PROOF COVER SHEET

Author(s):	Rosaria Franco
Article Title:	Chinese Refugee Children and Empires: The Politics of International Adoptions in Cold War Hong Kong
Article No:	FICH1408227
Enclosures:	1) Query sheet
	2) Article proofs

Dear Author,

1. Please check these proofs carefully. It is the responsibility of the corresponding author to check these and approve or amend them. A second proof is not normally provided. Taylor & Francis cannot be held responsible for uncorrected errors, even if introduced during the production process. Once your corrections have been added to the article, it will be considered ready for publication.

Please limit changes at this stage to the correction of errors. You should not make trivial changes, improve prose style, add new material, or delete existing material at this stage. You may be charged if your corrections are excessive (we would not expect corrections to exceed 30 changes).

For detailed guidance on how to check your proofs, please paste this address into a new browser window: http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/checkingproofs.asp

Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can comment on the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat. If you wish to do this, please save the file to your hard disk first. For further information on marking corrections using Acrobat, please paste this address into a new browser window: http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/acrobat.asp

2. Please review the table of contributors below and confirm that the first and last names are structured correctly and that the authors are listed in the correct order of contribution. This check is to ensure that your name will appear correctly online and when the article is indexed.

Sequence	Prefix	Given name(s)	Surname	Suffix
1		Rosaria	Franco	

Queries are marked in the margins of the proofs, and you can also click the hyperlinks below. Content changes made during copy-editing are shown as tracked changes. Inserted text is in red font and revisions have a red indicator . Changes can also be viewed using the list comments function. To correct the proofs, you should insert or delete text following the instructions below, but **do not add comments to the existing tracked changes**.

AUTHOR QUERIES

General points:

1. **Permissions**: You have warranted that you have secured the necessary written permission from the appropriate copyright owner for the reproduction of any text, illustration, or other material in your article. Please see http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/permissions/usingThirdPartyMaterial.asp.
2. **Third-party content**: If there is third-party content in your article, please check that the rightsholder details for re-use are shown correctly.
3. **Affiliation**: The corresponding author is responsible for ensuring that address and email details are correct for all the co-authors. Affiliations given in the article should be the affiliation at the time the research was conducted. Please see http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/writing.asp.
4. **Funding**: Was your research for this article funded by a funding agency? If so, please insert 'This work was supported by <insert the name of the funding agency in full>', followed by the grant number in square brackets '[grant number xxxx]'.
5. **Supplemental data and underlying research materials**: Do you wish to include the location of the underlying research materials (e.g. data, samples or models) for your article? If so, please insert this sentence before the reference section: 'The underlying research materials for this article can be accessed at <full link>/ description of location [author to complete]'. If your article includes supplemental data, the link will also be provided in this paragraph. See <http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation/multimedia.asp> for further explanation of supplemental data and underlying research materials.
6. The **CrossRef database** (www.**crossref**.org/) has been used to validate the references. Changes resulting from mismatches are tracked in red font.

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
AQ1	Please check whether article title footnote set correctly.
AQ2	Please note that the Funding section has been created by summarising information given in your acknowledgements. Please correct if this is inaccurate.
AQ3	The funding information provided (University of Nottingham Ningbo China) has been checked against the Open Funder Registry and we failed to find a match. Please check and resupply the funding details.
AQ4	The funding information provided (Teaching Leave Grant) has been checked against the Open Funder Registry and we failed to find a match. Please check and resupply the funding details.
AQ5	The disclosure statement has been inserted. Please correct if this is inaccurate.
AQ6	The CrossRef database (www.crossref.org/) has been used to validate the references. Mismatches between the original manuscript and CrossRef are tracked in red font.

QUERY NO.	QUERY DETAILS
	Please provide a revision if the change is incorrect. Do not comment on correct changes
AQ7	Please provide missing page range for reference “Choy 2013” references list entry.
AQ8	Please provide missing city for HKG n.d.” references list entry.
AQ9	Please provide missing city for HKG n.d.” references list entry.
AQ10	Please provide missing city for HKG n.d.” references list entry.
AQ11	Please provide missing city for HKG n.d.” references list entry.
AQ12	Please provide missing city for HKG 1962” references list entry.
AQ13	Please provide missing city for HKG n.d.” references list entry.
AQ14	Please provide missing city for HKG n.d.” references list entry.
AQ15	Please provide missing city for HKG n.d.” references list entry.
AQ16	Please provide missing city for HKG 1948” references list entry.
AQ17	Please provide missing city for Lawrence 1984” references list entry.
AQ18	Please provide missing city for Madokoro 2012” references list entry.
AQ19	Please provide missing page range for reference “Marshall 2013” references list entry.
AQ20	Please provide missing city for n.a 1956” references list entry.
AQ21	Please provide missing city for Pegg 1994” references list entry.
AQ22	Please provide missing city for Sinn 2003” references list entry.
AQ23	Please provide missing city for Tsang 2011” references list entry.
AQ24	Please provide a page number for the quotation ‘transnational linkages created by organizations and individuals’.
AQ25	Please provide a page number for the quotation beginning ‘in the hope that they would either be brought up … ’.
AQ26	Notes 15, 28 and 44. Should ‘*Problem of People*’ be ‘*A Problem of People*’ as in the Bibliography?
AQ27	Note 27. Should the quotation marks be removed from note 27?

How to make corrections to your proofs using Adobe Acrobat/Reader

Taylor & Francis offers you a choice of options to help you make corrections to your proofs. Your PDF proof file has been enabled so that you can edit the proof directly using Adobe Acrobat/Reader. This is the simplest and best way for you to ensure that your corrections will be incorporated. If you wish to do this, please follow these instructions:

1. Save the file to your hard disk.

2. Check which version of Adobe Acrobat/Reader you have on your computer. You can do this by clicking on the "Help" tab, and then "About".

If Adobe Reader is not installed, you can get the latest version free from http://get.adobe.com/reader/.

3. If you have Adobe Acrobat/Reader 10 or a later version, click on the "Comment" link at the right-hand side to view the Comments pane.

4. You can then select any text and mark it up for deletion or replacement, or insert new text as needed. Please note that these will clearly be displayed in the Comments pane and secondary annotation is not needed to draw attention to your corrections. If you need to include new sections of text, it is also possible to add a comment to the proofs. To do this, use the Sticky Note tool in the task bar. Please also see our FAQs here: http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/production/index.asp.

5. Make sure that you save the file when you close the document before uploading it to CATS using the "Upload File" button on the online correction form. If you have more than one file, please zip them together and then upload the zip file.

If you prefer, you can make your corrections using the CATS online correction form.

Troubleshooting

Acrobat help: http://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat.html
Reader help: http://helpx.adobe.com/reader.html

Please note that full user guides for earlier versions of these programs are available from the Adobe Help pages by clicking on the link "Previous versions" under the "Help and tutorials" heading from the relevant link above. Commenting functionality is available from Adobe Reader 8.0 onwards and from Adobe Acrobat 7.0 onwards.

Firefox users: Firefox's inbuilt PDF Viewer is set to the default; please see the following for instructions on how to use this and download the PDF to your hard drive: http://support.mozilla.org/en-US/kb/view-pdf-files-firefox-without-downloading-them#w_using-a-pdf-reader-plugin

THE JOURNAL OF IMPERIAL AND COMMONWEALTH HISTORY, 2017
https://doi.org/10.1080/03086534.2017.1408227

Chinese Refugee Children and Empires: The Politics of International Adoptions in Cold War Hong Kong[†]

Rosaria Franco

The University of Nottingham Ningbo China, Ningbo, Zhejiang Province, People's Republic of China

ABSTRACT

With the support of new sources from British and Hong Kong archives, this study casts new light on the post-war international adoptions of Chinese refugee children in the British colony of Hong Kong. It argues that while children were 'saved' and found families overseas, they were also used as pawns in a bigger political game. A way to delegate welfare for the Hong Kong government, a symbolic humanitarian concession vis-à-vis a strict anti-immigration policy for Britain, and an anti-communist propaganda tool for the United States, these adoptions also convey the competing power and population politics played over subject children by two multiracial empires: one in decline (the rapidly decolonising Britain), the other on the rise (the new cold war superpower).

