economic values in the Dominion. In the 1930s, with the possibility of economic absorption removed, the social concerns were no longer relevant. In other words, because there was no labour shortage, there was no need to debate the competing advantages of different marginal groups that might fill it. A memorandum in the Immigration Department file headed “Policy followed during the year 1931” offered evidence of the very limited number of permits granted during the economic depression. Permits were recorded for five categories: Chinese, Indians, Syrians,
Palestinians, and Other Race Aliens. No permits had been granted to Chinese applicants in 1931, noted as “the policy from the year 1926 onwards”.\footnote{Memorandum, 1931, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, National Archives New Zealand, Wellington Office (ANZ-W).} Regarding Indians, the memorandum cited the 1918 Imperial War Conference resolution that permits would only be granted to family of Indian residents. Eight women and 25 children were thus admitted, with the note that “since 1921 it has been the settled policy not to admit other Indians”. Similarly, only “close relatives” of Syrian residents were granted permits, which in 1931 meant one Syrian child. No permits were granted for Palestinians, as “no applications [were] received from wives or minor children of residents in the Dominion”.\footnote{Ibid.} Listing Palestinians despite the absence of any permit applications suggests that these were pre-existing categories. Anglo-Indians (referred to as “Eurasians”) were included in “Other Race Aliens”:

No permits for permanent admission 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.\footnote{Ibid.}

The 1931 memorandum is notable for the absence of any attention to the numbers of southern and eastern Europeans, who comprised the majority of successful permit applicants. This suggests that non-British European settlers were regarded at this time as “aliens” but not “race aliens”. The treatment of Chinese and Indians outside the general grouping of “Other Race Aliens” is attributable to historic migration by those communities to New Zealand, and testifies to the ad hoc development of immigration policy. The practice of regulating the flow of migrants according to labour requirements may have been economically and politically expedient, but it also created a legacy of familial separations and complex chain migrations. The separate and distinct treatment of Indians and Anglo-Indians as evidenced by this memo is also 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 in Chapter Five, 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 indeed in the 1940s when many sought to
emigrate in the wake of Indian Independence. It was, therefore, their “mixedness” rather than their “Indianness” that determined their inclusion in the “other race aliens” category.

The only letter in the Immigration Department file regarding Anglo-Indians between 1929 and 1937 was one that sought clarity about the citizenship status of a Homes graduate settled in New Zealand, regarding her right to leave and re-enter. The letter was written in 1932 by Mrs J. A. Tripe, the employer of a “Eurasian maid” from Kalimpong, who requested advice about taking the woman to England. Tripe asked whether she would be allowed to land and reside there, and “if she wished to come back to New Zealand, would she have a right to re-enter?”

This question of citizenship and mobility would be of ongoing concern to the Kalimpong emigrants. Descendants have understood their parent’s reluctance to leave New Zealand, or to apply for a passport, as a part of a lingering uncertainty over their citizenship status. This was of course a particular concern in the 1930s when Anglo-Indians were not permitted to enter. Stability in the Dominion can be read, as it was by Graham, as evidence of successful settlement, but it can also indicate a fear of not being allowed to return.

Tripe was advised that her “maid” would need to visit the Collector of Customs in person to apply for a Certificate of Registration, “which will authorise her to return to the Dominion within a period of four years”. In this directive, the Kalimpong woman was offered the same treatment as Indian residents at this time. The advice had the same non-committal overtones as that given to prospective emigrants in the 1920s – that they should make an application and await a decision. Rieko Karatani has noted similarly opaque processes in the application of restrictions in Britain, where unsuccessful applicants were not provided with any explanation of the authority’s decision, and no communication could be entered into. Addressing the question of admission to and living in England, the Under-
Secretary of the Department advised that upon landing, the emigrant would be subject to the laws of the United Kingdom and he was thus unable to advise Tripe whether her employee would be allowed to reside there permanently. The permit register contains no record of this Kalimpong woman returning to New Zealand in the 1930s and one assumes that the uncertainty over her re-entry saw her take up employment in another household.

The halt to the emigration scheme in 1929 significantly weakened the threads connecting Kalimpong and New Zealand. This was evident in the significant reduction of content regarding those living abroad in the 1930s editions of the *Homes Magazine*. This sudden change could indicate several things. Firstly, it suggests that printing the emigrants’ excerpts was as much about publicising the scheme as providing support for those settled at a distance from Kalimpong. Secondly, in terms of source material, there were no eager new arrivals to write frequent letters in that initial lonely phase of settlement, and little positive news for others to report. Thirdly, financial tightening may have reduced the size of the 1930s editions. In 1931, for the first time, no issues of the *Homes Magazine* were published. This was possibly attributable to Graham’s absence from Kalimpong in that year (discussed below), but may also have reflected a lack of funding. The *Homes Magazine* was circulated free of charge and therefore did not directly generate income. Finally, the scarce mention of New Zealand surely suggests the declining relevance of the Dominion to Indian interests, and vice versa. The shifting dynamics of the British Empire affected the audience and circulation of this vehicle of imperial fundraising, and this was reflected in its content.

Changing priorities at the Homes were evidenced more directly by Graham’s activities in the 1930s. In 1931 he was appointed Moderator of the Church of Scotland, which saw him spend eight months away from Kalimpong. One of the topics he often spoke of during his tenure in Britain was unrest in India as the nationalist movement gained momentum.\(^9\) Looking ahead to the possibility of an independent India, he encouraged a more “harmonious” relationship between Indians and Anglo-Indians as a necessary and desirable means of achieving local integration in India for his graduates. Late in 1934 Graham delivered a lecture to the Royal Society of Arts in London entitled “The Education of the Anglo-Indian

“Child” which reiterated this concern. Appealing for both British and Indian support, Graham apologised to Indian audiences for the Anglo-Indian tendency to act with “partiality towards their Western kin”. He concluded the paper by appealing to Anglo-Indians to cooperate with the Indian community and “respond with alacrity to every gesture they make”. James Minto traced these sentiments to a speech Graham gave to the Calcutta Committee of the Homes in 1921, in which he stated that:

One of the best lessons we can teach the youth of the domiciled community of our schools is to be proud of their motherland … An undoubted weakness of the domiciled community in the past has been in cherishing too often the thought that because of blood relationship with the paramount Power, they were entitled to special privileges. At the Homes we have sought from the beginning to emphasise the thought of the brotherhood of the people of India.

The Homes, of course, did no such thing. Even Minto, a great supporter of Graham’s, was bemused by these contradictions and pointed out that the Homes was established with the express intention of turning the children’s heads entirely away from their Indian heritage, and wherever possible, away from a future in India. While Graham had previously spoken positively to Indian audiences about placement in India, his suggestion that Anglo-Indians might be integrated into an Indian “brotherhood” demonstrated a heightened concern for the fate of the community if independence was achieved and incorporation into existing British structures ceased. By the mid 1930s, with some years having passed since the last group was emigrated and with India’s withdrawal from Empire looking likely, this rhetoric assumed a more prominent and urgent place in Graham’s thinking. It was in this frame of mind that he returned to New Zealand in 1937, with the hope of finding an improved economic outlook that would aid his call for the emigration scheme to resume. At 75 years of age, Graham knew that this would be his last opportunity to meet his former students and to reflect on the successes and failures of his original vision.

11 Ibid., 40.
12 Ibid., 41.
13 Minto, Graham of Kalimpong, 120.
14 Ibid., 120-121.
“Pour Les Intimes”: The Associates

Graham’s 1937 visit, like his first trip to New Zealand, was prompted by health concerns. This was to be a more extensive “world tour”, however, including six weeks in New Zealand. Graham’s diary illuminated the network of supporters that had grown in number and geographical spread since his 1909 visit. He was accommodated by associates in every centre except Auckland, and the transport they provided enabled his excursions to visit individuals. Graham’s itinerary is represented in Table 6.1 and Figure 17. He arrived in Auckland at 6.30am on 28 June, spending the day there before taking the evening train to Wellington. After a week there he crossed Cook Strait and spent four days in Marlborough. From there Graham took the bus to Christchurch and stayed for two days before travelling south to Dunedin, where he was based for ten days, making day trips to rural Southland and Otago. He took the train back to Christchurch on 21 July, where he spent two days before taking the ferry to Wellington. Three days later, Graham bid farewell to his biggest community of supporters and embarked on a ten day tour around the central North Island, during which he was driven almost 1000 miles by a Homes associate. He arrived back in Auckland on 6 August, where for the first time in six weeks of touring he stayed in a hotel rather than private accommodation. Graham departed from Auckland four days later.

Graham’s diary answers the question of the (unofficial) involvement of the Presbyterian Church in the emigration scheme. In Wellington, he was met at the train station by an elderly Presbyterian minister, “dear old Rev J.H. MacKenzie”. He stayed with the MacKenzies for a week and met many members of the local Presbyterian community. MacKenzie arranged for him to stay with his extended family in Nelson. In Christchurch, it had been pre-arranged that “Mr Armour, the minister of Knox Church, was to be my host.” Graham stayed with the Armours and was transported by them to church meetings and to visit Kalimpong emigrants. They also arranged a reunion on the evening of his return to Christchurch. In Dunedin, Graham stayed with a Homes graduate, George Langmore, but was otherwise hosted by the Presbyterian Church. He was driven by Dr Dickie of Knox (theological) College to two institutions run by the local Presbyterian Services Support
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Association (Ross Home for the elderly and the Glendinning Cottage Homes), addressed meetings at Knox College, and conducted services at two Presbyterian churches. On a day trip to Gore he was hosted by the local Presbyterian minister, Mr Barton, who organised a missionary meeting and gave a detailed account of the two Kalimpong women settled there, before putting on an afternoon tea for Kalimpong settlers and their families. Auckland was the only place where Graham did not record meeting with the Presbyterian community, but local newspapers reported that he was entertained by the Presbytery and delivered two sermons there in the days before he departed New Zealand.17

The second important constituent group of this local network was ex-India settlers. Graham’s diary provided a unique glimpse of this community in 1930s New Zealand.18 Of the 65 associates Graham mentioned in his diary, at least 20 had stated connections to India. Four were ex-planter, five were related to missionaries in India, another four had previously worked in the medical field there, one was ex-army and another was on furlough from working on the Indian railways. One of the teachers at Waitaki Boys School in Oamaru had stayed at the Homes in Kalimpong on a climbing expedition. Some Graham met by chance and saw opportunities for future assistance. While visiting tourist attractions in Rotorua, for example, he met an “old retired planter from Kandy, Ceylon, WWAT Murray, 84 years of age, came here for health, with a programme of 2 years more globetrotting”.19 Graham found many points of contact through him “with people in Ceylon, South India and Jersey”. Murray was a friend of Sir Herbert Newbiggin, who Graham had hoped to meet but had missed by a few days. Graham left a message for Newbiggin with Murray.

Others who had connections to India heard of Graham’s visit and sought him out. In Nelson, Mr Anderson-Smith heard Graham’s first radio broadcast and arranged to meet him.

17 “Notes in Passing”, 14 August 1937, Auckland Star.
18 Aside from James Beattie’s attention to the community in Nelson, little scholarly attention has been paid to British settlers who arrived in the Dominion via non-settler colonies. This is unsurprising given that their entry into New Zealand did not require any differential treatment from settlers who came directly from Britain; it was however a decidedly different path and one that is worthy of future research. James Beattie, Empire and Environmental Anxiety: Health, Science, Art and Conservation, 1800-1920 (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 59.
19 DGD 1937, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:8:2, NLS, 45.
Anderson-Smith was a tea planter in Assam for 22 years and his family in Glasgow had employed a Homes graduate. Anderson-Smith “filled up and corrected a number of particulars in the story” of this graduate’s admission to the Homes. Another who contacted Graham was the former Health Commissioner of Bengal, who had visited Kalimpong in 1907. After working on a number of tea estates in Ceylon, this visitor (who had the distinction of being the only person Graham recorded meeting but whose name he forgot) had settled in Auckland. Numerous associates were connected through both India and the church, and they were not exclusively Presbyterian. The Anglican Bishop of Wellington, who Graham found to be “most sympathetic” to the Homes scheme, had two brothers working as missionaries in India. In Dunedin, Dr North, who had employed Kalimpong women, was recorded by Graham as a former medical missionary with the Baptist church in East Bengal. The minister of the Lyttleton parish, Mr Stevenson, was related to an “aunty” at the Homes.

The contacts of greatest interest to Graham on this visit were those who were part of the political scene in Wellington and could potentially assist him in having emigration from the Homes to New Zealand resumed. Associates in Wellington arranged a lunch for Graham with the Governor General, Lord Galway, soon after he arrived there, and Galway advised Graham “whom to see on the subject” of emigration.20 This culminated with an appointment with the Acting Prime Minister, Peter Fraser, on Graham’s return to Wellington after touring the South Island. The meeting was set up by Charles White, a barrister and long time supporter of the scheme in Dunedin and Wellington, and he escorted Graham to the meeting. Graham later recorded his intentions for the visit in his diary:

My object was to get the Government of New Zealand to allow us to resume sending more boys and girls. I had a good argument to make in my experience of the OGBs in N.Z. Mr Fraser is the Minister of Education, a Presbyterian and a Scotsman. His wife too knows of the good service given by our girls. He was most sympathetic and asked me to send in a formal application which he could lay before his colleagues.21

Graham noted that some members of this first Labour government were held in suspicion by “the more conservative element. But Mr Fraser is not one of these. I found he had a

20 Ibid., 30.
21 Ibid., 40.
knowledge of India and many of the present Indian conditions. We are now certain of sending a batch in autumn.”

“Pour Les Intimes”: The Emigrants

In his final broadcast the day before he left New Zealand, Graham stated that of the 119 Kalimpong graduates settled there, he had “had personal contact with nearly all of them.” In his diary, he recorded meeting around 75 in person. Including those whom he heard news of but did not meet, the number is closer to 100. Graham referred to the men and women in similar numbers (49 women and 45 men); however he only actually met 27 of the 45 men named, compared to 48 of the 49 women. Thus he saw almost twice the number of women as men. This statistic reveals the persistently isolated and impermanent nature of the men’s work, and the relatively dense clustering of the women in urban centres. As Figure 17 illustrates, the majority of those Graham met were in the four main centres of Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin. Taking into account the men whom Graham did not meet, but whose locations he recorded, as well as those who travelled from rural areas to attend reunions in the city, the geographical gender differences were more notable. Table 6.2 shows a much broader dispersal of the men around the regions, a higher proportion of men in the South Island (38 per cent) than women (27 per cent), and a greater concentration of women in Wellington. This concentration was partly due to the fact that more women than men were sent in the 1920s, most of whom were placed in Wellington.

These geographical trends were reflected in attendance at social gatherings recorded by Graham. In Dunedin, the two get-togethers were held at the homes of Kalimpong men, one of which was specifically for the “Old Boys”; while in the North Island, the women hosted numerous dinners and social events, and attended the reunions in much higher numbers than the men. The first gathering in Wellington, at Rev MacKenzie’s home, was attended by 17 Kalimpong women and only one man. The “great party” upon Graham’s return to Wellington was hosted by the Didsbury family, who employed a Kalimpong woman. In the photograph taken to mark the occasion, there were 23 Kalimpong women and five men
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present (see Figure 18). Notable among the guests in the photograph was Janet Fraser, wife of the Acting Prime Minister and an active supporter of the women in Wellington. Another evening was held at the home of Mary Gibson (nee Ochterloney), a 1912 emigrant. In Auckland, Alice Stewart (nee Peters) hosted a “big gathering” which Graham found “so happy that I didn’t get to the hotel till 12.30am”. Graham noted his enjoyment of these functions in his final broadcast from Auckland:

No experience has given me a keener thrill of pleasure than to see – at the Re-unions we have had – the light-hearted, happy camaraderie and affection they have for each other. They have certainly imbibed much of the sense of humour, good-natured leg-pulling and vivacious banter so characteristic of New Zealanders. They have successfully dug themselves in to good purpose.

This comment gives an important insight into the nature of Graham’s assessment of his graduates’ integration. He noted a twin success, of full integration into the host community as evidenced by the traits they had “imbibed”, but at the same time the maintenance of strong bonds to their fellow settlers. While this continued contact with others from Kalimpong could be regarded as hampering their integration, Graham’s observation that they related to each other as “New Zealanders” (rather than Anglo-Indians) suggested that their transformation was complete. In his public broadcasts Graham emphasised the value of the emigrants’ labour and war service, but for the most part his private comments about their achievements were generated by satisfaction with their gendered socialization into domestic contentment, rather than their work or financial standing. He observed their situations through a discrete and detached paternalism, writing of the men as looking “manly” and “successful”, and taking pride in the women’s community and family involvement. For men and women alike, his most consistent accolade was for happy marriages and children with bright prospects.

Three of the unmarried women Graham met were working in employment other than domestic service (see Table 6.3). All three lived in Auckland. Evelyn Fullerton, the 1912 emigrant who was sent straight to nurses’ training, was a district nurse; Alison Gammie was working at the Presbyterian Girls Orphanage; and Alison Stuart was a dressmaker’s presser.
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All other unmarried women mentioned by Graham remained in domestic service. Eva Masson had been working for Mr and Mrs Green in Nelson for four years, and when Graham asked whether they were happy in the arrangement, all answered positively. “Eva is bright and full of fun,” Graham wrote, “ready to laugh on all occasions … She like all of them would talk about Kalimpong for a week.”

In Dunedin, Kate Sarkies was “a big success as a mother’s help”. Sarkies took Graham to see two former employers, both of whom were “devoted to her”. Graham made many observations about life in New Zealand, including the “democratic” family home. Even in the “best of homes”, he wrote in his diary, when the “help” had her day off “the mistress looks after the supper herself or with the help of the husbands.” Graham reiterated this point in an amusing and lengthy tribute to the “dinner wagon” in his Auckland broadcast, which repeated his persistent faith in New Zealand’s “simpler” social structure comprising values that matched the self-sufficiency of the Homes:

> It might be used as an all-New Zealand emblem and put on the corner of the National Flag. It is a time-save and its usage is not confined to the women’s sphere. The New Zealand man shares in domestic duties. This is not only applicable to poorer families – it is also true of those comparatively few who can afford to pay for help.

> Under the law of the land domestic helps have certain days and evenings off … and then mother has to take up the domestic’s duty in the kitchen and the husband pushes along the emblematic waggon, and even helps to wash up the dishes and clean the shoes. This all conduces to simpler and more real social relations.

Graham looked for these qualities in the homes of the Kalimpong women who were married. His reports were mostly positive. “Mary Ochterloney (Mrs Gibson)”, he wrote, “has a nice home with a good husband and three fine children”. Rose Duck (nee Cooper) was “also married, and looks like Mary, fairly stout. She too has a good husband who is a delicate man, and two daughters”. Molly Ireland’s (nee Roberts) husband was described by Graham “as a comedian, and everyone calls him Wally. He exercises his gifts in the interests of
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charities especially for poor children”.\textsuperscript{31} In Dunedin he “saw a great deal of Mary Pattison who got married lately to a Mr Robinson, a very nice well educated blonde New Zealander”. This was a telling statement about Graham’s keen approval of marriage partners who would help to erase from the next generation the skin colour that inscribed a legacy of racial difference upon the emigrants. Others had not fared so well as Mary. Graham described several women as having a “hard life”, which he variously attributed to poor choice of marriage partner, ill health, death of children, and the impact of the economic depression. In these cases Graham concluded with optimistic comments about better prospects ahead.

Marriage and family were also the focus of Graham’s visits to the men who were settled. Of the first four emigrants, Graham met three – Leonard Williams and Clarence Sinclair in Dunedin, and Eustace Boardman in Napier. He called first at Williams’ place of business, a “master’s tobacconist’s shop” on Stuart Street, in the centre of Dunedin city. Williams recognised Graham at once and gave him “an affectionate greeting”. He promised to attend “the party” with his wife and children, informing Graham that his brother Sydney was in Auckland working as the “Government Telegraph Master”.\textsuperscript{32} Graham then called on Clarence Sinclair, who was “more restrained in his welcome and didn’t even ask us in”\textsuperscript{33}. Graham’s explanation was that Sinclair had married a “keen Catholic”. Sinclair’s employment as a night watchman prevented him from attending any of the social functions. Williams on the other hand, not only attended the party but hosted the final gathering in Dunedin at his “delightful home”, which he shared with several in-laws who were “all well educated”. “Len’s boy promises to be a clever young man”, Graham added, noting that Williams added a “special gift” to the combined offering of the Dunedin community, “a walking stick with a silver label ‘J.A.G. from No.1’ – referring to his being the first of the emigrants”. The ease with which Graham located Williams and Sinclair, neither of whom had prior notice of his tour, attests to the continued functioning of the Kalimpong community in the south, despite having lain dormant for more than a decade.
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In Napier, Graham wrote a detailed entry on the fortunes of Eustace Boardman. Boardman was the emigrant who reported on life as a “rolling stone” in the early 1900s. He told Graham of the incident that ended his initial placement, which might be read as a clash of distinct colonial masculine types, as well as indicating Boardman’s apparently forthright personality. A foreman who was a “drunkard” disliked Boardman “because he spoke to him of his carelessness and drinking.”34 This eventually led to a physical altercation, where Boardman “struck him [the foreman] with a hoe and cut his face.” Boardman immediately “confessed” to his employer, advising him that he was leaving for another situation. Graham relayed the incident in his diary in order “to show what some of the early boys had to put up with”. He met Boardman and his family at Molly Ireland’s home. Though the family were “not so refined as the Irelands”, Graham found Boardman was “a well-built intelligent man who has done many different things”, including having his own business which had folded “during the slump following the earthquake”.35 Boardman’s current occupation – “doing odd jobs in connection with the shipping” – was of less concern to Graham than his family’s fortunes. One of his sons was working in the Woollen Mills and “his second who is a baker in Auckland was one of the best swimmers in the Hawkes Bay district”.36

The hardships Graham found among some of the returned servicemen were also balanced by positive assessments of their domestic happiness and the promise of improvement with the next generation. Some received state support, which Graham likely took as evidence of their treatment as “full citizens”. Historian Gwen Parsons has analysed the post-war benefits available to returned servicemen in New Zealand.37 Reading her findings with the Kalimpong men in mind, they seem to have been included and excluded on the same terms as others who fought for the NZEF. In Dunedin, Hamilton Melville was “much broken down” as a result of being “badly gassed in the war”, and suffered from “asthma and occasional fits”.38 But his wife was “such a nice woman”, Graham wrote, and “they have one fine boy”. Melville’s wife owned their “good house and garden” in
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Belleknowes, a hill suburb perched on the borders of the town belt. Melville was compensated for his war wounds and received “6s a week extra allowance because of the D.C.M.” He was using the extra allowance to pay off a radio, which Graham linked to him being “full of interest in world affairs and most intelligent”. In Dunedin, Graham also heard news of Edward Snelleksz, who was “badly disabled in the War”. His brother Wilfred hoped that Edward’s children, of whom there were six, “will be better off”.

Another who lived with the legacy of the war experience was Llewellyn Jones. Jones had a letter published in the Homes Magazine in 1930 describing his slow return to work after a long period of disability. By 1937 he was resigned to his inability to make an “independent living”. Graham visited him at Sunnyside mental institution in Christchurch, where he was a voluntary patient. Attesting to the psychological scars of battle, Graham noted that Jones could “leave any time he likes, but he doesn’t feel he could bear the strain of the outside world”. Jones was reportedly “delighted” to see Graham. A second Kalimpong inmate at Sunnyside did not recognise Graham and was a more serious case, having been confined to the institution permanently as a result of a criminal conviction. His mental illness was present prior to leaving India, Graham wrote, and was the reason that he had not served in the war. Graham’s conclusion that he was “one of the cases we should not have emigrated” signals his reluctance to find any negative outcome of the scheme itself.

Graham visited two other Kalimpong men in mental institutions, both in Wellington. One was “well behaved and helpful” but had “no hope of recovery”, while the other had suffered a nervous breakdown after a business failure and was soon to be released. Like the support extended to returned servicemen, the provision of these care facilities to those unable to make an “independent living” was suggestive of their eligibility for and inclusion within wider state services.

Gwen Parsons’ discussion of the tendency to attribute all ills post-war, to war, is relevant here. Graham only mentioned war service in cases where it had had a negative outcome and could be used to explain any difficulties the Kalimpong men were facing.

---
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Robert Ochterloney was an example of this. When Ochterloney failed to show at the arranged meeting point, Graham and his driver spent two hours searching the town, albeit “a small one”, and were about to give up “after telephoning up to the mines from which he came” when someone suggested they could find him at a certain hotel. Indeed they “found him in the bar!” Graham exclaimed. Ochterloney was living the lonely life of an unmarried gold-miner, and admitted to Graham that he had “gone back” after his promising start. Testimony to this effect was given by a local “gentleman” who knew Ochterloney well and remembered his former days as “a strong temperance man ... a fine worker on a farm, [and] a noted football player”. Reminding readers of his diary that he was “seriously wounded in the Great War”, Graham extracted promises from Ochterloney to “give up spirits”, write an account of his work as a miner for the *Homes Magazine*, and, notably, to write to his mother in Darjeeling. “I am sure that if all his friends help him he will change”, Graham concluded.

Most of the pre-1920s male emigrants had settled in Dunedin. Graham was hosted there by George Langmore, who had visited India in the 1920s. Graham was impressed by Langmore’s wife, two teenage daughters, and his “cement double-storied” home (See Figure 19). He mentioned the “soft carpets” that came from Glasgow, and that George named the house “Lopchu” after his father’s tea plantation – testament to the enduring transnational connections that the emigrants embodied and made tangible in their new homes. Graham’s conclusion that Langmore “must have done well” was characteristic of a degree of restraint in his enquiries. Langmore drove Graham around Dunedin locating “Old Boys” and arranging a social evening. Several of those who attended were returned servicemen, but given that they all “looked successful” Graham made no mention of their war service, nor their occupations. His report on Terence Buckley was typical of the concise assessments he made:

Terence is a particularly sweet affectionate and gentlemanly lad, doing well and with a little car of his own. He has the reputation of helping any O.B. [Old Boy] in need. He corresponds regularly with his brother in London. He is not married.  
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Of the 16 men whose occupation Graham did state, almost all of those who had arrived in the 1920s were engaged in rural labour (see Table 6.4). Contrastingly, only one of the earlier emigrants was employed in the rural sector, and he had his own farm rather than being an itinerant worker. The transience of the later arrivals affected their ability to meet with Graham. Some travelled long distances to meet him in urban centres. Others were included in a list compiled by Graham towards the end of his diary, which recorded those he had not met due to them being in an “isolated situation” or because their whereabouts was uncertain. Graham spent considerable time “tracking” several individuals, with limited success. His search for Donald McIntyre involved the greatest detour:

We started about 9am for Masterton to seek out Donald McIntyre who we had been told was working there. That meant going back towards Wellington for 85 miles … Alas we could not find Donald. The P.O. people said he had gone to Dannevirke, nearly a year ago but no one knew his address. So we went back over 85 miles to Dannevirke! We were no more successful there. But the Farmers’ Union Secretary was to send out that evening a circular to all the members asking if anyone knew about him. … [We] got back to Napier at nightfall … a journey in all of 252 miles.

