

Beyond the Eurocentric History of Migration: An Indian Perspective

ADAPA SATYANARAYANA

INTRODUCTION

The dominant paradigms in migration studies have not adequately examined contacts and linkages between Asian countries as significant in the evolution of modern globalization. In this paper an attempt is made to address some aspects of the process of formation of regional/sub-globalization based on contacts and linkages between Asian countries by exploring the trajectory of migration of South Indians to Burma, Malaysia and the Gulf countries during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It also seeks to locate and contextualise the significance of migration networks in the creation of modern world economy. It argues that the diversity and unevenness of globalization needs to be analyzed keeping in view the non-western dimensions as well as to explore its historical forms and contexts. It critically examines some of the themes in recent debates regarding the incorporation of the Indian subcontinent into the capitalist world market and highlights the importance of migrations for certain regions and sectors of modern Indian economy. Its aim is also to analyze the long-term dynamics of labour migration and the evolution of intra-Asian migratory processes in a regional perspective.

In this paper, I propose to de-construct certain notions of Eurocentrism in the writing of global history of migration in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The three important propositions which reflect the Eurocentric bias related to migration can be stated as follows:

Firstly, the underlying assumption of Eurocentric-Orientalist and traditional Marxist characterization of the difference between the West and the rest is that of a stagnant and unchanging East versus a dynamic West of mobile Europeans crossing seas and oceans to realize their dreams of enrichment and empowerment. However, 'the image of Asia as static and stagnant, common to European writings on Asia over many centuries, was only part of the story' (Amrit 2011: 20). In the Orientalist construction of an immobile and static peasantry that did not leave homes and villages, religious and cultural beliefs supposed to have played a

significant role. According to the Eurocentric view, unlike Western Christianity, the religion of the Hindus and the Indian caste system, taboos and prejudices did not facilitate the growth of an adventurous spirit and an entrepreneurial ethic. It has been maintained that while the Protestant Ethic led to capitalism in the West, the superstitious religions like Hinduism and Buddhism caused immobility, stagnation and backwardness in the East (Weber 1969; 2009). Further, Orientalist scholars tended to maintain that, 'British colonialism brought India out of morass of degradation and stagnation into which it had sunk and opened it to the energizing and uplifting winds of the West' (Lal 2007: 280).

Secondly, the western literature on migration tends to privilege Europe-based trans-Atlantic mobility of people, skills, commodities, ideas, culture, etc., and undermines the role of intra-Asian migrations in the making of the modern world. The privileging of the West as the source of all global changes and Europe as the loadstar of History and modernity is implicit in these studies. 'The age of mass migration that commenced in the 1840s has traditionally been conceived within the orbit of Atlantic history, and rendered as narrative of modernity and industrialization' (Bosma 2004: 116).

Thirdly, the Eurocentric migration studies while prioritizing the role of Western capital underplayed the role of Asian labour in the emergence of the international capitalist world order and modern globalization. Further, such studies also tend to conceptualize the evolution of modern/imperial globalization in terms of the Western impact on Asia and Asia's response to it. Socio-economic transformation in the colonial countries of modern Asia has been examined within the framework of the capitalist world economy centered on European imperialism. Likewise, in the Eurocentric writings the process of formation of regional and sub-globalization in terms of intra-Asian regional networks has also been inadequately explored. Hence, I wish to focus on the movement of people across the Bay of Bengal, Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean region and regional interaction. I will argue that a study of comparisons and inter-connections are necessary in writing an unbiased and comprehensive global history of migration. According to a Japanese scholar:

...an important aspect of global history is the history of the formation of mutual interdependence or interconnectedness between the various regions or areas in the world under the framework of a capitalist world economy. The progress of globalization has promoted the formation of interconnected economic linkages beyond national borders at various levels of transnational movements including exchanges of goods, peoples, money, technology and information. . . . Through the study of the process and progress of globalization, we can better interpret modern world history not only from comparative perspectives, but also from the perspective of the formation of relational history within a capitalist world-economy (Akita 2000: 2).

CRITIQUE OF EUROCENTRIC APPROACHES

The postcolonial historiography has been characterized by the fundamental conceptual differences between the scholarly discourses in India and in the West, especially regarding the relations between the West and the rest. In particular, in the subaltern historiography certain basic assumptions of Eurocentric meta narratives of modern world history have been subjected to criticism, on the grounds that they homogenize human experiences and 'airbrush out' the history of people without history (Bayly 2004: 4; Chaturvedi 2000: 66). The Eurocentric accounts and interpretations of modern India have been critiqued by the scholars of subaltern studies. The subaltern historians sought to recover the de-centred narratives of disempowered and history-less people like the downtrodden castes, communities, labourers and women. They vigorously critiqued and repudiated the narratives of colonialist, orientalist, nationalist and Marxist historiographies that sought to mould Indian experiences into Eurocentrism (Prakash 1990; 1992). In the words of Young, 'The concept of the subaltern ascribed a new dynamic political agency to those who had formerly been described as the wretched of the earth, the oppressed and the dispossessed. By means of the subaltern the oppressed assumed political agency to become the subject of history, no longer its abject object' (Young 2001: 355).

In modern Indian historiography the process of the incorporation of India into world economy and the colonization of the Indian economy under British rule have remained as themes of overriding importance. The recent voluminous and analytical interpretations of modern Indian economic history provides a refreshingly new understanding of the broader historical and theoretical insights into forces that have shaped the modern world and India's place in it (Balachandran 2003; Balachandran and Subrahmanyam 2006; Bose 1990; 2006; Parthasarathy 2011; Roy 2012). The different schools of thought have offered divergent and conflicting views about the impact of colonialism on Indian economy and raised important questions pertaining to the role of India in the evolution of modern globalization. They have also indicated the importance of India as a key player in the modern world history. These historiographical debates have also thrown fresh light on the multiple forms and processes of India's integration into the global economy, the understanding of which is crucial to analyze the historical experiences of India during the modern period. The world systems approach (Wallerstein 1986; 2004) has been subjected to critical scrutiny and a large number of historians of India have offered revisionist perspectives and interpretations within the broader interregional, supra-regional and global contexts (Chaudury and Morineau 1999; Frank 1998; Prakash 2002). Recent modern Indian scholarship has also critiqued the logic of Wallerstein's tripartite

classification of core, semi-periphery and periphery and found its wholesale application to South Asia to be problematic in the context of new evidence and data. The characterization of South Asia by world system analysts as 'abstract, theoretical and monothetic' and capitalism as 'concrete, empirical, idiographic' and the model of the 'incorporation of Indian subcontinent into capitalist world economy' have been disputed by many scholars. They stressed intricacies and peculiarities of South Asian region and the 'active agency of its inhabitants who, through their creativity, collaboration, resistance played a crucial role in the construction of the edifice of world capitalism' (Bose 1990: 2-6). Some scholars have emphasized the significance of 'the level of political and economic activity that lies, between, as it were, local specificities of the subcontinent and the generalities of the international capitalist system' (Bayly 1990: 31).