KEYWORDS

International adoptions; refugee children; Chinese refugees; Hong Kong; British empire; United States; cold war; immigration; decolonisation; 1950s; 1960s

Introduction

In October 1964, International Social Services of Hong Kong (ISS HK) sent its thousandth child for adoption overseas. ISS HK was a delegation of the US branch of International Social Service, a major international organisation with headquarters in Geneva dedicated to transnational social work.[1] In the British colony it had been supporting what was in fact a hybrid between a form of child migration and a cross-border alternative family care placement.[2] Between 1958 and 1963 alone it had organised 779 placements, sending 696 children to the United States, but oddly only 56 to Britain, the Hong Kong's metropole, with the remaining children going to other countries.[3] Some children were refugees from China, others foundlings abandoned anonymously, whose identity could not be ascertained. However, they were all classified as 'Chinese refugee children'. As such their plight resonated with world public opinion at a time when Hong Kong had to cope with about one million refugees from mainland China, and so they found loving homes abroad. They would also

CONTACT Rosaria Franco rosaria.franco@nottingham.edu.cn School of International Studies, The University of Nottingham Ningbo China, 199 Taikang East Road, 315100 Ningbo, Zhejiang Province, People's Republic of China

[†]Welfare Burden, Colonial Aliens, 'Bamboo Curtain' Refugees: The Politics of International Adoptions in Hong Kong (1953–62).

become the object of attention and ultimately contention among the British colony of Hong Kong, its imperial metropole, and the United States, that is to say, a cold war superpower flexing is political muscles in Asia.

Historically, the concern with helping children of foreign lands was an extension of the Western child-saving movement.[4] The first international adoptions started in Europe after the Second World War as a novel humanitarian initiative, supported by the Allied governments, to rescue war orphans, displaced, and refugee children left behind by the conflict.[5] Yet, other scholars have noted how in the early stages of the cold war international adoptions were used by the United States both in Europe and in Asia (Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, and so on) as tools of empire building and anti-communist propaganda.[6] This alone invites a comparison with the attitude of the British empire, which had closer links to Hong Kong.

In the international political climate of the 1950s and early 1960s, the international adoptions of Hong Kong's Chinese refugee children were *both* a humanitarian *and* a highly political affair. Hitherto, historians have highlighted mainly the first aspect, leaving the politics behind them in the background. Catherine Ceniza Choy examines the 'transnational linkages created by organizations and individuals', that is, private and non-governmental agencies such as International Social Services of Hong Kong (ISS USA) and would-be adoptive parents, in arranging what were the first transracial adoptions of Chinese children in the United States.[7] Laura Madokoro, too, mainly focuses on the role played by humanitarian actors in Hong Kong in facilitating the resettlement of Chinese orphans in settler societies (Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa) within the British empire after 1962.[8]

AQ24

By contrast, with the support of new sources from British and Hong Kong archives on the case of 'Chinese refugee children', this study shifts the attention away from non-governmental organisations or public opinion to reveal the complex politics underpinning Hong Kong's international adoptions, as played by the governments of the British colony, its metropole (Britain), and the United States. It argues that for these three political actors in the short term they represented, respectively: an opportunity to cut local welfare costs through international relief mobilised for Chinese refugees; a mere symbolic humanitarian concession, while refusing any policy of general resettlement of Chinese refugees; and a systematic and occasionally frustrated anti-communist propaganda exploit.

International adoptions are not only about making daughters and sons out of strangers, but also about making citizens out of foreigners. Kirsten Lovelock argues that, in embracing international adoptions, the receiving countries always prioritised their national interest over the children's needs. This attitude is confirmed by Tara Zahra's analysis of the eager welcome from Western countries to white displaced European children for demographic purposes.[9] Thus, this paper also considers the value of Hong Kong's Chinese refugee

children for the three political actors involved, not only as sending and receiving countries facilitating their mobility, but also as multiracial empires (or parts of empires), which had to engage with diverse 'racialised models of childhood' within their boundaries to guarantee their own future.[10] Exceptionally, all the three governments – whose governance was characterised by racial hierarchies, racial discrimination and, in the case of the United States, even segregation – ended with facilitating the first transracial adoption of Asian children against existing laws (the United States) or cultural practices (Hong Kong, Britain).[11] Yet, ultimately this option was determined by the far-reaching global politics of inclusion and exclusion of the two empires involved, which were affected, respectively, by cold war politics (for the United States as a rising superpower) and decolonisation (the declining British empire).

Saving Chinese Refugee Children

In post-war Hong Kong child abandonment was conveniently associated with a mass refugee movement caused by the Chinese civil war, the victory of the Chinese Communists in 1949, and the ensuing political and social turmoil. In addition to pushing hundreds of thousands Chinese people into Hong Kong, including a large number of defeated Nationalists, in the long term the formation of a communist state in China would change the dynamics of population exchange between the mainland and Hong Kong. Since the latter's foundation in the 1840s the borders between the two had been porous, so facilitating the flow of labour, traders, and goods; but henceforth Chinese migrants would come to Hong Kong never to return to China.[12] This, together with natural demographic growth, pushed the population from about one million in 1946 up to more than two million in 1950 and more than three million by the early 1960s.[13] Although conferring the status of refugees for about 700,000 immigrants was considered, it eventually became clear that they could not be resettled abroad.[14] Consequently, all the associated social needs (housing, education, medical care, and social welfare) had to be organised within the colony.[15]

As with all refugee communities, Chinese refugees included families. Hence, not only did they come with children, but they also contributed to an increase in births afterwards: 75,544 children were born in the colony in 1953, compared with only 20,886 in 1934. By 1954 it was estimated that 33.7 per cent of all the post-war migrants (900,000 people) were children below the age of 15, including 13 per cent below the age of four.[16] The 1961 census revealed that, out of the 3,133,131 residents of all the ages, 1,277,088 (40.8 per cent) were under 15, including no less than 500,726 (16 per cent) under five.[17] Hong Kong society, historically a by-product of a port economy, had never been so young. Concurrently, widespread homelessness and poverty among the refugees fostered child neglect and even abandonment, which, in turn, created the candidates for international adoptions.

For the colonial government, international adoptions were a convenient solution to the difficulty of finding adequate care for Chinese refugee and abandoned children locally, and thereby reducing the risk that these children would become a welfare burden. The colonial government sent two main groups of Chinese 'orphans' overseas. The first group, not publicised, consisted of real refugees from China. These had reached the colony usually accompanied by an adult, and were considered 'transit cases'. To this group we could add those children, whether refugees or born in Hong Kong, who were released voluntarily by their parents, so that they could migrate and join friends and relatives in the Chinese diaspora abroad. The second group, highly publicised, included foundlings who were wards of agencies of social welfare, who may or may not have been born of refugees.[18] The latter group raised the greatest concern because they contributed to overcrowding of orphanages and were hard to place with local families through adoption. It also included the main candidates for adoption by strangers.

As a port historically largely populated by merchants, seamen, and prostitutes, Hong Kong had always had high rates of illegitimacy and child desertion. This explains the early foundation of institutions for foundlings, such as Fanling Babies Homes, the French Convent Orphanage, and others.[19] New causes for child abandonment emerged after the post-war British reoccupation of the colony, as impoverished residents and refugees struggled to find shelter, food, and work and were hardly able to care for their children. According to the earliest post-war report of the colonial Social Welfare Office (SWO), infants were usually left near orphanages or police stations so that they could be found promptly. The report speculated that they were born of working or single mothers, who were forced to desert them due to poverty. It also noted that children were abandoned 'in the hope that they would either be brought up or buried at public expense'. Nine out of 10 were female, and hence considered a 'real financial liability', rather than an 'investment and source of pride' like boys.[20] Thus, plausibly, they were of Chinese heritage, for the Chinese preference for boys was well known. This situation exercised great pressure on the existing residential care system.[21] Although the colonial government modernised adoption law, there was little scope for local adoption as cultural biases informed its popular use by both Chinese and European residents alike.