While Graham stated in his Auckland broadcast that many of the men were still employed in the agricultural sector and that this was the appropriate entry point for them, it was quite apparent from his diary that the pathway to social integration and respectability for the Kalimpong men was found in urban employment and suburban family life. The one who did own a farm did not receive any special mention. Four of the married women, however, were involved in farming (Table 6.3). In Levin, Graham stopped for dinner with Mary Woodmass (nee Greig) and her family, who farmed 75 acres of land. A Kalimpong woman visited by Graham in Christchurch had married “a farmer boy” and was supported by a smaller holding. “They have five acres of land and make a living from the milk”, Graham noted. Lorna Peters was described by Graham as the “undoubted leader” of the poultry farm that she ran in partnership with her father, and Ellie Davenport ran a strawberry farm with her husband near Auckland. Farming was thus available to the women through marriage, and Graham’s diary confirmed that these enterprises were heavily reliant on their labour.

---
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Graham’s diary indirectly recorded the reunion of many siblings from the case study families who emigrated at different times. All three Gammie sisters attended the gathering at Alice Stewart’s (nee Peters) home in Auckland. Fergus was married with children “but lives at a distance and could not get away”.

Dora and Charles Moller were both married with children in Christchurch, which is interesting given Charles’ angst-ridden letters from India and in his early years in the North Island. The Mortimore siblings, Rend and Jeanette, were not mentioned in Graham’s diary but both were present in the photograph taken at the Wellington reunion. Although Egerton Peters’ arrival in New Zealand had initially been cause for family reconnection, this did not persist. When Graham visited Lorna on the poultry farm in Pine Hill, her brother George was not mentioned, and Alice was settled in Auckland. Although the Spalding brothers continued to have a very close relationship, they too were separated by distance at the time of Graham’s visit. Tom was in Kaitaia, north of Auckland, while Charles was in the reunion photograph taken in Wellington. (In fact Charles died suddenly, soon after Graham left New Zealand.) Richard Hawkins was also in Kaitaia. He made the journey south to Wellington to attend the reunion there, a return trip of 1200 miles, and again to Auckland, almost 400 miles return, for the final gathering.

The eagerness with which the emigrants met Graham in 1937 challenges the connection often drawn between their later silence and the trauma of family separations and prolonged institutionalisation. Lorna Peters, who never spoke of her upbringing at Kalimpong, hosted Graham for an afternoon at her home. While there is no evidence that the Peters family attended any of the gatherings in Dunedin, the fact that George Langmore took Graham to Lorna’s home suggests her continued association with the Kalimpong community. Graham christened Lorna’s first child and she kept his note of this in her Homes Bible. Richard Hawkins was another who refused to discuss his heritage with his family in later years, but as stated above he travelled huge distances to meet Graham. Among the photographs his children found in Richard’s collection was one of him bidding Graham farewell at the port in Auckland with other Kalimpong emigrants. Descendants of Peters and Hawkins have been surprised to learn of these meetings. Some older descendants remember Graham’s visit, particularly their parents’ anticipation of the event and emotive response to
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meeting him. In line with Graham’s own conduct during his tour, there was no sense of secretiveness or discretion in the emigrants’ public meetings and interactions with him.

**Legacies**

Graham’s aim in his public speaking engagements was to resume the emigration scheme. Initially he made his case chiefly around the future of the British Empire and the caution with which the Dominions should approach any actions that might be regarded as discriminatory against India. Graham’s intentional shaping of this rhetoric was revealed in his diary, where he noted the invitation to “broadcast to New Zealand” and promised to send a copy of the speech to his family in order to “show you my attitude in approaching the New Zealanders.” (While it was written in diary form, “Pour Les Intimes” reads as an open letter to his family.) Quoted in the *Evening Post* on 30 June, Graham argued that although British citizens entered India freely, Indians were subject to “unfair restrictions” when entering British territories. “If they were not careful,” Graham warned, “they would find that entry into India was also restricted.” Graham’s press interview in Dunedin repeated many of these sentiments, encouraging a sympathetic view of India as “the birthplace of leading religions and the home of deep philosophies … with a brilliant record of thinkers and scholars”. He also sought to educate New Zealanders about the plight of Anglo-Indians who had been wrongly treated as “step-children” rather than “our own kith and kin”.

Graham’s second broadcast was made from Auckland the day before he departed New Zealand. His message was less political and he spoke with a renewed confidence in colonial settlement for Anglo-Indians based on his experiences of the previous six weeks. Graham used his graduates’ labours and war service to claim that they had “fully approved themselves as good and helpful citizens” and their marriages to suggest that they were “taking a worthy share in all phases of the social organization”. As the government was reconsidering the policy of excluding “outside labour”, Graham asked that they consider allowing more Homes
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graduates to emigrate. Careful as always to note that there was no possibility of an influx of Anglo-Indians, Graham added that “we can only send a small number each year, for, although we have 610 children in residence in our settlement at Kalimpong, other openings are more feasible for the majority.” Appealing to local pride in New Zealand’s egalitarian reputation, Graham described the Dominion as “the best part of the Empire” in the quality of home-life, the lack of class distinction, and freedom from colour prejudice which the “presence of Maori has doubtless produced”.54 “In this matter of colour,” Graham lauded, “New Zealand is peculiarly fitted to become the teacher of the whole Empire.”55

Graham left New Zealand on the 10 August 1937. Seventeen “OGBs” were at the harbour to see him off. “They all had varied coloured streamers to which we hung on till they were broken by the steamer leaving the dock”, he wrote, “we all tried to keep our spirits up but I could see tears in many eyes and my own were not dry”. They continued to “signal to each other” until they could no longer make each other out. Graham’s final words as he sailed for the United States and Canada were that his “heart was sore to part with the children and with New Zealand”, and he “almost felt I wished I could stay there beside them”.56 In November the Evening Post carried a story of Graham’s account of his tour to an Edinburgh audience. Graham repeated his belief that “there is no colour prejudice in New Zealand”, and stated that the practice of “increasing the number of Anglo-Indians among other peoples” (presumably the white peoples of the settler colonies) should continue.57 Comparing the three Dominions he had visited, Graham described Canada as the “chief centre” of the British Empire, New Zealand as the “most British of the colonies” and the one which impressed him most, and Australia as “very friendly, except on the question of colour.”58

In September 1937 the Immigration Department logged an internal correspondence concerning an application received from Graham to send another group of emigrants from Kalimpong. Graham’s letter itself was not contained in the file. It was referred to in a letter
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from the Controller of Customs, E. D. Good, to the Minister of Customs regarding the meeting between Charles White, John Graham and Peter Fraser. The letter stated that Graham had recently traced those settled in New Zealand and found them “well established as worthy citizens of the Dominion”.\(^{59}\) 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.”\(^{60}\) 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”. While the department had no information about the scheme prior to 1922, Graham’s figure of 120 was repeated as the total number of emigrants up to that point, who were on average 18 years old when they arrived. He set the case out plainly for the minister:

> It seems to me that there are three main factors which require discussion before a decision is reached:
> (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.\(^{61}\)

In answer to his own questions, Good stated firstly 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”.\(^{62}\) Against this, however, he “venture[d] the opinion that it is open to question whether the importation of labour from other countries will provide a satisfactory solution of the problems raised by the present scarcity of labour, and I would not, on this score alone, recommend that a favourable consideration be given to Dr Graham’s request.” Good here was refining Graham’s simplification of the “labour shortage” as a problem that could be solved by filling it with marginalised adolescents in a mutually beneficial arrangement. If the scarcity of farm
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workers and domestic servants was caused by a local (white) reluctance to take on the lower echelons of work (rather than an under-supply of workers), did “importing” labour from other nations represent the best solution? Or was some other tinkering in the local labour market required? The issue of race is strongly implied in the phrase “imported labour”. It is difficult to imagine British immigrants being referred to in such terms.

The “racial question” was the one that Good found the “most difficult to dispose of”. Although he understood that some of Graham’s graduates were “almost completely European in outlook” and it was “no fault of their own that they are of mixed blood ... 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.” The statement harks back to the “obvious” problems of Asian immigration referred to, but not elaborated on, in the parliamentary debates cited in the first section of this chapter. It was significant also that the “problem” was “mixed blood” rather than Indian heritage, which weakened Graham’s appeals to colonial authorities to be sympathetic to India. Good added that it was necessary to bear in mind that being British subjects “it may be thought possible to relax the general rule to some extent”. The question was “really one of policy”, he continued, which could not “be regarded entirely on the same basis as (say) that of the immigration of Chinese.”

For this reason Good, in a very ambiguous “suggestion”, was hesitant to recommend declining Graham’s request; yet considered it “inadvisable at the present time to permit the entry of any large number of Eurasians”. He did not judge the shortage of labour to be permanent. 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. A week later he received a reply from the Minister and drafted a letter to Graham. The resulting letter, sent by Mark Fagan from the Minister’s office, advised 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

---
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Despite the refusal of his 1937 request, Graham remained confident of sending another group to New Zealand. The July 1938 edition of the *Homes Magazine* included an excerpt from a New Zealand publication, *The Listener*, regarding Anglo-Indians being “frozen out” of traditional occupations in India, after which the editor added “New Zealand doesn’t freeze them out”. Indeed permits were granted to one final group from the Homes, who arrived in November 1938. The conditions of their entry were temporary, as a note in the permit register fifteen months after their arrival stated that they were “now permitted to remain permanently”. Their arrival was reported in a New Zealand newspaper under the heading “Farm Workers: Eurasian Youths”. A photograph of the group was printed on the front cover of the December issue of the *Homes Magazine* (Figure 20). The same edition included an article entitled “A White Australia” by a church minister in Melbourne, who bemoaned the Australian immigration policy regarding Anglo-Indians:

> Since 1907 more than fifty young farmers have gone from the Homes to New Zealand, and have proved their value to the community, as the open door into New Zealand to-day proves. And Australia shuts them out. Meanwhile Italians, Germans, Jews, Austrians in great numbers are pouring into our shores. I am very thankful that they are … But why on earth bar the Anglo-Indians?

Early in 1939 the *Homes Magazine* reported that “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

---
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travelling from India then and who would be willing to guide them.” An article on the same page noted that “likely young Anglo-Indians” continued to “ask assistance to get to New Zealand”. This desire to make use of the pathway established by the Homes was no doubt sought out with increasing regularity as the situation in India worsened. They were advised to write to the Customs Department as the Homes could “only give financial assistance to our own pupils.” 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 been allowed to enter, it was not to be regarded as a precedent and the enquiry was to be refused in accordance with the “general policy” regarding Anglo-Indians.

The group that the Homes hoped to send to New Zealand in autumn was not granted permits. News of this rejection was reported in the Homes Magazine and picked up by the Evening Post in Auckland. Graham later 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”. The Evening Post story, sub-headed “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.” The article cited a statement from the Homes Magazine that “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.” Graham expressed a similarly emotive response, particularly regarding the rationale for refusal being the mixed-race designation, writing that “the assignation of these races seems absurd”. Restating his
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belief that most New Zealanders were a blend of Pakeha and Māori, Graham felt that they “should be the last to base their exclusion on such grounds as of mixed blood.”79

Conclusion

In the 1930s, the Homes Magazine column for those placed abroad and the correspondence contained in the Homes personal files quietened to a level that barely evidenced connections between Kalimpong and New Zealand. The family narratives followed in earlier chapters were not included here for the simple reason that their personal files contained very little correspondence in this period. Graham’s visit in 1937 reignited the local Kalimpong community, returned the issue of Anglo-Indian immigration to government attention, and filled the pages of the Homes Magazine once more with news of the New Zealanders. As this chapter has demonstrated, however, the resurgence was short-lived, ending with the refusal of the 1939 group. The Homes archive and the connections between New Zealand and Kalimpong were deeply aligned with the continuation of the scheme.

The reflective tone of Graham’s diary perhaps indicated his awareness that the road ahead would be a challenging one. It certainly inflected his stage of life, as an elderly man who knew that he would never see the New Zealanders again. His descriptions of the men and women whom he sent out in their youth are reminiscent of the tea planters’ earlier assessments of the young adults that the Homes moulded from their children. Upon Graham’s visit, it was the employers, in-laws and wider communities that he was grateful to for shaping his former charges into adult New Zealanders. Even in his private diary, Graham never attributed any negative aspects of the emigrants’ situations to the New Zealand social context. Negative situations were explained by pre-existing conditions, character flaws, war service, and economic depression – challenges that were beyond the control of the Homes and not unique to New Zealand. Nor was the strain of having siblings left in India ever acknowledged by Graham. As the next chapter will demonstrate, such concerns were raised during his tour.

79 Ibid.
Another absence in Graham’s commentary of his tour of New Zealand was the local Indian community. He spoke sympathetically of Indian culture, but not in a way that related it to New Zealand or New Zealanders in anything but the desire to keep India within the bounds of the British Empire. It was only on a superficial, political level that the Homes scheme was spoken of as connecting India to New Zealand. This was reinforced by Graham’s repetition of his claims subsequent to his 1909 visit that the emigrants showed no signs of wanting to return to India. The consequences of Graham’s focus on broad imperial connections would be felt in the years after his visit, when the stable presence of the Homes at the centre of the global Kalimpong network was to come under threat.
Table 6.1: Graham’s 1937 Tour of New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of arrival</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Mode of transport</th>
<th>Distance travelled (miles)</th>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 June</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellington region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 June</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marlborough region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 July</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 July</td>
<td>Blenheim</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 July</td>
<td>Picton</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>35 (return)</td>
<td>Day trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canterbury region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 July</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Otago/Southland region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 July</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>9 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 July</td>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>186 (return)</td>
<td>Day trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canterbury region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 July</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellington region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 July</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central North Island region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July</td>
<td>Dannevirke</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 July</td>
<td>Levin, Wanganui</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Day trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 July</td>
<td>Napier</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 July</td>
<td>Masterton</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>134 (return)</td>
<td>Day trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July</td>
<td>Havelock/Hastings</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>31 (return)</td>
<td>Day trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 July</td>
<td>Te Aute</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>62 (return)</td>
<td>Day trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 July</td>
<td>Te Urewera</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 August</td>
<td>Napier</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 August</td>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Motorcar</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>18 cities/towns</td>
<td></td>
<td>2715</td>
<td>43 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: “Pour Les Intimes”, Dr Graham’s Diary 1937)
Figure 17: Map of John Graham’s 1937 New Zealand Tour
(Source: “Pour Les Intimes”, Dr Graham’s Diary 1937)
Table 6.2: Locations of Emigrants Named in Graham’s 1937 Diary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaitaia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunterville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dannevirke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Island</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balclutha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Island</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: “Pour Les Intimes”, Dr Graham’s Diary 1937)
Table 6.3: Women’s Occupations by Year of Arrival (as per Graham’s diary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of Arrival</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Fullerton</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>District nurse</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mae Sinclair</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertie Plaistowe</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Sarkies</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Brown</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Edbrooke</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Greig</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Levin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna Peters</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Poultry farming</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Gollan</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Gammie</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Orphanage worker</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Masson</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Stuart</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Dressmaker’s presser</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Howie</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie Davenport</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Fruit farming</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: “Pour Les Intimes”, Dr Graham’s Diary 1937)

Table 6.4: Men’s Occupations by Year of Arrival (as per Graham’s Diary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of Arrival</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Williams</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Own business</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Williams</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Telegraph master</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustace Boardman</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarence Sinclair</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Night watchman</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Langmore</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Attendant</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ochterloney</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Gold miner</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Picton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Snelleksz</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>North Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Andrews</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Labourer – public works</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Balclutha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Snelleksz</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>South Canterbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Greig</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Muspratt</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Rotorua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hawkins</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>Kaitaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Watson</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Forester – public works</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Rotorua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Watson</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Forester – public works</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Rotorua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald McIntyre</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Farm labourer</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Dannevirke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Reid</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Civil service</td>
<td>Not recorded</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: “Pour Les Intimes”, Dr Graham’s Diary 1937)
Figure 18: Reunion at the Didsbury family home, Wellington, 1937.  
(Source: Gammie family archive, Wellington)

Figure 19: John Graham with George Langmore and Family, Dunedin, 1937.  
(Source: Langmore family archive, Hawke’s Bay)
Figure 20: November 1938 Group to New Zealand
(Source: Gammie family archive, Wellington)


CHAPTER SEVEN

ALTERNATE EMIGRATION AND PLACEMENT IN INDIA

James Halsey … is surprised to hear of so many boys working for themselves and says that “the sun that never sets on the British Empire now never sets on the Kalimpong Homes”, as their old boys are “scattered all over the world”. That is well and truly said, and the good luck that he wishes for us all, we all wish for him.¹

There are a series of questions that underpin attempts by Kalimpong emigrants’ families to make sense of the Homes scheme and its legacy. The question of what would have become of the children had they not been sent to the Homes was addressed in Chapter One, where I explored their diverse family circumstances and provided evidence of the possibility of absorption into their mothers’ families. John Graham would no doubt have pointed to the likelihood of abandonment by their fathers and subsequent destitution. That too was a possibility. More likely than either of these scenarios was the involvement of an institution – a school, orphanage or mission station – and direction into appropriate employment in India. This prompts the second question that is of interest to many Kalimpong descendants. What if their parent had not been sent to New Zealand? What would their life have been like if they were placed in India? Or elsewhere? Although Graham attempted to keep siblings together, this was not always possible, and contact between siblings made some descendants aware of the alternatives to their parent’s placement in New Zealand. But the decline of that contact in their parent’s later life – itself a site of distancing between Indian and New Zealand – has left these “alternate futures” as lingering unknowns.

This chapter addresses the question of placements other than in New Zealand, in the first instance using the Homes Magazine to provide a brief sketch of alternate destinations abroad and in India. An understanding of the Indian future cannot be gained simply by turning to previous studies of Anglo-Indian communities, because the Homes became known to turn out a particular type of graduate. Here I suggest that Graham’s preoccupation with “innovative” solutions, as evidenced by the emigration scheme, was also apparent in his

¹ “Indian News”, St Andrew’s Colonial Homes Magazine (SACHM) 14, no. 2 (1914): 29.
desire to place Homes graduates in new forms of employment in India, or at least in the upper echelons of Anglo-Indian hierarchies. Like emigration, these concerns impacted upon the education and training provided at Kalimpong. In addition, this chapter will demonstrate that those placed in India entered their employment with particular aspirations and feelings about India, which were influenced by their connections with friends and family in New Zealand. A rich understanding of these forces is afforded by the Homes personal files for the Moller and Gammie families, both of whom had siblings “left behind” in India in the 1930s. Correspondence between siblings in these families highlights the impact of Indian nationalism elsewhere in the British Empire – in this case keeping Indian perspectives current in the everyday lives of the New Zealand emigrants. In turn, emigration as a means of escaping growing political unrest was kept firmly in the minds of their siblings placed in India.

Indian nationalism culminated in India’s withdrawal from the British Empire in 1947, which consolidated a “spirit of emigration” as a central aspiration for Anglo-Indian people. Those who could, left; those who could not imagined and planned leaving. Ironically, while it remained a difficult task for Homes graduates to join their siblings in New Zealand, later changes to immigration policy in Australia saw large numbers of Anglo-Indians settle there. It is worth noting here the experiences of those who emigrated to Britain, the “shock” of which one Homes graduate later recalled in a short story entitled “England! Here We Come!”.

The opening passages of his story vividly convey the clash of a long-imagined, ingrained hope with unexpectedly bitter realities:

We first generation Anglo-Indian migrants felt a surge of excitement at leaving India in the 1940s and 1950s and coming “home” to England, a home we had never seen before. Only one thought filled our minds. “Thank goodness we are getting away from that smelly, dirty India and all the flies-chee! No having to learn Hindi now, boy! No danger of our children having to marry Indians!”

I don't know what sort of reception we expected to receive in England all those years ago. Perhaps we expected crowds of English people to be waiting at Tilbury docks or Southampton, ready to garland and smother us with hugs and kisses, and shrieking: “Welcome home! How lovely to see

you all again! Our own dear kith and kin!” The reality was somewhat different in those far-off days.

English people scrutinised our brown faces and tried to make sense of our flat, machine-gun chatter with clusters of sentences uttered in a single breath and unexpectedly ending in “no” or “men” – as in: “You're going out, no?” Or “What's the time, men?” … “Why have you Indians come to England?” some would ask curiously. “Why don't you go back to India?” Calling an Anglo-Indian an “Indian” in those bygone days was like calling Enoch Powell black! It made Anglo-Indians furious!

We were stunned. In India, the English knew only too well who we were and how we differed from the Indians.³

**Placement Abroad**

There is currently no publicly accessible source that gives exact, or even approximate, numbers of graduates from the Homes in Kalimpong and where they were placed. The admission books at the Homes do contain this information for each student, but they are only made available to family seeking information about individuals. The only known compilations of numbers are sporadic reports in *The Statesman*, the *Homes Magazine*, and Simon Mainwaring’s *A Century of Children*. According to Mainwaring, of the 278 children who had left the Homes by 1914, 74 (27 per cent) had emigrated: 34 to New Zealand, 10 to Britain “often with parents”, and the other 30 to various locations including the United States, South Africa, Manila and Australia.⁴ By 1925, 500 pupils had left the Homes, 23 per cent of whom had gone to the colonies with the remainder placed in India. “To leave India was the greatest prize”, Mainwaring suggests, “and so only the privileged few made it.”⁵ Mainwaring found that the emigrants were mostly the children of tea planters, or those who “found favour with a certain member of staff” who facilitated their emigration.⁶

The first mention in the *Homes Magazine* of emigrants being sent to destinations other than New Zealand were three graduates who went to the United States with a Mr and Mrs Brown, who had been involved in training on the Homes farm. The Browns had decided to
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settle as “agriculturalists in Virginia”, and took a female graduate with them in October 1908. They sent for her brother and “another lad” a month later.\textsuperscript{7} “It will be interesting to learn how those three do,” the \textit{Homes Magazine} article noted, “and if the result is satisfactory we may be able, through Mr Brown, to arrange for more to go to the United States.”\textsuperscript{8} This language of experimentation echoed that of the New Zealand scheme, and was also organised around farm work. In the United States, however, the scheme did not continue. The three who were sent there had frequent updates printed in the \textit{Homes Magazine}. One of the men reported in July 1911 that he had left Virginia and gone to New Jersey “because the wages [in farming] were very small”.\textsuperscript{9} His new work for an electrical firm earned $15 a week and this was to increase to $25 a week “as soon as I pass the Electric Wiring Examination”. Echoing the sentiments of their New Zealand counterparts, the United States emigrants were ambitious and prepared to move away from farm labour in order to advance their economic status. One emigrant later took up a transfer to Puerto Rico and another wrote of his intention to move to Canada.

No reports of Homes graduates being placed in South Africa or Canada have been found in the \textit{Homes Magazine}. Apart from New Zealand, Australia was the only other settler colonial destination for graduates. In 1914 Dorothy Marshall “accompanied Miss Houlston to Sydney” and was placed with a family there.\textsuperscript{10} She wrote, soon after arrival, of receiving ongoing support from Miss Houlston and another former Homes staff member. Graham sourced a large number of staff from Australia, who were part of the support network that assisted groups on their way to New Zealand. In 1924 two men wrote of working on farms in Australia. One was in South Australia, the other in an unstated location on a grain farm where he was carting hay and stripping oats.\textsuperscript{11} In 1928 Charles Flatman emigrated to Western Australia, where Michael Bishop was already settled on a farm and where Charles’ brother Lawrie would join him in 1930.\textsuperscript{12} The only other Australian emigrant recorded in the \textit{Homes Magazine} was Joan Copeland, who was placed on a sheep station in the “back country” of New South Wales for six months after initially working in Sydney. She described the “lonely
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\textsuperscript{10} “Leaving the Homes”, \textit{SACHM} 14, no. 1 (1914): 10.
\textsuperscript{11} “On the Land in Australia” and “Another Australian”, \textit{SACHM} 14, no. 1/2 (1924): 14.
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life” of a huge isolated station. Mainwaring suggests that Graham found graduates in Australia on his 1937 tour “either working on lonely stations and farms in the north, or in the cities of the south” and facing a more difficult battle than those in New Zealand.

In Britain, Graham’s extensive network of supporters facilitated the emigration of numerous young women, who discretely, and individually, accompanied Homes staff on their return to England and Scotland for leave or at the completion of their work at Kalimpong. British placement was distinct in that it was never part of the rhetoric of the Homes. Satoshi Mizutani made no mention of the women who settled in Britain. Graham’s stated aims did not include settling his graduates there, nor did he seek public support for it. Unlike his New Zealand supporters then, those in Britain were not asked to bring charity into their homes. Indeed the unwillingness, or inability, of planters to send their mixed-race offspring “home” for an education or to return with interracial families drove the establishment of the institution. The settlement of some graduates in Britain was perhaps an awkward exposure of the tea planters bowing to social pressures, rather than being limited by any legal barriers to their children’s entry. Lionel Caplan found anecdotal evidence that “better off” Anglo-Indians continued to “make their way” to Britain in the first half of the twentieth century, but there is a scarcity of documented numbers; and whether these immigrants were treated at the border as Indians, mixed-race British subjects, or “passed” for Europeans is not known. As Rudy Otter’s short story demonstrated earlier in this chapter, Anglo-Indians felt that they were treated as “Indians” in Britain. Shompa Lahiri found that many South Asians entered Britain in the 1920s and 1930s from “every layer of Indian society”.

From 1913, reports about Homes women who settled in Scotland, and later England, began to appear in the *Homes Magazine*. The first was Gwen Jones, one of the “original six”

---
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to be admitted to the Homes, who wrote of working as a nurse in the “Orphan Homes Hospital” in Scotland. In 1920 she was noted as a “distinguished student” at Edinburgh University, while two other women had just arrived in Edinburgh to take up nurses’ training. Several more began to report regularly from Scotland, but there was no explanation of how their emigration was facilitated. By July 1924 there were enough women to warrant a “Britain” section in the “For the Old Boys and Girls” pages. They wrote brightly from situations with families in Ealing, Henley, Surrey and South Devon, as well as London and Scotland. Under the sub-heading “Boys in Britain”, two male emigrants wrote that it was “very hard to get remunerative work” and the Honorary Treasurer in England added, “Life on this side is very hard for Homes Boys who have not got special qualifications ... and I think it would be well to discourage them from coming”.