The world system approach tends to concentrate mainly on relations between the West and the rest and describes how and why the economic and political links between the capitalist powers and their subject colonies were transformed. However, the complexities of India's integration into the capitalist world economy are inadequately conceptualized by the world system theorists. Critiquing the singularity of world system model, some scholars have suggested 'multi-centred approaches' and 'many routes to the modern world system'. Washbrook argued that the experiences of South Asia amply illustrate the virtues of a more multi-centred approach. He advocated the centrality of India as a semi-periphery in the capitalist world system: 'Indian intermediary capital, migrant labour, and administrative and professional skills are seen to be crucial in the worldwide enterprise of capitalist development' (Bose 1990: 78). Similarly, Sugata Bose remarked that between South Asia and world capitalism 'lay an inter-regional arena of social politics and political economy. The encounter between regional social formations and the capitalist world economy cannot be fully understood if this intermediate layer of interaction and exchange is overlooked'. In his opinion, 'regional social analysis is of critical importance within the context of a capitalist world economy, and the extent to which the "core" has constituted a major agency of regional social transformation'. Moreover, it is important to analyse, 'how inter-regional links have sustained the social and economic viability of "peripheral" and "semi-peripheral" regions, while at the same time qualifying the dominance of the "capitalist" core'. He goes on,

from about the mid-nineteenth century till about the 1930s agrarian regions of south Asia were critically dependent on systems of inter-regional specialization in the flow of capital and labour with regions of South East Asia and the Middle East. This is an extremely important level of analysis...which has been very imperfectly investigated by historical scholarship.... It is by tracking the fortunes and fears of Indian capital and labour in Southeast Asia, the Middle East and also East and South Africa that the nature of the Indian colonial economy can be

fully grasped and the character of the western capitalist and colonial/para-colonial enterprise more perceptibly interpreted (Bose 1990: 360-1).

Neither the framework of analysis of world system nor the theories of underdevelopment and dependency schools (Amin 1974; Frank 1976) adequately captured the internal dynamics of Indian economy and its changing position in global capitalism. Moreover, the emphasis in such studies on the dominating role and influence of the metropolitan industrial world tends to undermine the historical role and significance of non-western regions and regional economic integration. For instance, since the late nineteenth century the economies of some South and Southeast Asian countries were shaped and transformed by the penetration of colonialism. Two notable examples are: (a) the emergence of plantation economy in Southeast Asia during mid to late nineteenth century; and (b) oil boom in the Middle East in the late twentieth century. Although in both the cases the process in Asian integration was initiated by the advent of Western capital, yet the formation of the new interdependence between the countries bordering Bay of Bengal, Arabian Sea and Indian Ocean region worked to the considerable advantages of these economies (Bose 2006; Baker 1981). Recent studies have shown that Asian labour migrations and the diaspora had been crucial to the contribution of Asian continent to the changing world economy: 'a mobility revolution caused by migrations within Asia led to dramatic changes in scale and intensity after the 1850s. Migrations within different countries of Asia were far more important numerically than emigration to the British colonies in South Africa and the Caribbean' (Amrit 2011: 25). Thus a study of intra-Asian labour migrations, along with movements of capital which crossed geographical and territorial boundaries, helps us to understand the nature and dynamics of modern globalization. The rise of a global economy centred on European industrialization was the context for increased long-distance migration of labour and capital. However, in the mainstream studies on globalization the importance of labour flows has been inadequately acknowledged. 'In the grand narrative of globalization, the human condition is often overlooked. And likewise, historically, the role of migrant labour from the South in the making of the world economy has been generally ignored. Flows of commodities and capital are highlighted, not flows of labour from the South' (Bhattacharya 2006: 222). Available statistical data on the intra-Asian migrations indicate that there were fluctuations; yet migration rates rapidly increased in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and reached a peak during the first quarter of the twentieth century. Thus the Asian continent has been closely integrated by the mobility of millions of its people across the seas/oceans. From about the mid-nineteenth century, migrations within Asia were also closely linked to the changing global commercial, economic and political

conditions. Although the Indians migrated to the far off places in the Pacific (Fiji) and Caribbean islands and the Indian Ocean region, (Mauritius and South Africa/Natal) the interconnectedness was greater within Asian countries than beyond. Available evidence suggests that between 1834 and 1917, around 1.3 million indentured labourers migrated to the above destinations, whereas six million contract labourers went to Southeast Asia under the *kangani* and *maistry* systems (Vertovec 1990: 8-9). However, Bhattacharya pointed out that compared to the nineteenth century Indian labour migrations, the twentieth century patterns of migration were more Asian-oriented (Bhattacharya 2006: 212-13). Thus from about the mid-nineteenth century, migration of labour, capital, commodities and merchants had facilitated the integration of large parts of Asia within an expanding global economy and hence they formed intensive interregional connections and networks within Asia.

SOUTH INDIA AND SOUTHEAST ASIA: COLONIAL CONNECTION

PATTERNS OF MIGRATION

Historically, cultural and commercial relations between South India and Lower Burma and Malay Peninsula go back to the pre-colonial times. During the colonial period, South India was acknowledged as 'the most migration-prone region' (Lal et al. 2006: 52) of the Indian subcontinent as millions of South Indian labourers and unskilled and semi-skilled workers migrated to Southeast Asian countries under indenture, assisted, free, and middlemen-recruited systems. It has been observed that there existed 'an emigration habit' and 'an undoubted emigration tradition' (Yeats 1931: 79, 93) among the South Indian labourers. A colonial official wrote: 'This "an emigration habit" existed to some extent in Europe as regards America towards the end of nineteenth century and undoubtedly exists in South India and the Circars coast touching the movement to Ceylon, Malaya and Burma' (ibid.: 79). The growing pressure upon the land and unemployment, poverty, failure of crops due to bad seasons, natural calamities, famines and the proximity of prominent transport routes and ports undoubtedly stimulated emigration. Subsequent to the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, large-scale Indian emigration began with the development of European commercial and industrial enterprises in Southeast Asia. It has been estimated that 'of approximately 28 million people who emigrated from India up to 1940, close to 27 million went to just three destinations in Southeast Asia; Burma, Ceylon, and Malaya. About 4 million Indians journeyed to Malaya (mostly from coastal Tamil and Telugu districts), 8 million to Ceylon (primarily from the Tamil region of the far south), and between 12 million and 15 million to Burma (mainly from the Telugu districts of the east coast) (Amrit 2011: 32). Indeed,

systematic, continuous and large-scale emigration from the northern Coromandel coast, viz., the Tamil and Telugu regions of South India, began with the development of European commercial and industrial enterprises in Burma, Ceylon and Malaya Peninsula since the mid-nineteenth century. For instance, in the case of Burma, 2.59 million Indian migrants settled there permanently between 1852 and 1937, of whom a large number were South Indians; while in Ceylon, 1.53 million settled in the country between 1834 and 1938; and in Malaya, between 1860 and 1938, 1.19 million stayed back (Lal et al. 2006: 52). It has been pointed out that the two most significant flows of migration across Asia between 1850 and 1930 were: the movement of up to 30 million people from India to present-day Sri Lanka, Burma, and Malaysia, and about 19 million Chinese to Southeast Asia. An important characteristic feature of South Indian migration was their temporary, short-term and circular nature, as only 6 million Indians out of 30 million settled permanently in Southeast Asia (Amrit 2011: 18).

