



Universitetet  
i Stavanger

FAKULTET FOR UTDANNINGSVITENSKAP OG HUMANIORA


## MASTEROPPGAVE

Studieprogram: Master i Historiedidaktikk

Høstsemesteret, 2020

Åpen/ konfidensiell

Forfatter: Thomas Bjåstad

  
.....  
(signatur forfatter)

Veileder: Peder William Chellew Roberts

Tittel på masteroppgaven: Historiografi og  
imperiet: En historiografisk analyse

Engelsk tittel: Historiography and the  
Empire: A Historiographic Analysis

Emneord:

Historical analysis, Historiography, British  
Empire History, Historiographic tradition.

Antall sider: 90  
+ vedlegg/annet: 103

Stavanger, 31.08.2020  
dato/år

## Forord

Ved anslutningen av denne oppgaven avsluttes 5 lærerike år ved Universitetet I Stavanger som historiestudent. Det har vært bra år med mange dyktige og kunnskapsrike forelesere, spennende emner, og et godt studiemiljø.

Jeg vil gi en stor takk til min veileder Peder William Chellew Roberts for gode samtaler og konstruktive tilbakemeldinger. Takk for god veiledning og tilbakemeldinger både før og etter Covid-19 utbruddet.

Jeg vil takke min familie for at de holdt ut med meg i arbeidsprosessen gjennom oppturer og frustrasjoner.

Thomas Bjåstad  
31.08.20

## Abstract

Historiography “The History of History”. This study aims to explore how historical works is influenced by historiographical traditions and concepts.

In order to explore this, two empirical works were selected covering the same period of time in British Empire history. The older was the *Cambridge History of the British Empire: Growth of the new Empire*, published in 1940, the newer the *Oxford History of the British Empire: The Twentieth Century*, published in 1999. The aim of this thesis is to examine how two historical works covering the same historical period are different because of the different eras of their publishing, and to answer the question: *Which stories are told about British colonial enterprise in these two books, and how does the historical selection vary based on different historiographical traditions and historical writings changing relationship towards objectivity and content?* The background for such a selection is the Imperial History’s interesting history as a debated and criticised field.

Through historiographical theory, and the methods of qualitative document analysis and comparative analysis, similarities and differences were explored in content, selection, concepts, and historiographical traditions influencing each work.

## Sammendrag

Historiografi «Historien om Historien». Denne studien har som mål å utforske hvordan det historiske verk er påvirket av historiografiske tradisjoner og konsepter.

For å utforske dette har to empiriske objekter blitt valgt som omhandler denne samme perioden av Britisk imperiehistorie. Den eldste *Cambridge History of the British Empire: Growth of the New Empire*, publisert i 1940, den nyere *Oxford History of the British Empire: The Nineteenth Century*, publisert i 1999. Målet for denne oppgaven er å utforske hvordan to historiske verk som omhandler den samme historiske perioden er forskjellige på bakgrunn av deres ulike publiseringsdato, og for å besvare spørsmålet: *Hvilke historier er fortalt om Britisk kolonitid i disse to bøkene, og hvordan varierer den historiske utvelgelsen basert på forskjellige historiografiske tradisjoner og historieskrivingens endrede forhold til objektivitet og innhold?* Bakgrunnen for en slik utvelgelse er imperiehistories interessante historie som et debattert og kritisert felt.

Gjennom historiografisk teori, og metodene kvalitativt dokument analyse og komparativ analyse, likheter og forskjeller ble utforsket på områder som innhold, utvelgelse, konsepter, og historiografiske tradisjoners innflytelse.

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
TOPIC AND RESEARCH QUESTION .....	6
LITERATURE .....	7
SCOPE .....	8
<b>DESIGN AND METHOD .....</b>	<b>8</b>
QUALITATIVE METHOD .....	8
<i>Qualitative Document analysis</i> .....	8
<i>Comparative analysis</i> .....	9
<b>THEORY .....</b>	<b>10</b>
HISTORIOGRAPHY – “THE HISTORY OF HISTORY” .....	10
<i>Leopold Von Ranke</i> .....	11
<i>The Bury and Trevelyan debate</i> .....	12
<i>Carr</i> .....	13
<i>History is not objective: The linguistic turn</i> .....	14
<i>White’s Theory of the Historical Work</i> .....	14
<i>Explanation by Emplotment</i> .....	15
HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK: HISTORIOGRAPHICAL DEVELOPMENT .....	15
<i>A question of Objectivity</i> .....	15
HISTORICAL WRITING UNTIL 1940 .....	16
<i>Beginnings to professionalization</i> .....	16
<i>Romanticism and Whig history</i> .....	17
<i>Constitutional history</i> .....	19
<i>Revival of Traditional Liberalism</i> .....	20
<i>Science and Empire</i> .....	20
<i>War and Modernism</i> .....	21
HISTORICAL WRITING AFTER 1945 .....	22
<i>Post-Modernism</i> .....	22
<i>Postcolonialism and dependency studies – Critiques of Eurocentrism</i> .....	24
<i>Universalism and Global History</i> .....	25
<i>Subaltern Studies</i> .....	28
<i>The Objective Historian</i> .....	30
<b>ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>31</b>
BOOK STRUCTURE .....	31
<i>Structure Cambridge</i> .....	31
<i>Structure Oxford</i> .....	32
ANALYSIS OF CONTENT .....	33
THE DESCRIPTION OF IMPERIALISM AND COLONIALISM .....	33
<i>Cambridge</i> .....	34
<i>Oxford</i> .....	35
<i>Comparison and historiographical reflections</i> .....	37
THE DESCRIPTION OF INDIA .....	38
<i>Economic Description</i> .....	38
Cambridge .....	39
Oxford .....	43
Comparison and historiographic reflections .....	47
<i>Military description</i> .....	48
Cambridge .....	49
Oxford .....	51

Comparison and historiographical reflections.....	58
<i>Political description</i> .....	58
Cambridge .....	59
Oxford.....	63
Comparison and historiographical reflections.....	73
THE DESCRIPTION OF ANTI-SLAVERY AND HUMANITARIANISM .....	76
Cambridge .....	77
Oxford.....	85
Comparison and historiographical reflections.....	89
PRODUCTS OF THEIR TIME: CAMBRIDGE: THE EXTENSION OF WHIG TRADITIONS – OXFORD: POSTMODERNISM.....	90
<b>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>97</b>

## Introduction

### Topic and research question

This thesis will explore the historiography and the influences upon the historical work. The idea of this thesis had its inception in the lectures of the master level course “Historisk teori og metode” (Historical theory and methods). The subject opened my eyes to the historical work in itself and the objectivity question faced by historians.

Why the choice of such a thesis? History is a complex and multi-layered endeavour. It contains nearly endless subjects and fields of study. One can dive into the cause and effect of historical conflicts or explain the substance of renaissance fine dining. However, an interesting aspect behind all these fields of study is the historians behind them and their choices. Why did they study it? What selection did they make? What influenced their choices? The historian is not an objective machine programmed for one task, rather the historian is a being influenced by many factors, their education, social status, ideology, and their respective political climates. While some of my peers will delve directly into historical subjects, this thesis will take a perspective on the historical writing in itself.

To examine the question of objectivity and the historical work, two empirical objects have been selected. The objects selected are two books taking on British imperial history in mainly the nineteenth century. The first book was published in 1940, and the other in 1999, and it is exactly that difference of publication date that makes it interesting for such a thesis. My theory is that although the books cover roughly the same historical period, the historical writing and content will contain great variation based upon the difference in the times of their publication. The analysis shall then examine the two books historical writing and historical selection. This in turn requires this research question:

*Which stories are told about British colonial enterprise in these two books, and how does the historical selection vary based on different historiographical traditions and historical writings changing relationship towards objectivity and content?*

## Literature

The two selected books are both part of a larger historical work. The older is Cambridge History of the British Empire, and the newer is the Oxford History of the British Empire. Both historical works take on the history of the British empire, from early beginnings, through the “golden age”, to the dissolution. Within this anthology series, two books have been selected that covers roughly the same time period. The books chosen are 1. *Cambridge History of the British Empire Vol II: The Growth of the New Empire*, which was published in 1940, covers the British Empire from the late eighteenth to the late nineteenth century. 2. *Oxford History of the British Empire Vol III: The Nineteenth Century*, which was published in 1999, covers British empire history from late 18th century to early 20th century. Both books focus on the nineteenth century and the so called “New Empire”. The books contain a large array of chapters containing many topics. The books focus on the workings of the empire but do contain other historical events affecting the time.

Both volumes are part of multi-volume series on British Empire history:

1. Cambridge History of The British Empire vol 2, is the second volume of a series encompassing eight volumes. The book contains three general editors and 20 chapter writers.

2. Oxford History of the British Empire vol 2, is the second volume of a series encompassing five volumes. The series contain one general editor, the book contains one volume editor and 29 chapter writers.

## Scope

Given the rich content and large size of the books, the necessity to make limitations of inquiry is needed. The aim of this thesis shall be to reflect on both books' historiographical contexts, and to examine and compare the historical selection. Given this it will be useful to look at certain subjects appearing in both books, themes that are prone to variation through the changing historiographical traditions. Due to the books large size, it will be necessary to limit the selection of subjects. Three main subjects will be examined, the second including three subjects. The subjects selected to be examined is:

1. The books description of Colonialism and Imperialism
2. The place and coverage of the colonial enterprise in India:
  - 2.1.Economy
  - 2.2.Military
  - 2.3.Politics
3. The abolition of the slave trade.

## Design and method

### Qualitative method

#### Qualitative Document analysis

Document analysis is a systematic procedure for reviewing and evaluating documents both printed or electronic material. Like other analytical methods in qualitative research, document analysis requires the data to be examined and interpreted in order to elicit meaning, gain understanding, and to develop empirical knowledge (Bowen, 2009, p. 27).



The books shall be examined with the help of certain areas of focus that correspond with the main research question. These areas of focus will aid in the answering and conclusion of the research question. These are as follows: 1. How is the historical content presented? 2. How is the historical writing structured? 3. What information could be found on the contemporary historiographical traditions of writing of the books? This would entail a direct content analysis in the first two categories, however in the third the contextualisation of the content is intended. These areas of focus work as a framework for the analysis, however there will be certain specific research questions for different analysis topics. These will be listed at the start of each empirical chapter.

A challenge working with qualitative document analysis is the that it becomes influenced by subjectivity of the writer, both in terms of selection and research questions. An important aspect of the analysis is then to provide quotations directly from the book, in order to highlight specific information being analysed.

Although the books are large works with editor(s), my analysis will mainly be interested in the text found within them, not as much around the specific writers of the selected chapters. This is because such a work has a certain coherence because its woven together as a whole. There can of course be divergences in opinion between the authors but not on a large scale such as for instance writers writing on different projects with certain ideological frameworks. The writers however will be given a short introduction later to provide an insight into their professional standing.

### Comparative analysis

Kjeldstadli (1999) explains that to compare is part of the essence in the scientific explanation. When something historic is explained, the difference in time and condition becomes subject to examination. In comparative method the examination of at least two different objects of similar type is put up against each other and compared (Kjeldstadli, 1999, p. 265).