The Homes also pursued seafaring as a career for its graduates. Young men placed in this role in Britain occupied an ill-defined space between leaving India and settlement abroad. In 1901 the Homes Magazine reported that men of British and European descent born in India were finally being allowed to enter a seafaring career on the same terms as British soldiers. Signalling Graham’s desire to place his graduates at the top of (or above) the Anglo-Indian hierarchy, this shift in attitudes raised hopes of the career becoming available to Homes graduates. Indeed six boys were sent to Hull for marine training onboard the Southampton in 1906. Mizutani noted that marine training was originally proposed by the 1891 Pauperism Committee as a solution to the Anglo-Indian problem, and was eventually realised by the Marine Society of India in the early 1900s. As Mizutani argues, it is noteworthy that the “overwhelming majority” of children sent to the “Southampton” between 1906 and 1908 (21 of 29 boys) were from the Homes. This was further evidence of Graham’s use of transnational networks to channel his graduates into overseas employment that was not
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otherwise available to Anglo-Indians. Early supporters of the Homes such as John Woodburn and Sir Andrew Frazer, both former Lieutenant Governors of Bengal, and James Luke, a businessman in Calcutta, were all closely connected to the Marine Society scheme.\textsuperscript{26}

Graham viewed a career in shipping with the same hopes of upward mobility as other occupations. In 1911 a “Marine Superintendent” wrote of one boy who was likely to “pass his examination for a 2\textsuperscript{nd} Officer … and the wages he receives would make him independent of his friends.”\textsuperscript{27} The results of Laura Tabili’s study, which set out the stark differences in employment conditions for “black seamen” and their white counterparts, suggest that the Homes graduates were placed into European roles.\textsuperscript{28} They wrote letters from a wide array of global destinations, excerpts of which were published in an “Our Sailors” section in the \textit{Homes Magazine}.\textsuperscript{29} This apparent freedom of movement was notable when read alongside the continued anxieties over emigration, and considering that transit was a questionable site.\textsuperscript{30} Their status on land was equally ill-defined.\textsuperscript{31} While the Homes may have facilitated entry into a seafaring career, this by no means implied settlement in Britain.\textsuperscript{32} In Hull they stayed with “an old lady named Mrs Woods” before setting out for long stretches at sea.\textsuperscript{33} The seafaring scheme was halted in 1912 and the men were forced to accept menial labour in Britain – an outcome that Mizutani argues Graham viewed as successful emigration.\textsuperscript{34} But this destination was never mobilised in Homes publicity to capture the imagination of its supporters, who perhaps knew that life in England would not be easy for Anglo-Indians.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Ibid}.
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Placement in India

Graham’s rhetoric of placement in India echoed that of the emigration scheme, claiming that he sought “innovative” solutions to the Anglo-Indian problem. In India, this meant training and educating Anglo-Indians for a wider range of employment than had traditionally been seen as suitable for them. However Mainwaring found that like his primary aim of colonial emigration, Graham’s “second goal”, of industrial employment in India was “ultimately difficult to realise”.

Aside from an affiliation with Sibpur Engineering College, the industrial school “never really took off” and “faded out in 1931 when the Raja Ugen Dorji Memorial Workshops were closed down”. According to Mainwaring, as the industrial vision faded a greater emphasis was put on education, evidenced by the results achieved by Homes pupils. In the 1918 Elementary School Examinations, 92 per cent of Homes candidates passed, compared to 41 per cent in Bengal, and Graham’s students took 11 of the top 20 scores. Some boys won scholarships to university, but Mainwaring summarised the fate of the majority as gaining apprenticeships, or roles in the army, engineering, railways, mining or business, while the girls “mostly either went into nursing, or got married”.

Only one paragraph in Mizutani’s section on “Those Left Behind” deals with actual placements in India. His focus is on the anxieties that structured the Homes programme and he argues that Graham “never found a radical solution” to the question of careers in India.

The Homes Magazine deployed the same language of improvement to appraise the fortunes of Indian placements as it did for the emigrants. In the early 1900s, placements in India and abroad were reported together. In 1908, an article that described those who were “beginning to leave us” included the two first colonists to New Zealand and four graduates who “came to us late and whose educational advantages had been limited”. The four were sent to Sibpur Engineering College in Howrah, a city that sits on the Hoogli River opposite Calcutta. Despite their limited circumstances, the India placements were celebrated for being
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“the first of the domiciled class to be trained for this branch of work”\textsuperscript{41}. In 1909, a group photograph included two emigrants to the United States, one to New Zealand (Clarence Sinclair), one to Sibpur College and one to “Renard Train”, a transport company. Of seven graduates in a 1910 photograph, five were going to New Zealand, and the other two “got appointments in India” – one with the East Indian Railway (EIR) at Kanpur in Uttar Pradesh and the second to the Government Cinchona Plantation at Munsong, near Kalimpong. Far from being frowned upon, employment on the railways was reported as successful entry into a profession that required meeting bureaucratic standards. In 1911, for example, four boys were reportedly successful in the “E.I.R. Apprenticeship Examination”, and in 1915 George Fitzgerald and George Lima were congratulated for topping “the list in the Junior Signal Examination on the Bengal-Nagpur railway.”\textsuperscript{42} Railways and primary industries would continue to be prime destinations for the Kalimpong men, and these sectors were significant employers of Anglo-Indians in general.

In 1908 Graham visited Narayaganj in Eastern Bengal with the aim of finding employment for his graduates in primary industries. W. P. Suttie, likely related to the P. E. Suttie who assisted the Homes in Auckland, handed over a “fat cheque” to Graham as a result of several public meetings there.\textsuperscript{43} Narayaganj was a centre for jute production where many Kalimpong men would be placed. Along with tea plantations and coal mining, jute came to dominate the labour markets of the eastern states of Bengal, Bihar and Assam. All three were characterised by labour hierarchies that comprised a large migrant workforce, which was mobilised and managed by “a whole array of intermediaries” and overseen by Europeans.\textsuperscript{44} Presumably Homes graduates took middle management roles in these hierarchies. As mentioned previously, the agricultural sector took very different pathways in India and New Zealand. Graham was not ignorant of the finer points of these social forces. One of his supporters in India, Harold H. Mann, was an agricultural and social scientist who wrote extensively on the differing solutions that agriculture offered to impoverished populations in
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Britain, India, Russia and the Middle East.\textsuperscript{45} Mann’s low opinion of the situation in India was indicated by his arrangement for three young men from another institution to be sent to the Homes, specifically for the purpose of emigration to New Zealand.\textsuperscript{46}

As the numbers of graduates placed in India grew, their placements were reported separately to the emigrants and were notably briefer than reports of those sent abroad. Recent departures were listed only with their occupation and location. In 1914, of the ten boys placed in India, two went to a sugar factory in Bihar, and two passed the examination for the EIR workshops at Jamalpur (also in Bihar) and “joined our growing band in that station”.\textsuperscript{47} Percy White joined the Bengal-Nagpur Railways at Khargphur, another got work on the EIR at Jhansi, and four boys were placed in engineering apprenticeships in Howrah.\textsuperscript{48} These locations were to be often repeated in the \textit{Homes Magazine}, as discrete clusters of Kalimpong graduates developed in West Bengal, including Calcutta, and the northern provinces of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. Graham’s strategy seems to have been to inject Homes graduates into well-established Anglo-Indian centres in sufficient numbers that they would form a community within a community – quite the opposite of the much-touted aim of integration that was fundamental to the colonial solution.

Alongside these clusters of employment, the Homes developed local networks of support for its graduates. When Graham toured Eastern Bihar in 1914, he “found eight boys bright and contented in their workshops and hostels in the ideal Railway Settlement of
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Jamalpur.”

He then visited two boys at the neighbouring state quarries at Dharhara; at Bhagalpur he visited boys at Sabour Agricultural College; and in Madhupur he saw a Kalimpong woman who had married and settled there. The next year the *Homes Magazine* reported the formation of a “Bihar Committee”. Graham’s support in India was widespread, but he utilised existing Anglo-Indian enclaves in his “experiment” with placements in India. In the same way that overseas destinations were trialled, a small number of graduates would be sent to a particular location. If they did well, more would follow and a centre of support would be established.

In New Zealand, the concern to place the men within the protection of Presbyterian families faded as the scheme developed and the men found their own place in settler colonial hierarchies. Conversely in India, housing was a crucial means of segregation from the dreaded lower echelons of the Anglo-Indian community and the wider Indian population. Those employed on the railways were housed in “colonies” that functioned as small townships. Graham’s strategy was to place groups of Homes men together in order to counteract the negative aspects of these enclaves, which brought together Anglo-Indians of various backgrounds and attracted labour from diverse cultural groups. Accommodation was also provided in the academic, engineering and agricultural colleges that accepted Homes men. As for those working in cities, four young men placed in Howrah in 1914 were all staying at the local YMCA. Another who went to a workshop in Bombay was accommodated “in the YMCA Procter Branch, over which Mr and Mrs Potter preside as they did formerly over our Fraser Hostel”. Like their New Zealand counterparts, there was concern to protect the male graduates in the initial phase of their working lives, and a greater concern for the women than the men. In India, however, the restricted occupations and discrete locations into which they were placed were indicative of the full spectrum of opportunity.

---
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The women’s placements within India were more difficult to trace. Early reports in the *Homes Magazine* did not often specify occupation, usually only their location and announcements of marriage. Prior to marriage most were placed with British families in various locations in India. In the 1910s and 1920s Homes women were increasingly placed into public nursing and clerical roles, which fits with Lionel Caplan’s and Alison Blunt’s findings that these avenues of employment for Anglo-Indian women expanded in this period.53 In 1915, Norah Fullerton was the first Homes graduate to enter nurses’ training at the Presidency General Hospital in Calcutta, under “Lady Carmichael’s Scheme”.54 In 1918, five women were placed as nursery and hospital nurses in West Bengal.55 Four women finished nurses’ training in 1920 at Steel Memorial Hospital and went on to complete their training in Rangoon, where numerous Kalimpong women were placed.56 Calcutta also became an important centre for the women, where they were employed as stenographers and telephonists. These career options were in direct contrast to the New Zealand women, most of whom either married and stopped working or remained in domestic service.

The men too began to move into a greater diversity of roles, particularly in Calcutta, where they gained apprenticeships and employment through Graham’s extensive commercial network in a range of manual and clerical positions. In 1918 the police force employed its first Homes graduates.57 The question of accommodation in the city was a pressing one. In June 1922, Graham reflected on 21 years of support from Calcutta firms and looked to a new generation of “bara sahibs” [gentlemen] for support.58 Graham found that these new supporters were “full of encouragement as to a growing and not a decreasing spirit of responsibility and altruism”.59 Commenting on the uncertainty of emigration to New Zealand, he then outlined an initiative to provide accommodation for Homes graduates in Calcutta:
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The suitable placing out of our children in work and the guidance for the first few years is an increasing source of solicitation. The new hostel which Sir Archy Birkmyre’s generosity is to provide will be a big asset in this connection and should form a centre of wholesome influence for a community much wider than its own residents.60

Birkmyre Hostel indeed became an important centre of influence for Homes men in Calcutta. Many of those who emigrated to New Zealand spent time in the hostel before leaving India. Thinking about the confronting situations that the men encountered in rural New Zealand, Birkmyre could be seen as affording the type of protection in India that was absent in the settler colony. The hostel also facilitated frequent meetings between the graduates and Graham, when he was in Calcutta. The relative proximity of those placed in India to Kalimpong, and to Graham, was one of the most distinctive differences between their situations and that of the New Zealanders. Robert Webber wrote from Kanpur of his gratitude for the *Homes Magazine*, which sent “a hundred thoughts of happy school days through my mind”, and made him long for the day when he could visit Kalimpong. Unlike those in New Zealand, however, for Robert this meant waiting only “till the end of term” when he planned to visit.61 Letters from the Moller and Gammie personal files illuminate these channels of movement within India, as well as the corridors of communication between India and New Zealand, and indeed the triangular correspondence between Kalimpong and discrete sites in both colonies. Homes graduates lived in a world that to a large extent was structured by Graham’s imperial networks, with Kalimpong at its centre.

**Settled in India: Peter Moller**

Peter Moller was the fourth of Paul Moller’s children to leave the Homes. His correspondence with Graham tells us not only of his own movements in India, but of his two brothers who were placed in India and later settled in New Zealand. Peter’s letters, which continued for over 30 years, were generally motivated by requests for assistance with local employment and possible emigration. He first wrote to the Homes in April 1925, two months after he had been placed with the Government Telegraphs in Calcutta. Peter had already left
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his first residence, finding he “couldn’t stick to it there, but am being well treated here”.

“Here” was a boarding house with Mrs Rogers in Sooterkin Lane, where he paid “Rs60 for board and lodging, and paying my own dhobi and paying for current of electricity. I have a room for myself and every comfort I require.” Peter asked that more Kalimpong men be sent to the boarding house as he was lonely “living in a house where there are no other fellows from my school”. Eight months later, Peter wrote from another boarding house in Calcutta, with a Mrs Curtis in Dhurrumtollah Street. In this and many other letters Peter complained that a career in telegraphs was not as “bright and prosperous” as he expected. He pleaded with Graham to assist him to secure the next opening for a “jutewallah”.

Peter devoted much space in his letters to expressing his regret at not studying harder and choosing telegraphs as a career. His requests for assistance show the extent to which Homes graduates in India were reliant on Graham to facilitate any change in career, and evidence the restrictions around Anglo-Indian employment and mobility. In February 1926 he wrote to Graham after reading about jute apprenticeships in *The Statesman*, asking him to “make a way” for him by “giving me a letter directing me to the Head Office, alongside with a strong recommendation letter. I would like my name registered as one of the first apprentices.” In late 1926 he wrote from the YMCA in Calcutta, expecting that Graham would “drop in” on his way back to Kalimpong, and mentioned five telegraph trainees from the Homes who were staying there. Peter later recalled a guest at the YMCA giving a presentation on opportunities for any Kalimpong men with a “Senior Cambridge Certificate”. He also described reunions of Homes graduates. His letters contain ample evidence of an active and dense network of connections that provided residential, occupational and social support to those living in Calcutta.

In these letters Peter began to ask about going to New Zealand with his brother Charles. In 1925 he wrote that, unlike Charles, he was “not so very anxious to go to N.Z.
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quite so soon, as I should like to know and experience India more for myself".\(^{68}\) Thus he
would still like Graham to “transfer his services to the jute” and hoped that would allow him
to save enough for his passage to New Zealand.\(^ {69}\) In 1926 he wrote of meeting with Charles
and discussing their prospects. Charles suggested he would emigrate first and Peter could
follow “a few months later ‘God willing’”.\(^ {70}\) Two months later his plans were more concrete.
“Chas has privileged me to go out with him to N.Z.”, wrote Peter, “so could you kindly fill in
all the necessary items in my form, and let me know what else requires to be done”.\(^ {71}\) As with
his desired transfer, emigration was seen by Peter as only being achievable with the assistance
of the Homes. Peter wrote that Charles hoped to sail in May, but was anxious about the
likelihood of securing entry permits:

> If he isn’t allowed in, be sure there ain’t any room for me out there. By the
> way our school batch will be sailing on the 26\(^ {\text{th}}\) this month. What lucky
> souls they are? I always seem to be very unlucky! How many children are
> sailing out this time? I remember last year’s happy crew. I drove with
> them to the docks, and when I landed there, I didn’t in the least bit feel like
> returning back.\(^ {72}\)

Peter’s description of seeing the emigrants off at Calcutta reveals a level of connection
between the New Zealanders and those in India that might not otherwise be imagined. The
\textit{Homes Magazine} often described social functions in Calcutta to see off the emigrants, which
were attended by local businessmen, clergymen and politicians; but no mention was ever
made of other graduates being present. The separation in the pages of the \textit{Homes Magazine} of
those placed in India and those sent abroad masked some very real connections between the
two. The option of going to New Zealand was kept to the fore of Peter’s thinking in several
ways: contact with his brother, seeing off groups from Calcutta, reading the \textit{Homes Magazine}
and his own correspondence with emigrants. He wrote regularly to his sister Dora and several
others in New Zealand, one of whom sent him a “bundle of N.Z. papers”.\(^ {73}\) “There’s not a
soul amongst the lot of them that regrets having left India”, he wrote, “they all write cheerful
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letters regarding their life and new surroundings”. His words speak to the unsettling, everyday consequences of Graham’s belief that news of the emigrants would be a source of hope for those who remained in India.

In 1927 Peter was transferred to Delhi and wrote to the Homes proposing a third alternative for his future. Enquiring as to whether his father had left him any money, Peter informed Graham that if so he would like to use the money to go to England and join an engineering college. “At the same time, I have not given up hope of going out to New Zealand”, he added. Peter was confident that Charles would make it to New Zealand that year, which he did, and reported that Charles “says it would be better for me to follow up in Nov next”. Charles’ repeated suggestions that he would go first and Peter should follow imply a concern that Peter would hamper his prospects. Theirs is not the only Homes family where the relative “fitness” of siblings for New Zealand has been believed to be the reason for familial separations. Peter alluded to the onerous work conditions for Anglo-Indians on the railways, writing that Charles was having “a very tough time” and “scarcely finds time to reply to my letters now, as he is on his engine from six in the morning to about nine at night”. Peter also bemoaned the timing of his transfer, which coincided with the opening of Birkmyre Hostel in Calcutta. He was sorry to be missing both the opening and reunion functions, as well as the opportunity to be a “resident” there.

A few months later Peter wrote from Simla, where he and five other telegraph workers from Kalimpong were to reside every year from April to October to escape the heat of the Delhi summer. Their movements were determined by historic channels of travel, residence and occupations deemed appropriate for Anglo-Indians in India. For the next decade, Peter’s letters alternated between “Northview Quarters, Simla” and “Telegraph Bachelors Quarters, Atul Grove, New Delhi”. In a similar tone to letters from the men in New Zealand, he wrote of a “merry gang” of Homes men, reported on their work and health, and sent birthday greetings and thanks for the Homes Magazine. Unlike the New Zealand reports, these letters
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from India were rarely published in any length, supporting my argument that the emigration scheme was a more persuasive means of generating funding than news of placement and progress in India. In 1930 Peter wrote of his intention to visit Kalimpong. “I intend taking three months leave and mean to make an absolute rest-cure holiday of it. To me there is no better suited place than good old Kpg for this.” He was unable to “confirm the rumour afloat up there that there will be five of us coming up … as we are all doubtful of our positions in this present chaos and waiting to see how we are going to be affected by it.”

Later in 1930 Peter wrote that he was “sorry to hear that New Zealand was compelled to close its doors to us due to the unemployment there”, particularly because he was hoping that his younger brother Dennis, who was about to leave the Homes, would be sent there. He asked whether Purdie thought that New Zealand would “close its doors to us for good?” and pleaded for every effort be made to send Dennis. Two years later, after not writing for “ages”, he asked that Dennis be “grafted into the jute business, now that he is about to leave school.” Most of Peter’s letters were motivated by a concern about his own, or his siblings’, future prospects. Several months later he wrote on the same topic:

I shall be very grateful for anything you can do for him and realise that these are hard times, particularly in the securing of jobs for our boys, and I regret very much that I am not able to help where Dennis is concerned… my influence in this respect would not be giving the boy a fair chance of getting the best – which you only can give.

Peter wrote frequent letters about Dennis’ employment. He was upset at Dennis’ first position, which lacked security and paid only “pocket money”. By 1933 Dennis was working onboard the S.S. Nurjehan. Pleased with this career for his brother, Peter did not
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write to Graham again until 1936, when he announced his intention to marry, and requested birth and baptismal certificates to make this possible.\footnote{Peter Moller to John Graham, 25 October 1936, Moller file, DGHA.}

In 1947, some months after Britain’s withdrawal from India, Peter wrote from Calcutta, where he was spending time with Dennis and his family, and asked about visiting Kalimpong for “rest and quiet and peaceful surroundings”.\footnote{Peter Moller to James Duncan, 4 November 1947, Moller file, DGHA.} There was no indication that political events spurred Peter into seeking emigration until 1951, when he wrote of a correspondence with the New Zealand Trade Commissioner in Bombay. His queries coincided with letters regarding the same from Dennis, who emigrated to New Zealand in 1953. Peter informed staff at the Homes of his brother’s progress:

\begin{quote}
Dennis has secured railway employment and the money is good. They are determined I should follow up on retirement from service here in another three years time. I’m favourably disposed to this but it’s too premature to make a final decision now.\footnote{Peter Moller to James Duncan, 22 May 1953, Moller file, DGHA.}
\end{quote}

His letter also carried the news that his eldest sister, Dora, had died, leaving two teenage boys. Peter closed by noting his “permanent” change of address, back to Atul Grove in Delhi. He had “at last been allotted quarters” and ended his letter “I am very comfortable now”.\footnote{Ibid.} His final letter was written in 1956, upon hearing that the current superintendent of the Homes was returning to Britain. He did not refer to his own situation or impending retirement.\footnote{Peter Moller to James Duncan, 26 April 1956, Moller file, DGHA.}

Contact with Dora’s descendants has confirmed that Peter never left India. His thirty-year correspondence with the Homes narrated a life that was punctuated by recurring thoughts of joining his family in New Zealand. These thoughts were not only prompted by the challenges of life in India, but also by his siblings’ suggestions that he should join them. His dwindling enthusiasm over time points to the influence of life stage in contemplating the possibility of emigration and family reunions. Peter’s letters add a nuanced understanding to the small glimpses in the \textit{Homes Magazine} of a graduate’s life in India.
Anxious Separations: The Gammie Family

The Gammie family file, like the Mollers’, contained much correspondence during the 1930s regarding siblings being “left behind” in India. The file is a scintillating and emotive example of the transnational family sagas contained in the ageing pages of hundreds of files stored in basic wooden compartments of a small office at the Homes in Kalimpong. Gavin, Kathleen and Alexa Gammie were all placed in India in the 1930s with the express intention that they should join their siblings in New Zealand when the opportunity arose. Gavin’s correspondence illuminated his winding path to emigration, which saw him living in Birkmyre Hostel in Calcutta for several years and subsequently working on a dairy farm in Rangoon in preparation for colonial settlement. Letters in the Gammie file suggest that this farm was an important node in Graham’s imperial network. The correspondence regarding Alexa and Kathleen’s work situations provided valuable details of the Kalimpong women’s work in India, which was otherwise very sparse. Finally, the desperate letters written by their elder siblings Betty and Fergus in New Zealand as the decade came to a close attest to the powerful impact the separations wrought on many families in New Zealand.

The first letters of the 1930s, however, focused on the branch of these families that was rarely mentioned – the British side. On 20 October 1930, H. E. Tyndale wrote to Graham informing him that John Gammie had died in his bungalow the previous afternoon, and requested information about the remaining children in the Homes. As he had not left a will, Tyndale took it upon himself to visit one of Gammie’s five siblings, George, while on leave in England. George then wrote to Graham promising at least his fifth of the estate to the Homes for the upkeep of the children. George’s letter shows the extent to which British relatives were shut out of these interracial families, stating that “the existence of this family was absolutely unknown to me and it was a great shock to me to know the truth.”88 He was now faced with making decisions about the children still at the Homes, writing that “as regards the boy Gavin I shall be glad if you can arrange for his preparation for the Board of [Control] Examination at Silchar.”89 Some news of the children had been relayed by Tyndale, but George required clarification: “I understand that my brother sent money also to New Zealand? 

88 George Gammie to James Purdie, 29 July 1931, Gammie file, DGHA.
89 Ibid.
Do you happen to know how much he sent and to whom? I am sorry to give you so much trouble but I am so hopelessly in the dark.”  

George’s interest in the children speaks to a missed opportunity to be a part of his brother’s family, owing, one assumes, to John’s expectation that his siblings at home would take a dim view of his interracial family.

With the eldest four sent to New Zealand in the 1920s, it was only Gavin, Alexa and Kathleen who were still at the Homes when their father died. Gavin was placed in Calcutta in the early 1930s. His first letter to James Purdie, the Homes secretary, was written in 1933 from Birkmyre Hostel. He and two other graduates had been placed at Balmer Lawrie, a manufacturing company, and were “finding no difficulty whatever” with their employment; however they were feeling the cold, and he requested some winter clothes be sent to them.  

A year later Gavin enquired about his father’s family, writing that he had “nothing to grumble about and with all my school pals down here I feel quite at school again.” In Gavin’s words, Birkmyre was fulfilling its purpose as a centre of support and familiarity for the young men placed in Calcutta. Two years later, in mid-1936, Gavin wrote to Purdie with a clear purpose:

This letter is to remind you that the three of us, J Thompson, G Daunt, and I have finished our “Electrical Training” in Balmer Lawrie. Ours was a three year course which concluded on May 15th. We are still hanging on as apprentices, but I should be very pleased if you will give us some advice regarding our future welfare.  

Gavin requested a birth certificate and as much information as possible about his parents, given that he was “about to start on my own”. Several months later he advised Purdie that he had written several unsuccessful applications for work.

The next letters regarding Gavin were written early in 1938, when he was dismissed from his employment at “Roslyn Dairy Farm” in Rangoon. His employer, Miranda Wiseham, wrote to Purdie about the situation, closely followed by a letter from Gavin. While Wiseham complained that Gavin was disrespectful, his version of events echoed concerns of his brother
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Fergus in New Zealand. “It was not through bad temper alone that I left”, Gavin explained, “but that we on the farm were not getting fair-play”. Having received letters from Fergus and Betty informing him that he was to go to New Zealand, Gavin hoped that “this last episode will not let down my chances.” He apologised for having to “write and let you know I am unemployed, and so cause you further worry”, and asked Purdie to recommend him “to any farm, if possible a dairy farm”, while he waited for the opportunity to go to New Zealand. Five years after his departure from the Homes, Gavin was still working very much within the Kalimpong support network with the expressed hope of emigrating.

A month later Gavin accepted Graham’s offer of work on the Homes farm in preparation for emigration. He regretted that he had to “trouble you further Daddy, but please could you arrange for my travelling expenses as I am in a very difficult position at the moment.” A year later he wrote from a dairy farm in Opotiki, in the North Island of New Zealand, thanking Graham for “the privilege in being sent out” and responding positively to advice of the amount he would be required to repay the Homes for his travel. The youngest sibling, Kathleen, emigrated alongside Gavin in the 1938 group. Like Gavin, she had worked for Miranda Wiseham in Rangoon prior to departing India. Wiseham’s letter informing Purdie of Gavin’s dismissal was primarily to tell him that Kathleen had arrived safely accompanied by “the ladies”. Her letter indicated that she was a regular employer of Kalimpong graduates, and she gave news of two housemothers, Miss McCrie and Miss Shaw (presumably Kathleen’s chaperones), taking leave at the farm. When they returned Wiseham hoped they would “tell you and Dr Graham of our little world here”. Her description of the farm as “a little world” echoed the function of the Homes, tea plantations and railway colonies as havens from the unruly outside world, tasked with “keeping India at bay”.

The first recorded correspondence of the youngest daughter, Alexa, was written in July 1936 from within the Homes. She was working as a nurse in Lucia King. “I don’t wish

95 Gavin Gammie to James Purdie, 10 January 1938, Gammie file, DGHA.
96 Ibid.
97 Ibid.
98 Ibid.
99 Miranda Wiseham to James Purdie, 7 January 1938, Gammie file, DGHA.
to stay in Lucia any longer to take up a Child’s Nurse training”, Alexa wrote in a short note, which expressed her desire to “get out”.  

A short time later the Homes received a letter from Mabel Barnes in Cachar, Assam, asking if “there will be a nurse available [from] the first week of September. If so will you reserve her for me.”