Until 1956 Hong Kong did not have Western-style legal adoption. From the outset the British colonial government let the Chinese population regulate their private affairs according to the laws and customs of Qing's imperial rule.[22] This applied to family relations, which included a form of customary adoption. Chinese customary adoption was gender-biased and did not allow strangers to become full-right members of the family. The adoption of boys, usually relatives or kin, gave a male heir to families that had none, so allowing the continuation of the family line and the transmission of property.[23] As boys became part of their

adoptive families, they were well treated. By contrast, the adoption of girls was an economic transaction. A poor family would sell a female child to a rich family, where she would serve until old enough to have an arranged marriage. Chinese claimed that these girls (called *mui tsai*, literally 'little sisters') were not exploited, as they escaped a life of poverty and secured a good future. However, after British activists labelled it child slavery and called for its abolition, the colonial government started to monitor the practice.[24] This led to child protection legislation (last updated in 1951 with the 'Protection of Women and Juveniles Ordinance'), which made it compulsory to register the adoption of girls with the Secretary for Chinese Affairs, the colonial liaison with the Chinese community. By contrast, registration of the adoption of boys was voluntary.[25]

The arrival of Chinese refugees put pressure on the colonial government to introduce legal adoption. The old Qing imperial law could hardly apply to people whose public and private activities had been regulated by a modern, republican civil code since 1929.[26] The ensuing 1956 Adoption Ordinance was also modelled after the English 1950 Adoption Act, which introduced the concept of adoption in the interest of children, rather than of their adoptive families.[27] Thus, a combination of policy transfer and local circumstances shaped the reform.[28] Henceforth, the legal adoption of both girls and boys was finally possible for both Chinese and non-Chinese parents. This did not eliminate customary adoption, outlawed only in 1972, but Chinese families would gradually start to take advantage of the new law.[29]

Even so, not all abandoned children could be placed with local families. On the one hand a heightened concern with child trafficking very probably prevented some adoptions.[30] On the other, even when local people could afford to take in children, as before, they remained more interested in the adoption of known children, rather than of foundlings.[31] Confirmation comes from the earliest available study of the local applications of the 1956 Adoption Ordinance (Table 1).

Nor did it help that most abandoned children were girls, who, as ever, were not particularly sought after by the Chinese (Table 2).

Furthermore, European residents were less than keen to adopt children of other races, and consequently Chinese children remained in orphanages.[32] Understandably, the desirability of alternative, cost-cutting solutions enticed

Table 1. Analysis of adoption orders made by the Supreme Court 1962–1964.

	1962–1963	1963–1964
Abandoned children	29	27
Illegitimate children	8	9
Adopted by private arrangements	93	65
Confirmation of customary adoption	43	21
Total	173	122

Source: HKG, *Annual Departmental Report[s] of the Director of Social Welfare 1963–4* (Hong Kong: Government Printer, n.d.), Appendix 12 'The Adoption Ordinance, 1956', p. 64.[107]

Table 2. Abandonment of children 1958–1963.

Sex	1959–1960	1960–1961	1961–1962	1962–1963
Males	45	21	26	32
Females	160	133	94	109
Total	205	154	120	141

Source: HKG, *Annual Departmental Report[s] of the Director of Social Welfare 1961–2* (Hong Kong: Government Printer, n.d.), Appendix 4, p. 38; *1962–3*, Appendix 5, p. 41.[108]

colonial officials into accepting international adoptions, as did the children's origins and identity.

International adoptions were fully supported by overseas funding, targeted unwanted children, and allowed the colonial government to delegate their care. The early international adoptions were organised by Catholic Relief Service and ISS USA, two US organisations that were very active in providing relief to refugees in Hong Kong, although the work of the latter specialised agency is better documented.[33] It was ISS USA (New York Office) that in 1953 started to work with SWO to send children to the United States in compliance with the new 1953 Refugee Relief Act, which allowed the immigration of 4000 orphans.[34] Thus, Chinese children first went abroad independently from the 1956 Adoption Ordinance, as migrants. The scale of the initiative was initially very small. In the fiscal year 1953–1954 the Child Welfare section of SWO helped six boys and three girls to migrate to the United States.[35] In fact, international placements really took off only in 1958, when ISS USA opened a delegation in Hong Kong (ISS HK).

At this time Florence Boester, who introduced herself as the ISS (USA) Far Eastern representative based in Japan, approached SWO, now an autonomous Department of Social Welfare (DSW), with a proposal to open a delegation to send 500 children to the United States under the new 1957 Immigration and Nationality Act. Crucially, the proposal came with funding of US$50,000 to cover all costs, including staff, subject to renewal in the following year.[36] This generous offer was well received by the colonial government for its cost-saving implications.

Since the outset it had been clear that any abandoned children would be housed in local orphanages, subsidised by the colonial government.[37] However, as DSW noted, even with their 2500 places these institutions filled quickly. Besides, some of these children were at risk of becoming full charges of the colonial government in the future.[38] Thus, there were plenty of children available for adoption. This added to the costs incurred by DSW, which had also to coordinate and occasionally subsidise social services for the growing child population of the colony. Thus, no opportunity to reduce the colonial budget with external, international funding appeared too insignificant.

Children's welfare was de facto delegated to the receiving countries. Before the 1956 Adoption Ordinance children's emigration was facilitated by the Secretary for Chinese Affairs within the legal framework of the 1951 Protection of Women

and Juveniles Ordinance.[39] Subsequently, international transfers were managed by SWO/DSW. While this department continued to apply that ordinance for the emigration of older Chinese refugee children, for the foundlings it applied the new 1956 Adoption Ordinance, especially for the terms of release of children for adoption, parental consent, and court approval.[40] There was an exception, though: at first the colonial government disregarded the rule that both parents and children should be resident in the colony and the parents should look after the children for at least three months before confirmation of legal adoption.[41] The resulting adoption by proxy was not without risk, although this was somehow reduced by the fact that both British and US family placements were organised by ISS, whose staff specialised in international adoptions.[42] Still, as a minimum, the practice reflects a relaxed attitude to letting go of children who ultimately were hardly considered an investment by the colonial government.

International adoptions were a modern version of entrenched residual solutions to the social welfare of a transient population. First, residual social policy was in the nature of the British colonial system, historically keen on supporting only limited statutory services. This was much in evidence in Hong Kong, a colony valued for its location and trade potential, not for its resources or population.[43] In fact, after its post-war British reoccupation, here the 'people', including their children, rather became a problem. As mass immigration swamped the tiny colony, this emergency reduced human beings to mere numbers and, one could add, mere costs.[44] Second, initially the colonial government thought of the Chinese refugees as temporary residents who would either return to China or emigrate.[45] Hence, it logically welcomed a child emigration scheme that conveniently relied on the classification of Chinese children as refugees, whether they were infant children of local paupers or older immigrants. Although eventually it had to accept the permanent settlement of Chinese refugees, it maintained an adoption scheme that conveniently made up for local inefficiencies in childcare provisions. Third, if before the war the colonial government was already eager to delegate social services to local religious and charitable organisations, in its aftermath it rather expected that 'the costs of [refugees'] integration into Hong Kong's own community could be accepted as a charge upon the conscience of the free world …'.[46] International adoption could therefore be seen as an integral part of the international relief accepted by the colony in the 1950s and early 1960s. However, it was eagerly facilitated by a colonial government that saw Chinese children as a welfare burden.

Colonial Subjects or Racial Aliens?

Britain was, oddly, only the second major destination of Chinese refugee children from Hong Kong. Here international adoptions were initiated by International Social Services of Great Britain (ISS GB) as part of its contribution to

World Refugee Year (WRY). This was a humanitarian initiative, launched by British intellectuals and some Conservative politicians, which led to a major international campaign in 1959–1960 to develop a permanent solution to the problem of the hundreds of thousands refugees still left in various parts of the world after the Second World War.[47] ISS GB was a constituent agency of the national WRY committee and decided to work on a 'pilot project' to help British families interested in adopting refugee children from Hong Kong.[48] ISS GB had been moved into action by a concern for the children abandoned in the streets of Hong Kong, the demand from British couples to adopt Chinese refugee children, and 'a strong feeling that Great Britain should give practical expression to its concern for the conditions prevalent in this British colony'. [49] According to a survey, most children were female, had an average age of 22 months, were utterly abandoned, and were adopted for humanitarian reasons, mainly by Christian white couples, with only a minority of them going to couples of Chinese, mixed, or of different ethnic background.[50]

By the end of WRY, however, ISS had brought only three children to Britain.[51] By August 1961 the number had risen to 26 and the organisation anticipated that three children a month would arrive after that time.[52] In fact, while hundreds of British families allegedly applied to adopt these children, it took an entire decade to finalise the adoption of only about 100 children.[53] Yet, the British metropole had in place the legal framework to allow both the adoption of foreign children and their immigration from her colonies.

In Britain, legal adoption itself was a relatively recent innovation, having been introduced only with the 1926 Adoption of Children Act for children born within her national borders.[54] This law had a humanitarian purpose, as it addressed the needs of illegitimate children and a large contingent of children orphaned by the First World War and the Spanish influenza pandemic.[55] Only after the Second World War did attention turn to foreign children. Accordingly, the law evolved to enable British citizens to pursue international adoptions, sanctioned by the first nationwide 1950 Adoption Act and reconfirmed by the 1958 Adoption Act.[56] All in all, by 1960 when British adoptions of Chinese refugee children started, Britain had in place the legal framework for the adoption of children across borders.