As specific findings in each of the books will be discussed, the book will as well be compared to each other in order to discover divergences or similarities. This will be necessary to gain knowledge of the changing of historical writing from 1940 to 1999. Some comparative

reflections will be made during the Oxford parts of the analysis, but the main comparative discussion will be featured in a comparative section at end of each analysis chapter.

The use of long quotations could be a good tool to directly highlight what is examined. The other importance here for the use of quotations in the analysis is as an attempt to highlight some of the difference in prose between the two books. How they are written can as well be an indicator of some of the differences in the use of language, as well as an indicator for the importance of certain concepts or elements. The cited paragraph provides a window into the direct flow of language in the books, what information of interest and importance, the how narration and language use has changed from 1940 to 1999.

Because of the long book titles of the two books, they will be addressed as *Cambridge* and *Oxford* in cursive form in the analysis.

## Theory

### Historiography – “The History of History”

At the very centre of the professional historical venture is the idea and ideal of “objectivity”. It has been the quality which the profession has prized and praised above all else, for the historian and their work. A key term in the progress of the historical scholarship, the progress of moving ever closer to the objective truth about the past (Novick, 1988, p. 1). The objectivity question in such a thesis, becomes the question of the changing objectivity. How has the relationship with objectivity changed from 1940 to 1999?

The concept of objectivity has varied through history, and does objective truth really exist in history? This section will cover some important historians that have influenced history and the concept of objectivity.

## Leopold Von Ranke

To understand the question of objectivity in history, a return to the famous historian Leopold Ranke is needed. Ranke is viewed as the first professional historian and made an important impact on history as a subject.

The historical school is important because it marks the change from historical writing being merely a semi-scientific endeavour to becoming an actual subject discipline. Here Ranke's project emerges as an important pillar. Ranke's well known thought, that the goal of the subject of history is to show us *wie es eigentlich gewesen ist* (as it really is), provides a belief that objective knowledge about the past can be achieved. In his work *Geschichte der romanischen und germanischen Völker* (1824), Ranke discusses different approaches to historical knowledge. Initially he criticises earlier forms of historical writing. The first object of criticism is the moral function of historical writing, the emphasis on moral nature of actions. The second object of criticism is history as instruction in good behaviour, although a variety of the first one it functions as a criticism of much medieval works in the light of the didactic function. The third, the history of justifying certain interpretations. The fourth is, history as entertainment, this criticism along with the former signals the scientific achievements. History should be science, not literature (Melve, 2010, p. 113).

After criticising much of earlier modes of historical writing, what was then Ranke's alternative? In practical terms Ranke insisted on empirical evidence – the source material, as centrepiece. This entailed the search for source material, at first in state archives, and to publish critical editions. The source material would receive critical examination in suitable environment. The result, according to Ranke was a presentation of the past “as it really was”. The idea of history as a scientific discipline can be based on four core principles: 1. The objectivity of historical knowledge, 2. Facts as superior concept, 3. The uniqueness of all historical events, 4. The impact of politics (Melve, 2010, pp. 113-114).

The idealism of Hegel, wherein historical development is understood in the light of theoretical categories is important for understanding Ranke's alternative. Facts stands as a superior concept; each historical event is unique; historical events must be examined on their own terms and not as pieces of a determined historical development. The fusion with Hegel's idealism was also important for another reason: because of philosophy's theoretical or conceptual orientation, it became important for Ranke to detach the subject of history from philosophy. It was facts and empirical evidence that should establish history as a science. This however this does not entail that historical research should only revolve around the establishment of objective facts – or some type of scientific antiquarianism, rather according

to Ranke the critical approach to the past would reflect a world of meaning and values.  
(Melve, 2010, p. 115)

“While the philosopher, contemplating history from his field, sees the infinite only in progress, development, the totality, history recognizes in each existence something infinite, in each condition or being something eternal from God – and its living principle. How could something be without the divine ground for its existence?” Leopold Von Ranke (Beiser 2011, s. 260)

### The Bury and Trevelyan debate

In 1893, when G.M. Trevelyan was in his first year at Cambridge, Sir John Seeley, Regius Professor of History, infuriated Trevelyan by calling Carlyle and Macauley charlatans. This made Trevelyan angry because it called into question his family’s disposition towards narrative history. After all, Thomas Babington Macauley, the most popular historian of the nineteenth century, had been Trevelyan’s great-uncle. George Otto Trevelyan was as well a distinguished author, and Trevelyan’s father. Trevelyan himself would become one of the great narrative historians of the twentieth century. The problem for Trevelyan was the accusation that if he followed his instincts, he would become a mere storyteller, even if he did frequent the archives. Not many years later, Trevelyan would face another similar experience, this time by J.B. Bury, another Regius professor. In Bury’s inaugural speech he had declared baldly, that although history “may supply material for literary art or philosophical speculation, she is herself simply a science, no less and no more. Readers of Bury’s manifesto and Trevelyan’s response to it, will highlight the division among them between whether history was a “science” or an “art”. However, the two historians shared certain basic assumptions about the historian’s craft. The first was that history was a craft. Bury as the champion of history as “science”, insisted that it must be well written, and clearly; Trevelyan as defender of history as “art”, insisted that history should be systematic and embedded in research. Both empathise that that the best history should encompass a broad understanding of the many pathways to the past, and of the areas ripe for historical investigation. The Bury-Trevelyan debate remains relevant to students of history because its angles of vision symbolise different directions taken in the study and writing of history during the twentieth century. Trevelyan drew attention to the importance of maintaining a sense of story – recognition of the interplay between persons and circumstances, and for the significance of the unique event. Bury pointed to the study of historical experience as structure, system, and process – social,

intellectual, or material. These two historians raised an important question: History art or science? – this question continue to serve as a heuristic device, for this Edwardian debate capture tension that would continue in the historical profession throughout the twentieth century (Owram, Friesen, 2011, pp. 34-35).

#### Carr

E.H. Carr in his work *What is History* (1961) challenged established assumptions of history. It created a furore, it was a bestselling success and the reaction to it made it very interesting addition to the philosophy of historical knowledge, on par with Buckle's *History of civilization in England* or with the Bury and Trevelyan debate. Carr was both praised for providing answers to its title, as well as criticised by many. Carr criticised many of his contemporaries' views of fixed patterns or truths in history. He rejected Fisher's idea of the "patternless" history, not on the grounds that the past had a pattern, but rather that the historian had to create one, for Carr the pattern in history is what is put there by the historian. This was a direct challenge to the current realist attitudes. Without a pattern, imposed by the historian, there could be no history. Carr regarded some of the appeal of history as how it shows us the connection of the past with the future and how the pasts had shaped the conditions for our lives. Because the past it gave us that knowledge, it helped us to avoid being totally conditioned by the past or unquestioning about current fads, such as "progress" or "decadence". To accept the idea of total condition would bring "moral and intellectual bankruptcy". He was also critical of the fashion of "neutrality" amongst intellectuals like Oakeshott. He recognised that "to denounce ideologies" in general is to set up an ideology of one's own", for "neutrality" meant burying heads "not in the sand, but in the graveyards of dead ideologies" (Parker, 1990, pp, 221-222).

The mentioned historians all represent a common historical project, the scientific method and question of objectivity. Ranke and his status as the first professional historian pushed for the scientific approach using prime sources. The Bury and Trevelyan debate raised the question of history as science or art. Carr took it one step further, pointing to the historians' own influence on the historical work, especially the impossibility of not having ideological influences. These historians all reflected on the history as a science building upon each other and realising role of the historian as well as their predisposition, layers upon layers of the objectivity question. However, a new layer would be introduced, which further critically

questioned the objectivity of history, and that was the influence of the language itself, this was the linguistic turn.

History is not objective: The linguistic turn

The Linguistic Turn can be in short be defined as a new focus on the constructive and subjective aspects of all use of language. That language is contextual and shaped by a whole array of subjectivity on the individual and societal space it finds itself in is not something new. The new aspect here is that the thought process itself is constructed by language, thereby making it impossible to combine the subjective living world with an objective world outside language. Philosophers such as Plato, Descartes, and Kant operated certainly with a dualism wherein the individual subjective acknowledgment made the access of the objective world difficult, but not impossible. In Kant's teachings objective feelings are shaped by the acknowledging subject that categorise these feelings into space and time. In the twentieth century, especially after the second world war, philosophical positions emerge to further question the subject of acknowledgement. Since all knowledge is told through language, and since all use of language is subjective, it makes impossible to access objective access to a world outside language (Melve, 2010, p. 222).

Hayden Whites critique of historical writing is important for historians because it contains awareness of different aspects that come into play when composing any type of written historical work. it will be in this next part constructive to give an introduction into the concept of historical conceptualisation and narrative emplotment.

White's Theory of the Historical Work

White (2014) identifies five levels of conceptualisation in the historical work: chronicle, story, mode of emplotment, mode of argument, and mode of ideological implication. White places "chronicle" and "story" to refer to "primitive elements" in the historical account, but both represent processes of selection and arrangement of data for the unprocessed historical record, in the interest of rendering the record more comprehensible to an audience. The historical work represents an attempt to mediate among the historical field, the unprocessed historical record, other historical accounts, and an audience. The historical process starts with the organisation of events into a chronicle, that deals with the temporal order of their

occurrences, then the chronicle is organised into a story by furthering the arrangement of the events into the components of a “spectacle” or process of happening. The story arrangement processes a beginning, middle, and end. The transformation from chronicle into story is affected by the characterisation of some events in the chronicle in terms of inaugural motifs, of others in terms of terminating motifs, and of yet other in terms of transitional motifs (White, 2014, p. 5).

### Explanation by Emplotment

Providing a meaning to a story, and identifying which type of story it is, is called explanation by emplotment. Emplotment is the way sequences of events fashioned by the story gradually reveal themselves to be a story of a particular kind. While narrating a story, a historian who provides the plot structure Comedy, has indeed structured in another way than an historian that writes in the structure of Tragedy. White (2014) identifies four kinds of emplotment: Romance, Tragedy, Satire, and Comedy. It can however include more types for example the Epic, and a given historical account is likely to contain stories cast in one mode as aspects or phrases of the whole set of stories emplotted in another. An historian however is forced to emplot the stories contained in his narrative into a comprehensive archetypal story form. For example, Michelet cast his stories in the mode of Romance, Ranke in the mode of Comedy, Tocqueville in the mode of Tragedy, and Burckhardt in the mode of Satire. Every historian however “Synchronic” or “Structural”, will emplot in one certain way (White, 2014, p.7). Whites categorisation of emplotments provides tools for identifying the narrative structure of historical works. Emplotment is part of the realisation that every historian is bound by certain ways of communication history through writing.