The Homes apparently performed a similar role in India to the Ladies Committee in Dunedin, receiving applications for women to work with families. Notably, Alexa, the child of a tea planter, was returning to a tea planting district to work in her modified status as an Anglo-Indian domestic worker. In mid-September a Homes graduate in Chandpur, “Tom”, wrote of assisting with Alexa’s travel to Cachar. Again this prompts comparisons with the New Zealand network, which mobilised former Homes residents to assist new arrivals. The women’s travel in India apparently prompted an even greater degree of protection. Alexa was initially accompanied by a Homes worker, then met by Tom at “the Steamer ghat” who saw her safely to the train for Silchar.

A “man sent down by her employer” advised them there would be a car waiting at Silchar Station. Mabel Barnes advised Purdie immediately when Alexa arrived safely. She was “most pleased” with Alexa, and their young son had “taken a great liking to her”.

The chain of events that followed stimulated a flurry of correspondence from Assam, New Zealand, England and the Homes, and the outcome would have a lasting legacy for Alexa and her siblings. Initially, Alexa simply reported with regret that Mabel Barnes was to return to England for one year and that she would require alternative employment. Six months later, in November 1937, Alexa wrote an anxious letter to Purdie, explaining that her sister Betty had asked Graham (while he was on his 1937 tour) to send herself and Gavin with the next group to join them. But Barnes had suggested that she accompany her to England. Purdie advised Alexa go with Barnes and emigrate after returning to India. Alexa was then upset by a letter from Gavin suggesting that she join him in Rangoon. Barnes, who was also concerned that Alexa might miss the opportunity to emigrate, informed Purdie that Alexa did not want to go to Rangoon, but wanted to ascertain whether it was “a necessary intermediate
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When he was making preparations for sending the 1938 group to New Zealand, Graham wrote to Alexa at her Assam address asking if she would join them. Mr Barnes replied to Graham after opening the letter in Alexa’s absence, noting the “awkward situation” that Alexa was in England and not due to return until October 1939. Stressing that they had checked the possibility of her travel to New Zealand “on more than one occasion”, Barnes now had to consider the cost of her return passage to Britain in deciding how to deal with the situation. Graham replied promptly and sympathetically:

I can see that there will be a great difficulty in getting her back here in time for the 20th October. So perhaps it would be just as well to put her off going for another year. I think she should go ultimately, because all the other members of her family – something like seven – will be in New Zealand.

How much Alexa was told at this point was unknown, but as the October deadline approached, Betty and Fergus wrote separate letters to Purdie imploring that Alexa should be included in the group that would bring Gavin and Kathleen to New Zealand. There were no replies to these letters in the file, however a short reply to Barnes stated with confidence that Alexa would “go with next year’s band”. Graham’s desire to see the Gammie family reunited was laudable, but it was his confidence in the resumption of the scheme that caused Alexa to miss the final opportunity to emigrate to New Zealand with a Homes group.

Alexa’s distraught reaction upon learning that her siblings had gone to New Zealand ended her employment with the Barnes family. The Homes committee in London stepped in, offering to find her “a post … for the return voyage to India” through the “Ayah’s
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Association in London”. The only way to realise emigration from this situation was to utilise Graham’s British network to get back to India and realign herself with the Homes route to New Zealand. The complexity of this scenario illustrates the level of restriction on the movement of racially marginalised people around the British Empire in this period.

Though Alexa’s travel to England proceeded with apparent ease, getting her back to India was not so simple. Her plight highlighted the ambiguity of immigration rules that allowed her to cross the border into England as a domestic worker with an English family, but left her stranded when that family no longer wished to employ her. The existence of the ayah’s home attests to the fact that Alexa was not the first to get “stuck” in England.

The Homes office in London did find assistance through the “Amahs’ and Ayahs’ Home”, which secured a post for Alexa with a Mrs Clark who was returning to Rangoon. Alexa wrote to Purdie asking that she be found a post on Miranda Wiseham’s farm “until it’s time for me to leave for N.Z.” She then wrote from her position with the Clarks in Rangoon describing her unhappiness with the work. In August 1939 arrangements were made for Alexa to travel to Kalimpong. From there she was sent to Quetta to work for the Joyce family. Jinny Joyce’s initial contact with the Homes was notable for her request for a “governess … without an accent”, which she apologised for mentioning but cited as the reason that she had “refrained from employing any of the Anglo-Indian nurses obtainable in Quetta”. This suggests that women graduates found a place in the upper levels of the Anglo-Indian population, as did the men. Alexa apparently settled into life with the Joycees, her sister Betty writing now only of her sadness that “she [was] the only one left behind”.
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Alexa’s future was perhaps a typical outcome for the Homes women who were placed in India. Eighteen months after her arrival at Quetta, in Baluchistan, Joyce informed Purdie that Alexa was to marry a British soldier. She had been “very strict” with Alexa, “as I did not want her to go the way of the other Kalimpong nurses in Quetta – staying out till all hours.”

Joyce had made enquiries about Private Bibby and ensured that Alexa would be “recognised by the regiment as his wife and should not be abandoned later”. From this time onwards, responsibility for Alexa was left to her husband and his family in England. She wrote from England in 1943, where she and her husband and baby had “arrived home just a few days before Christmas”. “I am quite settled down”, she wrote, “and enjoying life here”. The baby had died in the interim, but Alexa was enjoying her work in a factory. She requested a birth certificate, noting that “I do need a birth certificate in this part of the world.”

Alexa wrote once more to the Homes, in 1951. Descendants of the Gammies in New Zealand informed me that Alexa stayed in England for the rest of her life, which was a known source of strain with her siblings. However this relationship was improved in the years prior to Alexa’s recent death with welcome visits from the next generation (see Figure 21).

End of an Era

The terms under which the Homes moved towards and through Indian independence is another arena where the reverberations of political change affected Homes graduates, especially those families where siblings placed in India and New Zealand relied on the stable existence of the institution to facilitate their continued contact. Previous chapters have tracked the rise of Indian nationalism as it affected the emigration scheme and the Kalimpong community in New Zealand. In India the impact of nationalist activity was of course far more immediate. When the emigration scheme came to an end, an important link between India and New Zealand was broken, and Graham’s focus turned entirely toward placement of Homes graduates in India. But this was also the moment when Anglo-Indians had no way of predicting what their place in an independent India would be, and emigration became an
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urgent and pressing course of action sought by many thousands of people. In a further
demonstration of the decidedly uneven application of immigration restrictions among settler
colonies, Australia would become the destination for large numbers of Anglo-Indians.\textsuperscript{125}

Graham had no way of predicting future loosening of border regulations, and as
outlined in Chapter Six, he concentrated his efforts on building a harmonious relationship
between Indians and Anglo-Indians. His public rhetoric on the matter was backed by several
shifts at the Homes to appease Indian nationalist interests. In 1939, for example, Graham
responded to local pressure by allowing five Nepalese children to be admitted as boarders.
There had always been a ceiling of 25 per cent non-Anglo Indians, but in practice there were
never more than a handful of local pupils, none of whom were boarders. In the \textit{Homes Magazine}
that year, Graham expressed his reluctance over the matter. The school was
“founded for a definite class of needy children and is supported as such”, he wrote, indicating,
as Mainwaring has suggested, “that the fundraising network he had set up was primarily
interested in a community that had a British connection”.\textsuperscript{126} Graham’s hand was forced, as
the very function of the Homes faced becoming redundant, with the exodus of British men
from tea plantations and the possibility of Scottish staff having to leave the Homes.

In 1939 Graham celebrated fifty years of service with the Kalimpong mission. A
tribute at the local Christian church performed songs in Lepcha, Tibetan, Nepali and English.
Already an elderly man of some frailty, Graham had a series of heart attacks in 1940 that left
him gravely ill. Although in name he continued as superintendent, his duties effectively
cessated. Graham died on 15 May 1942. James Minto emphasised the cultural diversity in the
proceedings that followed, stating that the road through Kalimpong was lined “with an
astonishing concourse of people” to view the funeral procession.\textsuperscript{127} The service was
conducted in Nepali, and lamas from the Kalimpong gompa paid a ceremonial tribute to
Graham. Graham’s death received widespread coverage in the press in India and Britain.\textsuperscript{128}
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Connections between the Homes and the Kalimpong community in New Zealand were further weakened by this event which, like the end of the scheme, represented the end of an era.

Maintenance of those links with New Zealand would depend on the staff who replaced Graham. Initially this was facilitated by the appointment of James Purdie as Acting Superintendent. Purdie was the secretary who had kept up correspondence with many of the New Zealanders. Graham’s eventual successor, Reverend James E. Duncan, arrived from Scotland in 1944. Duncan was born in India and his father had been a missionary in Darjeeling. He took on an institution that was in financial crisis. Four cottages had closed during the Second World War and the roll had dropped to 500 pupils. Fees had increased and Duncan was forced to look for support in a much changed social and political climate. It was a challenging time to be preparing a struggling Scottish institution that catered largely for Anglo-Indians for an Indian-governed future. Rani Maharaj Singh, National President of the YWCA and wife of the first Indian governor of Bombay, delivered an address at the last “Homes Birthday” in British India in September 1946. “I have come to claim you children for the land of your birth”, she stated, “the time has come for you to know and love and serve the real land of your birth ... and finally to give up the prejudices with which you have unconsciously looked upon her glorious culture”.

Change happened quickly at the Homes after Britain’s withdrawal from India. The board implemented two important changes to come into effect on 1 October 1947. The first was a change of name for the institution, removing “St Andrews” and “colonial” to be simply known as “Dr Graham’s Homes”. The second was to raise the ceiling of non-Anglo Indians to 40 per cent. The payback for Duncan was a grant of one lakh rupees from the Indian government, a significant contribution towards the Homes total debt of over two lakhs. A process of “Indianisation” began with changes to the language of instruction and teaching staff. Sri C. Rajagopalachari, Governor of West Bengal, visited the Homes in May 1948 and addressed both issues when he stated that “you must begin by getting the teachers and house
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staff, or whoever it may be, to talk to the boys and girls in Hindi.”131 While Indian staff members were recruited, it would be 1971 before the first non-European principal, Bernard Brooks, was appointed. The connections between Kalimpong and New Zealand were never completely lost, for Brooks, like his predecessor James Minto, would visit New Zealand twice during his tenure. Their visits were remembered by descendants of the Gammie family.

Conclusion

This chapter represents an initial incursion into the study of the global Kalimpong community. My focus on Indian placement and the life stories of those who had siblings in New Zealand has illuminated the continued sagas of the families disrupted by the Homes scheme. While the possibility of India’s withdrawal from the British Empire was linked in Chapter Six to a significant reduction in the correspondence in the Homes personal files, here I have demonstrated that for families with siblings placed in New Zealand and India, the opposite was true. Graduates in India were encouraged by hopeful reports from the New Zealanders, who in turn were convinced of their own relative good fortune upon hearing of difficulties in India. The letters that narrated attempts to realise family reunions have revealed the complex and restricted channels through which marginal populations moved around the British Empire in this period. The process of navigating those channels was far more intricate and people-centred than the language of doors “open” and “closed” would suggest.

In the opening paragraph of this chapter I posed a question regarding the fortunes of those placed in India. Reports in the Homes Magazine and letters in the Homes personal files suggest that for the most part they were placed into traditional areas of Anglo-Indian employment. While Graham sought new fields of employment for his graduates, in reality those placed in India moved within the same regulated channels as the wider Anglo-Indian community. They were differentiated from other Anglo-Indians, however, by their place in the local “Kalimpong community” and by the continued support of Homes associates. As I have argued, in India, initial placements were largely indicative of the full spectrum of opportunity. This, in combination with the potential loss of the place known as “Anglo-India” after 1947, meant that there was a strong chance that they would have emigrated, possibly to
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New Zealand or more likely to Australia.\footnote{Dorothy McMenamin employed this terminology in her wonderful collection of interviews with people who emigrated from “Anglo-India” to New Zealand in the 1940s. There was one Homes graduate among the families she spoke to. McMenamin, \textit{Raj Days to Downunder: Voices from Anglo-India to New Zealand} (Christchurch: Dorothy McMenamin, 2010).} Indeed several Kalimpong settlers successfully “sponsored” their siblings to enter New Zealand in the 1940s. But while chain migration did occur, it was by no means guaranteed. In families where attempts to secure entry permits for siblings were unsuccessful, the result was often enduring family rifts. Descendants have considered that this difficult situation added to their parent’s intentional distancing from India.
Figure 21: Jim Gammie (Gavin’s son) and Alexa Bibby (nee Gammie), 2009
(Source: Gammie Family Archive, Wellington)
CHAPTER EIGHT
STABILITY, SILENCE, (SUCCESS?)

What is to become of Kalimpong? Are the Indians taking it over? A good thing Dr Graham isn’t alive to see what seems to be the fate of a brilliant dream and undertaking.1

India’s independence from Britain on 15 August 1947 had a lasting impact upon the Kalimpong community in New Zealand. Like other Anglo-Indians, the Homes graduates had to reconsider their connection to their place of birth given that it was no longer a part of the British Empire. Their fathers joined the exodus from India, often to Britain, which placed them at a greater distance from their children. Siblings in India requested assistance to emigrate and in some cases this led to family reunions after long separations. The Kalimpong community in New Zealand was no longer boosted by groups of new arrivals, and their role of providing support to such emigrants was lost. The community could only expand through the next generation – but that was the generation that was meant to disappear into the fabric of New Zealand society. Moreover, the potential for their children to blend in seems to have been understood by the Homes graduates to be enhanced by not sharing details of their Indian heritage. Through these dynamics, I will argue, Indian independence reinforced the emigrants’ stoic, silent, turn towards a New Zealand future.

While I stress the importance of the events of 1947 for shifting the orientation of the Kalimpong settlers (as I refer to them hereafter), this chapter firmly locates them within the opportunity structures of mid-twentieth century New Zealand. In order to address the inconsistent glimpses of their situations gleaned from the Homes Magazine and Graham’s 1937 diary, I deploy a different type of source material than previous chapters. A survey of Electoral Rolls from 1946, 1949, 1954, 1957 and 1963 was carried out to give snapshots of their location, occupation and marital status in each of those years, which in turn enabled a more accurate assessment of their physical and occupational mobility. The study period was chosen to continue the narrative of this thesis into the 1950s and 1960s, and to allow for a
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period of adjustment following the major disruptions of two world wars and the economic depression of the 1930s. The majority of the early emigrants were still working in the 1940s and 1950s, although many retired or died in the 1960s; while the 1938 arrivals and earlier emigrants who fought in the Second World War had returned by 1946 and begun to settle. The basic tenet of this assessment is that the geographic stability and upward social mobility exhibited by the Kalimpong settlers in the post-independence period reflected consolidation of their local positions and a primary concern with raising their New Zealand families.

Severing Ties, Strengthening Ties

After John Graham’s death in 1942, James Purdie became the chief link to the Homes for emigrants around the globe. Although he relinquished his role as secretary in 1946, Purdie did not leave Kalimpong permanently until 1951. Despite his lingering presence, the personal correspondence between Purdie and Homes graduates between 1947 and 1952 is held with the Kalimpong Papers at the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh, rather than in the files at the Homes in Kalimpong.² The collection comprises many hundreds of letters. From 1947 onwards, the New Zealanders wrote to staff at the Homes if they required information (such as birth certificates) and introduced themselves as former pupils. Their correspondence with Purdie, on the other hand, was more personal and updated him about their own situations and those of other graduates. These letters were apparently regarded by Purdie as belonging to him and not the institution, which faced an uncertain future within the newly independent India. This archival shift represented a further weakening of the Homes web, as Kalimpong was no longer the central node around which the network was structured. Nor did Scotland assume this central position. The international community of graduates took on a disparate quality, reliant on the ties of kin and friendship. As Annie Larsen’s letter so bluntly stated, emigrants experienced a sense of alienation from the Homes when it was “taken over by Indians”.³

² These are the letters that Andrew May used in his article as noted in the Introduction to this thesis. 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, no.1 (2013).
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Of the large stack of letters Purdie received between 1947 and 1952, only a very small proportion originated in New Zealand. Correspondence from many graduates in various locations around the globe provides firm evidence of the eventual emigration of those placed in India. In this way independence, the main driver of this exodus, mitigated the perceived disruption caused by the Homes emigration scheme. In other words, settlement outside India was a likely scenario even for the graduates who were not “sent” to New Zealand. The first letter from New Zealand in the Purdie collection was received from Thornton Kennedy, a 1938 emigrant living in Palmerston North. Attesting to the vertical intergenerational reach of the Kalimpong network, Kennedy gave news of not only others in the 1938 group, but also of several 1920s emigrants. According to Kennedy, however, the majority of “our boys and girls” were in Auckland or Wellington, demonstrating that already the northern emigrants were losing sight of those settled in the South Island. Of interest in Kennedy’s letter was his hope, and expectation, that Purdie would be able to reconnect him with his siblings placed elsewhere. As the last link to the early graduates, Purdie remained a pivotal point in the broken and dispersed Kalimpong families.

Although Thornton Kennedy was unaware of the significant number of Kalimpong settlers in the South Island, the letters to Purdie do reveal a chain of communication connecting north to south. Kate Wilson (nee Pattison) was the main correspondent in the South Island. Originally placed in Greymouth, Kate had lived in Dunedin, Invercargill and Gore before settling in Christchurch. The other two Christchurch families contacted for this study both remember gatherings at “Mrs Wilson’s” house in Loftus Street, Papanui. In a letter to Purdie in 1948, Kate gave news and enclosed photographs of the two other women settled there, Dora Cone (nee Moller) and Gertie Plaistowe. Dora herself wrote of contact with Kate and of hearing “very often” of the Dinning sisters in Wellington. Another connection to the North Island was revealed by Gertie Plaistowe’s description of the “little evening” that Kate had put on when Mrs Olsen, a former Homes housemother, visited
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Christchurch. A letter from Annie Dinning in 1950 told of having “some good old laughs talking of our school days” when Kate had holidayed with them in Wellington.

Kate Wilson’s letters also indicated links between settlers in Christchurch and Dunedin. In 1952 Kate wrote of hosting Mae Sinclair, a 1912 emigrant, for Christmas, and reported that Mae’s brother Clarence and his wife had both died. Both Mae and Clarence had settled in Dunedin. The only letter from a Dunedin family among the Purdie correspondence was from Robert Savigny, the son of the 1911 emigrant Patrick Savigny. Robert wrote from Allenby Avenue, Pine Hill, in 1951, to inform Purdie with “deep regret” of his father’s recent death (and his mother’s two years prior) and to request information about his uncle, Charlie Savigny, of whose whereabouts he had “no idea”. Robert asked that Purdie inform Charlie of Patrick’s death, explaining that he had obtained Purdie’s address from his aunt Nellie Thompson (nee Savigny) in Dunedin. The sense from these letters and from descendant interviews is that while news of Dunedin was circulated by the Christchurch settlers, there were few direct connections between the southernmost settlers and those in North Island.

Looking to the other end of the country, the Auckland community was based around Betty Hall’s (nee Gammie) house in the suburb of Kingsland. Several Homes graduates who emigrated individually stayed with Betty until getting settled. Frank Donaldson wrote shortly after arrival in 1949 of meeting several of Betty’s siblings and numerous 1920s emigrants while staying at her home. Frank was married with several children when he arrived; within a year he had bought a house and was working for the Customs Department. Kenneth Storey wrote after his arrival in 1947 that New Zealand was a “great country” and asked for Purdie’s assistance for George (presumably his brother) to follow. “There is no need for a permit”, Storey suggested, just proof of being a “British subject by birth”. Immigration rules were a common topic in the letters to Purdie, and the various advice offered suggests that the policy

---

8 Annie Dinning to James Purdie, 14 May 1950, Purdie Letters 1950, 6039:14:1, NLS.
9 Robert Savigny to James Purdie, 4 August 1951, Purdie Letters 1951-1952, 6039:14:2, NLS.
regarding Anglo-Indians continued to be unclear in what was a period of significant change in the spheres of immigration and citizenship in New Zealand.  

Margaret Olsen’s lengthy letter regarding “The Wedding” of Gavin Gammie and Isabella Leith (who emigrated in 1947 to join her brother Fred, a 1938 emigrant) described a lively Wellington Kalimpong community, whose clustering in the suburb of Lower Hutt facilitated daily interactions. The wedding was held at St Stephen’s Presbyterian Church, and Olsen named 20 Homes graduate guests and a “real Kalimpong atmosphere”. All of the Gammie siblings except Alexa were present. Their family forged lasting ties between the Wellington group and settlers further north, due to the presence of Betty, Alison and Moira in Auckland, Fergus in Hamilton, and Gavin and Kathleen in Lower Hutt. Adding strength to these connections were the marriages of Alison, Gavin and Kathleen to other Homes graduates, who in turn had siblings in the North Island. The children of these Kalimpong settlers were thus connected variously by blood relation, marriage, and the Homes upbringing. Olsen wrote about the wedding with great sentimentality. “If you had been there Mr Purdie the picture would have been complete”, she wrote, “you would have been proud to see the faces of the old boys and girls as they met that day and see the two Kalimpongites united”. She would “never forget the reception they gave to an old Auntie of Kalimpong. Tell the Aunties of Kalimpong that it is well worthwhile, when in late years they meet their old girls and boys again, to see their faces, and the reality of their appreciation”. Her comment is an important reminder of the place of former housemothers in many Kalimpong families.

---

12 Immigration Department correspondence around permit applications in this period evidences the continued reluctance to admit Anglo-Indians. The Homes graduate Isabella Leith’s emigration was noted in response to a question in parliament. “Immigration of Eurasians”, Memorandum, 23 July 1947, General Papers: Anglo-Indians, Customs Personal File, R18786833, Archives New Zealand, Wellington office (ANZ-W). While the newly created national citizenship was extended to Indian residents in 1949, alongside all British subjects, Malcolm McKinnon suggests that family connections still largely determining the granting of permits: *Immigrants and Citizens: New Zealanders and Asian Immigration in Historical Context* (Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies, 1996), 41.

13 Margaret Olsen to James Purdie, 1 January 1950, Purdie Letters 1950, 6039:14:1, NLS.


One event in this era drew all of the regions together. In 1952, Ella Horgan and another staff member from Kalimpong spent ten weeks travelling the length of New Zealand showing a film about the Homes called “The Lollipop Tree” and collecting donations. Horgan’s “list of signatures” was noticeably bereft of southern supporters. In Dunedin, the women met “your old friend Mr Kennedy”, who “enjoyed the film”. However the meeting Kennedy organised in a Presbyterian Church there “wasn’t well attended”. Kate Wilson wrote of Horgan’s visit to Christchurch, noting from the film that things had changed since her day. “We had no servants when I was in school, I think those children are spoilt, don’t you?” she wrote. Several descendants in Wellington remember viewing the film at an event Horgan described as a “grand reunion”. It brought together Kalimpong settlers, and their spouses and children, who all watched the film and sang “Happy Birthday” to the Homes. The descendants who recall this event were among those who described their parents as reluctant to talk about their Indian background. These apparently contradictory forces will be explored in detail in Chapter Nine.

Electoral Roll Survey: Methodology

The social formations evidenced by Purdie’s letters, such as clustering of settlers, connections between all locations, and the existence of a vibrant community in Wellington, provide a qualitative context within which to read the following statistical survey. The sample comprised all settlers identified in the Electoral Rolls with complete certainty, by cross-referencing information from the Homes Magazines, Graham’s 1937 diary, the Homes personal files, First World War personnel files, Immigration Department records, and descendant information. The military files were particularly useful owing to the practise of updating servicemen’s records with intended residence, ongoing medical proceedings, claims for benefits, and date and location of death. Local cemetery databases also assisted verifying settlers’ identity by listing their place of birth as India. “Death printouts” from Births, Deaths and Marriages Online were useful for the same reason. There were two instances where

16 Ella Horgan to James Purdie, 30 June 1952, Purdie Letters 1951-1952, 6039:14:2, NLS.
17 Ibid.
18 Kate Wilson to James Purdie, 1 June 1952, Purdie Letters 1951-1952, 6039:14:2, NLS.
19 Ella Horgan to James Purdie, 30 June 1952, Purdie Letters 1951-1952, 6039:14:2, NLS.
persons very likely to be Homes graduates appear to have hidden details of their Indian heritage. One “death printout”, for example, listed Rarotonga as the person’s place of birth and had no information about parentage. Although this probable concealment could be taken to confirm their Kalimpong origins, these cases were not included in the sample.

One of the main advantages of this survey was the ability to not only locate but to track a group of migrants over time, which in other studies of social and occupational mobility has proved difficult. Distinctive surnames were useful here, and some of those names are still unique to Kalimpong descendants in New Zealand, such as Sarkies, Gammie, Snelleksz and Ochterloney. Those with more common surnames were often relatively easy to identify because of their status as single migrants. That is, there was not the confusion that can occur with repetitive naming over several generations of a family in one location. Several settlers with very common names were identified using descendant information. Tom Smith, for example, married Alison Gammie in 1954. Although Tom and Alison had no children, their nieces and nephews provided the details necessary to find them in the Electoral Rolls. Hence the continued functioning of the Kalimpong community has been valuable to this study on many levels. However it is important to stress that no information regarding occupation or location sourced from descendants has been used in lieu of official data. Only entries from Electoral Rolls have been used in the statistics presented here. Descendant information is added later to bring contextual and narrative fullness to the survey results.

Of the 130 Homes emigrants to New Zealand between 1908 and 1938, at least 14 died prior to 1946. One of those was Quinton O’Shannahan, who returned to India to enlist for the First World War and subsequently died on the battlefields of Europe. Two women also returned to India. Peggy O’Brien contracted an eye infection shortly after arriving in 1925. She was quarantined for a month and then “ordered to return” to India by New Zealand authorities. Mary Chaston, a 1920 emigrant to Dunedin, returned to India in 1936 with

---

21 Authors of various studies of social and geographical mobility in New Zealand have described difficulties of tracking any individuals with certainty. Gwen Parsons noted in her 2009 study of returned servicemen that the study was mostly concerned with “stayers”, as “leavers” were very difficult to track once they left the study area. See Parsons, “The many Derelicts of the War” (PhD diss., University of Otago, 2009), 18,22.
plans of completing nurses’ training there.\textsuperscript{23} The only other Homes emigrant known to have left New Zealand was a veteran of the First World War who moved to Australia prior to Graham’s visit in 1937.\textsuperscript{24} Excluding the four who left and those who were deceased by 1946, the maximum number of persons who could be included in the survey was 113. Of those, 85 (39 men and 46 women) appeared in at least one of the Electoral Rolls for this period.\textsuperscript{25}

Table 8.1 summarises the number of Electoral Rolls each Kalimpong emigrant was located in. The table comprises two data sets, one for region and one for occupation. For the male emigrants, the difference between the two sets of data is that those who retired during the study period were not included in the occupational data. Women who were listed as “spinsters” were similarly excluded from the “spouse’s occupation” data set. While it would have been preferable to only use those emigrants who appeared in all five Electoral Rolls, this would bias the sample towards those who arrived in New Zealand later (given that many of the early emigrants retired or died between 1946 and 1963) and significantly reduce the size of the sample. As it stands, for both men and women, the majority – 87 per cent and 98 per cent respectively – were located in three or more Electoral Rolls (see Tables 8.1 and 8.2). Important differences between the early emigrants, who were at the peak of their working life in 1946, and the 1938 arrivals, who were still becoming established, were taken into account by grouping the emigrants into the three main phases of arrival that structured the scheme: pre 1921, 1923-29 and 1938.