A further consideration is that at the height of the post-war refugee crisis Chinese abandoned children's identity could be uncertain because of the obvious racial homogeneity between the recent refugees and the rooted Chinese population. Older children born outside Hong Kong were not subjects of the British empire, but could not be legally considered as refugees either. Because of the existence of two Chinese states after 1949 – the People's Republic of China and the Nationalists' Republic of China in Taiwan – the legal category of refugeedom, with the associated international protection, hardly applied to Chinese refugees.[57] By contrast, the younger children born in the colony qualified for citizenship of the United Kingdom and Colonies. Either way, colonial

officials found a way to send them to Britain by issuing certificates of identity for refugees and passports for colonial subjects.[58]

The international transfer of Chinese refugee children also required supportive legislation, especially as it coincided with dramatic legal changes in British immigration policy. The above-mentioned arrangements enabled the children to move to Britain without restraint from 1960 to 1962. Then the drafting of the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, which would stop unhindered immigration from the colonies, potentially threatened to halt the scheme.[59] However, colonial officials from Hong Kong negotiated with the Home Office so that entry certificates issued by the colony should continue to remain acceptable for all categories of children.[60] The director of DSW may have been convincing in his argument that at a time when the US government had removed all obstacles to the international adoptions of foreigners, 'it would be particularly unfortunate if … the United Kingdom were to slam the door to the same kind of children, who are citizens of the Commonwealth'.[61] A compromise was evidently achieved, as children continued to arrive from Hong Kong during the 1960s.[62]

Still, from the figures available, the scheme remained minuscule. At the height of the interest in the plight of Hong Kong's refugee children, ISS GB managed to bring 60 children for adoption, a number nowhere near US figures (Table 3). So, in the absence of legal obstacles, what hindered the expansion of the scheme?

It could be argued the major barrier to the British government having a more generous attitude was its belief that the problem of Chinese refugees should be the financial responsibility of the colonial government, even if it had contributed to the colony's predicament by recognising the People's Republic of China diplomatically, combined with its entrenched racially biased population politics.[63] This, in turn, deprived ISS GB of crucial political and financial support.

As noted, ISS GB's initiative was part of the WRY. Although the British government supported the campaign, privately its main departments opposed any major official commitment. The Foreign Officer feared the cost, as well as being caught in the politics of the cold war, and was encouraging only towards non-governmental initiatives.[64] Indeed, by the end of WRY the British government would have given only the equivalent of $US560,000 (the United States, in contrast, pledged US$4,000,000), while private donations amounted to $US5,824,000.[65] Thus, although the British government allowed

Table 3. International adoptions 1960–1963.

	1960–1961	1961–1962	1962–1963
UK	18	23	18
USA	226	133	145
Total	247	160	181

Sources: HKG, *Annual Report[s] of the Department of Social Welfare for 1960–1* (Hong Kong: Government Printer, n.d.), p. 6; *1961–2* (n.d.), p. 8; and *1962–3* (n.d.), p. 10; TNA CO 1030/1320 ISS GB, *Annual Report* 1959–60, pp. 8–9.[109]

the ISS GB's scheme in principle, its bureaucratic caution and strategic withdrawal of financial support quietly undermined it. Similar to the colonial government, it rather expected that all costs of the transfers should be covered by would-be adoptive parents and ISS GB. For example, in the case of escorts, that is, adults needed to accompany the infants to Britain, the colonial government did not plan to pay for them and the British government did not offer to help.[66] This was problematic because the travelling cost for a child was 50 pounds, but paying for escorts would double it.[67] As in post-war Britain would-be adoptive parents often had limited means, as demonstrated by a couple who had to sell their caravan to bring a child into the country, they could hardly afford to pay also for escorts.[68] On the other hand, private funding also remained limited. Hence, the resources of ISS GB compared very poorly with its US counterpart, and by the end of WRY ISS GB could rely only on a few hundred pounds for its 'Hong Kong Project'.[69]

Furthermore, the British government did not encourage the immigration of refugees or other categories. The Home Office and the Ministry of Labour were particularly vehement, refusing to help even the 15,000 Europeans, formerly resident in China, who were now stranded in Hong Kong. In their opinion, the country had already accepted enough refugees from the European continent. The number of refugees eventually admitted was small (700) and consisted of vulnerable individuals, a category befitting Hong Kong's Chinese refugee children.[70] The debate on WRY and refugees, in turn, overlapped with a major debate about immigration, which was to lead to the closure of the borders for people from the colonies and Commonwealth. According to Ittmann, the British empire was arranged in a racial hierarchical order and Britain encouraged only centrifugal migration from the metropole to populate the colonies with white people.[71] This applied to child migration, too.[72] Thus, the 1950s' and early 1960s' centripetal immigration from the colonies and Commonwealth had already created alarm.[73] Indeed, the definition of the terms of admission of Chinese refugee children (1960–1962) overlaps with the debate on the risk of organised mass immigration of Chinese people from Hong Kong (also 1960–1962).[74] Unsurprisingly, the British government hardly supported the expansion of a programme entailing the arrival of Chinese children for transracial adoption, especially when Britain's own first coloured and mixed-race children languished in institutions.[75] Accordingly, when liaising with state agencies ISS GB sensibly acknowledged the great 'responsibility' associated with 'bringing to [Britain] babies of another race and culture'.[76] It also outlined a robust system of safeguards. ISS GB rejected adoption by proxy and secured the support of Dr Barnardo's Homes and the National Children's Homes Association, which not only oversaw the adoption process, but also committed to institutionalising some children if this broke down.[77] Thus, private funding, safeguards provided by voluntary agencies, and the small scale of the British adoption scheme made it acceptable to state agencies,

which nonetheless showed no interest in making dramatic exceptions to their anti-immigration stance towards refugees or colonial racial aliens, whose citizenship was precarious, of any age.

The Rise and Fall of US Adoptions from Hong Kong

ISS USA was instrumental in organising Hong Kong's international adoptions, but the success of the entire initiative relied heavily on the pivotal financial and political support of the government of the United States. By early 1961 600 orphans had been transferred to the United States.[78] These were a significant percentage of the 15,000 children adopted in the United States from overseas between 1953 and 1962, especially as they come from a single city.[79] US support, in turn, was part of a major relief effort in the British colony.

The US interest in the Chinese refugees of Hong Kong was both humanitarian *and* political, because it hosted the biggest population that had run away from communism and could be used as a site to collect intelligence information. [80] The US government had become the major aid donors of money by the 1950s and sponsored several specialised US organisations operating in the British colony, which distributed food, funded housing for squatters, provided education, and helped with resettlement of refugees abroad.[81] Between 1954 and 1961 the United States contributed $US7,842,596.76 to the colony as part of the US Far East Refugee Program (FERP) and continued to spend one million dollars a year afterwards. The US Consulate in Hong Kong worked with 14 agencies and had contracts with 10 of them, including ISS, which provided help to 700,000 people. Most of them were Christian, and besides providing relief were keen on the religious conversion of both adults and children as a good antidote to communist ideology.[82] During WRY the United States also donated money to build schools, hospitals and community centres, including half a million dollars for a centre to screen abandoned babies for further family placement.[83] The adoption of Chinese refugee children, therefore, was part of a major US relief effort.

The adoption of Chinese refugee children, as of other Asian children, was also seen as a propaganda tool in the United States' anti-China and cold war politics, which resulted in no little twisting of US adoption and immigration legislation. To begin with, international adoptions entailed transracial family placements, when these were actually illegal in many states.[84] Additionally, they required the relaxation of immigration regulations to allow the entry and naturalisation of Amerasian and Asian children, who by race and ethnicity would have been banned from entry by existing laws.[85] By removing these legal obstacles, the US government allowed the arrival of both abandoned children (mainly female infants) and 'known' children (mainly older and male). While the former were adopted largely by white parents for humanitarian reasons, as in Britain, the latter joined American Chinese parents who either wanted to

adopt to create a family or to provide a better future to children of friends or relatives. These older children often experienced difficulties in separating from their families and adjusting to a new environment.[86]

Initially, international adoptions were made possible by the inclusion of orphans in refugee legislation privileging the admission of non-communist displaced people and escapees from communist countries: the 1953 Refugee Relief Act and, after it expired, the 1957 Refugee-Escapee Act. Both included provisions for adoption, as noted earlier. These, in turn, were informed by political considerations.