### Historical Framework: Historiographical development

#### A question of Objectivity

Earlier in this chapter the rise of history as a science has been explained. Scientific ideas introduced the idea of the objective historian, and took on the question of objectivity, which in turn shed light on influences on the historians themselves. White’s narrative implications have been explored, and although criticized by many can function as a sort of framework on identifying historians’ style of writing, but this in itself is not enough, and comes short in

terms of the great changes in historical writing that has occurred during the latter half of the century. In the type of analysis that will be attempted in this thesis, which in turn focuses on the changes from 1940-1999, there needs to be a focus on what changes took place in the historiography during this period. White spoke of history as something subjective, and in this next section the question of objectivity will be further questioned through ideological concepts and changes in the historiography. How has the concept and rules of objectivity changed? What should be included and what should be excluded? The changes in the subject of history changes our perception and blur the lines between subjectivity and objectivity. This section will explore concepts that have influenced the subject of history and how historians write history, subjects such as the critique of Eurocentrism, universalism, postmodernism, global history, and subaltern studies. The concepts will be presented in a loose chronology, pre-1940, and after 1945

## Historical writing until 1940

### Beginnings to professionalization

Historical writing in the nineteenth century must be understood in the light of earlier historical traditions, the antiquarian tradition in the 1500s and 1600s as well as the Enlightenment approaches to historical writing. Often the focus on Gibbon as the great historian of the Enlightenment era is not wrong but contains in itself an overshadowing not only the continuous tradition of antiquarianism, but also developments on the base of antiquarian approaches. The Scottish theologian and historian Gilbert Burnet (1643-1715) further pushed for the method of using source material, and his work *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (1679-1714) was the first English language historical work to be based on almost solely primary sources. In Comparison Hume's *History of England* (1754-1762) relied more on philosophical history and was not fond of Burnet's excitement on the construction of events as close as possible to the original source material. The Victorian age which stretched through a period of industrial revolution and great democratic changes, and a period of plentiful, which can make it difficult to handle. The first decades of the nineteenth century can be characterised by a new approach to mankind, inspired by the Romantic period, and focused on progress. Philosophers such as Leibniz, Herder, and Goethe became inspirations for English thinkers on subjects of the modern society, politically, economically, and culturally



were built upon the foundation of past society. Literature which took on earlier periods became popular, when the “spirit of the past” became of interest. One of the most important Victorian historical writers Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800-1859), became a transitioning figure when elements from both traditions became apparent in *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second* (1848). A large knowledge of the source material, as well as keen sense on gathering source material that was not originally printed, is Antiquarian in nature. The use of this source material was still a long way from what Ranke deemed correct in terms in handling the past. Macaulay did not handle the source material in an objective manner, thus making people view Macaulay as a Whig-historian, because the past was understood in the light of development optimism, which encompassed thoughts of current time England and the democratic and industrialised pinnacle of development (Melve, 2010, p. 132-133).

Towards the end of nineteenth century the English society had been professionalised. *English Historical Review* was established in 1886, inspired by the German *Historische Zeitschrift*. The magazine wanted to move English historical research closer toward the continental, especially the German, but lacked the right environment to do so. However, in 1890 the journal was the largest in England. The development has a close relation toward another side of the institutionalisation of the subject of history, the subject of history by the end of the nineteenth century was under the influence of the prestigious universities of Cambridge and Oxford. Oxford was the first with the insertion of William Stubbs as Royal Professor in Modern History in 1866. This marked the first professional historian in England (Melve, 2010, p. 135).

#### Romanticism and Whig history

Romanticism had impacts on the British historical writing, especially following the defeat of Napoleon, where the British constitution was viewed as “perfection”. The successful victory brought warm colours to England and its past. An example of this came from the anonymous work *Chronological Abridgment of English History*, which could impress patriots by its sympathies for the English past even when anonymity helped conceal the author’s Irish birth and Catholic religion, however it did not conceal his profession, for the book dwells constantly on laws and asks as its master question whether any monarchs changed them. The work is structured by reign and each reign has two sections: “remarkable events” and the constitutions and laws. There follows the relevant king or queen, as well as their spouses and

connection to “contemporary princes. The text than include praise of some monarchs and disdain for others, and each monarch made and impact on the liberty and the constitutions in a negative or positive way. Hallam and Macauley, Kemble, Stubbs, and Freeman at once claim attention as the progenitors of what Herbert Butterfield termed *the Whig interpretation of history*. This is the most famous historical theme in that period. Historian such as Macaulay and Stubbs were praised as great historians. Whatever literary prowess, all these “Whig” authors sought to make their works as accessible to the widest possible audience, and to shape its taste and sensitivity to a tradition of constitutional continuity stemming from Saxon liberties through Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights to the Hanoverian understanding of the “perfect” combination: the mixed constitution of balance and counterbalance that accounted for Britain’s, and especially England’s greatness (Macintyre, Maiguashca, Pók, 2011, pp 207-209).

It sought too wide and audience for its own good and reduced the difficulties of real historical “research” to swirling narratives of progress and improvement. It rested on an implicit idea of the superiority of English culture in which the constitution to represent the most perfect composition, and the empire as a natural outcome of character and enterprise. Whig history used superlative nouns in the characterisation of English stock. The tendency within it: to foster purpose and direction within the timeline of English developments (Bentley, 2005, p. 5). The Whig interpretation of history has a direct bearing on Imperial history, in which it forms a respected tradition. Even during the time of the American Revolution, historical works reflected the belief of progress in the Empire. Historians in the nineteenth century generally believed that the British Empire brought the indigenous peoples civilisation. British colonies would advance towards self-governing status, later called Dominionhood, an idea planted towards India in the twentieth century as well. And the idea of providing Dominionhood to India after the First World War was attempted. An idea was that the Empire would justify itself in a way, through the equality of nations associated with the British Commonwealth. Although such later idealism is far removed from original Whig-interpretation there is a teleology in much of the historical writing on the Empire (Winks, 1999, p. 7).

## Constitutional history

When we speak of “Whig” history a concept that is important to speak of is Constitutional history. Constitutional history is a discrete, and dominant subfield that emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century. By the start of the nineteenth century, two different forms of English constitutional history strived for supremacy, a radical Whig view favoured by proponents of democracy and a Burkean version with the greatest appeal to those of property and station. The second half of the nineteenth century saw the classic Whig theories of the origins and development of the English constitution. The three writers who dominated this era, William Stubbs, Edward Augustus Freeman, and John Richard Green, are often considered to have constituted the “Whig” school of historiography. Despite their differences they all carried a common belief in the long-term development of the English constitution and the placing of that development at the centre of the English national history (Brundage, Cosgrove, 2007, pp. 1-3).

The increasing connection of constitutional glories to national identity issues in the 1870s provided both room for self-congratulation and critiques of other countries that did not enjoy the blessings of English liberty. The constitution featured political virtues that had turned Great Britain into an imperial power, with political influence stretching over the globe (Brundage, Cosgrove, 2007, p. 21).

Brundage and Cosgrove (2007) uses the term The Great Tradition in in describing the process of by which English constitutional history both as a research field and as a teaching field acquired a status that put in the apex of historical scrutiny. Constitutional history rested on some of the same assumptions as the Whig interpretation but transcended it in some important ways. The Great Tradition accepted the centrality of constitutional history but insisted on the highest scholarly in its study. This approach to English history privileged the positron of constitutional history above other means of inquiry, because constitutional history is interested in the workings of government (the interplay of forces), it makes it notice social and economic factors as well, which determine forces. Legal conventions as well, which regulates the relation of the different parts of the constitution. This means that the constitutional historians have to keep eye on many different modes of history (Brundage, Cosgrove, 2007, p. 24).

## Revival of Traditional Liberalism

Beneath the intellectual uncertainties and personal doubts of the Victorians lay a massive confidence, based on their island's prosperity, peace, and security. That confidence that functioned as a foundation of tolerant liberalism, suffered critical impacts in the first half of the twentieth century. The post-Whig realism of the 1890s and early 1900s could have started the doubt, however the Great War ensued the hammer blow. This led to a denunciation of everything German, including the German political system, and Idealist philosophy, especially the organicist and statist tendencies. This led to a reassertion of anything that could be lay claim to be part of native tradition, even more the new chauvinism was associated with renewed enthusiasm for the liberal national tradition which had become unfashionable before the War. University intellectual rushed to condemn Germany's political and intellectual traditions. According to Oxford scholars, the war was between "two different principles", that of *raison d'état*, and that of rule of law. Within England this conflict had been decided in favour of the latter in the seventeenth century, the conflict had now become internationalised (Parker, 1990, p. 104).

## Science and Empire

The period 1870-1914 brought in many changes to historiography, it put it into a more analytical and sceptical direction, and the two dispositions overlapped and intersected in the years before the First World War. The discipline's flagship journal, the *English Historical Review*, emerged through informal discussion in London by 1886 with its first, unintelligible article on the German school by Lord Acton. Acton identified a mayor genre. He alongside Stubbs championing of Ranke widened the horizons of insular British historians and an increasing number followed the example of George Prothero and Adolphus Ward in bringing German expertise into the British universities. Notable historians made important impacts in their respective fields: Maitland dominated and transformed the history of English law; Tout turned constitutional history into the study of administration; Firth picked up Gardiner's baton and brought a new level of research-endeavour in seventeenth-century studies to everywhere outside Oxford; Poole made the science of diplomatic his own and vastly enhanced what could be learned from archives. Each achievement needs its own history but a move towards investigation and away from description, a sense of professional expertise, and implication that history was hard, intellectually, and technically. One consideration unquestionably

preoccupied this generation of British scholars: the need to present evidence, rather than imaginative guesswork, and to assemble historical evidence in large-scale compilations that would make “research” feasible. Both projects contained a serious confusion by frequently making source and evidence identical, with the implication that the historical material could somehow speak for itself, but they also enhanced the effectiveness of a professionalising discipline- What then did the new generation of professionals write about? They had escaped the German concept of *Methodenstreit*, which in turn kept them away from contemporary emphasis in Europe and America on social and economic forces: industrialisation, class, and urbanisation. Of course, one can find examples of British historians exploring such themes, rather the university mainstream pointed in the direction of revising Victorian certainties about the middle Ages, reversing prejudice about the despicable nature of the Tudors, if not the Stuarts, who remained incorrigible, and looking to make the eighteenth century historical in scholarly work that would find its ultimate resolution in Namier’s redefinitions after the First World War (Macintyre, et al., 2011, pp. 213-216).

In the generations of the two historians Seeley and Froude the reality of empire was constitutional fact as much as category of aspiration and the history of it took some of its colour for the procedures of constitutional historians. As late as in 1953 a respected imperial historian could describe the foundation documents of the second British empire – the Durham Report of 1839 – as “the Magna Carta of colonial self-government”. A tradition of thought among imperial historians would endure for two generations after the last great names of Whig history (Bentley, 2005, p. 70).

#### War and Modernism

War against the Central Powers made a major difference to how the historical enterprise became conceived and how its practitioners behaved. Its subject matter swung towards the international and even global history. The disruption that followed played no small role in stimulating the production of economic and social history between the world wars. It radically affected the historians themselves, pulling many of them into the service of the state for the first time in government departments, especially in matters dealing with wartime propaganda and military intelligence, before propelling a collection of historical minds to Versailles to locate parallels with the Congress of Vienna 100 years before (Macintyre, et al. p. 217). Unlike America where Peter Novick shows us a profession swinging away from the ethos of objectivity in the years under the imprint of James Harvey Robinson, Carl Becker, and

Charles Beard, the British historical profession headed with optimism for the archives. Explanations for not abandoning naïve realism seem complex, but with certain elements to them. Science provided both opportunity and threat. The new explosion of relativity and new conceptions on the workings of the universe. The inter-war laboratory science reached new heights of status and those working in the human sciences felt the edge of contested authority. The inter-war period saw the beginning of a rift familiar to modernity, between academic output intended for a closed club of experts and styles of delivery intended for the widest audience at the expense of certain sophistication. A second cohort of historical authors stood uncomfortably with one leg on each side of that rift, a group informed by the teachings of the left, and a wish of bringing the element of Marxist reading of history to the mass audience whom their theory credited ultimate power. Throughout the 1930s their message gained significant as significant foothold, but it is however interesting that Marxism acquired such a grip on the most conservative historical culture in Europe. Reasons could vary from class dynamics, displacement of religion, or the economic downturn of the 30s.