**Geographical Mobility**

Before considering the trajectories of the Kalimpong settlers within New Zealand, it is important to reflect on their movements prior to arriving there. “Mobility” for these settlers had comprised two significant upheavals, the first from their place of birth and the second from Kalimpong. Both involved difficult journeys and permanent separations followed by periods of loneliness and transition. For some of the men, mobility had included time in India prior to emigration, and those who fought in the world wars experienced international

\textsuperscript{23} [title not recorded] *SACHM* 36, no. 3/4 (1936), [page number not recorded].
\textsuperscript{24} John Graham, “The Call of India”, Wellington broadcast, 4 July 1937, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:8:1, NLS.
mobility. Aside from these movements, descendant information has confirmed that the great majority of settlers never travelled overseas after arrival. Known exceptions to this were George Langmore, who visited India several times, and two women settlers who travelled internationally in the 1930s: Kate Sarkies visited her brother in India and the Dinning sisters were taken on a European tour by their tea planter father, who returned with them and bought the house in Karori that was to be the venue for many Kalimpong gatherings. This very low rate of international mobility was believed by descendants to have been influenced by their parent’s awareness of ongoing restrictions around Anglo-Indian migration, and by the absence of formal process by which citizenship was conferred. This sense of restricted mobility is an important platform from which to consider migrations at a local level.

Table 8.3 outlines the numbers of settlers residing in each province by electoral year. The data is also grouped into six main regions that align with the clustering described in the first section. Looking firstly at the provinces, Wellington had the highest number of emigrants in each of the five years (around 30 per cent), followed by Auckland, also relatively stable at about 20 per cent. Otago also sat at around 20 per cent for the first three electoral years, but eventually fell to 13.9 per cent. Canterbury, Manawatu-Wanganui and Bay of Plenty accounted for most of the other settlers. Grouping by major region shows that over a third were located in the Wellington area throughout the study period, which along with the Auckland and Otago/Southland regions accounted for three quarters of the emigrants. These figures roughly accord with initial placement (Table 8.4). The most notable difference was that 39 per cent were initially placed in Otago/Southland, while the proportion residing there in the study period ranged from a maximum of 21.8 per cent to a minimum of 15.4 per cent. Displaying positive changes were Auckland, from 14 per cent placement to between 23.1 per cent and 27.3 per cent residence, and the Central North region, which increased from 3.5 per cent placement to a range of 7.7 to 10.2 per cent during the study period.

The stability in the overall proportion of emigrants in each region was also apparent when tracking individuals over the five electoral years. Only 12 of the 85 emigrants moved to

---

26 These six major regions correspond with those used in the rest of the tables: Auckland, Central North, Wellington, Marlborough, Canterbury, and Otago/Southland.
a different province over this period. Those individuals are listed in Table 8.5. None moved to a different province more than once. Gavin Gammie and Colin Bayley both arrived with the 1938 group, and were living in Auckland in 1946 after returning from war service overseas. Gavin was living with his sister Betty in Kingsland, and this likely explains Bayley’s presence in Auckland too. Both settled in Lower Hutt from 1949 onwards. Several of those who moved did so at retirement age: George Langmore, Leonard Williams and Helen Savigny all moved from Dunedin to the North Island for this reason. Two others moved to neighbouring provinces: Sydney Williams from Northland to Auckland (in the same year that his brother moved to Auckland) and Mary Gibson (nee Ochterloney) from Wellington to Levin. Hence we could say that the level of transience among the Kalimpong emigrants was low in both absolute and relative terms.27

Having found evidence of stability in the proportion of Kalimpong settlers in each of the regions across the five election years, and very little individual movement between regions, a “settled destination” was assigned to each emigrant by allocating the region where they spent the majority of their working lives (Table 8.6). Although there were no statistical criteria for this allocation, the high level of persistence meant it was very straightforward in most cases. The benefit of doing so was that once a “settled destination” was assigned, gender and year of arrival could be brought into the frame. Table 8.6 shows several gender differences, most notably the relatively high proportion of men settled in the Otago/Southland region and the concentration of women settlers in the Wellington region. While 31 per cent of the men settled in the Otago/Southland region and 21 per cent in the Wellington region, for the women the statistic is reversed: 44 per cent settled in Wellington and only 15 per cent in Otago/Southland. This accords with the anecdotal evidence presented in Chapter Six using Graham’s 1937 diary. The proportion in the other main region, Auckland, is roughly the same for the women and men, at 22 per cent and 23 per cent respectively.

The breakdown according to “year of arrival” presented in Table 8.6 enables some elaboration of these gender differences. The groupings of pre 1921, 1923-1929 and 1938 were chosen to distinguish between the three “generations” of settlers and the changes in legislation that impacted the scheme. Of the 20 men who emigrated prior to 1921, 11 (55 per cent) settled in Otago/Southland, and a total of 75 per cent in the South Island. This was to be expected, as the early emigrants arrived in Dunedin and were placed in the South Island. However, of the 22 early (pre-1921) women emigrants, only seven (32 per cent) settled in Otago/Southland. Of the 1923-1929 emigrants, all of whom arrived at North Island ports, 50 per cent of the men settled in Auckland and 8 per cent in Wellington; while 35 per cent of the women settled in Auckland and 50 per cent in Wellington. Only two women and two men of this period settled in the South Island. The majority of the 1938 emigrants, 71 per cent of men and 50 per cent of women, settled in Wellington. All five men who settled in Wellington from the 1938 batch lived in the suburb of Lower Hutt. None settled in the South Island.

Two things are clear from this demographic data. The first is that, as would be expected, initial placement was a strong determinant of eventual place of settlement. But the second strong trend is that the women who arrived before 1930, regardless of initial placement, clustered in Wellington in greater proportions than the men. Table 8.7 groups the settlers according to “initial placement” in order to comment on the number who stayed in their region of placement (i.e. “no change”), and the direction of movement for those who settled elsewhere. Looking firstly down the “Totals” column, 52 per cent of those placed in Otago stayed in that region. One of the two women placed in Canterbury settled there; the figure for Marlborough is 29 per cent. In the two main areas of initial placement in the North Island, the persistence rate is higher. In Wellington, 61 per cent were placed and settled there, and in Auckland 83 per cent stayed. Initial placement was thus a stronger determinant of eventual settlement in the North Island than in the South Island. Over all the regions, the rate of movement away from initial placement is considerably higher than mobility during the study period. This suggests a positive mobility on the part of the emigrants – a willingness to move away from their initial placement (over which they had no choice), followed by a tendency to settle, which in turn was influenced by marriage, family and employment.
The high rate of movement away from the southern region warrants closer inspection of the direction of movement and some individual pathways. Of the 14 women placed in the southern region, eight (58 per cent) settled elsewhere, and of those, seven moved north and one south. Of the 19 men placed in Otago, the eight (42 per cent) who settled elsewhere moved northwards. Settling in the region in which one was placed, however, did not mean that they never left the region. Adrian Andrews, for example, was originally placed in Middlemarch, in Central Otago, but was working in Canterbury when he enlisted for war. After serving overseas he returned to Dunedin, where he was married in 1929. When Graham visited in 1937, Andrews was in Balclutha, a small town 50 miles south of Dunedin in a “public works camp”.

He returned to a Dunedin suburb in the 1940s and was listed in Electoral Rolls from then until his death in 1974. Likewise Mae Sinclair, of the 1912 group, was initially placed in Dunedin and spent more than a decade living there before working in Christchurch, where Graham met her in 1937, and then Auckland. By 1946 Mae was back in Dunedin and was listed in Electoral Rolls there until her death in 1984.

Of the women placed in the Otago/Southland region who moved north, three settled in Wellington: Rose Cooper, Minnie Lawless and Margaret Dinning. All became well-known members of the local community. Esther Graham and Dora Moller both moved northwards with their farmer husbands, Esther to Marlborough and Dora to Canterbury. Esther had lasting connections with the Wellington community, and Dora to the others settled in Christchurch. Alice Peters was an unusual case as she arrived in 1926 but was placed in Dunedin owing to the rest of her family residing there. Alice moved northwards in the late 1920s and settled in Auckland with her husband. As noted in Chapter Six, Alice hosted a Kalimpong reunion when Graham visited in 1937. She perhaps had more in common with the others of her generation placed in the north than the earlier generation in the south. Therefore, although marriage was a factor in determining where the women settled, they showed a strong inclination to seek out other Homes graduates in those places.

28 „Pour Les Intimes“, Dr Graham’s Diary (DGD) 1937, transcribed by James Purdie, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:8:2, NLS, 47.
The women who relocated northwards were more likely than their male counterparts to connect with others from Kalimpong. Of the eight men who moved northwards from the Otago/Southland region, three settled in Canterbury, three in Auckland, and two in Wellington. All had fought in the First World War. The three who settled in Auckland, Sydney Williams, Henry Holder and Eric Boardman, all went there immediately after returning from war. Graham did not meet any of them when he was in Auckland in 1937 and they are not known to have been involved in the local community. Two of the Canterbury settlers, the brothers Edward and Victor Snelleksz, had farms in mid-Canterbury. The third was Gordon Cullinan, who lived in Christchurch and was in contact with the small group that met occasionally at Kate Wilson’s (nee Pattison) house in Loftus Street.29 Gordon also stayed in lifelong contact with Harry King and Terence Buckley, who settled in Dunedin. All three men had arrived in the same group in 1920. The two men who settled in Wellington after beginning in the Otago/Southland region are not known to any of the descendants of the Wellington community who have participated in this study.

Another region that saw significant movement away, though in much smaller numbers, was Marlborough. Of the seven emigrants placed there, five settled elsewhere. The two who stayed are known to have never left Marlborough. One was Robert Ochterloney, who originally worked in Spring Creek and was in Picton when Graham visited in 1937; the other was Eva Masson who was placed with the “Mayoress of Blenheim” in 1927 and was found to be “most happy” by Graham in 1937 working for a Mr and Mrs Green whom she had been with for four years.30 Eva never married and stayed in Nelson. Of the five women who moved out of the region, two went south to Christchurch (Kate Pattison and Mary Howie). Of those who moved north, two settled in Wellington and one in Auckland. Again, those who moved to Wellington, Mary Gibson (nee Ochterloney) and Elsa Pomeroy (nee Spaul), became very familiar names among the community, establishing such close contact to Kalimpong settlers that their descendants consider them extended family. The high rate of movement away from the small townships of Marlborough can be understood as a movement towards the larger urban centres of Christchurch, Wellington and Auckland.

29 Personal communication with Gaynor Cullinan, 9 November 2011.
30 DGD 1937, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:8:2, NLS, 31.
Of the 28 emigrants placed in Wellington, 17 settled there, ten (seven women and three men) moved northwards, and one moved south. Rend Mortimore lived in Wellington for twenty years before serving in the Second World War, then married and moved to Invercargill in the south of the South Island, to be close to his wife’s family. Although photograph albums and letters show that Rend had been a part of the Wellington community, upon moving to Invercargill he broke contact with all except his sister, Jeanette (who stayed in Wellington). Rend never spoke of his background and his children were totally unaware of the Kalimpong upbringing or his presence in New Zealand prior to Second World War. Living in Invercargill, at a distance from any other Kalimpong emigrants, would certainly have facilitated this level of secrecy. Of the three men who moved north from Wellington, all settled in the Central North region. Three of the northbound women also settled in the Central North, two of whom formed a small community in Napier along with Molly Roberts (originally placed in Dunedin) and kept in close contact with those in Wellington. In every region except Auckland the women moved away at a much higher rate than the men, and yet this did not in any way weaken their Kalimpong connections. If anything the evidence suggests that their movements toward urban centres enhanced these ties.

**Occupational Status**

The occupations of the Kalimpong settlers listed in the Electoral Rolls from 1946 to 1963 were coded in order to comment on their place in colonial hierarchies. The coding was based on the classification scheme developed by Erik Olssen and Maureen Hickey for their study of urban occupations. Although their system was developed for census data between 1900 and 1936, the occupation lists in Olssen and Hickey’s appendices were found to comprehensively cover the descriptions used in the Electoral Rolls for my study period. The nine occupational codes and two supplementary codes used here are:

---

A third supplementary category for “Rural Occupations (16)” was used by Olssen and Hickey. While they provided additional coding for rural occupations that corresponded with the nine main categories, for those that are purely rural, such as “farm hand”, “dairy man”, or “poultry farmer”, there was no classification given other than “Rural Occupation (16)”. Olssen and Hickey kept the rural sector separate for two reasons. Firstly, their study was primarily concerned with urban occupational structures. Secondly, being listed as a “farmer” in this period was problematic owing to the heterogeneous circumstances such a classification might have indicated. However, because a specific concern of my study is the movement of the Kalimpong emigrants from their beginnings in the rural sector, their rural occupations were assigned a code within the main coding system. Those listed as “farm labourers” were assigned the “unskilled (9)” category, and those recorded as “farmer” were assigned the “small employers and self employed (4)” category. Although this did present some problems along the lines Olssen and Hickey indicated, it was deemed important to follow any progression from farm labourer to farmer, given that placement of the young men on farms, and indeed the emigration scheme itself, was predicated on this trajectory.

The issue of gender bias in the Electoral Rolls became immediately apparent. The women were, almost without exception, recorded only as “Married” or “Spinster”, despite information from private sources that indicated many, both married and unmarried, worked

---

32 Ibid., 58.
33 Ibid., 24.
throughout their lives.\textsuperscript{34} The women’s spouse’s occupation was used in lieu of their own paid work as an indirect means of assessing the women’s settled place in social hierarchies. This also facilitated comparison of the spouse’s occupations and mobility with the Kalimpong men, who were believed (on the basis of anecdotal evidence from various sources) to have occupied a similar demographic and been affected by the same social and political forces. But importantly, the spouses were, as far as is known, all of European ancestry.\textsuperscript{35} This affords a unique opportunity to assess the impact of race, by setting the social mobility of the Kalimpong men against a group that was not racially marginalised – but who were perhaps of a comparable class. It is through this comparative assessment that I bring race, migration and rural labour into conversation with the scholarship produced by the Caversham Project.\textsuperscript{36}

By coincidence, the numbers of married women (39) and Kalimpong men (38) located in the Electoral Rolls were almost identical. The men’s coded occupations were used firstly to look at the numbers of men in each category over the five years. For the Kalimpong men (Table 8.8) none were listed as “large employers (1)”; and very small numbers (three or less individuals in any given year) were coded as “professionals (2)”, “semi-professionals (3)”, “officials and supervisors (5)”, and “semi skilled (8)”. Of the two recorded as “professionals (2)”, one was a “marine engineer” for all four entries, the other was an “accountant” in 1957 after previously being listed as a “manager”. Both men were 1914 emigrants who fought in the First World War. “Small employers (4)” accounted for between 12.5 and 20 per cent of the Kalimpong men over the five electoral years. A similar proportion, 12.5 to 21.1 per cent, was assigned “white collar (6)”. The second highest proportion were employed in “skilled (7)” occupations, rising from a low of 12.1 per cent in 1954 to a peak of 36.8 per cent in 1963. The majority, in all years except 1963, were “unskilled (9)”, which showed a reverse trend to those in the “skilled (7)” category, falling from a high of 43.8 per cent in 1949 to a low of


\textsuperscript{35} While several of the Kalimpong men married Māori women, no evidence of a Kalimpong woman marrying other than Pakeha has been located.

\textsuperscript{36} See especially Erik Olssen, \textit{Building the New World: Work, Politics and Society in Caversham 1880s-1920s} (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1995); and Brookes et al, eds, \textit{Sites of Gender}.
21.1 per cent in 1963. These two categories, which accounted for over half of the Kalimpong men in four of the five years, indicate a generalised trend of upward social mobility.

Coding the occupations of the Kalimpong women’s spouses gleaned similar results (Table 8.9). None were listed in categories (1) and (2), and no more than four individuals in any one year were recorded in categories (3), (5) and (8). Like the Kalimpong men, many of the spouses (16 to 24.3 per cent) were “small employers (4)”, with categories (6) and (7) accounting for similar proportions over the five years. The largest category was “unskilled (9)”, although the proportion of spouses in this category peaked in 1957 – much later than the highest point for the Kalimpong men – before falling to its lowest point of 17.6 per cent in 1963. Comparison between the two sets of figures in this regard was hampered by the variation in the numbers of men listed in each electoral year, and the size of the sample meant that only very small numbers were present in each category. It was possible, however, and a useful starting point, to identify similar distribution of occupations in the two groups – albeit at a very basic level of analysis.

In order to enable a more meaningful comparison between the two groups, individuals were assigned a mean score, by averaging the codes over their working lives. (Listings as “retired” or “pensioner” were excluded, and one of the Kalimpong men was retired in all electoral roll listings and so was excluded from the occupational data.) Table 8.10 shows the mean scores for the Kalimpong men and the Kalimpong spouses. Again, the actual numbers are small and this should be kept in mind when looking at percentages. When compared, both groups were, as expected, very light at the “top” end of the ranking. Five men in each group scored between 4 and 4.9. The most striking difference was that twice the number of Kalimpong men scored between 7 and 7.9 than the spouses (n=10 compared to n=5), and the cumulative numbers at this point thus rank the Kalimpong men higher than the spouses: 26 (68 per cent) of the Kalimpong men scored at a 7.9 or above, compared to 20 (51 per cent) of the spouses. While nine of the Kalimpong men had an average score of 9 (i.e. never moved above “unskilled”), the corresponding number for the spouses was 14. In this basic measure of occupational status, therefore, race or origins do not appear to have been limiting factors.
The mean scores for the Kalimpong men were used to group the results by “settled destination” (Table 8.11) and “year of arrival” (Table 8.12). The “settled destination” table splinters the numbers to such an extent that it was difficult to identify any particular patterns, except to say that it does not seem to have affected occupational rankings in any noticeable way. Table 8.12 does not reveal any major differences between the 1910s and 1920s emigrants. In both groups most of the men scored in the middle ranks (4-8) with a very similar proportion in each comprising the lowest group. Notably, the seven men who arrived in the 1938 batch all scored between 6 and 8. Although they were fewer in number, it is interesting that they attained this relatively high range given that they were at the beginning of their careers in the period under study. Of the 1938 men, only Hamish Tweedie was ever recorded in an “unskilled (9)” occupation. Tweedie was a “soldier” (9) in 1946, a “factory employee” (9) in 1949 and 1954, and a “storeman” (6) in 1957 and 1963. Of the other six men, two were recorded as “clerk” or “public servant” for each of the five electoral years, two were “carpenters”, one was a “lineman” and one an “insurance agent”. None worked in the rural sector and none were self-employed. These were respectable occupations that placed the final group in employment that was far more conducive to settlement than rural labour.

Despite the high occupational rankings of the 1938 arrivals, Tweedie was the only member of that group who experienced any upward mobility over the study period. Apart from Colin Bayley, who moved “down” from “carpenter” (7) to “sheet metal worker” (8), no other 1938 emigrants strayed from their 1946 occupational coding. In conjunction with this workplace stability, the only geographical movement among the 1938 men was that of Gavin Gammie and Colin Bayley, who, as mentioned earlier in the chapter, were both listed in Auckland in 1946 and then settled in Lower Hutt. (See Appendix 2 for a full list of the 1938 men’s and women’s locations and occupations over the five electoral years, which further illustrates their remarkable stability.) Notable among the results for the women was that, with the exception of Kathleen Gammie, who married Hamish Tweedie, all of their spouses were coded in the lowest occupational status (all are in category 9) than the Kalimpong men.

Differences between the 1938 male arrivals and their earlier counterparts could be attributed to the rise in education standards at the Homes, and the reduced emphasis on farm
training when emigration to New Zealand halted in the late 1920s. Several of the 1938 group had trained in clerical positions in India while waiting for an opportunity to go to New Zealand. Gains made during their service in the Second World War and the improved employment prospects compared to that faced by the 1920s arrivals, also surely contributed to their relatively high occupational status. In addition, they were placed in the North Island, where an active Kalimpong community awaited their arrival. None of these factors, however, improved the prospects of the 1938 women, whose husbands began their working lives at the lowest end of the occupational structure. While the occupational stability of this later group of Kalimpong men was a positive factor (given that they entered a relatively high level of employment soon after their arrival), it does preclude a comparison between the opportunity structures available to them and the women’s spouses.

Fred Leith’s story provides a rich example of the particular dynamics of the 1938 group. The Leith family archive contains numerous documents from India that Fred brought with him as evidence of his qualifications. His Homes “Leaving Certificate” listed the examinations he passed prior to leaving Kalimpong in 1936, and achievements such as being school captain and “Platoon Sergeant”. There is a letter of recommendation from the principal of La Martiniere College in Lucknow, stating that Fred had passed the “Matriculation Examination of Calcutta University” before arriving at the college and was expected to have passed the “Intermediate Examination of the U.P. Board” which he had just taken.\(^{37}\) The letter continued in glowing terms regarding Fred’s sporting and military achievements, and his general “ability, diligence ... and pleasant personality”.\(^{38}\) Fred worked as a clerk for a shipping firm in Calcutta before joining the 1938 group. Like the earlier groups, the men were all placed on farms, which was emphasised by the *Evening Post* article that reported their arrival, stating that “the shortage of suitable farm labour in New Zealand was alleviated to a small extent yesterday by the arrival of a small party of Eurasian Youths at Wellington under a scheme arranged by the St Andrew’s Homes in Kalimpong, India.”\(^{39}\)

\(^{37}\) J.G. Taylor to Whom it May Concern, 4 May 1937, Leith family archive, Levin.

\(^{38}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{39}\) “Farm Workers: Eurasian Youths, Party from India”, *Evening Post*, 22 November 1938.
The story passed on by his son Martin is that Fred hated the farm work and lived in a “shack”. Soon after his employment began, Fred’s boss pulled him aside and gave him “a telling off”, calling him “useless”. Fred explained that he “had never worked on a farm before, that he wasn’t a farmer, he was an accountant”.40 After this, the farmer “took him into the house and gave him a room inside”. Fred found clerical work in the city and was living at the YMCA when war broke out several months later. According to Martin, Fred spoke of the war as the “highlight of his life”, which included promotion to the rank of Sergeant Major.41 Upon returning to Wellington, Martin felt Fred was “always turned down for government jobs because he didn’t have a New Zealand degree”. Even after re-qualifying at a New Zealand university in the 1960s, Fred never moved beyond “accounts clerk” despite performing tasks well above that description.42 A dedicated and diligent employee, Martin felt that it was because of Fred’s “colour” that he was never formally promoted. Fred’s story illustrates what might be thought of as a “false start” in the Kalimpong men’s farm placement, from which the majority moved upwards in occupational status. Given their education and work experience, had they been of European origin their first jobs would perhaps have more closely matched the positions they gravitated towards – skilled or white collar occupations in urban centres.

**Occupational Mobility**

Before exploring occupational movement across the sample as a whole, it must be stressed that the codes do not indicate a straightforward linear progression from lowest to highest. As Olssen has noted on more than one occasion, while a progression *is* implied between the highest and lowest categories, the boundaries between the mid-range occupations are less clear.43 It was useful however, to use the categories as a guide to identify movement and to then look to individual cases to make more specific claims about the outcome. A simple comparison of the Kalimpong men to the Kalimpong spouses (Table 8.13) was again quite remarkable for the similarities between the two groups. The same proportions in each did not change occupational category at all over the five electoral years and they moved

---

40 Personal communication with Joan Cudby-Leith (Fred’s wife) and Martin Leith, Levin, 15 November 2012.
41 Ibid.
42 Ibid.
category in almost identical numbers. There were interesting results regarding region among those who moved category (Table 8.14). Of the nine Kalimpong men who moved “up”, almost 50 per cent were in Auckland. Of the seven Kalimpong spouses who moved up, 71 per cent were in Wellington. Of the 16 men in total who moved up, only one was in Dunedin. Of those who moved down, across both groups, over 50 per cent were in Dunedin.

Downwards movements were, however, mostly between categories that were close to each other and therefore could not be claimed to equate to a fall in occupational status. Of the three who “dropped” more than three categories, one was Lorna McCabe (nee Peters, my grandmother). Lorna’s husband, Bill, was listed as a “poultry farmer” (4) for the first three electoral years, a “labourer” (9) in 1957 and “retired” (10) in 1963. My father’s understanding of this phase in his family’s fortunes illustrates the potential for the category “small employers and self-employed (4)” to distort the results. He remembered the period when Bill was working as a labourer at a brewery as the time that they were best off financially. The poultry farm continued to operate and provide an income, with Lorna, Bill and their two sons sharing the labour between them. This scenario also attests to the unrecorded work carried out by the women, a number of whom were married to farmers. The second who “dropped” was Terence Buckley, also in Dunedin, whose role as a “caretaker” (5) in 1946, 1949 and 1954, was followed by one listing as “DCC employee”. I coded this as category 9 due to lack of detail, but it could have been the same job. Finally, Clarence Bayley, in a working life that appears rather colourful, was the only obvious case of a lowering of occupational status. Bayley began as an “artist” (3), was then a “bootmaker” and “shoemaker” (4), an “assembler” (8) and finally a “factory hand” (9).

Several of the Kalimpong men who moved upwards achieved a clear rise in occupational status during the study period. Sydney Williams, a 1908 arrival who settled in Auckland, moved from an initial entry as a “faultman” (7), to the rest of his career as a “line foreman” (5). Henry Holder, another early emigrant who moved to Auckland, was a “manager” (5) for the first three entries and “accountant” (2) in 1957. Wilfred Snelleksz, a 1920 emigrant who was placed and stayed in Dunedin, was a “timberyard man” (9) for the first two electoral years and a “clerk (6)” for the last three. Snelleksz’s son-in-law described
Wilfred as having an “excellent career” for the Labour Department as the “chief rehabilitation officer” for returned servicemen.\textsuperscript{44} Richard Hawkins, a 1925 arrival who was a “farm labourer” (9) for the first three electoral years (and for the twenty years prior), became a “dairy farmer” (4) in his own right in 1957 as a result of winning a ballot for returned servicemen. Tom Spalding, a close friend of Hawkins’, was listed as a “motor mechanic” (7) between 1949 and 1954, before using his tea-planter father’s inheritance to purchase the business and become a “garage proprietor” (4) for the remaining years of the study period.

The Kalimpong spouses who rose notably in occupational status did so in similar ways to the Kalimpong men, though in slightly smaller numbers. Jeanette Mortimore’s husband became a “building supervisor” (5) after several electoral years as a “carpenter” (7). Esther Graham’s husband moved from “labourer” (9) in the first three entries to “farmer” (4) in the final two. Two of the women’s husband’s moved upwards in the final electoral year: Eva Royston’s husband from “labourer” (9) to “clerk” (6), and Kate Edbrooke’s husband from “agent” and “clerk” (both 6) to “superintendent” (5). Several of those whose coding did not change over study period are known to have had successful businesses. Molly Roberts’ husband owned a picture framing business in Napier; Mary Greg married into an established farming family in Levin; and Mary Howie’s husband was first a farmer, then a milkbar proprietor, and finally owner of a restaurant at New Brighton Pier in Christchurch. Lucy Boden was married to Sam Cairncross, a well-known New Zealand artist whose occupation remained steady in category three, with his various occupations recorded as “cameraman” in 1946 and 1948, “photographer” in 1954, and “artist” in 1957 and 1963.