South Indian migrations to Burma was encouraged because of 'the march of industrialization of agriculture in Lower Burma' (Riot Enquiry Committee 1939: 6) and the growing international demand for Burmese rice, as well as the establishment of paddy processing industries/rice mills, minerals and oil refineries, sawmills and timber yards. The rapid expansion of paddy cultivation in Lower Burma since the late nineteenth century necessitated large scale Indian immigration. The area under paddy cultivation increased from 1,871,542 (1.87 million) acres in 1872 to 9,855,258 (9.85 million) in 1936-7, an increase of eight million acres (ibid.: 17). The process of labour migration began with the need of immigration to match the speed with which the paddy lands in Lower Burma were brought under cultivation between the years 1870 and 1932. Historically, migration to Burma had become an important factor in the economic life of labouring communities/classes of northern Coromandel coastal region of South India. The departures were heaviest when there were crop failures and harvests were poor. Numerous official reports mentioned the positive correlation between the occurrences of natural calamities and large scale migrations to Southeast Asia (Boag 1922: 47; Francis 1994: 149; Malony 1912: 26). The expansion of commercial agriculture and the plantation economy also produced an increasing demand for labour and it acted as 'the engine' of mass migrations from South India during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. By the 1870s, plantation-based production of commodities for export began to expand, especially in Ceylon, Burma and Malaya. Similarly, new regions of rice production which were opened up in Lower Burma also attracted millions of migrant labourers to the great Irrawaddy river delta. South India had also contributed around 2,92,640 indentured labourers to Mauritius, Natal, Fiji and so on. Nevertheless, the major destinations of South Indian labourers during the colonial period were Burma and Malaya.

TABLE 1. SOUTH INDIAN MIGRATION TO SOUTHEAST ASIA, 1889-1929
(SELECTED YEARS)

Year	Number	Year	Number	Year	Number
1889	53,848	1904	2,67,702	1914	2,72,931
1894	1,51,532	1905	1,65,265	1921	1,63,076
1895	1,79,115	1906	3,50,264	1922	1,76,747
1896	2,01,406	1907	3,08,341	1923	2,16,122
1897	2,60,517	1908	3,57,485	1924	3,18,687
1898	2,28,952	1909	3,36,852	1925	3,10,282
1899	1,75,300	1910	3,95,691	1926	3,86,707
1900	3,32,893	1911	3,89,231	1927	3,02,988
1901	2,30,271	1912	4,07,454	1928	3,37,675
1903	2,53,558	1913	4,38,567	1929	3,56,411

Grand Total 83,25,870 (8.32 million)

Source: *Emigration and Immigration Reports of the Madras Presidency*, Government of Madras, Madras for the years shown.

During the nineteenth century Burma had drawn labour from all parts of British India. The main outlets were the ports of Calcutta, Chittagong, Madras and the six ports on the northern Coromandel coast, namely, Coromandel, Vizagapatam, Bimlipatam, Calingapatam, Barua and Gopalpore. Indian immigrants were drawn from six main ethnic groups viz., the Telugus/Andhras, the Oriyas, the Tamils, the Hindustanis, the Bengalis and the Punjabis. However, the Telugus and the Oriyas formed the most significant component of the unskilled labour force. Migration to Burma was undertaken from the northern coastal districts of Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavari, Kistna and the Ceded districts in the erstwhile Madras Presidency and they constituted the bulk of the labour employed in mills and factories and by the shipping companies. Many of them also found work as porters/carriers and several thousands were engaged as rickshaw pullers, scavengers, sweepers, handcart men, etc. Telugu labour migration to Burma was more temporary and seasonal in nature; labourers migrated during the harvest period, i.e., between the months of October and December and returned again between March and May (Andrew 1933: 35-6). Free migration to Burma had taken place to an appreciable extent for the greater part of the nineteenth century. In the beginning, the employment was confined to that of domestic service and the miscellaneous labour of mercantile ports. Subsequently agriculturists and labourers migrated. A considerable number of labourers also migrated to Burma for working in the ports and dockyards and returned at the end of the shipping season. Among the Indians in Burma, the Telugus, known as *Coranghis*, constituted the single largest ethno-linguistic labour community and they contained a larger proportion of industrial workers than the others. Indeed, during the first quarter of the twentieth century, within Burma's expanding economy, they had dominated the commercial and

industrial employment. Until 1930, the port of Rangoon was worked entirely by the Telugu labourers. Likewise, in the urban economy of Rangoon, Indians have played a significant role. According to the Burma Census Report of 1921, they constituted over 55 per cent of the total population of Rangoon and over 65 per cent of the male population. In the factories and industrial enterprises of Rangoon, 95 per cent of the unskilled and 70 per cent of the skilled labourers were Indians, of which Telugus formed a major constituent (Royal Commission 1983: 425). The demographic data provided by the Burma Census Report of 1931 reveals that more than 60 per cent of the nearly 1,80,000 persons constituting the six major ethno-linguistic groups of Rangoon were southerners and the Telugus/Coranghis were on the top of the list (Maung Than 1993: 588). Telugu migrants to Burma hailed mostly from the northern Coromandel districts of Srikakulam, Vizagapatam, East and West Godavaries, Kishna, Nellore and Chittoor. 'The Telugus...furnished most of the...labour in factories and mills and in the port and are the most prominent section in the work of the city of Rangoon. Few of them are to be found in the upper ranks of labour' (Royal Commission 1983: 428). It was acknowledged that the South Indian migrant labourers 'played a significant part in transforming Burma's subsistence economy into a commercialized export economy' (Lal et al. 2006: 168).

During the first half of the twentieth century, emigration of Telugu labourers to Burma remained free, unassisted and unregulated.

The remarkable feature of this great volume of immigration is, it is somewhat steady and seasonal. A majority of these people do not enter Burma with a view to settle down permanently but only for a temporary stay. In other words, they are migratory.... This migration to and from Burma takes place only at certain periods. That is, immigration runs its course from October to December and emigration from March to May. This is partly due to monsoon conditions and partly to the demand for seasonal labour in agriculture and rice mill industry (Narayana Rao 1930: 35).