Of the Victorian mainstream, now only a few contributors remained. Constitutional history persisted through the inter-war period, but it owed less to lawyers and more to political historians. The Empire fared likewise, except that that it now boasted a scholarly infrastructure in Oxford, Cambridge, and London a growing number of historians wishing to be part of imperial history studies of the kind reflected in the eight-volume collaborative *Cambridge History of the British Empire* (1929-36) (Macintyre, et al., 2011, pp. 219-221).

### Historical writing after 1945

This section will focus on the periods that influenced historical writing after the Second World War. Impacts on historical are more universal here, with concepts familiar to many Western nations. This section will however include non-Western historical concepts as well, such as the Subaltern Studies movement.

### Post-Modernism

Over the last quarter of a century, there have been many claims that Western societies have entered a new era of their history. While remaining industrialised societies, Western societies

have undergone such an extent of changes that they can no longer be characterised under outdated terms or old theories. Hence new names and categories are assigned such as “post-industrial”, “post-Fordist”, “post-modern”, as well as “post-historical” (Kumar, 2009, p. 8). The post-war period provides criticism of colonialism, as well as undermining of the West’s ability to represent other societies, through theorising about the limits of representation (Cliffords, Marcus, 1986, p. 10). Ethnography is direction which post-modern history provides. Post-modern ethnography privileges “discourse” over “text”, and builds upon dialogue instead of monologue, and it emphasises the collaborative and cooperative nature of ethnographic situation instead of the ideology of the transcendental observer. Instead of an “observer-observed” type of situation, there is instead a mutual dialogical production of a discourse (Tyler, 1986, p. 126). One prominent attack on history have been histories alleged special complicities with power. This critique can sometime take the form of calling history static, as history often have been bound with the nation-state project. Thereby according to post-modern critique all histories since the nineteenth century have been national histories (Sarkar, 1999, p. 301). The demand for histories outside of the old national history canon becomes more relevant when the subject of history itself is more open for deduction and critique.

Ethics is a relevant term in the post-modern world, this is a problematic term and is often raised in intellectual debate. Intellectual, epistemological, or even political recognition is not enough to move from politics to ethics. If one says politics is about general principle and universal laws that benefits all ethics is about the singularity of each. The question on the political agenda today is how to bring the ethical concern for the singularity for each living being into politics. The tension that arises between politics and ethics can be found at centre of justice. The tension in the centre of the radical notion of ethics is echoed in the tension between the concrete social, historical context of situated objects, on the one hand, and the witnessing structure of subjectivity constituted through address and response, on the other. The tension between eyewitness accounts, and the bearing of witness to what is not seen, or seen as, is productive for thinking about the relationship between ethics and politics (Wolfreys, 2017, p. 141). If ethics is a concept that is pushed for in the post-modern world, historians can be influenced or feel bound by making selections based on the current understanding of ethics place in the historical canon.

## Postcolonialism and dependency studies – Critiques of Eurocentrism

Postcolonialism applies postmodernism to the situation of formerly colonised peoples. The post colonialists examine, for example, how Western hegemony, for example, still influence categories of thought in independent countries such as India. “The linguistic turn” was used as a term to put these categories together under one rubric that emphasize the centrality of language. Since “linguistic turn” seemed to imply a connection to linguistics that did not always pertain, “cultural turn” came to be used as an alternative, especially in the US (Hunt, 2014). The dissolution of colonial rule and the emergent independence of African and Asian countries laid the foundation of a new view of looking at the world, now not only through the Western perspective. Historical writing on non-European topics were of course not a new concept, and features in the large writing of colonial history from the nineteenth century onwards, written by colonial powers. As a result of the independence from colonial rule, the colonial historians, criticised for having a racist outlook on the colonial societies, were replaced by colonial historians from the colonies themselves, often educated in Europe. It was primarily after the Second World War historians approached the “Global” through new perspectives. Two perspectives emerge: postcolonialism and dependence studies.

Inspired by Foucault’s perspectives on discourse, Edward Said claimed in his book *Orientalism* (1978) that Western understanding of the non-Western was based on a definition of the non-Western as the opposite to the West. As a Palestinian driven to Egypt, before settling in the US, Said had a theoretical as well as practical framework in understanding the “subaltern” – a term describing the ones outside the hegemonic power structures. Said examined literary objects: Western novels, travel logs, and anthropological literature to highlight that the Oriental was not just viewed as subordinated to the West, but as well seen as something distant, exotic, mystic, strange, and dangerous – the opposite to the Western view of itself as: rational, peaceful, liberal, and logic. The book has received criticism, for instance that Said is caught in the same essentialism that he tries to oppose, just with reversed initial letter. However, the book has led to greater attention towards Western conceptualisation of the non-Western, and for a long time it was the key in postcolonial studies thematization of the unbalanced power between the colonies and their former colonial masters.

In the critique of Eurocentrism, the new subject subaltern studies emerge. One important representative of the subaltern direction Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak raised the question in his work *Can the Subaltern Speak* of the problematic paradox when intellectuals speak on behalf



of the “powerless”, and this results in the lack of speech by the “powerless”. Spivak talks about the hybrid discourse and signalise that the Western thoughts about the non-Western is far from constant (Melve, 2010, p. 238). Subaltern studies will be discussed in greater detail in a later section.

Where post-colonial studies have in many ways been placed as the extension of the postmodern focus on discourse, power and knowledge, there exists a central world system analysis in another direction, which has contributed in the extension of the global perspective in a different light. The subject of dependence studies uses a structuralist approach on how imperialism, as part of the western capitalistic system, forces non-Western countries into a dependency relationship. Where the studies of post-colonialism are occupied by culture and literary representations, dependence studies rely more on the capitalistic structures that locks third world countries into dependent relations. Dependence studies have been criticised by post-colonialists of ethnocentrism, because of the presentation of a history that culminates, or are being observed by the European or Western perspective. The critique has led to an expansion of the old perspective where world analysis started with the discoveries, and earlier forms of capitalism in the fifteenth- and sixteenth century, to a more expansive perspective, the inclusion of the last five thousand years. The latter is to underpin that Europe has only been the economic driving force in the later period of this period (Melve, 2010, pp. 238-239).

### Universalism and Global History

The historian Novick (1988) stresses that over the last hundred years no component of the synthesis of ideas which went to make up the norm of historical objectivity had been more central and enduring than “universalism”. This entailed universal truth, truth was one, the same for all peoples, lesser categories such as national, regional, ethnic, religious, ideological were seen as enemies against objective truth. Lesser categories had to be transcended in order to reach unitary truth (Novick, 1988, p. 469). Novick raises the problematic relationship of objectivity in minority historical writing. Black and feminist historians’ attempt to provide a usable past for their constituencies resulted in the introduction of strong particularist currents which contradicted the universalist ethos of scholarship. Their external commitment was deeply felt, their work cast in an academic idiom, and appearing in academic media, rarely reached a lay audience. Most of them were embedded in a culture of academic professionalism. Their avowedly perspectival and particularist sensibilities implicitly

challenged universalist norms, but their institutional location, and socialisation into institutional values, constrained how far theory could push that challenge (Novick, 1988, p. 510). Universalism with its attempt to construct a universal subject for study can be related to the historical concept of global history. But Global history differ in certain areas on how to handle multiple subjects.

Post-colonialism as well as analysis of world systems are important global historical approaches, but the term global history in its narrower understanding is of a newer date and can often be related to *A Defence of World History*, a lecture by William H. McNeill. The lecture was held at the Royal Historical Society in 1981. The lecture was a defence of Global History as an independent subject, and not just as a supplement of Eurocentric World History. McNeill claimed that Global history was not different from other historical subjects by either methods nor by academic targets if it was grounded in systematic and critical source selection. McNeill did however point to potential challenges when it comes to delicate questions over a longer period of longer time and space, but that these did not pose a challenge for World History to be made into something different than other types of history (Melve, 2010, pp. 237-240). Many things have changed after McNeill defended Global history. Publications concerning global historical themes have increased, as well as university courses and academic journals the likes of *Journal of World History* (1990) have established a new innovative institutional framework. McNeill's beliefs that there is no difference between the Eurocentric historical writing and Global history have only in limited ways been reality. The scepticism of Global history, before 1980 as well as into the 2000s, is in sum grounded in the problematic relationship of analysing questions of such an encompassed degree that it cannot be realised by the traditional source-based approaches. Questions have been raised about what exactly Global history is. There exists a common understanding that one of the prime targets of Global history should be a complete and coherent history, and not a fragmented collection of different societies. The definition of what Global history is and should be, have tendencies to be in constant expansion, by the limitations and decreasing accept of traditional themes as politics, war, diplomacy, and sometimes high culture. It can be difficult to set limits for Global history because some of the foundations of criticism of traditional historical writing, as well as the foundations of Global historical independence can be undermined. In the light of this framework McNeill viewed Global history as the history of human society built upon the establishment and diffusion of religions and cultures which in turn created the building blocks called civilisations. More concretely the contact with strangers were the prime force of

historical change. The large expansion of knowledges from the 1980s on, have made the task more accessible, even still on the side of the discourse of expanding the perspective to encompass the whole period of Big Bang until today. A series of investigations have shown that it is possible and fruitful to operate with larger Global historical frameworks. Intellectual changes in China, the Middle East, and Europe, during the medieval period, have been compared in order to understand characteristic sides of these revolutions. The expanding trade between cultures and continents is also a subject that shed light on the characteristics of trade development inside cultures, as well as relations between them. Although these approaches strive for symmetry between the West, and non-Western parts of the world, many views absolute symmetry as too strict. An example of this is the military revolution of the West in the early modern period, been compared to similar revolutions, or the lack thereof outside European context, to further shed light on the European revolution. Inspired by the anthropologist Eric Wolfs views on the European colonial enterprise in the early modern period and onward from the perspective of the colonisers, one has in turn studied the impact and in what degree British imperialism made it harder for economic developments in other developed nations in the old world (Melve, 2010, pp. 240-241).

The development of Global history has thus in the last few decades seemed to move in multiple directions. On one side there exists the desire to form a cohesive global historic synthesis, which in turn means the explanation and comparisons of civilisations and societal systems. It is on that note where scepticism of macro historic generalisations comes apparent. Global historic approaches in finite areas has been viewed effective but do contain challenges in perhaps a higher degree than other historical subjects. One of these challenges is imbedded in the horizontal and vertical integration, which entails compartmentation of the huge diversity of human experience in a given time, and how to identify this pattern over time. One other challenge is of a cross-subject character in which global historians have to touch upon other subjects, such as economy, anthropology, archaeology, and sometimes the natural sciences. The cross-subject dilemma is tied to a third challenge, which is the problem of how to define global history, both in terms of thematic and methodological conditions. McNeill's wish for Global history to be integrated into the established historical subjects, could prove difficult when it comes to the integration of the thematic horizons of Global history. Because of the inclusion of other scientific disciplines, global history could prove difficult to place into both the subject of history as well as the cross-subject area (Melve, 2010, p. 241-242).