The Kalimpong men were also successful in business (category 4). Leonard Williams’ hairdressing and tobacconist business in Dunedin provided his livelihood for over thirty years. James Bishop was a “grocer” in Wellington for all of his entries in the Electoral Rolls. Tom Watson was a “milk vendor” in 1946 and a “poultry farmer” for the next three entries. Charles Moller had one listing as a “poultry farmer” before being listed variously as “farmer” and “dairy farmer” for the rest of the study period. The practice of running small businesses

\textsuperscript{44} Personal communication with Niall Allcock, 26 July 2013.
is a common strategy for migrants to establish a niche in a new country.\textsuperscript{45} This was slightly different in the Kalimpong case however, as they could not rely on their own “community” (given its dispersal and small numbers) to patronise their businesses. To be successful at the kinds of businesses they established required a high degree of social integration and a reliance on the community at large to provide their customer base. At the lower end of the occupational spectrum, the Kalimpong men were variously employed on the railways, in factories, or as general labourers. None listed farm labour as their occupation in final electoral year. This could be taken as evidence of the mobility that Graham hoped would be possible in New Zealand, but it equally supports the argument that their rural beginnings were a symptom of the disruption and disjuncture effected by the migration scheme.

The final word in this section is given to the Kalimpong women who were enrolled to vote but whose status and mobility could not be assessed because they were not married. Six women were in this category. In Wellington, the Dinning sisters and Amy Gollan were known for their support of the Kalimpong community. Gollan used an inheritance from her father of £6000 to buy a house in Lower Hutt, and when Gavin Gammie was building a house nearby he and his family lived with “Aunty Amy”.\textsuperscript{46} Eva Masson was listed in Electoral Rolls in Nelson throughout the study period and beyond. In 1981 her status changed from “spinster” to “retired”, evidence that she had been working. When Eva died in 1998, her death notice described her as the “loved Auntie of Malcolm and Robert Junior, and Norma and Jim Ellis, all of London”.\textsuperscript{47} My contact with Eva’s extended family revealed that these were paternal relatives. When Gertie Plaistowe died in 1983 she had cash assets of almost NZ$10,000 and valuable furniture items including an “Indian brass table” and other items possibly inherited from her father. She bequeathed two thirds of her cash assets to the Homes in Kalimpong. Although these women did not “produce” their own families in New Zealand,

\textsuperscript{45} Sekhar Bandyopadhyay notes that by 1921 a third of the Indian male population in New Zealand was self-employed. See “Reinventing Indian Identity in Multicultural New Zealand”, in Asia in the Making of New Zealand, ed. Henry Johnson and Brian Moloughney (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2006), 127.
\textsuperscript{46} Jessie Twist (nee Kennedy) to James Purdie, 28 March 1950, Purdie Letters 1950, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:14:1, NLS; Isabella Gammie (nee Leith) to James Purdie, 22 August 1951, Purdie Letters 1951-1951, Kalimpong Papers, 6039:14:2, NLS.
they continued to receive financial and emotional support from paternal relatives and maintained a presence in extended “empire families” despite their distant settlement.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have taken a different approach in order to make more definitive comments about where, and through what type of labour, the Kalimpong settlers found their place in New Zealand. The silence that I argue was consolidated by political events in India in 1947 meant that there were few written sources available regarding their later lives in New Zealand. The only letters in their Homes personal files after the 1940s were requests for birth certificates, written mainly in the 1960s when they applied for pensions. Descendants have provided much information about family life in this phase, and they support the contention that producing their own children seemed to solidify the emigrants’ silences. This surely made them reflect on their own familial separations, as evidenced by a letter from Isabella Gammie to James Purdie in 1951. Explaining the difference in her own and her brother’s attitudes to their father, Isabella reminded Purdie that Fred “was just five years when he went to school and he asked me whether I could imagine him sending young John away now?”

The divergent development of regional Kalimpong communities has been frequently mentioned in this chapter. A memorable event in 1966 speaks to the particular nature of the Wellington community. Local Kalimpong settlers were invited to Government House for “morning tea” with the Governor General, Sir Bernard Fergusson (Figure 22). The photograph taken that morning portrays the coming of age of a group of people who found a place in the respectable working classes of New Zealand (Figure 23). Most men settled in non-professional occupations as skilled or unskilled wage workers, or as self-employed small businessmen. The women found their place, through marriage, in a similar demographic. Men and women alike moved towards urban centres, and they were remarkably stable in their chosen region of settlement. These patterns were to be expected of migrants who had arrived under a system of legislation that restricted the entry of others from their community. Once a

---

48 Isabella Gammie (nee Leith) to James Purdie, 22 August 1951, Purdie Letters 1951-1952, 6039:14:2, Kalimpong Papers, NLS.
49 Though Fergusson served in India during the Second World War, his connection to the Kalimpong community is not known.
settled place was found, there was an understandable reluctance to risk further movement. Overall, the results presented in this chapter suggest that race and origins did not substantively limit the Kalimpong settlers’ access to opportunity structures. Their movement away from farm labour and domestic service saw them absorbed into urban communities, assisted by their quiet conformity in the wake of the essential loss of their homeland.
Table 8.1: Frequency of Entry in Electoral Rolls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Entries</th>
<th>Regional Data</th>
<th>Occupational Data</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men (n=)</td>
<td>Women (n=)</td>
<td>Men Working (n=)</td>
<td>Women’s Spouses Working (n=)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)

Table 8.2: Number Located in Each Electoral Year by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)
Table 8.3: Province and Region by Electoral Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Region</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>n=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikato</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auckland total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Plenty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkes Bay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central North total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manawatu-Wanganui</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellington total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Coast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marlborough total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canterbury total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Otago/Southland total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)
### Table 8.4: Region of “Initial Placement”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago/Southland</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)*

### Table 8.5: Inter-Provincial Movements by Individual Emigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emigrant</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayley, C</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Lower Hutt (W)</td>
<td>Lower Hutt (W)</td>
<td>Lower Hutt (W)</td>
<td>Lower Hutt (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boardman, E</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>No entry</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Tangimoana (MW)</td>
<td>Tangimoana (MW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammie, G</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Lower Hutt (W)</td>
<td>Lower Hutt (W)</td>
<td>Lower Hutt (W)</td>
<td>Lower Hutt (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langmore, G</td>
<td>No entry</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Tauranga</td>
<td>No entry</td>
<td>No entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moller, C</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Reporoa (BP)</td>
<td>Reporoa (BP)</td>
<td>No entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholls, S</td>
<td>Papamoa (BP)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochterloney, M</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Levin (MW)</td>
<td>Levin (MW)</td>
<td>Levin (MW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattison, M</td>
<td>Waitakere (A)</td>
<td>Waitakere (A)</td>
<td>Marton (MW)</td>
<td>Maxwell (MW)</td>
<td>No entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savigny, H</td>
<td>No entry</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Hamilton (Wk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savigny, M</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, L</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>No entry</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, S</td>
<td>Dargaville (N)</td>
<td>Helensville (A)</td>
<td>Helensville (A)</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)*

**Key:**

A Auckland  
BP Bay of Plenty  
C Canterbury  
MW Manawatu-Wanganui  
N Northland  
W Auckland  
Wk Waikato  
W Wellington
Table 8.6: “Settled Destination” by Year of Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>&lt; 1921</th>
<th>1923-29</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>&lt;1921</th>
<th>1923-29</th>
<th>1938</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central North</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago/Sthldnd</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)

Table 8.7: Direction of Movement from “Initial Placement”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Placement</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Men (n=)</th>
<th>Women (n=)</th>
<th>Total (n=)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otago/Southland</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central North</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)
Table 8.8: Kalimpong Men’s Occupational Category by Election Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th></th>
<th>1949</th>
<th></th>
<th>1954</th>
<th></th>
<th>1957</th>
<th></th>
<th>1963</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Large employers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Semi-professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Small Employers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Officials and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) White-collar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Skilled</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Semi-skilled</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Unskilled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)

Table 8.9: Kalimpong Spouses’ Occupational Category by Election Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th></th>
<th>1949</th>
<th></th>
<th>1954</th>
<th></th>
<th>1957</th>
<th></th>
<th>1963</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Large employers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Semi-professionals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Small Employers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Officials and</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) White-collar</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Skilled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Semi-skilled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)
### Table 8.10: Occupational Category Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Average</th>
<th>Kalimpong Men (n=)</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Kalimpong Spouses (n=)</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-5.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-6.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-7.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-8.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)

### Table 8.11: Occupational Average by “Settled Destination”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occ. Average</th>
<th>Auckland</th>
<th>Cen. North</th>
<th>Wellington</th>
<th>Marlborough</th>
<th>Canterbury</th>
<th>Otago/Sth</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-5.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-6.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-7.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-8.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)
Table 8.12: Occupational Average by Year of Arrival

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occ.</th>
<th>&lt;1921</th>
<th>1923-1929</th>
<th>1938</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>( n = )</td>
<td>( % )</td>
<td>( n = )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-4.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-5.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-6.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-7.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-8.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)

Table 8.13: Occupational Movement and Direction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occ. Movement</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Spouses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)

Table 8.14: Occupational Movement by “Settled Location”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kalimpong men</th>
<th>Kalimpong spouses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Up} )</td>
<td>( \text{Down} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago/Southland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central North</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: New Zealand Electoral Rolls)
Figure 22: Invitation to Government House
(Source: Gammie family archive, Wellington)

Figure 23: Kalimpong Settlers at Government House, 1966
Front row, at centre: Lady and Sir Bernard Fergusson
(Source: Gammie family archive, Wellington)
CHAPTER NINE
RECOVERING KALIMPONG

He used to talk about looking out the window and seeing the mountains ... He couldn’t quite remember the recipe for chapatis, and over the years he tried to make them, but he loved his curries. I remember sitting down at the table one time and we were all perspiring and he wasn't. But he was very quiet about it, didn't say too much. And he just didn't want to go back.¹

The Kalimpong settlers’ “silence” about their heritage has emerged in the course of this study as the chief intergenerational legacy of the Homes emigration scheme. Almost every descendant has informed me that questions asked of their parents about their Indian heritage were met with responses that indicated significant discomfort or unwillingness to talk about it. In this chapter, the phrase “Indian heritage” encapsulates the circumstances of their birth, racial ancestry, and upbringing at the Homes. These three components can be linked to sources of major stigmas in the early twentieth century regarding illegitimacy, race and institutionalisation.² The resulting reluctance to talk about any aspect of their childhood has perplexed their children and grandchildren, who simply wanted to know something about this thread of their family history. As Gilbert Hawkins’ above comment beautifully illustrates, whisper-fine glimpses of India in these otherwise silent histories have been woven together by descendants in their attempt to forge narratives out of barely anything at all. The descendants’ visits to Kalimpong to fill these silences from the 1980s onwards have triggered a decisive turning point in the narrative, which I have argued throughout this thesis to be inextricably linked to the shifting place of India in New Zealand, and New Zealand in India, be it in the sphere of politics, empire, economic imperatives or imagined entities.

¹ Interview with Gilbert Hawkins, Wellsford, Northland, November 2011.
² Deborah Cohen’s work on stigma, and her argument that secrets had an important place in delineating and managing the borders between private and public sphere, has been highly influential in my analysis of the descendant testimony presented in this chapter. Deborah Cohen, Family Secrets: Living with Shame from the Victorians to the Present Day (London: Penguin Books, 2013), passim.
The drive to understand parental silence has preoccupied Kalimpong descendants in the same period in which academic scholarship on family secrets and shame has emerged.  Tanya Evans has argued for “explicit engagement with the needs, wants and methodologies of family historians” in order to synthesise otherwise disjointed histories, and to find the meeting point between genealogists who tend to work through the material “backwards” and academics who move “forwards”.  I envisage my own position here as working backwards to my grandmother, and then across to the other emigrants’ families, encountering descendants as they reach the point of intersecting interests. Attempting to enhance our understanding through the existing scholarship (both myself in this chapter, and descendants for their families) thus became an iterative process: the Kalimpong descendants were in possession of a wealth of material about their family stories and often informed opinions about the historical context, but were bereft of knowledge of the narrative of the larger scheme that included their parent or grandparent. This chapter is thus a constant interplay between the twin processes of addressing the absent public record of the Homes scheme and recovering a collective memory through the sharing of descendants’ memories, stories and research.

Silences

I was interested to hear your interview on National Radio recently. My Dad was one of the 1912 arrivees, H. S. Holder, and like so many Kalimpong kids spoke little about his experiences at Dr Graham's school or the circumstances prior to his attending.

Lou Holder’s first words of communication with me were typical of the way descendants have broached the subject of their parent’s Indian background. The perception that the Kalimpong settlers did not speak freely about their heritage is something that has, almost without exception, been acknowledged as a reason for their children’s and grandchildren’s curiosity. Here I aim to break down that generalised sentiment into a more nuanced understanding of a silence which has occurred across a spectrum – from not offering

---

3 Barbara Brookes has been a key contributor to this field in New Zealand historiography. See Brookes, “Shame and its Histories in the Twentieth Century”, *Journal of New Zealand Studies* 9 (2010): 37-42.
5 I have sought written permission to use all of the informal communications cited below.
6 Written communication from Lou Holder, 26 February 2013.
information, to a reluctance or refusal to answer questions, to outright denials of any Indian heritage, concealment and intentionally misleading their families. There has also been considerable variation in the reverberations of those silences in the next generation. Most descendants I have been in contact with grew up with some limited knowledge of their Indian heritage, and filled in the gaps in later life, often after their parent’s death, through research and travel. Others had no inkling of the scheme that bought their parent to New Zealand until I contacted them. In some cases this has meant prior confusion about whether their ancestry was Indian, Māori or European. Some have known a considerable amount about their parent’s background, but all were unaware of the scale of the emigration scheme.

Gavin Mortimore phoned me the day after receiving my letter suggesting his father, Rend, was possibly a Kalimpong emigrant. “You’ve told me more about my father in one letter than I learnt in 60 years”, Gavin informed me. He was delighted, and had already shared the information I had provided with his six siblings worldwide. Gavin told me of the conversations at their many family gatherings, which at some point would always come back to speculation about his father’s origins (he died in 1978). Rend would never talk about India – they “quizzed him” to no avail. Rend’s children would usually conclude that he must have been assisted to come to New Zealand after fighting in the Second World War, which was the earliest knowledge they had of him. “But then”, someone would say, “what about Aunty Jeanette?” For the family to learn that their father had lived in Wellington and laboured on farms for twenty years prior to settling in Invercargill was as much of a revelation as the Kalimpong background. Despite this sudden burst of information from an unexpected source, the details immediately rang true to Rend’s descendants and were accepted wholeheartedly.

Several similar cases of revelation emerged when the University of Otago issued a press release about my research early in 2013. Newspaper articles and an interview on National Radio brought numerous descendants forward. One listener was reminded of a friend’s father to whom “something horrible had happened” in his past. When I rang her friend, she was interested, but negative about the possibility of her father, Donald, being a
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7 Personal communication with Gavin Mortimore, 15 October 2011.
8 Jeanette was Rend’s sister in Wellington, referred to as Jean in earlier chapters.
9 Personal communication with Patsy Cowen, 1 February 2013.
Kalimpong emigrant. I did have a name on the list of emigrants that matched his, but it was a reasonably common name. As she began to tell the story of her father’s removal from India on a “ghost ship” to then be raised at an unknown orphanage in Wellington, I began to suspect that this was a family story that concealed a Kalimpong background. The only other detail the woman had was that the “Indian nurse” who accompanied him on the ship took a lifelong interest in him, and they knew her as “Aunty”. When she said the name of the “Aunty”, the Homes link was confirmed, as she was a well-known Kalimpong settler. Donald had died only a few years ago, aged 91. The topic of his childhood was one that his children knew they were not allowed to mention, as this would make him extremely agitated and upset. Their mother would always stop them if they started asking him about it.10

In both of the aforementioned cases, the descendants at least knew that their ancestry was Indian. Deborah French’s family did not even have that knowledge. According to her great-granddaughter, Deborah “was sent to New Zealand at about 15 years old and never spoke about her experiences. In fact, we grew up believing we were French until she died in the mid-90s when we found a yearly Kalimpong calendar and letters from the school”.11 In another family, the two children of a male settler had formed differing opinions of his heritage. One believed that their ancestry was Indian, the other Māori. This had repercussions for his many descendants, as his great-grandson wrote:

Growing up I always believed I had a trace of Indian heritage but in my teen years I realised that there was no proof available to me. ... I think the worst thing is just not knowing something, or being unsure of something. People notice I have darker bloodlines than most British settlers and usually think it’s Māori and I have been unsure of how to address their observations. ...

My daughter had to do a school project and present on her family tree and I had to explain the uncertainty to her as well so it’s really not a nice feeling. Just finding out about this little information you have amazingly discovered brought tears to my eyes.12

10 Personal communication with Barbara Cox, 1 February 2013.
11 Written communication from Emma Punter, 28 April 2013.
12 Written communication from Matthew Sturje, 26 July 2013.
This testimony raises the important issue of appearance, the telling factor that for many Kalimpong emigrants raised curiosity. The “dark complexion” noted in the war documentation had disappeared in some families by the next generation, as Graham and others hoped and theorised. In others, it has continued to show for several generations. In my own family, my father and my brothers inherited Lorna’s dark skin colour and eye colour. Because of this, there was never any question about the mixed-race heritage, plus we knew she came from India because of the tea planting memorabilia on permanent display in the family home. Numerous descendants have testified to a similar situation, where the tea planting heritage, and hence the knowledge of India as the place of birth, was never hidden (yet never really spoken about). This perhaps is a pointer to the changes effected by Indian independence. Whereas for the next generation, admitting to an Indian heritage suggested something exotic, this was not the case when India was under British rule. The great unknown for many families, then, was how and why they migrated to New Zealand. When my mother asked Lorna in the 1970s about where she had grown up, Lorna underlined her unwillingness to talk about it, simply saying “you wouldn’t want to know”.

Yvonne Gale’s family story was very similar to mine. Her grandmother, Jean Mackay, was sent to Dunedin in 1911 with her brother John. Yvonne began to research her Indian background some years after Jean’s death. As with the Peters family, colonial objects and photographs prompted curiosity from childhood onwards. Yvonne’s father remembered regularly receiving five pound boxes of tea from India, and Yvonne credited a photograph of Jean and John in Singapore, en route to New Zealand, as “spiking her interest”.\(^{13}\) Piecing these fragments together with an otherwise total absence of information, the only plausible explanation for Jeannie’s descendants was that her tea planter father took the children on a world tour and abandoned them in New Zealand. Unlike Lorna, Jean denied her (“obvious”) Indian ancestry, which made it difficult to ask questions about the topic. As Yvonne recalled, “we did bring it up, but she was so adamant that she didn’t have any Indian heritage – you just had to stop asking her.” The only time Yvonne remembered Jean “letting something out” about her Indian background was a reference to plantation life, which Yvonne “didn’t know

\(^{13}\) Interview with Yvonne Gale, Wanaka, February 2013.
was the truth or not – about peacocks in the garden, and having servants. But that, and the grandmother I knew, didn’t go together.”

Not having a broader understanding or contextual knowledge about how places could be connected made Jean’s stories more difficult to believe. As Yvonne stated, she struggled to make a coherent narrative from a story that took her grandmother “from India, to Owaka. It just seemed a huge jump.” When Yvonne sent the information from the Homes file to John’s (Jean’s brother) family, his widow phoned her in tears, saying that John had tried to talk about it, but they had not believed him. Lou Holder’s father, Henry, “never talked about” his upbringing, but did share many adventurous tales. Lou felt that Henry went to some lengths to invent “extravagant stories” about his background to conceal the truth. Another descendant of a male emigrant, Brian Hepenstall, wrote that his grandfather “never said much about his past. He was a great storyteller so it is hard to know the truth about some of the things he said.” Niall Allcock described his father in law, Wilfred Snelleksz, as “a great orator... but not very open” regarding his Indian heritage, although his Indian parentage was never denied. Niall felt that Wilfred was proud of his ancestry despite refusing to discuss the specifics of his background.

The stigmas that surround the Kalimpong story regarding race, illegitimacy and institutionalisation have a complex legacy in these silences. While the emigrants’ shame about their parents not being married has not been directly referenced in descendant testimony, there would certainly have been a concern to conceal this mark against their respectability. Race and institutionalisation, however, were commonly believed by descendants to explain the reluctance to divulge details of their Indian heritage. George Langmore called his house in Dunedin “Lopchu” after the tea estate his father owned, and he and his wife visited India several times. But according to his granddaughter he “never talked” about India, and while the upbringing at Kalimpong was never hidden, the fact that he was

14 Ibid.
15 Personal communication with Yvonne Gale, February 2013.
16 Personal communication with Lou Holder, 17 March 2013.
17 Written communication from Brian Hepenstall, 13 February 2013.
18 Personal communication with Niall Allcock, 26 July 2013.
Indian was. Mary Gibson’s (nee Ochterloney) daughter remembered being “excited about telling her teachers and schoolmates all about myself” on her first day at school, but was told by her mother “not to mention anything about India”. She felt her mother’s shame “as if it were my own” from that day forward. For others, the primary stigma was the trauma of growing up in an institution, due to separation from family or conditions at the Homes. Fred Leith was remembered by his wife, Joan, as being “very expressive about his gratitude to Daddy Graham and Daddy Purdie. But he never talked about his life at the Homes.” Mary Milne recalled the Dinning sisters describing the Homes as a private school for tea planters’ children, “and were very indignant about it being looked at as anything else.” When I asked if the Kalimpong women spoke of a desire to revisit the Homes, Mary recalled Nancy Dinning saying “she’d never go back to that place again. She said ‘It’s become an orphanage so we won’t be going back there’”. 

One family did not sense a particular silence around the Indian heritage when they were growing up. Tony Spalding’s children, Margaret and Ian, were “always aware” of the Indian ancestry, plantation life, and the circumstances that led to their father being sent to Kalimpong and later to New Zealand. However, Ian felt that his father “portrayed the Homes as a boarding school, not as a ‘home’ type of thing” and both he and Margaret struggled to remember their father sharing any information about Kalimpong:

MM: He used to sing “Remember St Andrews and old Kalimpong”. 

... 

IS: And stories of walking down in the cool mornings from Grant Cottage, through the – what’s that flower? – cosmos, orange cosmos. He loved cosmos. And he used to walk down and it was misty and he had these huge rows of those. But not a lot of school memories, mainly from the plantation.

Both Margaret and Ian attributed their father’s lack of talking in depth about the Homes simply to it being an experience that did not lend itself to the same storytelling as plantation

---
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life did. This again raises the question of what we mean by “talking”. Answering questions and telling stories are two very different things. Because the Spaldings never felt that information was being withheld from them, they had less need to ask questions. Margaret and Ian fondly remembered their father’s pact with his brother Charles that “they wouldn’t marry until they could live in the manner which they were accustomed to on the tea plantation ... So you see I think the plantation was always a foundation of their lives really.”

For those emigrants who remembered plantation life, it provided a positive framing for their lives that was not available to those sent from their place of birth in very early life.

The Kalimpong emigrants’ reticence about the Indian heritage has also been understood as a generational trait and one that did not necessarily originate with difficult memories of their upbringing. Sydney Williams seldom talked to his son, Vic, about India, the Homes or his early life in New Zealand. Nevertheless Vic felt that his father had a good life in New Zealand and enjoyed his career with the Post and Telegraph Department. While he had been interested to learn more about the circumstances of his father’s background from the family’s personal file held at the Homes, the information did not significantly alter Vic's understanding of his father’s life.

Sylvia Slater, the only daughter of Kalimpong emigrants Connie Walker and Horace Brooks, shared a similar sentiment. Her parents’ generation was one that did not talk freely about personal matters, and if information was not offered, children were not encouraged to ask. While there were many ways of interpreting the silence around this heritage, one common thread that I noted in my experiences with Kalimpong families was that the recovery of archival information prompted highly animated conversations among descendants. This is still a highly emotive subject, but silence is not the way descendants cope with their emotions. The boundaries between public and private space, as described by Cohen, are not guarded as they were in the early twentieth century.

25 Ibid.
26 Personal communication with Vic Williams, 2 February 2013.
27 Personal communication with Sylvia Slater, 13 November 2011.
28 Cohen, Family Secrets, xii-xv.
Communities

I think the Dinnings were a bit uncomfortable with people knowing that they came from India. Because one thing I can remember when we were little, they had a big gathering of OGBs [Old Girls and Boys] at their house … and then we went to St Ninian’s church in Karori which I think was their church. And they showed the film “The Lollipop Tree”. But I think the Dinnings never divulged to friends that they’d come from India, they said that they’d come from England I think. But they were lovely.29

How was it that an open and vibrant group of people were nevertheless remembered for their silence about the very heritage that connected them so closely to each other? Anne Beckett’s description of the Dinning sisters revealed something of the subtle workings of the Kalimpong community in Wellington. Although the Dinnings’ house was a focal point for gatherings, they were also remembered for their concealment of their Indian heritage. This contradiction is partly explained by the Dinnings’ assertions about the Homes being a private school for the children of tea planters, rather than a home for mixed race children. There is a general sentiment among descendants that while the Kalimpong emigrants might have spent a lot of time together, they did not talk about their school days “as such”.30 But the community also seemed to function on a tacit understanding that some were more accepting of their Indian ancestry than others. This issue was accorded a sensitivity and respect that was due at least in part to the very high regard in which the emigrants were held by the next generation of this community.

Whether or not the emigrants “talked about it”, contact with others from Kalimpong usually meant descendants had some awareness of the Homes. I have found evidence of close, lifelong relationships with fellow emigrants in all of the centres where they clustered. Particularly in the North Island, there has been a practice of descendants referring to the Kalimpong friends of their parents as “Auntie” and “Uncle”. When I first met with the Gammie family (Gavin and Isabella’s children) and Sylvia Slater in Wellington, they referred constantly to aunties and uncles, some of whom were blood relations, others were not. No distinction was made between the two. (Another descendant spoke of not realising that an “aunty” was not a blood relative until very late in childhood.) Like the Gammies, Sylvia’s

30 Personal communication with Leslie Gammie, Hamilton, November 2011.
parents were both Kalimpong emigrants. As neither of her parents had siblings in New Zealand, and Sylvia was an only child, her family was the Kalimpong community. She and the Gammies thought of their relationship as akin to being cousins. Despite this closeness, Sylvia does not remember her parents ever talking about Kalimpong, unlike “Uncle Gavin and Auntie Isabel” who often reminisced about their upbringing.