Thus it is clear that labour migration to colonial Burma was mostly temporary, short-term and circular (sojourning). The extent to which it was migratory was also illustrated by the fact that, 'although during the decade 1911-21 the Indian immigrants were more than two million, the increase in the Indian population in Burma was only 1,42,000, i.e., from 7,45,000 to 8,87,000. From 1922 to 1929 on an average nearly 3,20,000 Indian immigrants per year entered Rangoon.... The annual average of the number of Indian emigrants leaving that port in the same period was about 260,000' (Royal Commission 1983: 426). In the 1921 Special Industrial Census of labourers employed in major industries such as rubber, minerals, wood, metals, rice, oil-refining, construction and transport, it was found that out of a total of 62,498 male Indian labourers born outside Burma, only 2,598 reported that they intended to reside

permanently in the country (Baxter 1941: 3-4; Grantham 1923: 93). An examination of the available data on arrivals and departures from Burma between the years 1889 and 1929 and for Malaya between 1888 and 1935 indicates that more than 80 per cent of the South Indian labourers did not migrate to settle permanently. 'They the South Indian labourers intended to stay only temporarily, for two to three years, though many returned for subsequent spells on the plantations and in the rice fields and mills' (Satyanarayana 2002: 96; 2004: 22).

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, the city of Rangoon was known as a city of Burmans inhabited by some Indian traders and labourers. According to the Burma Census Report of 1931, the Indian labour constituted 56 per cent of the craftsmen and 88 per cent of the unskilled and semi-skilled labourers of Rangoon (Pearn 1913: 290). For many years, the stevedore labour of the Rangoon port had been monopolized by the Telugu immigrant coolies. 'The number of coolies engaged in stevedoring is between 3,000 and 4,000, the majority of whom are Telugus from the Godavari and Kistna districts of the Madras Presidency' (Bennison 1928: 84). Gradually Rangoon had developed into a city populated by more Indians than Burmans. The overseas trade, not only of Rangoon, but of the country fell very largely into the hands of Indians and other foreigners. An examination of the records of the Rangoon Corporation reveals the process and the extent to which the city and its business passed into the Indian hands. In the 1930s, over 55 per cent of the total Corporation taxes were paid by Indian owners and landlords. The total taxes paid in respect of the city amounted to over ₹ 6 million per annum, of which 55.49 per cent were paid by Indians, 15.34 per cent by Europeans, 11.27 per cent by Burmese and 17.89 per cent by others. Further, all the big private bazaars were owned by Indians and, according to the 1931 census, out of the total population of 4,00,415 in the city of Rangoon, 2,12,929 (53.17 per cent) were Indians, 1,21,998 (30.46 per cent) were Burmans, 30,626 (7.64 per cent) were Chinese and the balance was made up of other small communities (Riot Enquiry Committee 1939: 17). Rangoon was the main city and port of Burma, and the second largest port of the Indian Empire. Until the 1930s, it was second only to New York in importance as an immigration port but later it emerged as the foremost immigration and emigration port of the world. Similarly, its growth and importance as a commercial port could be judged from its shipping and trade. In 1861, 614 vessels with a tonnage of 1,57,472 entered the port; the number increased to 874 with a total net tonnage of 5,98,303 in 1880-1, to 1501 with a net tonnage of 2,800,513 (2.80 million) in 1920-1, and to 1667 vessels with an aggregate net tonnage of 4.06 million in 1925-6 (Andrew 1933: 5).

South Indian emigration across the Bay of Bengal to the Straits Settlements and Malay Peninsula dates before the beginning of the nineteenth century. The earliest emigration to the Straits Settlements

was from the south of the Madras Presidency. The emigrants were employed both as domestic servants and as agricultural labourers. To begin with, sugar, spice, tapioca, and coconut plantations of Penang have entirely depended on the South Indian labour. In the 1870s on an average 4,000 persons migrated from the Madras Presidency to the Malay Peninsula. During the first decade of the twentieth century, emigration from Madras to the Straits Settlements jumped from 27,950 in 1901 to 85,105 in 1910 (Morgan Web 1986: 78). Subsequently, the total Indian population of British Malaya in 1921 went up to 4,71,666, as compared with 2,67,203 in 1911, an increase of 76.5 per cent (Marjoribanks and Marakkayar 1917: 25). Among the Indian population in Malay, the great majority were from South India. Tamils constituted more than 80 per cent of the South Indian migrants to the Straits Settlements and Malay Peninsula, and the rest made up of Malayalees from the West Coast (Kerala), and Telugus from the eastern Coromandel Coast. Sixty per cent of the estate population in Malaya consisted of South Indians, and of the remaining 25 per cent were Chinese, 15 per cent were Malayas and others (ibid.: 28). With the development of coffee plantation in Malaya, the planters dispensed with the long indentured labour contracts and recruited free labourers. From about 1900, rubber began to replace both sugar and coffee and the area of the plantations increased rapidly. At the beginning of the twentieth century there were three kinds of immigrant labour in British Malaya, viz., indentured or contract labour, *kangani*-recruited labour, and the so-called free/independent labour. Between 1844 and 1910, about 250,000 indentured labourers immigrated to Malaya. In Malay Peninsula the indentured labourers were mainly employed on the sugar estates, government departments dealing with roads, railways and other public works and a few of the rubber estates where the conditions were such that other labourers were reluctant to work there. Indentured labour to British Malaya was abolished in 1910 and *kangani* system of labour recruitment was introduced. Under this system about 50,000 to 80,000 South Indian labourers were recruited annually for employment in the plantations. Thus the *kangani* recruited labour formed the bulk of the labour in the rubber estates. From 1844 to 1938, *kangani*-assisted migration accounted for 62.2 per cent of total Indian labour migration compared to 13 per cent for indentured migration. The system of controlled recruitment and assisted immigration to Malaya had increased during the first two decades of the twentieth century. For instance, the number of emigrants recruited by *kanganis* in each of the three years between 1913 and 1915 increased from 52,572 to 88,486. Apart from the *kanganis*, independent and voluntary system of labour migration to Malay Peninsula also existed. It was estimated that in 1920, only 12 per cent Indian workers were voluntary migrants, but this proportion had increased to over 91 per cent by the 1930s (Lal et al. 2006: 158-9).

Telugu migrations to Southeast Asia were predominantly male-oriented

and it was rare to find the entire family migrating. The migrants were generally single men, who had left their wives and families behind and stayed on in Burma and Malaya for a few years. Thus a remarkable variation in sex proportion was observed; of quarter of a million Madras emigrants to Burma during the first decade of the twentieth century, over 200,000 were men; in the Straits Settlements there were about 58,000 Madrasis, among whom men outnumbered women in the proportion of four to one (Malony 1911: 27). The caste-centred customs and taboos among the South Indians were very rigid; especially so in the case of the Oriyas, and therefore, it was rare to find a man who had taken his wife across the Bay of Bengal into Burma. A local official remarked: 'It will be difficult to induce respectable females to emigrate in anything like a reasonable proportion to males to distant colonies, save, perhaps, in times of famine or distress.... The women that come across are generally those who have been ostracized or have lost caste as a result of a lapse from virtue or some similar cause and many that pose as wives of their male companions are really concubines or mistresses' (Andrew 1933: 19). During the first quarter of the twentieth century, it was found that the sex ratio in Burma was one female for every 17 Telugu males and in the case of Oriyas it was one female to 150 males. An actual count during the year 1926-7 revealed that a total of 109,633 males and 5,799 females have arrived from the Coromandel Coast: the sex ratio was 19 males to one female. In the same year, the Telugus accounted for 75,869 males and 5,558 females, with a sex ratio of 13.6 males to one female, and Oriyas numbered 34,005 adults of whom only 241 were females, equivalent to 140 males to every female, a very high sex ratio (ibid.: 19). The imbalance in the sex ratios among the South Indians in Burma was mainly due to social and cultural factors.