On the one hand, Asian adoptions were a consequence of US empire building and the deployment of US soldiers (in Japan, Korea, and so on), whose affairs with local women led to the birth of mixed-race babies. In contrast to Eurasian mixed-race babies born in the colonies of European powers, an effort was made to repatriate these half-American citizens, who were shunned by their own societies, back to the United States.[87] On the other hand, rescuing orphans and refugee children was an integral part of US foreign policy and anti-communist propaganda, confirmed by their preference for children displaced from communist countries in eastern Europe, Korea, and, later, Vietnam and Cuba.[88] All humanitarian activities sponsored by the United States in Asia also aimed at conveying the message that the United States had overcome the racial prejudice that was previously a major obstacle to the immigration and naturalisation of Asian people, and freedom-loving people on the continent could confidently turn to US leadership for support and protection from communist authoritarianism;[89] so international adoptions were a powerful symbol of both ideological expansion and a novel anti-racist position.

As the Hong Kong case shows, however, US policy required political cooperation on the ground. As noted, the ISS USA's initiative in Hong Kong was part of the quite generous US FERP, which was politically motivated. However, in agreement with the local colonial government, the US political sponsorship and funding had not been revealed in Hong Kong and it was publicised only from 1957 outside the colony.[90] Accordingly, at least in the non-confidential records available, ISS USA did not give any hint about its patrons. When it applied to open a branch in Hong Kong in 1958 it displayed its credentials as an organisation affiliated to the United Nations Economic and Social Council.[91] Yet, in the same years US officials were trying to induce other British territories to open similar operations. For example, in Singapore, too, they advertised the services of the ISS Far Eastern delegation. Ultimately, the success of such initiatives depended on the willingness of local colonial governments to bend their own laws, illustrated by the fact that Singapore refused to allow adoption by proxy, while Hong Kong proved more flexible.[92]

US discretion ended abruptly in 1962, though, causing a strong reaction in the colonial government. This coincided with a new inflow of Chinese refugees. Since the famine caused by the Great Leap Forward the flow of refugees into

Hong Kong had been significant, but there was a major surge in May 1962 after China opened the borders from its side.[93] Fearing destabilisation of the colony, the United States launched a massive propaganda operation. On 22 May President Kennedy announced the exceptional opening of the national borders to five to six thousand refugees from Hong Kong, entrusting Robert Kennedy to coordinate the operation under the prerogatives entrusted to him as attorney general by the 1957 Immigration and Nationality Act.[94] International adoptions must have looked a good way to raise popular awareness. However, the use of international adoptions from Hong Kong for propaganda purposes was risky for the tiny colony, as China considered Hong Kong to be a Chinese territory, and all its people, whether old residents or recent immigrants, her own citizens.[95] So sending Chinese children overseas for good could raise all sorts of objections and, arguably, even offer an excuse for an attack on the colony. Unsurprisingly, the colonial government reacted assertively.

On 23 June 1962 Robert Black, the colony's governor, approached the Colonial Office and the Foreign Office and asked to convey his complaints to the US government about an imminent propaganda stunt organised by Robert Kennedy, the brother of John F. Kennedy, the president of the United States. Black reported that ISS HK was about to send 50 children to the United States on a special chartered flight. However, this number could have been reached only by delaying the departure of the small numbers routinely available for international adoption. Noting that the colonial government should have been consulted, Black expressed his concern that the transfer could be exploited for political aims.[96]

In fact, the colonial government seems to have missed an early opportunity to object to the project, which forced a stronger response later. As Murray MacLehose, the political advisor to the governor, explained in a separate note to R.T.D. Ledward, the British ambassador in Washington, news of the stunt had already reached Hong Kong on 4 June, when at a press conference Robert Kennedy had announced the imminent arrival of a small number of Chinese orphans, representative of hundreds still available in Hong Kong, and had appealed to US families to adopt them. The colonial government had not immediately grasped the political implications until the associated planned maximum publicity had become clear. MacLehose complained that the colonial government had not been informed and the US Consulate General feigned ignorance. He anticipated great embarrassment for the colonial government if it was advertised that the colony had 'hundreds or thousands orphans, all victims of Communism', or that they were not properly cared for in the colony and even 'shipped overseas in large numbers'.[97] The complaint was duly conveyed. As Ledward later reported, he had 'found the State Department quite sympathetic' and there had been 'very little publicity'.[98] While Chinese children had duly arrived and Kennedy had indeed welcomed them, at least major national newspapers had ignored their

Table 4. Child abandonment and adoptions in Hong Kong 1959–1961.

	1959	1960	1961
Children found abandoned	228	145	128
Adopted in Hong Kong	97	128	193
Adoption overseas (mainly to the United States)	208	228	170

Source: TNA CO 1030/1320 Hong Kong Government, *Daily Information Bulletin* (19 July 1962), p. 2.[110]

lucky escape from communism.[99] Yet, the US initiative in general seems to have had a long-term impact on colonial policy.

In dealing with Kennedy's stunt Ledward had also redirected US bureaucrats to a new change of Hong Kong's policy on emigration and humanitarian assistance from overseas, which had obvious implications for international adoptions.[100] The general terms had been laid down in a widely publicised speech by Claude Burgess, the colonial secretary, to the Hong Kong Legislative Council. Accordingly, the colonial government had rejected emigration and relief assistance as solutions to the problems of the people of the colony; rather, it highlighted the need to develop a more permanent form of local welfare and development.[101] Subsequently, on 19 July DSW had announced a decrease in rates of child abandonment (Table 4), an increase in the number of applications of local would-be adoptive parents, and even the formation of a waiting list.[102]

Consequently, there were fewer children available for adoption abroad, especially as 'local adoptions would normally be considered preferable on the ground that it would usually be in a child's interest to be adopted into a family in his or her community, wherever this is possible'.[103] Therefore, 'only a proportion' of the continuous generous offers from abroad to adopt Hong Kong children would be accepted.[104] The announcement of 19 July, which marked the official end of Hong Kong's international adoptions, matched the colonial government's final acceptance of Chinese refugees as part of the settled population and its shift from emigration and temporary, international relief to localised, permanent forms of welfare to address their social needs.

Ultimately, neither the 'Kennedy affair', nor the new colonial policy affected the movement of Hong Kong's Chinese children to the United States. Local demand for foundlings remained feeble (see Table 1). Thus, once the colonial government asserted its position, it continued to send children abroad, although in smaller numbers. For example, in 1963 alone 125 children left for the United States.[105] Henceforth, no further issue appears to have arisen and international adoptions continued to be arranged discreetly.

Conclusion

All in all, for Chinese refugee children to be able to leave Hong Kong and find a home in the British metropole or the United States, several legal hurdles had to be overcome. Locally, they relied on the willingness of the colonial government,

the sending party, to use its prerogatives to enable children, over whom it often had no claim, to move abroad specifically for adoption purposes. In the receiving countries, they benefited from exceptions made to immigration laws for refugee children, as well as changes in national adoption laws.

For the colonial government international adoptions addressed the dramatic social needs of an enormous immigrant and refugee population at no cost to the public pursue, in line with the internationalisation of relief during the refugee crisis of the 1950s and early 1960s. They also countered a tepid response from the local population to new adoption legislation. For Britain, the weakened post-war imperial metropole threatened by mass immigration from its current and former colonies, they were at best a small concession made during the WRY campaign, totally left in private hands. For the United States, the emerging cold war superpower, they were a symbol of other political battles.