## Subaltern Studies

The Indian historian Dipesh Chakrabarty (2000) provides an outline of the history of Indian Subaltern studies. He sketches out the principal debate. The academic subject called “modern Indian history” is a relatively recent development and comes as a result of research and discussion in various universities in India, the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, and elsewhere after the end of colonial rule in August 1947. Its early phase was marked by the struggle between tendencies affiliated with imperialist biases in Indian history and a nationalist desire to decolonise the past of India. Marxism arises as a popular direction for a nationalist decolonisation of the past. Critical questions were raised about the past, for example did British imperial rule have a positive impact by making India a modern, developing, united nation? Was the Hindu – Muslim conflict that divided the country into India and Pakistan just a divide and conquer policy put in place by the British or just internal divisions in a South-Asian society? Official documents of the British government in India, and traditional imperial history writing always portrayed colonial rule as beneficial for Indian society. They praised the British for bringing in political unity, modern educational institutions, modern industries, modern nationalism, a rule of law, and so on. Indian historians in the 1960s, many of whom had English degrees and who mostly belonged to a generation that grew up in the final days of British colonial rule challenged the positive view. They claimed that the colonial rule had a deteriorating effect upon Indian economic and cultural developments. They saw modernity and Indian unity not as gifts from the British, but rather results of Indian struggle for independence. (Chakrabarty, 2000, pp. 11-12)

The problem of how to write history in earlier colonial societies is marked by the “versus”, in other words the struggle between how to view colonial history, negatively or positively? In here lies the struggle on how to construct an historical identity based on one or the other. Subaltern studies intervened in the conflict. Intellectually it began in the same area in which it contested: the historiography of the colonial education system. It began as a critique of the two contesting schools of thought the Cambridge school and the nationalist historians. The preceding schools were both criticised for being too elitist, and providing nationalist stories based on the elite classes’ achievements, whether Indian or British. The declared aim of Subaltern Studies was to produce historical analyses in which the subaltern groups were viewed as the subject of history. The Indian Subaltern historian Guha removed Subaltern studies from the English Marxist historiography, and the historical style of “history from below”. This led into three distinctions and entailed: 1. A relative separation of the history of power from any universalist histories of capital. 2. A critique of the nation-form. 3. An

interrogation of the relationship between power and knowledge. Chakrabarty points to these three categories as the beginning of a new way of theorising the intellectual agenda for postcolonial studies. Guha sought to redefine the category “of the political” in reference to colonial India. His argument was that the Cambridge and nationalist historians conflated the political domain with the formal side of governmental and institutional process. Guha preceded by fusing together “people” and “subaltern classes” synonymously and defining them as the “demographic difference between the total Indian population” and the dominant indigenous and foreign elite. Guha claimed that in India there was in colonial India an “autonomous” domain of the “politics of the people” that was organised differently than the domain of the elite (Chakrabarty, 2000, pp. 14-15)

Guha’s separation of the elite and the subaltern domain, had some radical implications for social theory and historiography. For example, the standard tendency in Marxist historiography were to view peasant revolts organised along the axis of kinship, religion, and caste as movements exhibiting a “backward” consciousness, something that has been called “pre-political”. This was viewed as a kind of “consciousness” that had not come to term with the institutional logic of modernity or capitalism. Guha on the other hand rejected the idea of peasant consciousness as “pre-political” and by avoiding revolutionary models of “consciousness”. Guha went in the direction of explaining the nature of the collective action against colonial exploitation of India as something stretching the constructed barriers of the “political” far beyond the boundaries placed upon it in European political thought (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 16).

If one view the colonial experience in India as case of modernity, by introducing Subaltern studies, the domain of the political is irreducibly split into two distinct logics which get braided together all the time, then the logic of formal-legal and secular frameworks of governance and that of relationship of direct domination and subordination derive their legitimisation from a different set of institutions and practices including those of religion. This opens a very interesting problem in the global history of modernity. This is ultimately the problem on how to think about the history of power in an age where capital and the governing institutions of modernity increasingly develop a global reach. The assumption through Marx’s discussion of capitalist discipline, the rule of capital entailed the transition to capitalist relations of power. Foucault explained that in order to understand the key institutions of modernity that originated in the West, the juridical model of sovereignty celebrated in modern European political thought has to be supplemented by the notion of discipline, bio-power and governmentality. Guha then claims that in the case of colonial

modernity in India, the supplementation must be followed by an extra pair of terms: domination and subordination. This is not because India is any form of semifeudal, semi capitalist or semi modern country, but rather that the question of power and democracy to propositions about incomplete transitions to capitalism. Guha does not deny that colonial India had connections to the global forces of capitalism. His important point here is that the global history of capitalism does not need to be reproduced in the exact same manner everywhere. Capital and power could be separated into two analytical categories, they need do not have to be linked (Chakrabarty, 2000, pp. 19-20)

Subaltern studies challenge historical writing, it challenges the historian's notion on objectivity. When evolutionary stage theory which operates in Western historical thought to understand societal evolution is challenged the objectivity is itself becomes challenged. What is to be included in relations to India, and is the construction of subaltern studies in itself a subjective project for Indians to explain its own society? I can be understood as a need to understand their own history in their own light, a need to take distance from Westernised doctrine of societal understanding. Is the objectivity of the West and its historical evolutionary criteria more objective than subaltern studies? Or is it really just as subjective, being conceived through the lens of the experiences of the West?

### The Objective Historian

All these historical trends and ideologies makes an impact on the historical work. It makes an impact because this is what shaped the historian's predispositions. The historian becomes shaped by the contemporary trends and his political and ideological biases. In turn in the academic environment the demands of the market exist within the same predispositions. This question of the objective historian seems impossible, and this is the framework for this thesis, the examination of the historiographical and ideological influences of the historians behind the empirical objects in this next section.

## Analysis

### Book structure

#### Structure Cambridge

The structure of this book is based on the chronological style.

The chapters are large and can contain information on a whole array of countries and colonies in one chapter. Each sentence has a keyword on the primary content of the page in question.

#### Key Historians:

John Holland Rose (ed) University of Cambridge

A.P. Newton (ed) University of London

E.A. Benians (ed) John's College Cambridge

The challenge in providing some information about the editors of this volume is that there is really not much to find on it. What is interesting however is the general similarities in background and institution on most of the relevant writers, many of whom worked at Cambridge, and their common identity as British historians. Considering the many chapter

writers, most of them come from English universities and colleges, some from other parts of Britain, one Australian, and one American. Although not everyone is British, they come from the Western or Anglo-sphere making their background based in Western scholarship.

#### Structure Oxford

The structure of this book is thematic. This entails that the book has chapters based on certain themes and areas.

The book has is divided into two parts, part 1 and part 2. Both parts encompass around 30 chapters. This type of structure makes the content easily accessible to the reader.

Most of the chapters have underlying chapter and topics which contain information on certain aspects and areas of focus.

#### Key Historians:

Andrew Porter (ed): Ph.D. Cambridge. Rhodes Professor of Imperial History at King's College, London. His books include *Origins of South African War*, *Victorian Shipping, Business and Imperial Policy*, and *British Imperial Policy and Decolonization, 1938-1964*. Been editor of the *Journal and Imperial and Commonwealth History*.

D.A. Washbrook (Chapter writer): Ph.D. Cambridge. Reader in Modern South Asian History and Fellow at St. Antony's College, Oxford. Author of the *Emergence of Provincial Politics: Madras Presidency, 1870-1920*. He has written many articles on modern Indian history.

It is much easier to extract information here because the book features a list of all contributors to this volume. Both of these writers feature in the selected material for this analysis. Both work at the same University and are British citizens, but their expertise and fields of study already breaks with older historiographical traditions, D.A. Washbrooks's especially considering his fields in South Asian History. The volume on a larger scale features a varied set of writers from different Universities and some of non-Western origin.



## Analysis of content

### The description of Imperialism and Colonialism

This first section will differ from the other two that will investigate specific subject matter. In this section the general description of colonialism and imperialism will be explored. The intent is to provide a notion of which initial stand the book takes in relation towards the concepts. The choice of focusing on this is because the concepts are important to such a subject, every subject that follows will contain the words colonialism and imperialism in many instances. Of course, both “imperialism” and “colonialism” as historical terms are problematic, and it could be useful to try to characterise them before this particular analysis. Osterhammel (1997) provides this definition for colonialism: “Colonialism is a relationship of domination between the indigenous (or forcibly imported) majority of minority of foreign invaders. The fundamental decision affecting the lives of colonized people are made and implemented by the colonial rulers in pursuit of interests often defined in a distant metropolis. Rejecting cultural compromises with the colonized population, the colonizers are convinced of their own superiority and of their ordained mandate to rule” (Osterhammel, 1997, pp. 16-17). Imperialism on the other hand is the concept that compromises all forces and activities contributing to the construction and maintenance of “transcolonial empires”. Imperialism appears in the ability of an imperial centre to define as imperial its own national interests and enforce them worldwide in the anarchy of the international system. Imperialism then is not only colonial politics, but international politics for which colonies are not just ends themselves, but pieces in a global power play as well. “Imperialism” and “colonialism” are therefore not the same concept. “Imperialism” could be interpreted to be a more comprehensive concept, and “colonialism” appear to be a manifestation of “imperialism” (Osterhammel, 1997, pp. 21-22). It can be constructive to have a look at the preface of the books in order to understand the intent of the book, as well as getting an understanding of the editors’ intent and historiographical traditions. Some information provided in the introductory chapters shall as well be examined.

Cambridge

The preface of this book provides some insights into the editor John Holland Rose's view on empire and colonialism. The writer opens with factors that led to the expansion of the empire, mainly the loss of the colonies in America. The writer writes:

The object of this expansion of power was not, as Adam Smith had said of the First Empire, to raise up a people of customers, but to secure Great Britain the freedom to sell all over the world the products of her growing industries. The stimulus of the industrial revolution created the motive of imperial policy. Little conscious of the manifold problems in which their activity entangled us, our merchants and statesmen, seeking new markets, were binding up our fortunes with a quarter of the human race (Rose, Newton, Benians, 1940, p. V).

The author provides us at the start with an overlying notion on what the main objective was, but as well indications on possible problems that followed. The writers provide us with some paragraphs that explain that societal changes and development in Britain led to changes in colonial policy, for example the humanitarian movement, and antislavery. He also takes on the complicated area of how to govern such diverse areas. Although the book is from 1940 the writer recognises that there are complications towards colonialism, and some certain areas was subject to change. The overall notion of the preface is however the British perspective and the innovations that this country provided to its empire. An important aspect here is the opening of new markets and the binding of fortunes. Could this contain the notion of “formal” vs “informal” empire? Osterhammel (1997) provides a good definition on these two concepts: 1. Colonial rule (formal empire) is the replacement of indigenous rulers by foreign rulers (for example and Indian prince by a British governor). The pre-colonial political order ceases to exist or at least stops functioning freely. Representatives of the colonial power perform the central sovereign functions. 2. Quasi-colonial control (informal empire): The weaker state remains intact as an independent polity with its own political system. It can conduct its own foreign policy and regulate routine domestic affairs. There is no colonial administration, but sometimes especially in areas such as finance, a mixture of indigenous and foreign administration. The weaker state is sovereign to a limited extent (Osterhammel, 1997, p. 20). “Informal empire” then could be the way of securing new markets for British products.