LABOUR RECRUITERS

Majority of labourers for Burma were recruited by the *maistry* system (Kondapi 1951; Narayana Rao 1930). It involved the payment of advances to the labourers for transportation and food during the voyage. The *maistry* also usually arranged for the payment of small sums the labourers needed for the maintenance of their families left behind, and for the clearance of debts they might have contracted in their villages. Thus the contract labourers reached their destination and worked with a debt. There was hardly a labourer who was not indebted to the *maistry*. In addition to the labour recruited by the *maistry* or his agent, the British India Steam Navigation Company, also employed a large number of agents for labour recruitment. These agents influenced as many people as possible to go over to Burma, irrespective of the prospects of getting any work at the destination. The ignorant village folk, lured by the rosy picture of Burma,

often borrowed for their transportation and other expenses from the village money-lender or the recruiting agent himself at the high rate of interest. Besides *maistry* and shipping agents, there was also a certain amount of voluntary migration. This sort of free movement of labourers to and from Burma was a part of chain and return migration system. Chain migration was possible because the prospective migrants learnt of opportunities, were provided with transportation, and obtained initial accommodation and employment arranged by means of contacts and social relationships with previous migrants. Caste, kinship and village networks played a significant role in the chain and return migration of Telugu labourers. According to a government official, 'that of the immigrant labour into Burma, 70 per cent was absolutely free labour coming in without the intervention of the *maistry*' (Proceedings 1923: 54). However, those who migrated voluntarily and worked as free labourers would be a small proportion of the total labour force in Burma. The *maistry* system of labour recruitment was widely prevalent in the rice mills and shipping sector. Under this system the employer had no direct control over the labourers. Their wages were paid directly by the *maistry* and he personally supervised and controlled them. The chief feature of the *maistry* system in Burma was that 'the recruitment, employment, control, payment of wages, and dismissal of labour were all entrusted to the labour contractor' (Chakravarti 1971: 44).

Unlike in Burma, labour recruitment to Malay plantations was mediated by the *kangani* system. The *kangani*, like the *maistry*, was the most important mediator between the employers and employees. System of cash advances as inducement to migration and labour indebtedness characterised both the *maistry* and *kangani* systems. However, there were some basic differences between them in terms of labour recruitment and control. The *kangani* was officially authorised by the plantation owners and provided licence for labour recruitment. He was also paid commission, 'head money and pence money' (Lal et al. 2006: 54) for his services. But the wages of the *kangani*-recruited workers were directly paid by the employers. In the case of *maistry*, the employers neither appointed him as an authorised agent nor provided finances. The *maistry* was also not paid any commission by the employers, though he earned income through several illegal deductions from the pay of workers. Nevertheless, both systems have certain common features: network of middlemen, gradation, illegal deductions, hierarchy, supervision, control and debt-bondage. It has been estimated that between 1840 and 1942 more than 1.70 million South Indian labourers were recruited by the intermediaries to British Malaya and 1.60 million to Burma and about one million to Ceylon (ibid.: 53). An examination of the structure and function of recruitment agency system which dominated labour recruitment and supervision reveals that it represented a distinct network of socio-cultural arrangement. Indeed,

these intermediaries were an integral part of the caste/clan system and networks of local society of rural South India.

MIGRATION OF MERCHANTS

In addition to the migration of labour, the traditional merchant communities from South India also went to different countries in Southeast Asia. Historically, merchants from different parts of India expanded trade networks into the Middle East, Central Asia, Russia, Southeast Asia etc., during the pre-colonial period (Dale 1994; Markovits 2000). South Indian Muslim and Hindu merchants like the Klings, Chulias, Mappillas, Marakkayars, Deccanis, Narsapuris, Komatis, and Chettiers were prominent in Southeast Asian countries. Among them, the Chettiers in the nineteenth century followed colonial expansion into Southeast Asia and dominated the rural credit and trading networks (Mahadevan 1978: 146), while the Muslim merchants were mostly involved in the retail trade. For instance, the Tamil Chulia merchants owned shops in many small villages of Burma and some of them were also well-known for trade in metal goods. The Mapilla merchants from Kerala were well entrenched in the restaurant business in Burma, Singapore and Sarawak. The Narsapuri and Deccani/Hyderabadi Muslims were overwhelmingly represented in the retail trade of colonial Burma. Although oceanic merchant/commercial migrations from South India had a very long history, they took an entirely new dimension with the onset of Western colonialism in the nineteenth century, as 'Southeast Asian economies were transformed from entrepôts for Eastern commerce to primary producers which supplied food and raw materials to the industrializing worlds. The opening up of Southeast Asian economies offered enormous opportunities for the investment of capital to Indian traders' (Lal et al. 2006: 60). Available evidence indicates that between 1844 and 1931 there were a total of 6,43,000 non-labour migrants from the Indian subcontinent in Malaya alone. Burma and other Southeast Asian countries also witnessed similar influx of merchants. It was estimated that by the mid-1930s, 20 per cent of all Indian migrants in Burma were traders: the Straits Settlements, with 14.3 per cent and the Malay States with around 5.6 per cent (ibid.: 59).

In the studies on Indian merchant Diaspora, South Indian Chettiers's economic importance has been acknowledged in the context of increased European colonial penetration into Southeast Asia, the expansion of global markets and economic networks (Adas 1974). With the opening of the Lower Burma delta in the mid nineteenth century, they were firmly entrenched as the major source of credit and investment. Besides lending money to the cultivators, they also invested in import-export trade; wholesale business in oil, timber and the operation of saw mills. As the Burmese rice economy was fully integrated into the world market, the

role of Chettiar capital acquired significance, particularly in a context when the European capital stayed away from internal financing of agricultural production and trade. Hence, Chettiar business grew from the urban centres like Rangoon to the interior villages along the railway line. In 1881 there were only 587 professional money lenders in Lower Burma, but by 1901 their number increased to 3,200 (Dobbin 1996: 139). Thus the Chettiars had played a crucial role in the Burmese 'rice frontier' and helped Burma to become the 'rice bowl' of the British Empire. It has been estimated that they provided about two-thirds of all agricultural credit, and in many of Burma's provinces they provided nearly 100 per cent of loans to the peasantry (Rudner 1994: 84). As creditors, the Chettiars exercised complete control over the agricultural production and often confiscated debtors' property. It led to land alienation, especially in the 1930s. Due to the economic depression vast majority of the Burmese peasantry could not pay back loans.