From a humanitarian perspective, the international adoptions of Hong Kong Chinese refugee children were a relative success, a true exercise of acceptance. Committed social workers and generous adoptive parents, many blind to colour and race, saved children from need, suffering, and social rejection to give them a stable home. Some of the adoptees' testimonies, as those of grown-up children who went through the experience, convey a generally positive outcome of most of these placements, notwithstanding the possibility of adoption breakdown and occasional racial abuse.[106]

Nonetheless, from a political perspective, their acceptance was a more rational affair. Significantly, all three governments used the label 'Chinese children refugees', even when the latter's identity could really not be ascertained. This conferred a twofold meaning to their rescue. On the one hand, as 'Chinese refugees', children were never dissociated completely from the adults in the same predicament, who were *not* especially welcomed by any of the three governments involved. The colonial government used it to resettle at least a small group of the mass of Chinese refugees, who could neither return home, nor were accepted abroad. The British metropole, which by the late 1950s was suffering from humanitarian fatigue, did *not* find the label itself sufficient to justify a major overhaul of its entrenched racially biased immigration policies. Finally, the United States exploited the label to denounce communist persecution, even if some of the foundlings would have hardly suffered from it. However, children's immigration did not alter the limited nature of Chinese immigration in general. On the other hand, as 'children' they were powerful symbols of a future, which the governments under consideration accepted or rejected. As such, there is an additional imperial dimension that should not be overlooked. The symbolic importance of international adoptions of Chinese children for the ascending US superpower as an empire-building strategy has been noted. By contrast, as an empire in decline Britain had less reason than ever to bring 'home' children from its colonies, especially when it was losing those colonies to decolonisation. Unsurprisingly, its commitment to Hong Kong's children took the form of a

mere footnote to WRY. As for Hong Kong, which both received and sent out children, international adoptions offered a way to farm out Chinese children, whom it considered more a burden than an investment. While the three governments examined allowed schemes of different scope that may have physically 'saved' Chinese refugee children, they never considered them more than pawns in a bigger political game.

Notes

1. ISS was set up in 1924, originally as International Migration Service, to assist transnational families created by migration. Lawrence, *Twenty-Five Years*, 4.
2. For international adoption as a form of child migration, see Lovelock, "Intercountry Adoption," 907–49.
3. Lawrence, *Twenty-Five Years*, 9. In 1958–1960 other destinations, reached with the help of ISS HK and others, included Hawaii, Japan, Canada, Cuba, the Netherlands, Indonesia, Panama, Germany, and France. Hong Kong Public Record Office (Hereafter: PRO) HKRS 890-2-5 from [Department of Social Welfare] to J.D. Duncanson, Information Services Department, 23 Nov. 1960.
4. See Marshall, "International Child Saving".
5. Lovelock, "Intercountry Adoption," 907–08; Zahra, *The Lost Children*.
6. Hübinette, "From Orphans Trains," 144–45; Klein, "Family Ties," 143–90; Briggs, "From Refugees to Madonnas," 129–59.
7. Choy, "Hong Kong Project," quotation in Loc. 1013.
8. Madokoro, "Refugee Families".
9. Lovelock, "Intercountry Adoption," 909–11; Zahra, *Lost Children*, 171–72.
10. For the concept, see David Pomfret's path-breaking research on the relation between 'racialised childhoods' and imperial rule in pre-war European empires in his *Youth and Empire: Trans-Colonial Childhoods in British and French Asia*.
11. See Choy, "Hong Kong Project"; Rainor, *Adoption*, 23–24.
12. Tsang, *Modern History*, 180–81.
13. Hambro, *Problem of Chinese Refugees*, 142, 144; Hong Kong Government (HKG), *Annual Report 1961*, 25.
14. Gatrell, *Making of the Modern Refugee*, 186–89.
15. As detailed in n.a., *Problem of People*.
16. Hambro, *Problem of Chinese Refugees*, 145, 150, 165.
17. HKG, *Annual Report 1961*, 25.
18. Out of the 486 children that left Hong Kong between 1958 and 1960, 139 were 'transit cases', 121 were let go by their parents, and 226 were wards of social welfare. PRO HKRS 890-2-5 from DWS to Duncanson, 23 Nov. 1960; Lawrence, *Twenty-Five Years*, 8; Choy, "Hong Kong Project".
19. Orphanages were one of the few early forms of colonial welfare. Midgley, "Imperialism, Colonialism, and Social Welfare," 44.
20. HKG, *Annual Reports [SWO] 1948-54*, 6–7. SWO was set up in 1947 as a sub-department of the Secretariat for Chinese Affairs, but went on to become an autonomous department in 1958.
21. Ibid.
22. Tsang, *Modern History*, 23.
23. Pegg, *Family Law*, 278–79.

AQ26

24. Not just in Hong Kong, but in other colonies with significant Chinese communities. See Pedersen, "The Maternalist Moment in British Colonial Policy"; Pomfret, "'Child Slavery' in British and French Far-Eastern Colonies 1880–1945".
25. Protection of Women and Juveniles Ordinance No. 1 of 1951.
26. Lo, *Chinese Law*, 1–2.
27. 'The modernization of adoption law affected other British colonies. The topic appears still under-researched, but even a cursory examination of public records reveals post-war changes (for example, in Singapore).'

AQ27

28. Local circumstances do not include the 1956 riots, which saw clashes between young Nationalists and Communists and alerted the government to the risk of neglecting the refugees' welfare. On 10 October, when the riots unfolded, the Adoption Ordinance was ready to be issued (12 October). On the acceptance of the refugees, see n.a., *Problem of People*.
29. Lo, *Chinese Law*, 50–51; Adoption Ordinance No. 22 of 1956; Pegg, *Family Law*, 283. See also *The Adoption Act, 1950*, 14 Geo. 6. C.26 in S. Seuffert (ed.), *The Adoption Act, 1950 and Orders*.
30. The problem was regularly denounced in various governmental annual reports. For an early example, see HKG, *Annual Report 1947*, 79–82.
31. Not all Chinese were poor. The colony had an established local Chinese elite, when rich Chinese refugees from Shanghai joined them. See, for its formation, Sinn, *Power and Charity*; Carroll, *Edge of Empires*. On Shanghai's entrepreneurs, Wong, *Emigrant Entrepreneurs*.
32. British civil servants posted abroad preferred to adopt white children from the metropole, which became possible only in 1958. See *The Adoption Act, 1958*, 7 Eliz. 2. C.5. Otherwise, they generally neglected their own mixed-race, illegitimate children. See Hübinette, "From Orphans Trains," 144; see also Pomfret, "Raising Eurasia".
33. HKG, *Annual Report [DSW], 1957–58*, 6. Catholic Relief Services was among the top 10 organisations funded by the US government to provide aid overseas in the 1950s and 1960s. McCleary, *Global Compassion*, 24, 27.
34. PRO HKRS 41-1-9597, Memo 5102/56, Department of Social Welfare to Colonial Secretary, 21 March 1958. For the US laws enabling international adoptions, see Winslow, "Immigration Law and Improvised Policy in the Making of International Adoption, 1948–1961"; Forbes and Fagen, "Unaccompanied Refugee Children".
35. HKG, *Annual Report [SWO], 1954–55*, 8.
36. PRO HKRS 41-1-9597, from Florence Boester to Kenneth Keen, 17 Feb. 1958.
37. HKG, *Annual Reports [SWO], 1948–54*, 6–7.
38. PRO HKRS 41-1-9597, Memo 5102/56 ,… , 21 March 1958.
39. PRO HKRS 41-1-8651, from D.C.C. Luddington for Colonial Secretary to the British Consulate, Washington, 14 Sept. 1955.
40. See PRO HKRS 890-2-5, Memo from Graham Sneath, Attorney General's Chambers, to David W.B. Baron, Department of Social Welfare, 17 Nov. 1960, with enclosed note 'Adoption Abroad of Children from Hong Kong'; and Adoption Ordinance No. 22 of 1956. For the older Chinese refugee children, PRO HKRS 890-2-5 from [DSW] to Duncanson, 23 Nov. 1960.
41. See Adoption Ordinance No. 21 of 1960. The procedure is explained in The National Archives, London (TNA), CO 1030/1320 from David W.B. Baron, Director of Social Welfare, to John C. Burgh, Colonial Office, 23 Dec. 1961, and the enclosed template form 'Consent of Adoption of an Infant and Delegation of Rights of Guardianship for such Purpose'.