As English colonists had been left to govern themselves, a commercial policy had sufficed for an imperial policy in the Old Empire, but English statesmen were now setting themselves a larger task, and had to learn the art of government in a great variety of climes and circumstances and over a great variety of peoples. And this not in a stationary world, but in a world awakened to a new energy with the

discoveries and stimulus of industrial and political revolution. And not in a stationary empire, but in one which grew and changed before their embarrassed eyes. In earlier centuries our colonial policy was not affected to any appreciable extent by religious and humanitarian movements at home. But in the years when the Second Empire was taking shape the impulses of evangelical religion were powerful forces in English politics, missionary societies exerted an important influence, and the Humanitarian movement was pursuing its eager and tumultuous course. Public attention in England was increasingly directed to the issues of slavery and the slave trade and our relations with aboriginal races, which were bound up with problems of colonial government and imperial expansion (Rose, et al., 1940, pp. V-VI).

An interesting reflection that highlights the complexity of the world and the Empire. The paragraph holds both critical as well as positive reflection. The importance of Humanitarian and religious movements, as well as critical British public is given great importance in the shaping of the Second Empire. Here the importance of the British parliament taking control over the empire is important, as before much of the ventures of empire was in the hands of seemingly autonomous colonialists. The writer takes it as a given that the whole world was waking up to the new industrial age, which raised the question of the forcible implementation of this in the empire.

Oxford

Also, here the preface is examined. The editor Andrew Porter opens on a serious note, describing the "Britain's Imperial century".

The years 1815 to 1902 were pre-eminently 'Britain's Imperial century', and they provide the core of traditionally triumphalist Imperial narratives. At both dates Britain emerged the victor from major wars. The peace treaties of 1814-15 not only acknowledged Britain's dominance in Europe; they confirmed her conquests made during the wars with France since 1793. Colonies everywhere were thus relieved from fears of attack, political upheaval, and financial loss, and new possessions were converted into fresh bridgeheads for British advance or keystones in the naval defence of Britain's trade. In 1902 the Treaty of Vereeniging, which ended the South African War, from another perspective also coincided with the final phase of Africa's partition. Although victory was bought at a high price, one indicative of future problems, for the moment at least it marked Britain's final emergence as the dominant power in the last colonized continent. Imperial co-operation was manifest in the colonial presence at Queen Victoria's funeral in 1901 and military contributions to the Transvaal's defeat (Porter, 1999, p. IX)

The first paragraph identifies the subject matter. Already in the first sentence a critique of earlier imperial narrative can be detected. Overall, the paragraph highlights the British position at that time as the leading global power. Already differences as well as similarities emerge: both contain an outline of what the Empire was in that time. However, the tone of the

paragraph is quite different, *Cambridge* with a quite progressive view tangled up in commerce, and *Oxford* with a more serious tone.

This, then, is a history integrally related to and overlapping that of the eighteenth and twentieth centuries. In organizing the volume, account has been taken not only of these different chronological perspectives, but of both the enormous growth in recent years of writings on colonial issues, and a much longer tradition of Imperial historiography. Contributors have had to incorporate knowledge and insights accumulated by earlier generations with newer findings and perspectives. Only in this way has it been possible to bring together the British and the Asian, African, and other indigenous aspects of Empire. Although selection has been inescapable, and consolidation and assimilation would not always have been either possible or appropriate, the underlying aim is that of scholarly crossfertilization and merger rather than segregation. Subjects currently attracting much attention—gender and empire, the role in expansion of 'imperial ideologies', the nature of colonial 'identities', the costs or benefits of Empire—have therefore been generally drawn into broader discussions, rather than isolated in chapters of their own. In this way the isolation or disappearance of important insights may be avoided and the mainstream of Imperial history be continually invigorated and sustained (Porter, 1999, pp. IX-X).

Already the writer is interested in providing a historiographical context of the work. Here the emphasis is on the link of the old Imperial historiography with the recent and expanding array of research on colonial issues. The use of “colonial issues” provides an insight into the problematic and criticised world of imperial history, and an expanding historiography featuring sides not featured before. The fusion of the old with the new to creates a new work highlighting many sides of imperial history, and perhaps a reflection as the successor of the old Cambridge History of the British Empire.

Although the work is not very old yet and the inclusion of gender and identity history in the work is in tune with the times, the work has gained criticism for not including this in specific chapters. Bellantyne (2010) criticised the Oxford History of the British Empire in its entirety for the marginal placement of gender and sexuality, which had been central in recent works on colonialism and empire building (Bellantyne, 2010, p. 433). Providing a notion on the rapid development of colonial history that could make even Oxford History of the British Empire feel outdated.

The introduction chapter in this book provides us with interesting information on how scholars have changed their understanding of empire and colonialism:

In approaching Britain's nineteenth-century Empire, scholars now acknowledge both its complexity and its place in the broader history of indigenous societies outside Europe, as well as the history of

international affairs and British domestic change. The nature of empire is no longer taken for granted, and historians show a better sense of proportion in assessing its significance. Consequently, they have developed a keener awareness not only to the strengths but also the weaknesses of Britain's imperial system. They no longer see Empire the simple product of metropolitan design imposed on comparatively inert indigenous peoples. They are much more alive to the varied processes of interaction, adaptation, and exchange which shaped the Imperial and colonial past (Porter, 1999, pp. 1-4).

This is as the last paragraph the eagerness of this work to be a work containing many sides of imperial history, explored through many sides. One interesting part of the writers comment is that "the nature of empire is no longer taken for granted, and historians show a better sense of proportion in assessing its significance", this can be understood in the direction that some of the negativism around empire is still there, but positive sides emerge yet again through the historical changes through the twentieth century. However, the writer also stresses that the negative sides of empire are more relevant, something that could point towards this area lacking in earlier works. The aim it seems is not to just feature the "imperial history outlook", but to feature imperial history in other histories.

#### Comparison and historiographical reflections

Having looked at the prefaces of the books as well as the introductory chapter some differences and similarities emerge. As said in the analysis *Cambridge* contains a more positive progressive outlook on the empire, it contains criticism of earlier lack of humanitarianism in the empire, but through the lens of this progression occurring during the imperial century. *Oxford* contain a more critical outline of the imperial century. *Oxford* does as well mention the historiographical complexity of empire as containing both negative as well as positive sides. This could be a direct reflection upon the different times of their production. *Cambridge* written during the still existing empire, at the advent of war, making the empire a progressive force for good, British liberties and humanitarianism as ever evolving. *Oxford* safely situated in the post-modern era want to highlight the complexities and feature representation from many sides of imperial history and other histories it touches. By providing a picture of some of the initial stances and features of the books, this could in turn help to understand information given in the two following parts. Initial stands such as the "free trade" economic of *Cambridge*, and the representation of histories in *Oxford* could take form in the following analysis.

## The description of India

In this section the theme of India in the two books will be explored. The selection of this description is based on India as a key and prestigious part of Britain's Empire at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and the keeper of this position throughout the century (Lloyd, 1984, p. 1). India as such a large and important part of the empire makes it a relevant and interesting topic. This part will focus on three different areas, however the focus on India is widely different in the two books.

The description of India will focus on three different areas that the books touch upon:

1. Economic
2. Military
3. Political

Each section will contain one research question:

1. Economic: Which stories are told of economic endeavours about India?
2. Military: How are the different sides represented?
3. Political: How are the different sides represented and affected by imperial politics?

### Economic Description

In this section the economic enterprise of colonialism in India will be explored. The area of focus will be on the historic narration, and the description of economic policy instigated by the British, and the effects on Indian society. I will dive into the specific chapters on India in the Oxford book, and search for economic aspects in the general economic chapter in the Cambridge book. The inclusion of this chapter is relevant because of economic aspects as a logical driving force behind colonialism, and colonial enterprises are often based on the possible resources and profits it can provide for it. Factors such as competition and increased wealth are important factors. Even when a colony was not primarily acquired for economic reasons, the extensive economic effects upon that colony or region were inevitable. The establishment of colonial rule was one of the most important means of acquiring natural resources and human labour to foster intercontinental trade, which accelerated in the early modern period (Osterhammel, p. 71).

The first chapter on Indian economy is touched upon in the “Movement towards free trade” chapter. It first appears in the Opening of the China Trade and British Manufactures in the East sections. The first section releases some Indian economic numbers along with Chinese. India is more referred to in the latter section:

“When the merchants of England were pleading for the opening of the Indian trade in 1813, they were thinking mainly of a share in the import trade from India. It hardly seemed possible then that England should supply India, the home of the cotton manufacture, with English cotton. None the less by 1840 this change had come, and it was visible, not only in India, but in that great theatre of trade which Sir Stamford Raffles had won for Great Britain in 1819, namely Singapore and the regions farther east, which the possession of Singapore gave access. Witnesses of 1840 speak of the change in the East as a “recent” revolution. Says one: British manufactures are not confined to the English in India, “They are spreading all over the country, particularly the Manchester goods and the Glasgow good: in fact, it is a question of cheapness. Cheapness has forced our manufactures into India, and as long as we can, by the power of machinery, make them cheaper, though they may not be so durable as their own, yet that is nothing compared with the cheapness which to a poor people is the first object they have in view”. Says another: “Almost all the natives, high and low, in the neighbourhood of Calcutta are clothed in English cottons.” England thanks to her fleet and the enterprise of Raffles. Held Java for a few years, before established herself in Singapore. According to a trader of 1830, “When I first went to Java in 1811, they were almost exclusively clothed in Chinese manufactures, and I witnessed a revolution there which almost clothed them in European manufactures during the time I was there.” The Chinese in the Straits Settlements were keen and progressive traders which would suit the Chinese and Malays. Moreover, many of the Chinese went back to China after a time and took back with them a preference of English goods, so that the result was a second India. At first the Chinese obtained from India the raw cotton which they made into their own durable clothing. Then came the machine-made product of England, which being cheaper, was invincible. By the aid of cheapness and an illegal drug, “free trade”, England conquered the East commercially.” (Rose, 1940, pp. 399-402).

This section is interesting in terms of how it views British dominance in trade. It can appear to bear a Eurocentric or Anglocentric view. It provides a picture and context around the British manufactures and the changes they brought to India. This view broadens when applying quotations from the experiences of actual manufactures and tradesmen, it provides a window into experiences of people living in the time described. The first encounter of the Indian economy is merely a footnote in the chapter and appears along with histories about other East-Asian parts. Which type of effect this British dominance had over the Indian market is as well not mentioned. However, the inclusion of other Asian parts especially the opening towards the Chinese markets are important factors in providing context to the growing British goods dominance.

The writer mainly focuses on the British industrial achievements as factors for its manufacturing dominance, the inclusion of British favouring Company policy does not appear. The section however gives praise to both Indian and Chinese manufacture and provides mainly the “cheapness” of machine-made manufacture as the basis of British dominance.