Migration of Chettiar merchants to Malay Peninsula followed the British conquest and the process of its integration into the world economy. But unlike in Burma, Chettiar capital, in the initial stages, dominated the financing of opium trade. By the late nineteenth century, they financed most of the opium trade in Singapore and Penang and monopolized a position as intermediaries between British exchange banks and Chinese traders. Indeed, the Chettiars were the most important trading community in Malaya between the late nineteenth and mid-twentieth century. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century with the development of tin mining and rubber plantation they became a major source of finance to the local entrepreneurs, peasants and landowners. By the early 1920s Chettiars extended their business operations from Rangoon to Saigon. 'In Indo-China, the earliest Indian trading firms were those of two Chettiars from Karaikudi, who arrived soon after the French occupation in 1885, reportedly with a sum of ₹ 60,000. By the early 1930s, there were no less than 125 firms with investments exceeding ₹ 80 million' (Lal et al. 2006: 60). Thus the South Indian trading Diaspora was firmly entrenched in the economies of Southeast Asia and gradually emerged as an important immigrant community.

GULF-BOOM AND SOUTH INDIAN MIGRATION: THE POSTCOLONIAL CONTEXT

The Gulf boom of the 1970s and thereafter led to a considerable increase in the revenue of the oil producing countries in West Asia and the Gulf region. Consequently a number of development programmes such as construction of roads, airports, offices and commercial complexes, schools, hospitals, and houses were undertaken on a massive scale. This caused a spurt in demand predominantly for manual and unskilled labour. During the last quarter of the twentieth century, the South Indians

responded almost immediately to the growing demands for labour in those countries. Starting on a modest scale in the early 1970s it continued to grow. The data provided in the official reports reveals that the total number of Indian workers who have been granted emigration clearance for migrating to the Gulf countries had gone up from 0.42 lakh in 1976 to 6.26 lakhs in 2011.

TABLE-2. NUMBER OF INDIAN WORKERS GRANTED EMIGRATION CLEARANCE, 1976-2010 (FIVE YEARLY AVERAGES)

Years	No. in Lakhs
1976-1980	1.16
1981-1985	2.16
1986-1990	1.35
1991-1995	3.79
1996-2000	2.95
2001-2005	4.27
2006-2010	7.17

Source: Calculated from the *Annual Reports of Labour Ministry* and the *Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs*, Government of India, New Delhi for the years shown.

Between 1976 and 2011 more than 29 million Indian workers obtained emigration clearance to work in the foreign countries, predominantly in the Middle Eastern countries. The flow of workers was prompted by an unprecedented boom in the construction sector. For the South Indians, the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries were the major destination for migration and employment. Among the Indian migrant workers in the Gulf countries, Keralites/Malayalees were/are the single largest ethno-linguistic group. It has been estimated that during the years between 1993 and 2005, more than 100,000 Keralites migrated annually to the Gulf countries. The preponderance of Keralites is due to the longstanding historical and cultural relations between the Malabar (west) coast and the Gulf region (Prakash 1998; Zachariah et al. 2002). In 2001, the total number of Indians in the GCC countries was 3.68 million, but by 2010 it rose to 6.41 million. In 2002, Indians constituted 28 per cent of the total expatriate population in those countries (Lal et al. 2006: 222). However, the highest proportion of South Indians was employed abroad in low paid occupations: unskilled and semi-skilled workers constituted more than two-thirds of the total workforce. Most of them were employed either as casual labourers or labourers on short term temporary contracts of a couple of years. Majority of the Gulf migrants returned to India after the expiry of their contractual employment. It was a sort of circulation of labour and sojourning. Further, it has been a predominantly male migration, characterized by irregular ties with the families and communities back home in India. In terms of labour migration to the Gulf countries

TABLE 3. STATE-WISE FIGURES OF WORKERS GRANTED EMIGRATION CLEARANCE/EMIGRATION CLEARANCE NOT
REQUIRED ENDORSEMENT DURING THE YEARS, 1993-2005

State	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Andhra Pradesh	35,578	34,508	30,284	29,995	38,278	30,599	18,983	29,999	37,331	38,417	65,971	72,580	48,498
Karnataka	34,380	32,266	33,496	33,761	40,396	11,535	5,287	10,927	10,095	14,061	22,641	19,237	75,384
Kerala	155,208	154,407	165,629	167,328	156,102	91,720	60,445	69,630	61,548	81,950	92,044	63,512	125,075
Maharashtra	35,248	32,178	26,312	25,214	25,146	24,657	9,871	13,346	22,713	25,477	29,350	28,670	29,289
Punjab	14,212	12,445	11,852	11,751	12,414	26,876	15,167	10,025	12,422	19,638	24,963	25,302	24,088
Rajasthan	25,243	27,418	28,374	18,221	28,242	19,824	9,809	10,170	14,993	23,254	37,693	35,108	21,899
Tamil Nadu	70,313	70,525	65,737	64,991	63,672	69,793	47,402	63,878	61,649	79,165	89,464	108,964	117,050
Others	68,156	61,638	53,650	60,756	52,174	80,160	32,588	35,207	57,913	85,701	104,330	121,587	107,570
Total	438,338	425,385	415,334	414,214	416,424	355,164	199,552	243,182	278,664	367,663	466,456	474,960	548,853

Source: *Annual Reports of Labour Ministry and the Ministry of Overseas Indian Affairs*, Government of India, New Delhi for the years shown.

since the 1990s, the three South Indian states of Kerala, Tamilnadu and Andhra Pradesh have played a prominent role, as they accounted for more than 50 per cent of emigration clearance obtained by the unskilled workers.

It has been found that among the population of more than five million Indians in the Middle East, people from the South Indian states of Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka accounted for about two-thirds. In the recent period, emigration to the GCC countries from Andhra Pradesh has been accelerated and their number increased over time. For instance, between 1993-4 and 2004-5, it went up from 35,578 to 72,580, an increase of more than 100 per cent. A large number of people from Andhra Pradesh have migrated to the United Arab Emirates to work as labourers in the booming construction industry. In addition to unskilled workers, middle class professionals like doctors, engineers, etc., though in small numbers, have also migrated to the countries in the Middle East. In terms of social and geographical background, the vast majority of Telugu labourers were drawn from the lower caste/classes and backward regions of Andhra Pradesh. In particular, the availability of cheap labour in the villages of backward Telangana region has prompted many local and Mumbai-Dubai-based recruiting agencies to send their agents in search of labourers. The structure of recruiting system incorporated the existing social networks based on village, caste and community. For the rural poor, higher money wages in the Gulf countries was certainly an attraction and acted as the pull factor. The prospect of higher income lured many unemployed youth to 'escape' and 'run away' to the Gulf. A study of Kuwaiti repatriates in the city of Hyderabad in Andhra Pradesh has shown that flow of petro-dollars from the Gulf countries substantially changed the socio-economic profile of the Muslim community as well as the physical landscape of city (Sharieff 1994). It has been estimated that presently there are about one million Non-Resident Indians (NRI) in the Middle East from Andhra Pradesh, making them the second biggest community among NRIs after Keralites. The highest number of NRIs from Andhra Pradesh — about 500,000 — is in Saudi Arabia followed by 250,000 in the United Arab Emirates, 80,000 in Kuwait, 65,000 in Oman, 35,000 in Qatar and 25,000 in Bahrain (*The Asian Age*, 2 March 2005).