42. ISS was to influence the evolution of US law and internationally acknowledged guidelines on international adoptions, TNA CO 1030/1320 ISS GB, *Annual Report 1959–60*, 5–6; Winslow, "Immigration Law"; Choy, "Hong Kong Project".
43. On colonialism and welfare, see Midgley, "Imperialism, Colonialism, and Social Welfare"; on Hong Kong as a non-settlement colony, see Tsang, *Modern History*, 20–23, 62; on its pre-war residual social policy, see Tang, *Colonial State*, 45–50.
44. N.a., *Problem of People*, 6. The financial implications of dealing with this humanitarian crisis inform all the report.
45. Ibid., 15.
46. Ibid., 15–16. More than 100 voluntary organisations, both local and international, had already been coordinated by DSW by 1956. Ibid., 39–40. For a historical perspective of non-state actors, see Lee, "Nonprofit Development in Hong Kong".
47. For details on the British origins and internationalisation of WRY, see Gatrell, *Free World*, 77–140.
48. TNA HO 392/133 World Refugee Year, United Kingdom Committee, Progress Report (1 June–25 Nov. 1959), Appendix A: 'Summary of World Refugee Year Activities of the Constituent Agencies'.
49. TNA CO 1030/1320 Memorandum "Hong Kong Refugees Adoption Project" enclosed in letter from Mrs C. Wheeler (chairman of ISS GB) to Lord Perth, Minister of State for Colonial Affairs, Colonial Office, 8 Oct. 1960.
50. Feast et al., *Adversity, Adoption and Afterwards*, 67, 68.
51. TNA CO 1030/1320 ISS GB, *Annual Report 1959–60*, 8–9.
52. TNA CO 1030/1320 "Lists Closed," *Liverpool Post*, 17 Aug. 1961.
53. TNA CO 1030/1320 "Precious Lotus Finds Happiness," *Reynolds News*, 17 Dec. 1961; the figure of 106 children, mostly foundlings, is given in Feast et al., *Adversity*, 1.
54. HC Deb 26 Feb. 1926 Vol. 192 cc934-5. See also Keating, *A Child for Keeps*.
55. Rossini, *History of Adoption*, 86.
56. *The Adoption Act, 1958*, 7 Eliz. 2. C.5.
57. More details on the refugee status of these people can be found in Peterson, "To Be or Not to Be".
58. TNA CO 1030/1320 from Baron to Burgh, 23 Dec. 1961.
59. On British post-war immigration policy in context, see Paul, *Whitewashing Britain*; Hansen, *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-War Britain*.
60. See the comment by G. McGee to Mr Farran (20 Feb. 1962) to enclosure 56 in the index of TNA CO 1030/1320. For the legal position of dependants entering Britain, *Commonwealth Immigrants Act, 1962*, Section 2 (2b) 14 & 15 Eliz. 2. C.21.
61. TNA CO 1030/1320 from Baron to Burgh, 2 Nov. 1961.
62. Only further investigation would show whether the new refugee crisis experienced by Hong Kong in May 1962, as a result of the famine caused by the Great Leap Forward, had any influence on the 'compromise' achieved over Hong Kong children. The relevant correspondence available does not extend to that period. On the May crisis, see Dikötter, *Mao's Great Famine*, 240–41.
63. Financially, post-war Hong Kong could have hardly expected help from the metropole, especially as its economy recovered quickly. Tsang, *A Modern History*, 161–67.
64. Gatrell, *Free World*, 81.
65. US House of Congress, *Refugee Problem*, 38.
66. TNA CO 1030/1320 from Robert Black to R.W. Piper, Colonial Office, 5 Nov. 1960; PRO HKRS 41-1-9597 from D.W.B. Baron, Director of Social Welfare, to Mrs Joyce E. Fried, ISS Representative, 1 Oct. 1958.
67. TNA CO 1030/1320 Memorandum "Hong Kong Refugees Adoption Project".

68. TNA CO 1030/1320 TNA CO 1030/1320 "Precious Lotus".
69. TNA CO 1030/1320 ISS GB, *Annual Report 1959–60*, p. 4.
70. Gatrell, *Free World*, 81–82, 205.
71. Ittmann, *A Problem of Great Importance*.
72. Between 1618 and 1967, 130,000 white children were shipped out to populate the colonies. Hübinette, "From Orphans' Trains," 141.
73. See Ittmann, *Problem of Great Importance*, 198.
74. For the risk of immigration of Chinese adult refugees, see selected documents in TNA CO 1030/1319.
75. These were illegitimate children born to the first coloured immigrants and, similarly to the situation on European continent and in Asia, from liasons between local women and US soldiers. For further details, see Goodman, "'Only the Best British Brides'"; Lee, "A Forgotten Legacy of the Second World War"; Bland, "White Women and Men of Colour".
76. TNA CO 1030/1320 Memorandum "Hong Kong Refugees Adoption Project".
77. They guaranteed, respectively, for 50 and 20 children. TNA CO 1030/1320 Memorandum "Hong Kong Refugees Adoption Project"; TNA CO 1030/1320 Report to the Council … by Joyce Moore, Dr Bernardo's Homes senior adoption officer, 1 Sept. 1960, 2.
78. US House of Congress, *Refugee Problem*, 20.
79. 'International Adoptions,' at Ellen Herman, "The Adoption History Project".
80. Mark, *Hong Kong*, 204.
81. US House of Congress, *Refugee Problem*, 17; Lombardo, "United States," 192–93.
82. US House of Congress, *Refugee Problem*, 18. Some of these US organisations funded smaller local organisations. See Chu, "From the Pursuit," 364–65.
83. US House of Congress, *Refugee Problem*, 17; PRO HKRS 365-1-31 "HK ½ m. Reception Centre for Needy Children," *Hong Kong Working Committee for World Refugee Year. Quarterly Report*, June 1960, 2.
84. Choy, "Hong Kong Project".
85. Historically, Asian immigration was discouraged. Anti-Chinese immigration legislation included the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act, only partially lifted by the 1943 Chinese Exclusion Repeal Act. It was not until 1965 that the immigration and naturalisation of Asians became possible. This was also the year when segregation ended in the United States.
86. Choy, "Hong Kong Project," especially 49, 58–62, 62–63.
87. Hübinette, "From Orphans Trains," 144–45.
88. Briggs, *Somebody's Children*, 150–58.
89. Klein, "Family Ties," 143–90
90. US House of Congress, *Refugee Problem*, 29, 31.
91. PRO HKRS 41-1-9597, from Boester to Keen, 17 Feb. 1958, p. 1.
92. National Archives of Singapore (NAS) Social Welfare Department (SWD), File Reference No. 65/66, Microfilm MSA 2784, Memo of Director of Social Welfare of Singapore, 10 Feb. 1955.
93. Dikötter, *Mao's Great Famine*, 240–41.
94. Lombardo, "United States," 248.
95. Mark, "Problem of People," 1152.
96. TNA CO 1030/1320 Inward Telegram 556 from Sir Robert Black to the Secretary of State for the Colonies; copied to Foreign Office, 23 June 1962.
97. TNA CO 1030/1320 from C.M. MacLehose to R.T.D. Ledward, 23 June 1962.
98. TNA CO 1030/1320 from Ledward to Willan, 6 July 1962.

99. N.a., "Chinese orphans greeted in U.S. by Robert Kennedy," *The New York Times*, Thursday, 28 June 1962, 4; Ellen Key Blunt, "Chinese WAIFs To Come to U.S.," *The Washington Post*, Part B 5 "For and about Women," Tuesday, 19 June 1962, 5; n.a. "Bob Kenney greets orphan arrivals here," *Los Angeles Times*, Thursday morning, 28 June 1962, Part II, 1, 3.
100. TNA CO 1030/1320 from Ledward to Willan, 6 July 1962.
101. TNA CO 1030/1320 Inward Telegram to the Secretary of State for the Colonies from Hong Kong, 13 June 1962.
102. TNA CO 1030/1320 HKG, Daily Information Bulletin, 19 July 1962, 2–3.
103. Ibid., 3.
104. Ibid.
105. PRO HKRS 70-2-2 "Overseas Adoption of Hong Kong Children" [various DSW bulletins for 1963].
106. As reported in Choy, "Hong Kong Project"; and on the psychological study on the adoption outcomes of some of these children's adoption placements in Britain, see Feast et al., *Adversity*.
107. HKG, *Annual Departmental Report[s] [DSW] 1963–4*, 64
108. HKG, *Annual Departmental Report[s] [DSW] 1961–2*, 41.
109. HKG, *Annual Report[s] [DSW] 1960–1*, 6; *1961–2*, 8, and *1962–3*, 10; CO 1030/1320 ISS GB, *Annual Report 1959–60*, 8–9.
110. TNA CO 1030/1320 Hong Kong government, *Daily Information Bulletin*, 19 July 1962, 2.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Colin Heywood and Joseph Askew for their constructive comments on this paper and Peter Gatrell for turning the author's attention to the history of the Chinese refugees of Hong Kong. Thanks are also due to the two anonymous reviewers of this journal. All factual mistakes and interpretations are the author's.

Disclosure Statement

AQ5 No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

AQ2 This work was supported by the University of Nottingham Ningbo China with a Research AQ4 AQ3 and Teaching Leave Grant.

AQ6 Bibliography

Bland, Lucy. "White Women and Men of Colour: Miscegenation Fears in Britain After the Great War." *Gender & History* 17, no. 1 (2005): 29–61.