Free trade as a concept was important aspect of imperialism by the 1860s, free trade had been achieved and Britain was able to negotiate free trade agreements. This meant that “informal” imperialism could flourish. There was no need for Britain to conquer territory in order to exploit economic opportunities when free trade offered even greater opportunities at no cost (Aldred, 2004, p. 46). An important concept here is “free trade”. “Free trade” could again be linked to the concepts earlier talked about, “formal” and “informal” empire. Most colonies over the recent centuries have been parts of colonial empires. The idea of empire assumes that several so called “peripheries” are subordinated to the empire’s centre in a star-shaped configuration. In some cases, the number of colonial possessions remain under what could be justifying the term colonial empire. The overseas empires of the early modern era were almost exclusively colonial empires. This changes after the late eighteenth century with the increasing gap in economic productivity between the growth of economies in Europe and the overseas world, consolidation of economic relations, the improvement of internationally available means of military intervention, and the role of political thinking on a global strategic scale. Great Britain, the leading economic and naval power between 1815-1880, could pursue its economic and strategic interests with plural options that reach beyond the mere acquisition of colonies. It was often sufficient to arrange for politically independent overseas states to open their markets to the products of British industry and to guarantee foreign property by law and in practice. This could be achieved by diplomatic pressure, military threats, naval interventions, such as the “Opium War” which opened the Chinese empire in 1842 (Osterhammel, 1997, pp. 18-19). As the paragraph show the Asian markets become opened to British commerce, the mild looking concept “free trade” then becomes the product of “informal” empire.

A chapter focusing on economic aspects in India is called “The Anglo-Indian” trade:

Though Anglo-Indian trade has been included under certain of these generalisations, the effects of the East India Company monopoly, the nature of the political connection with India and the possession of a wealthy merchant class of its own gave it certain distinguishing characteristics. Private trade by Englishmen with India was started chiefly by the civil servants and agents of the East India Company



who became agents and bankers. For many years their firms—the Great Houses—carried on most of the private trading. The capital was supplied from salaries, and as it was usual to make the partners trustees in all the settlements of their constituents, great numbers of the servants of the Government retired home leaving their fortunes in the hands of those agents and bearing high interest (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 757).

Much of the chapter is very detailed oriented towards trade and goods, as well as trading routes, but this paragraph provides some interesting aspects of this trade. The fact was that India was under the administration of a commercial company that functioned as mediators and tradesmen. The phrase “Private trade by Englishmen with India”: this could be understood in two ways either the mediator function of the Company, or Englishmen trading with Englishmen, the latter could be suspected because of the monopoly held by the Company.

The anxiety of England in the 1840s’ to get rid om imperial preference, either by the colonies to herself or by herself to the colonies, seems an excess of fiscal purity. Certainly, it was not due to pressure from the colonies. The key to it perhaps, is to be found in India and the East. A parliamentary report of 1840 examining into East Indian affairs contains this notable sentence: “Colonial possessions scattered over the four quarters of the globe and legislatively dependent on the acts of a distant government, can only be maintained in peaceful and willing obedience by making strict justice and impartially the sole guides of every legislative proceeding by which they may be affected.

This was at a time when cotton goods from India into England paid 10 per cent., while English cottons into India paid 3 ½ per cent.: and when Indian cottons entering Ceylon paid twice the rate of those coming from England or from Europe! And if empire rates were claimed, what was the British Empire? Was Mysore included, which was a portion of the British dominions in everything but their name? Was the territory of the Nizam? Was Central India as a whole? “Internally they are independent but externally their relations are managed by us”, it was said of the last. Perhaps, then, it was to avoid these problems of differential treatment that Great Britain moved towards the simpler uniform rate, which was not simple when it was no rate at all, in other words when there was free trade. In 1850 free trade was not disruptive of an empire such as England had. For that empire, in addition to being scattered, was of very dissimilar composition; and in both hemispheres formal empire was the near neighbour of informal empire. The West Indies fringed South America. British India surrounded native India and was the avenue of Singapore and Hong-Kong, both of them British outposts in regions of foreign dominion. (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 404).

This paragraph takes on the differences in economic policies. India’s position in the empire becomes highlighted through the influence on British imperial policies, rather than other colonial parts. The writer introduces the parliamentary report with “this noble sentence” which in turn could be understood as the writer wanting to highlight the enlighten policies of the British.

Infrastructure has been viewed as an effective aspect of the rising imperial and colonial economies. The British Empire was an arena for hemispheric and international trade, which put upon it a commercial character. The attachment to commerce and the means that connected the different parts of the empire together, made it different from its predecessors and some of its rivals. For the far-scattered British Empire to function effectively in commerce, it also required to be maritime (Armitage, David, 2000, p. 8). Important routes of commerce are highlighted here:

Before and while English engineers were busy with the projection, and construction (1851-8), of the Alexandria-Suez Railway, the East India Company through its splendid Bombay Marine, which from 1848 onwards was converted to steam, did work of imperial importance by its surveys of the coastline from Bombay to Aden and from Aden up the Red Sea to Suez. For the first time all this region was intensively mapped ... We have spoken already of the connected whole of the India and China trade. These events in the Arabian Sea were part of it ... England, with her trunk route of East Indiamen from England to India and China and permanent residents her trading factory in Canton, was working towards a new and modern conception of long-distance steamship service. When the East India Company withdrew from trade, steamship lines arose to take over its work, and when in 1869 the Suez Canal was opened the evolution was completed. Steamships piled from England to the East by water, touching British stations the whole way. Thus the Suez Canal was the culminating point of more than half a century of efforts towards rapid and unbroken contact with the East (Rose, et al., 1940, pp. 410-411).

In this paragraph India is inserted into a wider importance, that of the Suez Canal. This project opened effective routes of commerce. The Indian based resource of the Bombay Marine being an instrumental resource. The paragraph includes elements of national exceptionalism in the form of superlative language. Empire's positive influence of connectivity is as well important for the writer, and the Suez Canal stands as the effective commercial key to the East.

The remaining chief source of supply was British India with its enormous population accustomed to hard work and low wages. Mauritius as was natural with its geographical positions, was the first colony to introduce Indian coolies, and as many as 24,000 were brought in between 1834 and 1838, 50 per cent. of whom came over in the single year 1838. In the same year 406 were brought to British Guiana. In both colonies the Indians were induced to sign indenture for five years. Considerable abuses, however, arose, and in 1839 the Government of India prohibited all further emigration from India. This prohibition continues in force until 1842, when it was abrogated so far as Mauritius was concerned. It was then laid down that the Mauritian Government should appoint and pay a Protector of Immigrants in Mauritius and emigration offices at three Indian ports from which emigration was permitted – Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. The indenture system was abolished, but the colony undertook the repatriate at its own expense all Indians who had resided five years in the colony. In the three years, 1843-46, as many

as 57,145 Indians entered Mauritius, of whom 34,525 came in the single year 1843 (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 510).

Here it the important resource of India in terms of manpower is highlighted. Being the largest colony in terms of manpower, extracting resources or providing Indians work opportunities in the colonies could have been an important move. The writer mentions abuses being problematic in terms of immigration, and reactions being undertaken by the governments is an important inclusion because it shows the value in that human resource. The writer's inclusion of separate colonial governments shows how although the British Empire was an empire it was administratively scattered. The use of manpower from colonies could be an easy and cheap way. Phillip Curtin provides six different features to the Atlantic plantation of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: 1. Slave labour, 2. Demographic insufficiency, 3. Large-scale organisation with fifty to five hundred workers and a strict timetable for production, 4. "Feudal" sovereign power of the plantation owner, sometimes over life and death, 5. Supply of an overseas market, 6. Political control over the system from Europe. All of these except the first also apply to the plantation emerging in the nineteenth century. The conditions of the plantations however did not necessarily differ much from the preceding centuries. Workers were often recruited from neighbouring island or coming from as far away as India. Worker, capital, and management all had to be imported. The working conditions were harsh and racist, as well as a level of exploitation hardly differing from slave labour (Osterhammel, p. 77). Although this paragraph is more focused on economics it mentions the harsh treatment which led to the prohibited emigration from India, which was a surprisingly humanitarian move, but could be a result from the rise of the humanitarian movements that worked against slavery and ill treatment in the colonies.

### *Oxford*

*Oxford* takes on economic descriptions in specific sections of the chapter, making it easily accessible for extracting information. However, the first part here is found in the previous section.

Military imperative also clearly came to dominate economic policies. The army was extremely expensive and absorbed most available revenues. This made the state very reluctant to give up potential income by withdrawing from the many economic activities which it had inherited from its Indian predecessors. Parliament might attempt to prise a range of concessions for 'free' business interests- dismantling the Company's erstwhile monopolies on Indi-and Sini-British trade in 1813 and 1833-but

it would be a mistake to see the Indian economy opened up to anything resembling 'free trade' in this period" (Porter, 1999, p. 402).

The writer provides an important introduction to some of the workings of the Indian economy and how it was regulated. Especially the how the East India Trade Company as well as the British Parliament dictated and controlled the trade.

Further the writer explains that a crucial part of the Indian economy was the land revenue system. Through this system the Company could extract from newly required land through the ryotwari system. This meant direct taxation of 'individual' peasants (ryots) in which facilitated the continuous revision and rising of assessment levels. The writer follows on to describe that the parliament made no serious effort in limiting the Company's monopolies of a wide range of the most valuable items of domestic Indian commerce. "The Company's military state was backed and financed by an extremely powerful state economy and the interests of the one was closely intertwined with those of the other, especially with regard to expansion to the East and North-West" (Porter, 1999, p. 403).

"Expectations in London that the conquest of India would lead to a greatly expanded trade with Britain for a long time were only partially fulfilled" (Porter, 1999, p. 403). The trade relation between Britain itself and India became less lucrative, which meant that the trade eventually took on eastwards. Goods such as cotton, silver, and most importantly Opium were growing in popularity in China and South-East Asia. "That Indo-British military power also, along with the export trade, should have been swinging to the East was no coincidence. In economic terms, Company India was engaged in building perhaps the world's first 'narco-military' empire, an empire in which power and profit remained closely linked as ever they had been in the Mercantilist Age of the eighteenth century" (Porter, 1999, p. 404). The paragraph also describes how persons in the Company could privately profit from the economic policies.

This section is quite important because the book early on gives us an overview of the exploitations done by the East India Trade Company. The exploitations through purely profitable means that can be deemed immoral, and the militaristic control over India. Using the term "narco-military" provides a notion that the writer is critical to the enterprise endorsed by the Company. The term is interesting because it carries the aspect of immoral business in colonialism. Such a word would not likely be used in the more positive and progressive nature of Constitutional history in the *Cambridge* book.

The first economic aspect touched upon in this book describes the strange case of a financial company's hold on the economy. It could prove important to include such an area because it contains a notion on the raw financial exploitation of India. The next section of the chapter introduces the first actual chapter on economy in India and follows economic changes, as well as Company policy.

The chapter opens by describing some of the key changes in the Indian economy during the nineteenth century:

Another reason why, perhaps, the Company state promoted the 'rule of Oriental difference', over that of Anglicization was that, from the late 1820s, the economy in most regions of India plunged into a recession and did not recover until the early 1850s. In many ways, the effects of this broke up the more advanced indigenous institutions of commerce and investment which had sustained India during the early-modern economic heyday, and fostered expansion of more primitive forms of petty commodity production and peasant subsistence farming". The chapter goes on to explain that a recession influenced the economy. The economic depression can in turn be traced toward the changes in international economy, and the vulnerability in the large and historic Indian textile trade. "India's high-quality export markets were undermined by the products of Britain's industrial revolution, while the beginnings of global economic integration under British Imperial auspice reduced commodity prices world-wide. India was scarcely unique in feeling the impact of the depression but was much more so in the depth and length of time that depression lasted. For this distinctive feature of colonial rule can be held responsible" (Porter, 1999, p. 408).