In our first meeting, the Gammie family collectively remembered frequent gatherings, as well as several occasions where principals of the Homes were hosted by the Dinnings or the Gammies on visits to New Zealand.\(^\text{31}\) When the same people were interviewed as a group a year later, Anne Beckett suggested that the “big gatherings” probably did not occur as often as she originally thought, “but it’s just that looking back they were quite memorable”.\(^\text{32}\) The occasions where they did all get together were remembered by these descendants for the delicious curries, and the children sitting together on the floor while their parents reminisced about aspects of life in India in their distinctive Kalimpong accent. The Dinnings’ house in Karori was “quite grand, and large, almost like a palace” in Anne’s recollection, with “lots of ornaments… and lovely china”. Mary Milne, who was brought up in the South Island but moved to Wellington in her late teens, also had strong memories of the Karori house:

> You’d have afternoon tea at 3 o’clock at the Dinnings. That was right on – everything was precise on time, meals and everything. It would be like high afternoon tea, it would always be nice, silver tea service, lovely china teacups and serviettes. They were very ladylike, and that was the British way, … Everybody used to remark on going to the Dinnings for afternoon tea.\(^\text{33}\)

Apart from the Kalimpong gatherings, many descendants have recalled regular visits between the Dinnings and their parents. Anne Beckett said that her father, Gavin Gammie, “would go and prune their trees or help with the garden, just things like that. And we’d always go and have a meal there.”\(^\text{34}\) Likewise the Dinnings would catch the bus and the train to come and visit her parents. Mary Gibson’s (nee Ochterloney’s) granddaughter remembers
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\(^\text{31}\) Personal communication with the Gammie family and Sylvia Slater, 13 November 2011.

\(^\text{32}\) Gammie group interview, Wellington, November 2012.

\(^\text{33}\) Mary Milne interview, Wellington, November 2012.

\(^\text{34}\) Anne Beckett, Gammie group interview, Wellington, November 2012.
taking her to the Dinnings house and leaving her to spend the day with them.\textsuperscript{35} Many descendants also remember visiting Mary. They speak of these relationships as being very supportive ones, whether that meant financial assistance or housing or simply a place to stay when they were on holiday. Mary Milne recalled that when she and her husband were travelling north the Dinning sisters would always suggest Kalimpong people that they should stop off and visit on the way. I asked the Gammie group interviewees about other occasions that they might have gathered:

\textit{JM}: Were there any other activities – sporting, clubs – that bought the OGBS together?  
\textit{SS}: Not that I’m aware of.  
\textit{AB}: Just getting together for tea.  
\textit{SS}: But no sporting events, or -  
\textit{JG}: But what about the card night at the Brookes’?\textsuperscript{36} [laughter]  
\textit{AB}: The cards eh! There were a lot of cards – Aunty Lucy liked the cards.  
\textit{SS}: Yes fair enough, there were cards [laughter] … and the horses. The horse-racing at Trentham.  
\textit{AB}: Oh yes, Trentham, picnics!  
\textit{SS}: Picnics, and everything.  
\textit{AB}: I can remember Colin Bayley being there once. A picnic under the tree.  
\textit{SS}: Yes he was there, and Hamish, Katherine … Aunty Lucy. Yes, the races bought them in, over at Trentham. And as you say, picnics. And I can remember us running up all the old steps, collecting the tickets [general agreement].\textsuperscript{37}

I have spoken to numerous descendants of Kalimpong families from the Wellington region during the course of this study. Most could name at least four or five Kalimpong emigrants that their parent kept in contact with, and they describe a community in which there was much humour, close bonds and a special affection for these unique individuals that were a much appreciated presence in their childhoods. Ruth O’Connor, daughter of Margie Smith, wrote that “As children we were never told of mother’s background, which I felt was a great pity because it was something different.”\textsuperscript{38} However Ruth had begun her letter by naming many of the Kalimpong women who she remembered from her childhood:

\textsuperscript{35} Personal communication with Maryellen Chandler, 27 January 2013.  
\textsuperscript{36} Jim is referring to Sylvia’s home.  
\textsuperscript{37} Gammie group interview, Wellington, November 2012.  
\textsuperscript{38} Written communication from Ruth O’Connor, February 2013.
Firstly many thanks for the magazine pages you sent, have found them most interesting. Many of the names listed on the Permit Register are so familiar to me, the likes of Constance Walker, Alice Smith, Margaret Fox, Lucy Tweedie were all our “Aunts”. They would all come to our home on a Sunday afternoon, play cards and have a curry – which I didn’t like!  

Molly Chambers was another who developed very close relationships with other Kalimpong families in Wellington. Her son, Clyde, was able to provide detailed information about seven of the women in the 1937 Wellington photograph with Graham, including the whereabouts of their grown children. Their families spent holidays together and supported each other in a myriad of ways. Given this closeness, Clyde “never thought” to ask those who had grown up at the Homes about their background. He did say that Molly was a little bit embarrassed about her heritage and that there were a couple of “rough moments” that made her a bit introverted. But he also said that they knew about the Homes, and that Molly always admitted that her mother was Indian and her father British. However when her granddaughter went to India to find out more about Molly’s upbringing, she avoided questions about where she had grown up and would “shrug and either say nothing, or say that she didn’t know.” As in every case, there were gender, generational, familial and individual dynamics to consider in unpacking the way that the community (and the silence) functioned. My sense is that the closeness of the community in some way functioned to protect the silence from specific queries. As my father has said, Lorna was “just Mum”, and he did not think to ask questions. Clyde’s sentiment regarding the “aunties” was very similar.

Further south, in Christchurch, Gordon Cullinan kept in touch with two emigrants in Dunedin, Terry Buckley and Harry King. Gordon’s daughter-in-law, Gaynor Cullinan, remembered visiting Harry and his family in Dunedin, as well as get-togethers in Christchurch. Gaynor knew that the men had come from the same place in India, but no further information was ever offered. On one occasion she asked Harry directly about the Kalimpong background. He looked to Gordon and Terry and “deferred to them”, as they
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indicated that he should not talk about it. But Gaynor emphasised that the occasions on which the men were together were “very special”, they were “very happy together”, and while Gordon was “disappointed” by the lack of correspondence with his parents, he regarded his background and emigration to New Zealand positively. In my own family, Lorna concealed from her family the Kalimpong connection to two women in Dunedin with whom she had lifelong friendships. When I asked my father if Lorna ever talked of India, he remembered particular occasions prompting some memories:

DM: Probably when I was about midway through school she might have talked – I might have asked more then, because we were doing things at school or something. I remember asking her about what different words were in India for tea and milk ... But then we’d have the wee trips to Port Chalmers ... She’d talk a wee bit then because she was going to Mrs Mac’s and that would remind her of coming over here.

JM: So Mrs Mac was someone that she worked for?
DM: Yes at the church ... she must have – probably helped at the church.44

Some time later I discovered that “Mrs Mac” was in fact Mrs McDonald (nee Kennedy), the former Homes housemother who went from Dunedin to the Homes in 1908 and was mentioned later in the Homes Magazine as a supportive presence for the Dunedin emigrants. Although my father had suspected she had some connection to Lorna’s early life, it had never occurred to him that she was linked to the Indian background. After all of the occasions we had talked about Lorna’s silence, which had never particularly concerned my father, the information about Mrs Mac prompted a strong response from him. “Why didn’t she tell me!” he exclaimed. Another Kalimpong emigrant, Lorna’s “best friend” Mae Sinclair, used to frequently stay with the family at Pine Hill. Don knew that Mae was Indian, but was unaware that they had grown up together and been sent to New Zealand as part of the Homes scheme. Any talk about India would be hushed before the children could really understand what was being said:

JM: So [Mae] used to stay here [at his home in Pine Hill]?  
DM: Yes, they were real good friends ... She used to come up on Saturday afternoon, in the taxi, and [as] we got older and had cars we’d take her home on Sunday night. But she was nice, always tidying up, she

43 Ibid.  
44 Interview with Don McCabe, Dunedin, April 2009.
was busy, busy busy all the time. You’d come out here at 7 o’clock in the morning and she’s dusting everything [laughs].

**JM:** Did Mae look Indian?

**DM:** Oh yes. Very much. She had quite a small face, round sort of face, always had her hair tied back in a bun, and quite dark. She seemed to be darker than Nana.

**JM:** So did you think they’d come here together? That they’d come from the same place?

**DM:** Yes, we sort of knew. They’d talk about things together sometimes, and you’d listen in, and think a wee bit about it [laughs]. But they were pretty shrewd. Mum would soon – if it got too deep she’d whip onto something else so quickly you wouldn’t know.\(^{45}\)

Dunedin was also the place of Mary Milne’s early childhood with her mother Kate Pattison, whose house in Broad Bay was often visited by the “Indian girls” (as Mary refers to them). Although the family moved to Gore and Invercargill, before settling in Christchurch, Mary had strong childhood recollections of the women, whom her mother remained close to throughout her life. Like other descendants, Mary felt that her childhood was greatly enriched by the Kalimpong people who were an integral part of her family. She shared many humorous and colourful stories with me, and her memories portray Kate’s friends playing an intimate role in her family life, as a few snippets show:

**JM:** So the memories you have of the “Indian girls” in Dunedin then, that’s from your very young life ... they must have made quite an impression.

**MM:** They did, because they were so happy and always laughing and always full of love. You could never do anything wrong. And Aunty Kathy, as I say, she was such a darling.

**JM:** And they all called you darling didn’t they?

**MM:** Oh yes, “darling”, and “pet”, and my aunty would always call me “dumkey”, “little dumkey”, whatever that was, some term of endearment.

**JM:** In Dunedin, you lived in Broad Bay, and the “Indian girls” used to come and see you at your place?

**MM:** Oh yes ... some of the girls would come out and stay at our place in Broad Bay the night. ... It was just so happy, it really was. They’d all be cooking together and making curries. I mean, we were brought up on curry. And they used to sit up on the verandah ... and we’re down here playing ... and we’d turn around and they’d be leaning over the

\(^{45}\) *Ibid.*
balcony... “Oh Kate”, they’d say, “they’re darling little girls, they’re beautiful little girls”. We thought we were the only little girls in the world at that stage.

**JM:** What did your Dad think of these Indian girls coming over to visit?

**MM:** He thought it was wonderful. Because they were always nice to Dad. And it was good for Mum and Dad, I mean he’d come in from working on the roads, in depression times and they would all be laughing and chattering away, and they’d be so pleased to see – “so pleased to see you Bill”, they’d all say. And they all used to hug one another. It was a nice relationship. ... Aunty Kathy would say to Dad, “now Bill, I don’t think you should have said that to Kate”, and “you know you shouldn’t have spoken to little Mary like that, she’s not a naughty little girl”. That was her favourite – she’d always say, “no you’re not a naughty little girl, you’re a good girl darling”.

**Being Mixed-Race in New Zealand**

With limited information about their Indian heritage, most Kalimpong descendants grew up with a generalised sense of being mixed-race. They were (and are) often thought to be part-Māori. Exploring this aspect of their experiences contributes an interesting layer to the growing scholarship on interracial communities in New Zealand. As noted previously, Graham made repeated public statements that New Zealand was an ideal destination for his graduates due to the absence of colour prejudice and acceptance of racial mixing between British and Māori. This was an outsider’s perspective. Few mixed-race Māori claimed this ancestry during the era of assimilation. Graham’s public rhetoric seems to have been an oversimplification of even his own beliefs, as letters to his graduates revealed that he was not surprised that they experienced some hardships owing to their darker skin colour. Graham was apparently satisfied that New Zealand at least allowed his graduates to cross the border and to find a place for themselves in which they could quietly raise their families. His great hope was that both the colour and hence the discrimination would completely disappear in
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subsequent generations. Graham’s biographer, James Minto, echoed this sentiment in his assessment of the emigrants’ fortunes, noting that many married New Zealanders and that “in another generation the Indian connections will probably have been forgotten”.49

Few descendants had ever heard their parents speak of discrimination or racial slurs, but most expected that their parents would have experienced both. The nature of any such discrimination was complicated by the common perception that the emigrants were part-Māori, as Graham had anticipated and regarded positively. The reactions of the emigrants depended on whether people assumed that they were part-Māori, part-Indian, or neither, and on how they felt about those categorisations. According to her granddaughter, Mary Gibson (nee Ochterloney) lived in an area where there were many Māori, and so preferred that people thought she was Māori rather than Indian.50 I encountered this attitude on numerous occasions, particularly in the North Island where there is a much higher Māori population. Several male emigrants married Māori women and produced families that are strongly connected to their Māori heritage. Hence attitudes of the wider Pakeha community toward Māori, as well as the proximity of Kalimpong families to Māori communities, have often determined the nature of the experiences of the emigrants and their descendants.

The importance of geographical location goes beyond the northern-southern divide or regional variation in the density of the Māori population. The testimony of two Kalimpong families who settled in northern areas demonstrates the complexity of everyday life in ethnically diverse rural communities. Their memories challenge Graham’s simplified version of New Zealand social relations, and in the first of those two families, reveal the direct impact of racial prejudice upon the Kalimpong emigrants. Richard Hawkins’ family grew up on a farm in Pune, a rural locale serviced by nearby Pukekohe – the town well-known in the history of New Zealand race relations as the birthplace of the White New Zealand League.51
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Pam’s recollection of racial segregation in Pukekohe contrasted with her initial answer about the family being “white” among the Pune community:

_JM:_ We’ve talked a bit before about Pukekohe, about the ethnic diversity there.

_PG:_ Oh, at Pune school, yes. We had the Māoris, the Chinese, the Indians, and us, the whites. But yes, Pukekohe - in those days it was a bit … we didn’t really realise until we had grown up what it was really like. It was a nice place, but the street was divided. We called it the “Māori side” down the bottom, and in the picture theatre the Māoris were only allowed to go downstairs. And if Dad wanted a haircut, he was only allowed down the bottom of the street because of his colour. Nobody up the other end of the street would cut his hair. He never ever said anything negative about it. So he may have had lots of thoughts but never ever told us children._52

Tony Spalding’s two children grew up in Awanui, a small rural community even further north. Like the Hawkins’, they differentiated between their acceptance in this tiny community and the reputation of the nearby town of Kaitaia. Margaret firstly connected their acceptance to the high proportion of Māori:

I can remember – probably when I was about twelve – realising at some stage that I was very fortunate because I was totally accepted by the Māori children. Probably half of the children were Māori, and I was always accepted because of my brown skin. My father was accepted as well. Whereas some of my Pakeha friends... they suffered from it a bit, because they were Pakeha, from the Māori children, but I never ever ever felt that._53

Margaret also stated that their parents sent them to Awanui school, unlike “the people on the road next to us [who] were all sent by bus to Kaitaia school, and that was the racist thing ... So we were lucky that our parents were never ever racist”._54_ This was something that caused confusion in interviews – people assumed I was asking about their parent’s racism...
towards others, rather than the other way around, which demonstrates the fluctuation between thinking of their parents as white and or as different, part of the majority or marginalised. This points to the perception of mixed-race people as interlocutors, which Margaret referred to when talking about the broader impact of her Indian heritage, which she believed gave her a “sort of tolerance of other people, and an understanding that I can meet anybody at any level and ... they seem to be able to relate to me”. Margaret also linked the presence of a sizable local mixed-race community (which sprung from intermarriage between Māori and Yugoslav immigrants in the early 1900s – “what we called Māori-Dallies”) to the family’s high level of integration, which was required to successfully run the only garage providing petrol and mechanical services to a large rural area.55

As discussed earlier, Margaret and Ian stated that they were “always aware” of their father’s Indian background and ancestry. “I don’t ever remember not knowing that my father was part-Indian”, Margaret said, “or suddenly being made aware of it”, Ian added. Margaret elaborated further on the way she answered questions about her ancestry: “When people would say, ‘are you Māori?’ I would say ‘no, I’m Indian, my father was Indian, part-Indian’”.56 Margaret used the common terminology for mixed-race in New Zealand, “part-Indian” or “part-Māori”, which acknowledges non-European ancestry without implying affiliation to a particular community (in contrast to the Anglo-Indian community in India) or employing the “language of fractions” used by officials in the early twentieth century.57 As Angela Wanhalla has argued, there was no established “mixed” identity among interracial Māori communities in southern New Zealand.58 Thus, terminology could be seen as carrying information about the way mixed-race is understood or valued in New Zealand.59 Margaret’s

---

55 This community is the focus of Senka Bozic-Vrbancic’s Tarara: C roats and Māori in New Zealand. See also Adrienne Puckey Trading Cultures: A History of the Far North (Wellington: Huia Publishers, 2011), 154-55.
56 Interview with Ian Spalding and Margaret Matterson, Auckland, November 2011.
57 Wanhalla discusses the use of “half-caste” or “quarter-caste” terminology in official definitions of Māori identity in In/visible Sight, 110.
58 Ibid., 45. Wanhalla does refer to the existence of a mixed-race “subculture” in the North Island, which Judith Binney has addressed in “‘In-Between Lives’: Studies from within a Colonial Society” in Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand’s Pasts, ed. Tony Ballantyne and Brian Moloughney (Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006), 93-118.
59 For a discussion of the “erasure” of mixed race people from national narratives, see Emma Jinhua Teng, Eurasian: Mixed Identities in the United States, China and Hong Kong, 1842-1943 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013), 8.
way of answering questions about her Indian heritage also illustrates the importance of colour and appearance. Unlike Richard Hawkins’ children, whose appearance would not suggest any non-European heritage, Margaret and Ian have both often fielded questions about their ancestry because of their colouring. In this sense, Pam and Gilbert could only comment on their experience of being mixed race; while Margaret and Ian could additionally consider the impact of being perceived as mixed race. The distinction between these two has affected the range of experiences and thoughts expressed by Kalimpong descendants.  

My finding that many Kalimpong descendants bemoan that they do not carry any visible reminders of this heritage was one of many indicators of the profound shift in societal attitudes to race in just one generation. The Gammie family have a very lively remembrance of Gavin’s involvement in a confrontation after he was refused alcohol because the barman thought he was Māori. He took some offence at this suggestion. Another descendant remembered their parent showing concern for grandchildren born with dark skin, believing that they would “have a hard life”. Others, as already mentioned, preferred to be thought of as Māori. When Sylvia Slater’s skin darkened over summer, her mother, Connie Walker, called her “my little Māori”. In contrast to the varying reactions of the emigrants, their descendants have all spoken of their Indian heritage positively. This shift in attitudes has coincided with, and is no doubt related to, the increasingly multi-cultural composition of New Zealand’s population. An important element in the resurgence of the Kalimpong narrative is the greater acceptance and visibility of the local Indian population. Mary Milne (in her mid-80s) used an older terminology to express this new kind of social interaction:

I think it was lovely, Mum being half-caste Indian. I always used to say, “Oh I’m an eighth”. And then Sabita, my friend – she’s Indian – she said to me, “Do you realise you’re quarter?” And I said “For goodness sake, I’ve been saying I’m an eighth”. “No girl”, she said, “you’re a quarter”. I said “Oh, that’s very nice”.

---

60 Teng also discusses of the implications of “looking Chinese” and related claims of authenticity. Eurasian, 17-18.
61 Māori were prohibited from drinking in public bars until the Licensing Amendment Act was passed in 1948. Marten Hutt, Māori and Alcohol: A History (Wellington: Health Services Research Centre, 1999), 72.
62 Personal communication with Sylvia Slater, 13 November 2011.
63 Interview with Mary Milne, Wellington, November 2012.
Legacies

Aside from skin colour, most Kalimpong descendants have been able to identify some tangible reminders of their British Indian heritage, which becomes more visible when looking at the community collectively. In this section I begin by exploring Indian cultural legacies (food and language), then a Kalimpong legacy (accent) and paternal British ones (plantation stories and colonial objects). Looking firstly at language, Richard Cone remembered his mother, Dora Moller, being “quite fluent” in Hindi and wanting to teach it to her sons, although she never did. Mary Milne recalled the Kalimpong women in Dunedin speaking and writing Hindi “for a start”, but felt that they “lost interest” as they carried on with their new lives. In later years her mother would say, “I should have taught you girls Hindi”, and would sometimes sit down and try to write in Hindi. Mary also remembered mentioning the language to Margaret and Nancy Dinning, who indicated that they had “forgotten that part of life” and did not want to speak Hindi. Pam Gardiner remembered her father teaching them “Jack and Jill went up the hill to fetch a pail of pani [water]”.

When I first met Gavin and Isabel Gammie’s children, they spoke of their parents often using an Indian language to swear at each other. I broached the subject again in a recorded interview:

JM: I think you mentioned last time that there were some language things that came through, phrases that they used? [immediate laughter]
AB: I know Mum and Dad used to curse each other in – what’s that thing Mum –
RG: [reels off a long Indian phrase to lots of laughter]
AB: Oh that’s right.
RG: Yes because after we went to Kalimpong we went to Nepal, and the evening after we went for the walk, and there were some young kids around…they would have been about 16 or 17 … I said that [the Indian phrase] to them and they looked at me and they laughed … But I can’t remember what it actually meant [lots of laughter].
AB: I can remember being on holiday at Smith St in Hamilton and Mum said that to Dad and I said “what does that mean?” and, [gestures that she won’t tell her] and I said “I’ll ask Uncle Ferg” and she said “NO you don’t!” And she used to say [kerja mai…]. I don’t know what that meant. And Mum always called Dad a “lhata”, which I gathered was a stupid oaf, or something derogatory.
JM: Do you know what language it is?

---

64 Personal communication with Richard Cone, Christchurch, 8 November 2011.
65 Ibid.
66 Interview with Pam Gardiner, Auckland, November 2011.
AB: I don’t know.
RG: No I don’t know.
AB: No idea!67

A related topic is the Kalimpong accent, which many descendants have noted as the Indian legacy that most differentiated their parent. Given the stigma around accent in India, which was an important determinant of their position on the spectrum from British to domiciled and mixed race, as well as within the Anglo-Indian community, it is interesting to speculate on how it might have been received in New Zealand. For descendants, the accent is something they remember fondly. Wellington descendants sometimes used the Kalimpong accent when recounting memories of their parent, describing it as a combination of Indian accent and a Welsh sound. Anne Beckett had a childhood memory of hearing someone talking to her parents at a sports game, and she thought he spoke “just like Mum and Dad, and it did turn out that he was from Kalimpong. At the get-togethers they would all just fall into this way of talking, all the same. They had a real lilt.”68

References to food have already frequently appeared in the excerpts in this chapter, and it is the most tangible legacy of the Indian heritage in Kalimpong families. Eating Indian food in 1950s and 1960s New Zealand was significant because it not only meant eating a distinctive type of food that looked, smelt and tasted different, but also required preparing and cooking food a particular way, and locating unusual ingredients. Mary Milne recalled that when they gathered, the women would “sit on the porch and be chatting away in Hindi, eating soup and picking stones out of the lentils ... boiling up the rice and drinking the rice water.”69 Later when Mary travelled to Fiji and stayed with an Indian family, she described feeling “at home” when they engaged in identical food rituals, which she had never seen outside her family home.70 George Langmore also loved to cook Indian food. His granddaughter

67 Gammie group interview, Wellington, November 2012. A local Nepali speaker, Rajni Wilson (who grew up in Kalimpong but now lives in Dunedin) confirmed that lhata is derogatory Nepali term. Lhata appears in Simon Mainwaring’s appendix “Homes slang” as meaning “dim-witted”. Mainwaring, A Century of Children (Kalimpong: Dr Graham’s Homes, 2000), 196. Rajni could not understand the other phrases repeated by the Gammies. They are possibly from the Khasi language, Isabella Gammie’s mother’s community.
68 Personal communication with Anne Beckett, 22 October 2011.
69 Personal communication with Mary Milne, 11 March 2012.
70 Ibid.
remembered him sourcing pickles and tea from India throughout his life.\footnote{Personal communication with Judy Wivell, Dunedin, 23 April 2013.} Ron Gammie stated that “apart from having curries, which were a really great thing to have, I would have classed myself as a Kiwi”. Anne Beckett’s husband Charlie supported that sentiment, stating that it was really a “school culture” that they brought to New Zealand, rather than an “Indian culture”, and that “the only Indian thing I know is Mum (Isabel Gammie) and her curries”.\footnote{Gammie group interview, Wellington, November 2012.}

British dining habits have been brought from plantation bungalows to New Zealand dinner tables by some emigrants, and in some cases by the planters themselves. Egerton Peters and Hugh Dinning were not the only tea planters to visit or settle with their children in New Zealand. Richard Hawkins’ father arrived in New Zealand in the 1960s to spend the last few years of his life with his son and young family. Although he did not share stories of plantation life with his grandchildren, he made a strong impression on them. Pam thought that “he spoke like the Queen” and Gilbert noticed his very different habits:

> We were typical Kiwi family, we’d roar in for tea – and he’d turn up for tea, in his suit, tie, and you had to have a napkin with a napkin ring on there, and a solid – a silver knife and fork there like this, and I’d just look [and think], like where’s this joker come from? And he did that right up until the end.\footnote{Interview with Gilbert Hawkins, Wellsford, Northland, November 2011.}

Although Gilbert saw his grandfather’s behaviour as contrary to their own “Kiwi” way of life, many descendants have found a legacy of plantation life in the Kalimpong emigrants’ tendency to be “very particular” in a variety of ways. Edward Snelleksz’ grandson described him as “incredibly gentlemanly” and “in fact, a bit overboard” about his concern with manners and hygiene.\footnote{Personal communication with Brian Hepenstall, 13 February 2013.} Although Vic Williams remembered his father for his deft manual skills (another trait common among the male emigrants), he too described his father as “a wonderful gentleman”, who “dressed for lunch”.\footnote{Personal communication with Vic Williams, 2 February 2013.} Pam Gardiner remembered her father “always dressed spic and span, nothing out of place”.\footnote{Interview with Pam Gardiner, Auckland, November 2011.} Tony Spalding’s daughter directly connected his memories of having a punkah wallah at the dining table at the plantation with
his later concern that things were arranged in a particular way: “You always had to have your napkin beside you, even if it was your lunch or breakfast, the table settings had to be just perfect. He was very particular about those sorts of things.”

The final legacy of the British fathers was financial bequests. In some families this was a source of discontent; in others it was regarded as testimony of their lifelong concern for their children’s wellbeing. Amy Gollan bought a house with the money she inherited from her father. Tony Spalding purchased his business in Awanui with a trust fund held by the Homes from his father’s estate. Mary Milne remembered being about 12 years old when her grandfather passed away “in London or wherever he was”. “All of a sudden, out of the blue, we’ve got a grandfather”, she said. Although her mother’s claimant rights were contested by relatives in England, the sum awarded financed much needed renovations on their Loftus Street house. Yvonne Gale believes that the events following her great-grandfather’s (Jean McKay’s father) death created significant disturbance in their Dunedin household. “Dad talks about a huge row in the family”, Yvonne said. In their case an inheritance was not forthcoming, and this caused a rift between Jean and her husband that was never mended. Judy Wivell believed that her grandfather George Langmore received financial support from his father’s family in England, with whom he had regular contact. For most descendants I have spoken to, however, any contact with the British branch of their families has occurred when they have travelled to England or Scotland to research their family history. Often the first step in making those reconnections has been a trip to the Homes in Kalimpong.

Return to Kalimpong

And so nothing much was said until I was about 18, and I asked my father, “how about going back to India?” He said “this is the first time in my life that I've had a family around me and I don't want to leave it. I'm not interested in travelling or anything.” So that was the end of that. It took many years before I started to think about it again.