In recent years South Indian/Telugu labourers are making news for having 'braved Iraq death trap' to work in the military establishments there as menials. 'Dangerous terrain, decent pay' seems to be the formula acceptable to many of them. However, instances are also not lacking where the petro-dollar dreams of the unemployed youth have been badly shattered. Many youth did land in the 'desert trap' after being lured by greedy and unscrupulous agents and brokers in the name of attractive jobs in Dubai. Scores of them had left for the Gulf countries by paying exorbitant amounts, as much as ₹ 150,000 each, taken as loans at high

interest rates. In particular, the Telangana youth seemed to be venturing into such acts out of sheer desperation. The devastating drought and famine conditions and lack of livelihood opportunities in the villages have forced them to 'escape' abroad. Most of the youth were so frustrated with the lack of opportunities at home that they were willing to take any risk. A perceptive journalist reported:

Andhra Pradesh's agricultural labourers prefer the scorching deserts of Iraq to the barren fields of their home state. The ever-present possibility of violent death does not terrify them: the alternative is a slow death from hunger. Hundreds of agricultural labourers from several drought-hit villages of Andhra Pradesh are migrating secretly to Iraq to make a living doing menial jobs in US military camps, construction sites and transport companies. . . . It is the prospect of decent pay packets that keeps their chins up. At least they don't have to resort to begging, like many of their compatriots (*Khaleej Times*, 1 January 2006).

At present, the labourers from Andhra Pradesh also gained notoriety and reputation for being the single largest group of illegal migrants from India in the Gulf countries.

CONCLUSION

My paper focused on some key issues and recent developments in postcolonial historiography and de-centering of global history from an Indian perspective. It highlighted the latest historiographical approaches and debates pertaining to the writing of post-Eurocentric world history. In this paper an attempt has been made to analyze the formation of migration networks, intra-Asian linkages and regional economic integration in the context of evolving capitalist world order. The driving force behind this integration between South and Southeast and Southwest Asian economies was the movement of labour, capital, skills and remittances. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, under the impact of emerging global economy interdependence within the regions was also developed. This paper examined the factors behind labour migration and its course of evolution and found that South Indian migration networks were a response to and a part of trade and investment opportunities in different parts of Asia in the era of modern globalization. Although during the pre- and early colonial times self-induced and autonomous commercial and cultural networks developed between the countries of the Asian continent, the contribution of western imperialism since the mid-nineteenth century cannot be ignored. The introduction of steamship, improvements in the technology of transport and communications and government induced/assisted/sponsored labour recruiting systems added a completely new dimension to the migration of South Indian coolies. The earlier trade-religion-culture-centered migration gave way to predominantly economic-centred movement of unskilled labour. However, unlike the

earlier movements of people, labour migration networks in the modern period were increasingly formed and mediated through traditional social and institutional agencies like village, caste, and kith and kin. In the development of such a pattern the return migrants and neighbourhood contacts had played a significant role.

Contrary to Eurocentric approaches, we have shown that intra-Asian migrations are an integral part of world-wide flows. Indeed, South Indian migrations contained the short-term, chain and return as well as family-oriented patterns. In the case of South Indian labour migrations, development of extensive middlemen and agents' networks were crucial and 'these networks channelled further migration and expanded well beyond direct European influence to create a world densely enmeshed in an expanding global economy' (McKeown 2004: 174) both during the colonial and postcolonial periods. It was found that unassisted and voluntary labour migrations become popular in Burma and Malaya during the first quarter of the twentieth century. Over a period of time, the impact of changing colonial legislation, state policies and increased consciousness of labour further weakened the role of middlemen. The frequent travel and mutual contacts of labourers had enabled many to gather information about employment and wages which allowed them to find jobs on their own. In addition to the use of traditional caste/social principles, ties of village and blood relationships, circulation of information, the impact of new forces of economy further contributed to the decline of the role and authority of the middlemen and the increasing outflow of emigrants. The South Indian migrants relied on the networks and connections that kinship and local community provided to find jobs and security and to carve out new ways of migration to Southeast Asia and the Gulf countries.

Our study contradicts the world systems theorists' assumption that non-European migrations are simply a by-product of the expansion and intervention of Europe. In the trajectory of South Indian migrations, the flow of labour, capital and skills across the Bay of Bengal, Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean resulted in regional economic integration, which was linked to the western dominated world economy. Migration of South Indian labour and capital to Southeast Asia during the colonial period and export of labour and skills to capital-rich and labour-scarce Southwest Asia in the context of oil boom were responses to the changing nature of global economy and regional specialization. On the basis of our findings, we suggest that unlike the West-biased studies that tended to privilege and highlight the predominance of European migration and uniqueness of the trans-Atlantic system and framework, it is necessary to undertake comparative micro and macro studies about the operation of migration networks, migration's relationship to economic and demographic changes and processes of regional interactions. As McKeown pointed out, 'Detailed comparative analyses between different migrant flows around the world

will certainly provide continued insights into the processes of migration. The nearly contemporaneous rise of global migration suggests that non-Europeans were very much involved in the expansion and integration of the world economy, well beyond the direct intervention of Europe' (McKeown 2004: 171). Available evidence pertaining to the Indian migrations clearly indicates that in the evolution of contemporary globalization, the role of Indian sub-continent is quite significant. The impact of migration networks on the regional economic integration of South, Southwest and Southeast Asia is an important dimension of sub-globalization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Professors Sven Beckert, Harvard University and Dominic Sachsenmaier, Jacobs University, Bremen for their help and encouragement in writing this paper. An earlier version of this paper was presented in the conferences on Global History, Globally held at Harvard, Gottingen and Berlin.

REFERENCES

- Adas, M., 1974, 'Immigrant Asians and the Economic impact of European Imperialism: The Role of the South Indian Chettiars in British Burma', *Journal of Asian Studies*, no. 3, pp. 385-401.
- Akita, S. (ed.), 2002, *Gentlemanly Capitalism, Imperialism and Global History*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Amin, S., 1974, *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment*, New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amrith, S.S., 2011, *Migration and Diaspora in Modern Asia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Andrew, E.J.L., 1933, *Indian Labour in Rangoon*, Calcutta: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, C.J., 1981, 'Economic Reorganization and the Slump in South and Southeast Asia', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, no. 3, pp. 325-49.
- Balachandran, G. (ed.), 2003, *India and the World Economy, 1850-1950*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Balachandran, G. and S. Subrahmanyam, 2006, 'On the History of Globalization and India: Concepts, Measures and Debates' in J. Assayag and C.J. Fuller (eds.), *Globalizing India: Perspectives from Below*, London: Anthem Press, pp. 17-46.
- Baxter, J., 1941, *Report on Indian Immigration*, Rangoon: Government Printing and Stationery.
- Bayly, C.A., 1990, 'Beating the Boundaries: South Asian History, c.1700-1850', in S. Bose (ed.), *South Asia and World Capitalism*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 27-39.
- Bennison, J.J., 1928, *Report of an Enquiry into the Standard and Cost of Living of the Working Classes in Rangoon*, Rangoon: Government Printing and Stationery.
- Bhattacharya, S., 2006, 'International Flows of Un-Free Labour', in K.S. Jomo (ed.), *Globalization Under Hegemony*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 195-225.
- Boag, G.T., 1922, 'Madras Census Report', Pt. 1, Madras, Government Press.