Briggs, Laura. "From Refugees to Madonnas of the Cold War." In *Somebody's Children: The Politics of Transracial and Transnational Adoption*, 129–159. Durham: Duke University Press, 2012.

Carroll, John M. *Edge of Empires: Chinese Elites and British Colonials in Hong Kong*. Cambridge, US: Harvard University Press, 2009. Ebrary.

Choy, Catherine Ceniza. "The Hong Kong Project: Chinese International Adoption in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s." In *Global Families: A History of Asian International Adoption in America*. New York: New York University Press, 2013. Kindle.

Chu, Cindy Yik-Yi "From the Pursuit of Converts to the Relief of Refugees: The Maryknoll Sisters in Twentieth-Century Hong Kong." *The Historian; A Journal of History* 65, no. 2 (2002): 353–376.

Dikötter, Frank. *Mao's Great Famine: The History of China's Most Devastating Catastrophe, 1958-62*. London, England: Bloomsbury, 2011.

Feast, Julia, Margaret Grant, Alan Rushton, John Simmonds, Carolyn Sampeys, and BAAF. *Adversity, Adoption and Afterwards: A Mid-Life Follow-up Study of Women Adopted From Hong Kong*. London: BAAF, 2013.

Forbes, Susan S., and Patricia Weiss Fagen. "Unaccompanied Refugee Children: The Evolution of U.S. Policies (1939-1984)." *Migration News* 3 (1985): 3–36.

Gatrell, Peter. *Free World? The Campaign to Save the World's Refugees, 1956-1963*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Gatrell, Peter. *The Making of the Modern Refugee*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Goodman, Giora. "'Only the Best British Brides': Regulating the Relationship between Us Servicemen and British Women in the Early Cold War." *Contemporary European History* 17, no. 4 (2008): 483–503.

Hambro, Edvard. *The Problem of Chinese Refugees in Hong Kong: Report Submitted to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees*. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1955.

Hansen, Randall. *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-War Britain: The Institutional Origins of a Multicultural Nation*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Herman, Ellen. "The Adoption History Project." Accessed May 24, 2016. http://pages.uoregon.edu/adoption/index.html

HKG. *Annual Departmental Report of the Director of Social Welfare 1960-1*. Hong Kong: Government Printer, [n.d.].

HKG. *Annual Departmental Report of the Director of Social Welfare 1961-2*. Hong Kong: Government Printer, [n.d.].

HKG. *Annual Departmental Report of the Director of Social Welfare 1962-3*. Hong Kong: Government Printer, [n.d.].

HKG. *Annual Departmental Report of the Director of Social Welfare 1963-4*. Hong Kong: Government Printer, [n.d.].

HKG. *Annual Report 1961*. Hong Kong: Government Press, 1962.

HKG. *Annual Report of the Director of Social Welfare 1957-58*. Hong Kong: Government Printer, [n.d.].

HKG. *Annual Report of the Social Welfare Office, 1954-55*. Hong Kong: Government Printer, [n.d.].

HKG. *Annual Reports of the Social Welfare Office, 1948-54*. Hong Kong: Government Printer, [n.d.].

HKG. *Annual Report on Hong Kong for the Year 1947*. Hong Kong: Government Printer, 1948.

Hübinette, Tobias. "From Orphans Trains to Babylift: Colonial Trafficking, Empire Building, and Social Engineering." In *Outsiders Within: Writing on Transracial Adoption*, edited by Jane Jeong Trenka, Julia Chinyere Oparah and Sun Yung Shin, 139–149. Cambridge, Mass.: South End Press, 2006.

Ittmann, Karl. *A Problem of Great Importance: Population, Race, and Power in the British Empire, 1918-1973*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013.

Keating, Jenny. *A Child for Keeps: The History of Adoption in England, 1918–45*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Klein, Christina. "Family Ties as Political Obligation." Chap. 4 In *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-1961*, 143–190. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

Lawrence, Anthony. *Twenty-Five Years of International Social Service, Hong Kong: [1958-1983]*. Hong Kong: Pamphlet, 1984.

Lee, Eliza W. Y. "Nonprofit Development in Hong Kong: The Case of a Statist–Corporatist Regime." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 16, no. 1 (2005): 51–68.

Lee, Sabine. "A Forgotten Legacy of the Second World War: GI Children in Post-war Britain and Germany." *Contemporary European History* 20, no. 2 (2011): 157–181.

Lo, Man-kam, ed. *Chinese Law and Custom in Hong Kong: Report of a Committee Appointed by the Governor in October, 1948*. Hong Kong: Government Printer, 1953.

Lombardo, Johannes Richard. "United States' Foreign Policy Towards the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong During the Early Cold War Period, 1945-1964." *Unpublished PhD Thesis*., University of Hong Kong, 1997.

Lovelock, Kirsten. "Intercountry Adoption as a Migratory Practice: A Comparative Analysis of Intercountry Adoption and Immigration Policy and Practice in the United States, Canada and New Zealand in the Post W.W. Ii Period." *International Migration Review* 34, no. 3 (2000): 907–949.

Madokoro, Laura. "Refugee Families, Orphan Adoptions, and the Politics of Representation and Resettlement, Hong Kong (1962)." Chap. 4 In *Unwanted Refugees: The Making of a Global Humanitarian Agenda, 1949-89*, 135–171: Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of British Columbia, 2012.

Mark, Chi-kwan. *Hong Kong and the Cold War: Anglo-American Relations 1949-1957*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 2004. Ebrary.

Mark, Chi-kwan. "The 'Problem of People': British Colonials, Cold War Powers, and the Chinese Refugees in Hong Kong, 1949–62." *Modern Asian Studies* no. 41 (2007): 1145–1181.

Marshall, Dominique. "International Child Saving." In *The Routledge History of Childhood in the Western World*, edited by Paula S. Fass. London: Routledge, 2013. Mylibrary.

McCleary, Rachel M. *Global Compassion: Private Voluntary Organizations and U.S. Foreign Policy Since 1939* [in English]. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Midgley, James. "Imperialism, Colonialism, and Social Welfare." In *Colonialism and Welfare*, edited by James Midgley and David Piachaud, 36–52. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2011.

n.a. *A Problem of People*. Hong Kong: Government Press, 1956.

Paul, Kathleen. *Whitewashing Britain: Race and Citizenship in the Postwar Era*. Ithaca, N.Y. Cornell University Press, 1997.

Pedersen, Susan. "The Maternalist Moment in British Colonial Policy: The Controversy Over "Child Slavery" in Hong Kong 1917-1941." *Past & Present* 171, no. 1 (2001): 161–202.

Pegg, Leonard. *Family Law in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Malaysia: Butterworths Asia, 1994.

Peterson, Glen. "To Be or Not to Be a Refugee: The International Politics of the Hong Kong Refugee Crisis, 1949-55." *Journal of Imperial & Commonwealth History* 36, no. 2 (2008): 171–195.

Pomfret, David M. "'Child Slavery' in British and French Far-Eastern Colonies 1880-1945." *Past & Present* 201, no. 1 (2008): 175–213.

Pomfret, David M. "Raising Eurasia: Race, Class, and Age in French and British Colonies." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51, no. 2 (2009): 314–343.

Pomfret, David M. *Youth and Empire. Trans-Colonial Childhoods in British and French Asia*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2016.

Rainor, Lois. *Adoption of Non-White Children: The Experience of a British Adoption Project*. London, England: George Allen & Unwin, 1970.

Rossini, Gill. *A History of Adoption in England and Wales, 1850-1961*. Barnsley, England: Pen and Sword, 2014.

Seuffert, S., ed. *The Adoption Act, 1950 and Orders* (London, 1951). London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1951.

Sinn, Elizabeth. *Power and Charity: A Chinese Merchant Elite in Colonial Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2003.

Tang, Kwong-Leung. *Colonial State and Social Policy: Social Welfare Development in Hong Kong 1842-1997*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998.

Tsang, Steve. *A Modern History of Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2011.

U.S. House of Congress. *Refugee Problem in Hong Kong: Report of a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.

Winslow, Rachel. "Immigration Law and Improvised Policy in the Making of International Adoption, 1948–1961." *Journal of Policy History* 24, no. 2 (2012): 319–349.

Wong, Siu-Lun. *Emigrant Entrepreneurs. Shanghai Industrialists in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Zahra, Tara. *The Lost Children: Reconstructing Europe's Families After World War II*. Cambridge, US: Harvard University Press, 2011.