---

77 Interview with Ian Spalding and Margaret Matterson, Auckland, November 2011.
78 Interview with Mary Milne, Wellington, November 2012.
79 Personal communication with Judy Wivell, Dunedin, 23 April 2013.
80 Interview with Gilbert Hawkins, Wellsford, Northland, November 2011.
A surprisingly high proportion of descendants that I have been in contact with have made the trip to Kalimpong to retrieve information and see for themselves the circumstances under which their parents grew up.\textsuperscript{81} Most of this travel has happened from the 1980s onwards, which coincided with a greater ease of international travel and with India becoming a much more common tourist destination for New Zealanders – another way in which the Kalimpong narrative has been influenced by reconnections between New Zealand and India at a broader level. As Gilbert Hawkins said, when he first thought about going to India, very few people that he knew of went there. “In those days, everyone went to Australia”, he explained. The timing of this travel also coincided with the period in which many of the original Kalimpong emigrants died; thus reflecting a nostalgic interest in knowing more, and the opportunity to do so without upsetting the delicate balance of their parent’s acceptance of their past. These journeys have also been prompted by the discovery of photographs or documents among their parent’s possessions that led them to Kalimpong. Many descendants had been reluctant to carry out research into such a sensitive area when their parents were still alive, while some were actively discouraged or misled. Mary Howie’s granddaughter wrote that Mary was “horrified when I told her that I was going to start looking into my family history” and so she had “not really pursued this side of my ancestry”\textsuperscript{82}.

The contrast between descendants’ mobility and the Kalimpong emigrants’ stability warrants some exploration here. The strategies of silence and stability used by their parents to make a new start were a poignant precursor to their children’s subsequent mobility as a means of disrupting the silence and reconnecting with the past. What is remarkable, like the shift in racial attitudes, is how quickly that transition occurred. In one generation, descendants have been secure enough in their “New Zealandness” to turn back towards a heritage that for their parents was something that threatened the possibility of their social acceptance. The journey to Kalimpong has been viewed as an opportunity to answer questions about family heritage, but also as a means of giving purpose to an existing desire to travel. Many descendants, myself included, have been quite happy that the only way to find out more was to pack one’s bags and go to Kalimpong. Certainly in my own case, there was a prolonged frustration with

\textsuperscript{81} In the course of the study I been in contact with descendants of just over half (67) of the Kalimpong emigrants. Copies of Homes personal files have been retrieved by at least 40 of those families.

\textsuperscript{82} Written communication from Carole Duffield, 9 June 2013.
stories that had “worn out” – stories that had been heard and misheard so many times, and changed and misunderstood to such an extent, that they held no possibility of disentanglement. Some fresh “evidence” or simply photographs of the place my grandmother might have inhabited, had the potential to add new life and new possibilities to a family history that had come to be thought of only as shrouded and mysterious.

If I could generalise about descendants’ responses to visiting Kalimpong it was one of sadness at the discovery of certain details about their parent’s upbringing, but also in the realisation that it was chiefly the stigma of being born into an interracial family that prevented discussion of this background – a stigma that descendants understood, but did not themselves share in any way. They have been amazed and surprised to find the Homes in a similar state to what it would have been when their parent lived there, and impressed by the beauty of the landscape. For many the motivation to go to Kalimpong was simply to stand on the ground that their mother or father had grown up on, particularly for male descendants. Gilbert Hawkins was moved by his ability to be in the precise location of his father’s childhood, which he was surprised to learn was essentially unchanged:

That first time we went there they said it was virtually the same condition as when my father was there and we walked around, up the hills, and into the dormitory. It was rather, mmm, it sort of gave a certain amount of closure to it.\(^{83}\)

Gilbert found his father’s name inscribed into the head of the bed in what they knew to be Richard’s cottage. His sister Pam, who visited Kalimpong separately, remembered “going up and down the big stairway” in her father’s cottage and thinking “wow, I wonder how many times he went up and down there, and did they ever dare slide down the banister!”\(^{84}\) Many people have found visiting the dormitory room in the cottages to be a moving experience. Seeing forty beds close together brings home in a very direct way the nature of “orphanage” life, regardless of what they know of Graham’s motivations to provide a better future for Anglo-Indian children. When Ron Gammie attended the Homes Centenary in 2000, his parents’ reminiscences allowed him to connect with many aspects of Kalimpong life. Ron

\(^{83}\) Interview with Gilbert Hawkins, Wellsford, Northland, November 2011.
\(^{84}\) Interview with Pam Gardiner, Auckland, November 2011.
was surprised by the extent to which visiting Kalimpong heightened his interest in his parents’ history. “I think to me I almost need that real element for it to mean – well not to mean a lot, but to really understand it”, he explained. 85 When I asked him about the most emotional aspects of his visit, his answer conveyed the very real sense of reconnection between the distant sites of Kalimpong and New Zealand towns (in his case Lower Hutt) that many descendants experienced:

    On the road below the school … it winds down to that Rilli River. I guess that’s where for me it was the most emotional, because that’s where there were a lot of young kids … I remember them [his parents] talking about going down and swimming in the river. But there were lots of moments, just things like seeing the names [of his parents’ cottages] and you knew what a part of it [they were] – and here you are, so many miles away. 86

The recovery of information through the Homes practice of retaining correspondence in a “personal file” for all previous students has been an unexpected bonus for many who have travelled to Kalimpong, and in retrospect this information has become the most “amazing” part of that journey. Other descendants have received copies of the files in the post after making contact with the Homes. The information they contain has often brought about a complete transformation in their family narratives. For the Spaldings, who had never had reason to suspect a negative aspect to their father’s upbringing, some letters in the file “took a while to come to terms with”. “Margaret and I went into a great funk for about a week”, Ian told me, for “we couldn’t imagine that this had been my father’s life.” It seemed to them that Tom’s upbringing had been “glossed over”, particularly the separation of the boys’ from their mother. 87 In addition, the Spalding file revealed that a third brother, Donald, whom Tom said had died prior to Ian’s visit to India in the 1970s, had actually still been alive at the time. Although this information had a positive outcome in their eventual reconnection with Donald’s daughter, their initial response was one of betrayal by an otherwise “very honest” father. For Yvonne Gale, reading letters written by her grandmother and her great-grandfather had the opposite effect. “I was amazed”, Yvonne said, “it showed a side of my grandmother I didn’t really know when she was alive ... It completely changed my thoughts

---

85 Interview with Ron Gammie, Wellington, November 2012.
86 Ibid.
87 Interview with Margaret Matterson and Ian Spalding, Auckland, November 2011.
about her. I was a little bit in awe of her considering she had another language, and that she’d travelled the way she’d travelled. We knew nothing about that.” The letters also showed a surprisingly caring side to her great-grandfather. “We thought that the two of them had been abandoned”, Yvonne said, “so our opinion of her father wasn’t very high. That changed it.”88

In seeking information to fill the gaps incurred by their silences, we descendants have ended up privy to information which the emigrants themselves did not necessarily know about. Concealment began with their fathers, and Graham, both of whom kept information from them. When we ponder their silences, we might consider that part of the silence may have represented a genuine lack of information about central aspects of themselves. Perhaps at the core of the stigma and the pain was the simple fact of not knowing who your mother was, or what became of her, or why your father sent you away. Speculating about such sensitive matters is one thing when perusing letters written by a great-grandfather over a century later, but raised very different feelings for the Kalimpong emigrants, many of whom knew very little about their own parents. The extent of this sense of absence and loss that Homes graduates wrestled with over their lifetimes was expressed with incredible poignancy in a letter from a New Zealand emigrant to John Graham in the 1920s, who simply asked “Who are my parents? Will you please write to me and let me know what I am?”89

Lou Holder’s post-Kalimpong sentiments were common to many descendants who regretted that their parent or grandparent did not feel comfortable talking to them about it before it was too late. “The Kalimpong heritage was something I had always wondered about”, Lou said, “and I was very sorry to have not pressed it when my father was alive and been able to talk to him about it and possibly taken him there”.90 But I would (and did) say to Lou that there were reasons why those discussions did not take place. In hindsight it may seem a simple thing to persist with a line of questioning, but in real time, in any given moment, it can be incredibly difficult to broach a subject that an elderly parent wishes to

88 Interview with Yvonne Gale, Wanaka, February 2013.
89 Note that Mary asks what, not who she was, and referred to questioning of her racial status by some fellow emigrants. Mavis Haslett to John Graham, 10 January 1922, Haslett file, Dr Graham’s Homes Archive (DGHA), Kalimpong.
90 Personal communication with Lou Holder, 17 March 2013.
avoid, especially if the reasons for that reluctance are not known. My own understanding of the silences in the Kalimpong story is that there was a process by which the emigrants reached an acceptance of their past, which took time, but which once settled gave the impression to the outside world that all was forgotten. The slightest stirring, however, could instantly raise that sediment, disturbing the present moment, and making it murky with past memories and emotions of surprising intensity. There is no separation of the good and the bad when it comes to the emotions stored inside our precious memories, especially when delving into the stuff of childhood and family. While the return to Kalimpong has been an adventurous, emotive and tranquil journey for the present generation, there is an enormous gap between those sensations and the distant, complex memories of those who left it a century before.

“Final thoughts”

It seems apt to draw this final chapter to a close with the responses given by descendants at the end of their interviews, when I invited them to add any final thoughts. Several descendants spoke of wanting to know more about their Indian grandmother. Margaret Matterson said that while she felt her Scottish and Irish heritage were important to her, she would “love to know more about my Indian side, would love to have known my Indian grandmother”. 91 Yvonne Gale also identified her maternal Indian ancestor as the only part of the story that she had not been able to fully explore, but viewed that as “an impossibility”. She spoke of a friend who was looking further back into the family line, “but that totally doesn’t interest me. It was just Granny [Jean] and her life. Her story.” 92 I had a strong sense with Yvonne that after a sustained period of research, she had let the story rest. Learning about my research and meeting me had stirred up her engagement with the family story, but in a more limited way. For Yvonne, and for many descendants I met, learning of the larger community was a welcome opportunity to dip again into their family history, almost like an epilogue to the research they had already done. Nothing would ever approximate the very personal and intense journeys of discovery that they had already been through.

91 Interview with Ian Spalding and Margaret Matterson, Auckland, November 2011.
92 Interview with Yvonne Gale, Wanaka, February 2013.
The lingering gap which is the absence of information about the Kalimpong emigrants’ mothers echoes Cohen’s discussion of the present preoccupation with “talking” as inherently better than “not talking”.93 We might just as soon ask ourselves why it is that we do talk, as ask a former generation why they did not. But I think descendants would say that the problem with “not talking” was that future generations were left with a gap in their family line. In our way of thinking, there is nothing that carries so much stigma that it is worth sacrificing a branch of one’s family tree. It is difficult for descendants like Gilbert Hawkins to accept that despite their full commitment to this research, they can only put “Bengali” in the space for their grandmother, with nothing but blankness further down the line. Even so, Gilbert found the whole experience of travelling to Kalimpong and Assam very meaningful:

While I was milking the cows tonight, I was just thinking about how it has all affected me, not knowing at the time. I’ve always felt that I’m a bit different ... and you often wondered, well, where do you actually come from. So that’s become quite a big part of my quest to at least find out a little bit about India, or the area [we’ve] come from. It wouldn’t be completed until I’ve found something out about my grandmother, but I don’t think that’s going to happen.94

Final thoughts about the merits of Graham’s scheme have brought forth conflicting opinions. Lou Holder was shocked and upset by the cold manner in which his Indian grandmother was treated, as evidenced by the letters in his father’s file. After speaking with Lou, he sent me an email to clarify his opinion of the Homes, stating that although he was “initially distressed by the actions of my Grandfather and Dr Graham towards my father and his mother” he was also “eternally grateful” that his father was given an opportunity to settle “in a more caring environment probably than if abandoned to the streets of India.”95 Those present for the Gammie group interview had differing opinions of the Homes, but agreed on their good fortune as a result of their parents being placed in New Zealand. Graham himself would probably be surprised at the turn towards India that the next generation has exhibited, despite and even because of the heritage fading over time. His inability to foresee the anxiety that blank family lines would cause, illustrates the function of a kind of forgetfulness that in his time was a precursor for a new beginning. And although he lauded the relationship

94 Interview with Gilbert Hawkins, Wellsford, Northland, November 2012.
95 Written communication from Lou Holder, 17 March 2013.
between settlers and Māori in New Zealand, it is unlikely that he had any sense of the deep connection with Māori culture that many Kalimpong families would develop, as expressed in Anne Beckett’s response to meeting with me and learning of my research:

I think part of this thirst to know as much as I can about my parents comes from my journey learning Te Reo Māori [Māori language]. I am truly inspired by so many concepts and values within Māori culture. For instance there is this premise that you have to walk backwards into the future, always acknowledging those people and experiences that have preceded you and have helped shape your individual identity. ... In a way, I see your research in that same light, Jane, for you are uncovering the history of a group of people who share a common kinship and your research is going to bring their stories to light for so many of their descendants.⁹⁶

---

⁹⁶ Written communication from Anne Beckett, 4 April 2012.
CONCLUSION
SETTLING THE NARRATIVE

My one regret is that no one ever asked me if I wanted to go to New Zealand.¹

There is no doubt it was a successful plan and policy bringing so many now fine people to New Zealand and our society at this end of the world. We owe them much for their part in the family life of ours and so many others’ families in our community.²

In January 2014, just a few months before completing this thesis, I travelled to Queensland, Australia, to visit Beryl Mortimer (nee Radcliffe). Beryl, who emigrated from the Homes to New Zealand with the 1938 group, had just turned 93 years old and was still living independently. To be informed so near to the end of this project that one of the original emigrants was alive and well turned out to be excellent timing, presenting an unexpected and welcome opportunity to talk to Beryl about my findings.³ When I walked into her modest but very bright and comfortable home, two framed photographs in prime position on the wall above her armchair in the living room immediately grabbed my attention. One was a portrait of John Graham; the other was the studio photograph of the 1938 group. Beryl’s daughter noted my reaction and assured me that these were permanent fixtures on her mother’s wall. It was a remarkable experience to spend two days talking with Beryl, and listening to her often strident testimony about the difficulties of her Homes upbringing, while my view of her was framed by portraits that communicated her desire to be reminded of it on a daily basis.

Beryl was not alone in experiencing conflicting and very powerful emotions about being raised in an institution that left her with a sense of indebtedness to its founder and pride in being associated with “the Homes”, despite the lingering hurt of her familial circumstance. In writing this thesis I have utilised a range of archival sources that have exhibited similar ambiguities. The layered narrative built from those sources has identified key junctures of the

---

¹ Interview with Beryl Mortimer (nee Radcliffe), Queensland, Australia, January 2014.
² Sir John White to Isabella Gammie, 17 April 2000, Gammie family archive.
³ Beryl’s daughter found my website in the course of looking for information about Kalimpong and contacted me. My project website has facilitated many such descendant contacts: www.kalimpongkids.org.nz
collective story; however the emigrants’ experiences and the legacy of the scheme have been
understood in a myriad of ways. In this dissertation I have argued that the diversity of
circumstances from which the emigrants were sent to Kalimpong was a vital contributor to
this complex legacy. In the opening chapters I utilised the Homes personal files to
disentangle the children’s categorisation as Anglo-Indian upon admission. The files also
revealed important dynamics of interracial tea plantation “empire families” of the early
twentieth century, countering the historic erasure of mixed-race offspring from British
families and the Homes suppression of the children’s maternal family line. Highlighting both
the disruption to, and continued operation of, these empire families, I have demonstrated that
sending the children from the plantation to the Homes and later from India to New Zealand
were distinct and crucial moments in their lives. Emigration to a distant settler colony
substantively shifted the balance of these families, in some cases facilitating increased contact
(as in the Peters family) and in others quite the opposite (as in the Moller family).

My meeting with Beryl immediately reinforced the argument that emigration to New
Zealand was more than simply a continuation of the trajectory initiated by admission to the
Homes. As soon as we sat down to talk, Beryl made the unprompted statement (cited above)
that her only regret was not being asked if she wanted to go to New Zealand. In a sharp
reminder of the uneven social settings navigated by the Homes scheme, Beryl stated that the
main problem with her first domestic service position was that she was “treated like an
Indian” or “a coolie” because she was expected to eat separately from the rest of the family.
She thought of her emigration to New Zealand as being sent away from India and a further
rejection by her father, rather than an opportunity. Beryl’s only positive memory of her initial
placement was that the problems she had with the family led to her friendship with Janet
Fraser, the wife of the politician Peter Fraser, who intervened in the situation and assisted her
into a nursing position. Despite ongoing dissatisfaction, Beryl spent most of her adult life
living in Wellington, moving to Australia when she was 73 years old.

Beryl’s negative portrayal of her placement of New Zealand is not included here as
representative of the emigrants’ experiences. Her feelings do, however, bring a grounded
perspective to discussions of immigration legislation in the 1920s and 1930s. Although I
have argued that the workings of that legislation was about more than doors open and closed, Beryl’s emphasis upon her lack of choice in emigrating to New Zealand is an important reminder that those permissions were navigated “successfully” by an institution on behalf of adolescents who had little awareness of the repercussions of that success. But Beryl spoke very highly of the Fraser family, who were instrumental in facilitating the entry of the 1938 group. Graham identified Peter Fraser as an ideal supporter due to his political standing, Scottish background, and Indian sympathies. This thesis has illuminated a network of Homes associates throughout New Zealand, many of whom had existing connections to India, and without whose assistance Graham’s emigration scheme would never have become a reality.

John White, author of the letter to Isabella Gammie cited above, was another well-placed Homes associate. His father, Charles, was a long-time Graham supporter in Dunedin and later in Wellington, and both his mother and his sister employed Kalimpong women. His assertion that the Homes scheme was successful in bringing many “now fine” people to New Zealand could be read as an answer to Charles Holdsworth’s question a century earlier as to whether the Kalimpong emigrants were “likely to turn out well”. It is undoubtedly easier to definitively claim the benefit of the scheme for the host community, than to make a similar claim from the emigrants’ perspectives. Indeed my research has indicated that the Homes graduates found their place in the respectable working class, and descendants have generally described their parents as hard-working, community-minded people who made the best of their situations. In many ways they were ideal settlers.

As this thesis has demonstrated, however, the emigrants turned towards a New Zealand future with a quiet fortitude, seldom sharing the difficulties of their past, even with their immediate family. In their initial years in New Zealand, emigrants retained ties with various strands of their dispersed families and staff at the Homes; while new associates, and other Homes graduates and siblings placed in New Zealand comprised their extended local family. As they began to produce their own families, the details of their Indian heritage and the nature of their Kalimpong connections faded from view, both in public life and in some

---

4 It was Charles White that arranged Graham’s meeting with the acting Prime Minister Peter Fraser in 1937 to discuss resumption of the emigration scheme.
cases in their private family life as well. In terms of their relationship to New Zealand society, the Kalimpong emigrants were afforded what was seen as the best possible option for people of mixed descent – the right to disappear into colonial society. Building consensus out of diversity was a key characteristic of New Zealand communities when the Homes scheme began, but fundamentally that was a British consensus that rewarded only those outsiders who took on the values of the majority and kept any differences to themselves. For the Kalimpong settlers, the desire to conform was reinforced by the political upheavals in India in the decades after their arrival in New Zealand. Through their families’ experiences, this thesis has demonstrated the wide-ranging impact of India’s withdrawal from the British Empire.

Studies of migration that have explored the exclusions of non-white or non-British perspectives tend to focus on the cultural loss or conflict incurred by that process. In this study, however, I have emphasised the gendered conflict that emigrants encountered in undertaking their labour roles. This was partly because the cultural loss was mostly brought about by their “pre-assimilation” at the Homes in Kalimpong, where ties to their maternal linguistic and cultural heritage were substantially attenuated. While I have identified the importance of the legacies that did live on in the emigrants’ private worlds (their memories, their family homes, the Kalimpong community), those legacies were largely hidden from public view. Hence in exploring the integration of Kalimpong emigrants into the colonial majority I have argued that labour and gender were the primary vehicles of socialisation. These modes carried traits of distinctive social worlds of British India – namely tea plantation families and Anglo-Indian communities – to New Zealand, cutting across the usual delineation of ethnicity according to religious affiliations, race and regional groupings. The results that this analysis has yielded point to the advantage of focusing on economic perspectives in the migration experience.

From my early imaginings of a single chapter that outlined the Indian “background” to the Homes emigration scheme, the thesis has instead coalesced as a study of connections to India that have been as important in phases of low visibility as when they were trumpeted by Graham at the height of the scheme in the 1920s. And while I initially thought that I was putting to paper a narrative that was yet to be articulated, in my meetings with descendants I
encountered a powerful yet subterranean origin narrative that we all reached for at various stages of our engagement with our family histories. The use of public archives to bring about reconnections that remedy the very disruptions that those archives were implicated in, is an irony that confronts many family researchers. But this study has looked also to private archives to narrate the emigrants’ life stories. In my interviews with their children I have often been reminded that the Kalimpong settlers were “just Mum” or “just Dad”. They did, however, lead lives that followed an extraordinary trajectory, where sudden shifts to vastly different social worlds were followed by long periods of stillness. As silent as they were about their pathway to New Zealand, one heartening commonality among the family stories is that the emigrants have, in almost every case, left a trail to their Indian heritage. Those clues have led their descendants to their specific origin stories, and from those new places we have walked through our memories of their lives in New Zealand with a fresh perspective.
### Appendix 1: Arrivals from Kalimpong, 1908-1938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group #</th>
<th>Year of Arrival</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>n=</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Age at Arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Williams, Sydney</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams, Leonard</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boardman, Eustace</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sinclair, Clarence</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sinclair, Aileen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bishop, James</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brooks, Tom</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boardman, Eric</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cruden, James</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May, Richard</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mackay, Jean</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mackay, John</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hall, Harry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Langmore, George</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Savigny, Patrick</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cooper, Rose</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fullerton, Evelyn</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hall, William</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Higgins, Dorothy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hughes, Ernest</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Llewellyn</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O’Shannahan, Quinton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ochterloney, Mary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ochterloney, Robert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Savigny, Helen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sinclair, Mae</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snelleksz, Edward</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart, Eric</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plaistowe, Gertrude</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roberts, Molly</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Holder, Henry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawless, Charles</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lemare, Stuart</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Andrews, Adrian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bishop, Max</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hall, Richard</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melville, Hamilton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chambers, Molly</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lawless, Minnie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarkies, Kate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Savigny, Minnie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pattison, Kate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pattison, Mary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #</td>
<td>Year of Arrival</td>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Age at Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brown, Annie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buckley, Terence</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cullinan, Gordon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edbrooke, Kate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>King, Harry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snelleksz, Victor</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sommerville, Hera</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dinning, Margaret</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graham, Esther</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greig, Janet</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greig, Mary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyon, Robert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snelleksz, Wilfred</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Chaston, Gwen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaston, Mary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haslett, Mavis</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moller, Dora</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters, George</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters, Lorna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greig, Thomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muspratt, Hugh</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith, Tom</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blackhall, Alexander</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gammie, Elizabeth</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gammie, Fergus</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O’Brien, Peggy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watson, Charles</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watson, Thomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bayley, Clarence</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brookes, Horace</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dinning, Annie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duncan, Miriam</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gammie, Moira</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gollan, Amy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greig, Helen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hawkins, Richard</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keelan, Thomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Penny, John</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reid, James</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robertson, George</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Royston, Eva</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spalding, Charles</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed, Thomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spencer, Roland</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stevenson, Michael</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group #</td>
<td>Year of Arrival</td>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>n=</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Age at Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Allcard, Alice</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allcard, Violet</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fox, Margaret</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gammie, Alison</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MacIntyre, Donald</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macey, Richard</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mason, Eva</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortimore, Jane</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mortimore, Rend</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moss-Hayes, Oscar</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peters, Alice</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith, Alice</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith, Margaret</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spalding, Thomas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart, Alison</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walker, Constance</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White, George</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>French, Deborah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Howie, Mary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott, Anne</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speed, Constance</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tweedie, Lucy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moller, Charles</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boden, Lucy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Davenport, Ellie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennedy, Jessie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moller, Elizabeth</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spaul, Elsa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Anderson, Peter</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayley, Colin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beaton, William</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berkeley, Dorothy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gammie, Gavin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gammie, Kathleen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kennedy, Thornton</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leith, Fred</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lethaby, Pamela</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McKenzie, John</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholls, Sheila</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Radcliffe, Beryl</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tweedie, Hamish</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuart, Reginald</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of emigrants = 130: 67 men, 63 women
## Appendix 2: Occupations and Locations for 1938 Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayley, Colin</td>
<td>Carpenter (7)</td>
<td>Carpenter (7)</td>
<td>Metal Worker (8)</td>
<td>Sheet Metal Worker (8)</td>
<td>Sheet Metal Worker (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaton, William</td>
<td>Insurance Agent (6)</td>
<td>No entry</td>
<td>No entry</td>
<td>No entry</td>
<td>No entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammie, Gavin</td>
<td>Pensioner (war) (10)</td>
<td>Carpenter (7)</td>
<td>Carpenter (7)</td>
<td>Carpenter (7)</td>
<td>Carpenter (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy, Thornton</td>
<td>Clerk (6)</td>
<td>Clerk (6)</td>
<td>Clerk (6)</td>
<td>Civil Servant (6)</td>
<td>Public Servant (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmerston North</td>
<td>Palmerston North</td>
<td>Palmerston North</td>
<td>Palmerston North</td>
<td>Palmerston North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith, Fred</td>
<td>Clerk (6)</td>
<td>Clerk (6)</td>
<td>Clerk (6)</td>
<td>Clerk (6)</td>
<td>Clerk (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart, Reginald</td>
<td>Lineman (7)</td>
<td>No entry</td>
<td>Lineman (7)</td>
<td>Lineman (7)</td>
<td>Lineman (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opotoki</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opotoki</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tauranga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tweedie, Hamish</td>
<td>Soldier (9)</td>
<td>Factory Employee (9)</td>
<td>Factory Employee (9)</td>
<td>Storeman (6)</td>
<td>Storeman (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women*</th>
<th>1946</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley, Dorothy</td>
<td>Spinster (11)</td>
<td>Farm Hand (9)</td>
<td>No entry</td>
<td>Farm Hand (9)</td>
<td>No entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gammie, Kathleen***</td>
<td>Soldier (9)</td>
<td>Factory Employee (9)</td>
<td>Factory Employee (9)</td>
<td>Storeman (6)</td>
<td>Storeman (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Lower Hutt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholls, Sheila</td>
<td>Spinster (11)</td>
<td>Spinstern (11)</td>
<td>Spinster (11)</td>
<td>Dairy Worker (9)</td>
<td>Porter (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papamoa</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radcliffe, Beryl</td>
<td>Spinster (11)</td>
<td>Spinster (11)</td>
<td>Spinster (11)</td>
<td>Slipworker (9)*** Presser (9)***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* showing spouse’s occupation if married  
**spouse is Hamish Tweedie  
***spouse deceased, Beryl listed as “presser”
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