- Bose, S. (ed.), 1990, *South Asia and World Capitalism*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- , 2006, *A Hundred Horizons: The Indian Ocean in the Age of Global Empire*, New Delhi: Permanent Black.
- Bosma, Ulbe, 2004, 'Beyond the Atlantic: Connecting Migration and World History in the Age of Imperialism, 1840-1940', *International Review of Social History*, no. 3, pp. 116-23.
- Chakravarti, N.R., 1971, *The Indian Minority in Burma: The Rise and Decline of An Immigrant Community*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Chaturvedi, V. (ed.), 2000, *Mapping Subaltern Studies and the Postcolonial*, London and New York: Verso.
- Chaudhury S. and M. Morineau (eds.), 1999, *Merchants, Companies and Trade: Europe and Asia in the Early Modern Era*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, C. et al., 1990, *South Asians Overseas: Migration and Ethnicity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dale, S.F., 1994, *Indian Merchants and Eurasian Trade, 1600-1750*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dobbin, C., 1996, *Asian Entrepreneurial Minorities: Conjoint Communities in the Making of the World-Economy, 1570-1940*, London: Routledge.
- Frank, A.G., 1976, *On Capitalist Underdevelopment*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- , 1998, *ReORIENT: Global Economy in the Asian Age*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Francis, W.S., 1992, *Vizagapatam District Gazetteer*, Madras: Asian Educational Services.
- Grantham, S.G., 1922, *Burma Census Report*, Pt. 1, Rangoon: Government Press.
- Kondapi, C., 1951, *Indians Overseas, 1838-1949*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Lal, B.V. et al., 2006, *The Encyclopedia of the Indian Diaspora*, Singapore: Editions Didier Millet.
- Lal, V., 2003, 'Provincializing the West: World History from the Perspective of Indian History', in B. Stuchty and E. Fuchs (eds.), *Writing World History, 1800-2000*, London: Oxford University Press, pp. 271-89.
- Mckeown, A., 2004, 'Global Migration, 1846-1940', *Journal of World History*, no. 2, pp. 155-89.
- , 2007, 'Regionalizing World Migration', *International Review of Social History*, no. 3, pp. 134-42.
- Mahadevan, R., 1978, 'Patterns of Enterprise of Immigrant Entrepreneurs: A Study of Chettiers in Malaya, 1880-1930', *Economic and Political Weekly*, no. 4-5, pp. 146-52.
- Malony, J.C., 1912, *Madras Census Report*, Pt. 1, Madras: Madras Government Press.
- Marjoribanks, N.E., and A.K.G.A. Tambi Marakkayar, 1917, *Report on the Indian Labour Emigration to Ceylon and Malaya*, Madras: Madras Government Press.
- Markovits, Claude, 2000, *The Global World of Indian Merchants, 1750-1947: Traders of Sind from Bhukara to Panama*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maung Than, T.M., 1993, 'Some Aspects of Indians in Rangoon', in A. Man and S. Sandhu (eds.), *Indian Communities in Southeast Asia*, Singapore: Time Academic Press.
- Morgan Webb, C., 1986, *Burma Census Report*, vol. 1, Delhi: Manas Publication.

- Narayana Rao, A., 1930, *Contract Labour in Burma*, Madras: Current Thought Press.
- Parthasarathi, P., 2011, *Why Europe Grew Rich and Asia Did Not: Global Economic Divergence, 1600-1850*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pearn, B.R., 1913, *A History of Rangoon*, Rangoon: American Baptist Mission Press.
- Prakash, B.A., 1998, 'Gulf Migration and Kerala', *Economic and Political Weekly*, no. 50, pp. 3209-12.
- Prakash, G., 1990, 'Writing Post-Orient Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, no. 2, pp. 383-408.
- , 1992, 'Postcolonial Criticism and Indian Historiography', *Social Text*, no. 31-2, pp. 8-19.
- Prakash, Om, 2002, 'Asia and the Rise of the World Economy in the Early Modern Period', in R. Gommel and M.A. Denzil (eds.), *Weltwirtschaft und Wirtschaftsordnung*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp. 115-23.
- Proceedings of the Burma Legislative Council*, 10 March 1923, vol. 1, p. 54.
- Riot Enquiry Committee, 1939, *The Interim Report of the Riot Enquiry Committee*, Rangoon: Government of Burma Printing and Stationery.
- Rothermund, D., 2009, *India: The Rise of an Asian Giant*, London: Yale University Press.
- Roy, T., 2012, *India in the World Economy: From Antiquity to the Present*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Royal Commission on Labour in India, 1983, *Report of the Royal Commission on Labour in India*, New Delhi: Agricole Publishing Academy.
- Rudner, D.W., 1994, *Caste and Colonialism in Colonial India: The Nattukottai Chettiars*, New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Satyanarayana, Adapa, 2002, "Birds of Passage": Migration of South Indian Labourers to Southeast Asia', *Critical Asian Studies*, no. 1, pp. 89-175.
- , 2004, 'Body-Shopping' Migration of South Indian (Telugu) Coolies to Southeast Asia: A Case Study of Colonial Burma', in I. Thirumali (ed.), *South India: Regions, Cultures and Spaces*, New Delhi: Bibliometrics, pp. 18-36.
- Sharieff, A., 1994, 'Socio-Economic Transformation of the Kuwaiti Repatriates: A Case Study of Hyderabad', Department of Geography, Osmania University, Hyderabad, Unpublished Ph.D. thesis.
- Wallerstein, I., 2004, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- , 1986, 'Incorporation of Indian Subcontinent into Capitalist World-Economy', *Economic and Political Weekly*, no. 4, pp. 28-39.
- Washbrook, D., 1990, 'South Asia, the World System and World Capitalism', in S. Bose (ed.), *South Asia and World Capitalism*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 40-86.
- Weber, Max, 1952, *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, New York: Charles Scribners and Sons.
- , 1958, *Religion of India: The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism*, New York: Free Press.
- Yeats, M.W., 1932, *Madras Census Report*, Pt. 1, Calcutta: Government of India Publication Branch.
- Young, R.J.C., 2001, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zachariah, K.C. et al., 2002, *Kerala's Gulf Connection: CDS Studies on International Labour Migration from Kerala State in India*, Tiruvananthapuram: Centre for Development Studies.