The writer provides us with a well-rounded picture of how the economy changed and reasons for it. The inclusion of the concept of international economy as an influential category provides relation to Global History and understanding the relation of influence on a global scale. The last part is especially interesting, it shows how the industrial revolution instigated by the British had an impact on the world and even its own colonial holdings.

The next section contains information on how Company policy had an impact in the region at large, which in turn had an impact on the Indian economy. Company policy was often at odds with local economic structures and traditions.

The effects on these changes on the economy were very considerable. Although some historians have seen the tax-farming regimes of the eighteenth century as merely exploitative, others have emphasized the benefits which they brought to investment and production. Bankers advanced money to produce and often themselves invested in improved irrigation works and manufacturing facilities (Porter, 1999, p. 410).

A paragraph that could fit well into the complicated debate on benefits versus exploitation by Empire. As Chakrabarty writes about the problematic historical debate in India, the older

academics favoured the colonial enterprise, and the new historians through the subaltern movement had a more complicated relationship towards Empire.

The privileges and dominance of British enterprise in India comes apparent:

British business houses now came to enjoy, if sometimes informally, privileged access to loans from state treasuries and banks, to licenses from state monopolies, to contracts for government supplies, and to powers over land and agricultural production in order to found plantations. Moreover, their deepening access to state power also saw them distancing from indigenous businessmen and developing a greater 'racial' exclusivity. In Calcutta, particularly after the 'indigo' crisis of the late 1820s, new British firms arose-most noticeably in the expanding import trades-which eschewed forming partnerships with Indians: in Bombay, London-based companies came to dominate over Indian-based agencies. Again, the benefits of this shift to the Indian economy can be seriously doubted. British businessmen were reluctant to commit themselves to heavy fixed investments and always looked to repatriate their profits home (Porter, 1999, p. 411).

Raising the question on the dominance of British enterprise in India is important. The Company policy providing privilege towards Englishmen in India deepens the divide in India. The writer uses a strong term "racial exclusivity" to underline this divide and the privileges obtained by the British. The writer points out the doubt of benefits toward the Indian economy, rather profit motivation were placed in exactly that profit.

This is a paragraph that is similar to the first paragraph mentioned in the *Cambridge* book. However, they differ greatly in narration. *Oxford* is interested in providing context to the "why" of British dominance in trade, while *Cambridge* praise the industrious English and the industrial revolution rather than mentioning British favouring policies.

But the shift also raises questions about the 'moral' character of the company state. Cornwallis had tried to restrain the private trade interests of government officials and, subsequently, London had organized a series of campaigns aimed at converting the Company's bureaucrats into 'disinterested' civil servants. One consequence of this was that, was supposedly to weaken the attraction of 'corruption', the salaries of European officials in India were raised to astronomic heights, far above those to be found anywhere in the Empire and making Company Collectors financially equivalent to Maharajas". (Porter, 1999, pp. 411- 412)

But even this scarcely broke the nexus between state office and business activity, although it may have relocated it from individuals to families. Access to Haileybury School, whence the Company now drew ever more of its officials, remained patronage-based and very restricted. Many families successfully gaining entry there also sent of other sons to train in the City of London. As a result, a series of family dynasties arose represented simultaneously in the Indian bureaucracy and in companies operating in India-usually in the same local regions. In Madras, for example, the Arbuthnots provided five successive generations of leading civil servants and ran the largest agency house and private bank in the

presidency. The Stokes and the Sullivans were not far behind them. 'Gentlemanly' combinations of office and business remained basic to the structure of Indian Empire, as much as in the nineteenth as the eighteenth century-but combinations possible now only for Englishmen.'" (Porter, 1999, p. 412)

The writer ushers in the paragraph with an interesting sentence "the moral character of the company", which could be a question of the economic power relations inside a commercial company's colonial rule. The writer provides interesting points on the attempts to limit corruption, that in itself could be deemed moral actually made a huge impact and ushered in family dynasties of immense wealth. The inclusion of "equivalent to Maharajas" paints a picture of the status and dominance of British individuals in India, and the replacement of "old rule" toward "new rule", or a "new ruling class" equal in wealth to country's princes. The inclusion of dynastic family enterprise, mainly the school recruitment and generations in office provides us with both the notion on power and privilege but also provides us with important cultural information about the British sense of private schooling and how the elite are recruited from elite schools and so on.

#### *Comparison and historiographic reflections*

The economic section was easier to compare in contrast to later sections in terms of quantity. Economic aspects are covered roughly the same, however, they vary greatly in content.

*Cambridge* was mainly focused on British enterprise and how the industrialisation changed the market in India. The chapter does seldom provide picture on the impact of changes. The narration is more focused on imperial enterprise and how this benefited British tradesmen to a high degree.

*Oxford* mainly focusses on Company policy and how this changed Indian society. The book is eager to cover how the effects of Company policy had an impact on the Indian economy, and often takes a critical stand towards it. The cover of cause-effect is present, and the benefits and downsides of Company economic policy thoroughly described. The starkest contrast of narration could be how *Cambridge* narrates more in terms of blunt financial facts: "this happened this way", in contrast *Oxford* favours the cause-effect as well as a critical stance.

*Cambridge* focus on the British side of business could again be linked to constitutional history's tendencies. For the most part Britain went its own way, which resulted in a distinctive and remarkably time-specific tendency which focused on the British experience at the expense of the world outside, a history that on concentrated on types of constitutional

history rather than social, cultural or intellectual studies, and often imbued with linear logic leading from past to present, so that history became a matter of identifying broad processes working themselves out over hundreds of years, connecting the present to Victorian Westminster with a past running back through the Glorious Revolution, Magna Carta, the Witanagemot and eventually to the forests of Saxony (Bentley, 2005, p. 63). The historiographical trend then more focused upon the British economic system and how it became realised through imperialism and “free trade”.

### Military description

This section will explore an important aspect of colonialism. Military power is a complicated aspect of imperialism and colonial rule, it is not as straightforward of the old “invade and subjugate” notion. Osterhammel (1997) provides categorisation on the different military use in different types of colonies. When applying this to India, we could consider the latter categories of Osterhammel: 5) Empire-Building wars of conquest, and 6) Construction of naval networks. The first category has its roots in the “classic” or “Roman” form of establishing the rule of one people over another. An imperial centre continues as the ultimate source of power and legitimacy, even if the military expansion primarily is fused by resources mobilising on the spot while pushing forward. However, a centralised unified empire does not invariably continue to exist. The British Empire at its height consisted of three loosely connected spheres: the “white dominions”, “the dependencies”, and the “empire” of India, whose government could pursue its own “subimperialist” interests. As a rule, empire building has come as consequence not by annexation of territory in “empty” areas but by subjugating existing state and societal institutions. The latter category features a form of maritime expansion that involves systematic construction of military protected trading factories. Expansion of this type did not necessarily lead to either inland colonisation or to large-scale military annexation of territory. The extension of British power in India from Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras was atypical, at least prior to 1820 (Osterhammel, 1997, p. 8-9). This section will look at the differences in military narration of colonial enterprise in India.



## Cambridge

As stated in the first section the lack of India in specific chapters makes it harder to extract information from the *Cambridge* book. The information extracted however provides a notion on the narrative of the military aspect and India.

Much of the content available on military aspects carry a more global perspective, where Indian strategic importance is highlighted as a part of that. This first paragraph is good example of this:

“But after October 1795, when the Directory came to power at Paris, more attention was given to the navy and to the colonies; and in March 1796 Rear-Admiral Sercey sailed with three frigates and two corvettes, with troops on board, for Ile de France. The corvettes were taken; but the frigates long harassed British commerce in the Indian Ocean. The approach to the Bay of Bengal had, however, been safeguarded by an expedition from Madras which captured Trincomalee (August 1795).

Dundas deserves credit for the promptitude with which he struck at that strategic point commanding the Bay of Bengal. From the time of Clive every far-seeing man had discerned the need of securing a safe naval base as near as possible to the harbourless Coromandel coast. The landlocked harbour of Trincomalee was especially inviting. To its importance the great French commodore, Suffren, bore witness in letters written in 1782 during his desperate tussles with Admiral Hughes: "I think that the essential point is the capture of Trincomalee, as we can have no existence on the [Coromandel] coast without a port.... It would be the best prologue to our success in India." And again: The importance of Ceylon is such that, if the English troops captured that island,...its recapture would be more important than all the other conquests wherewith one could begin a war in India” (Rose, et al., 1940, pp. 59-60)

The placing of India into military aspects in this book is rather difficult to find. The former paragraph mentions India, but more in the context of greater military happenings. However, the strategic importance of India is mentioned through the importance of the Bay of Bengal. The paragraph lacks any form of domestic narrative, how did the Indians experience this conflict? The narrative is more focused upon the administrative side and decisions put on by the imperial leaders. The influences of European rivalry upon India although remote is an important aspect.

A question that poses itself is why India so absent here, and more a piece in a global imperial context. This could be the fact that to as late as the 1960s the understanding of events in India before 1858 tended to be pursued from the “top down”, concentrating narrowly on concerns of government, and relating context and consequences of decision-making and public policy

to imperial development. Understandings merely varied in how much critical detachment or new data blended into an otherwise imperial or national outlook. In ideological and moral terms, these could be characterised as Whig interpretations of history, with appropriate adaptations to events in India (Winks, 1999, p. 199).

The next paragraph has a similar build but lays more emphasis on global colonial rivalry and what that meant for India in the Empire:

“Meanwhile France was sinking into bankruptcy and unable to preserve her influence in Europe ... While there was no intention in England deliberately to make profit of the difficulties of France it was impossible not to feel the advantage of her temporary incapacity. At a time so critical in the growth of our Indian power, when it still remained to be decided whether the Company would be the paramount power, or only one of the contending powers in India, France was paralysed. Though she gave Tipu's ambassadors "a splendid reception" at Versailles in 1788, she had to refuse him help. She could not aid the Indian princes as she had aided the American republicans, and break the British power in the East as she had broken it in the West. If so, she might have completed her revenge for the double catastrophe she herself had suffered in 1763. Her financial position would not allow it. Great Britain took her opportunity; Cornwallis who had failed in the West triumphed in the East, and before France was again in a position to act, the foundations of British power in India were broad-based across the subcontinent, in the hilly south as well as in the Gangetic plain; and beyond India the East India Company was feeling its way in Further India and China” (Rose, et al., 1940, pp. 32-33)

French difficulties and the advantages of such a situation come into play. The paragraph shows a sense of British prowess in the description of its firm action that led to triumph. It is effective in its illustration of the powerplay and solidifying of power in India. British India was primarily what we could call informal empire (protectorates and protected states or territories under indirect imperial rule), it comprised over 600 “native states” and tribal territories, each with its own ruler or chief overseen by a British resident or agent. The Indian empire however was much larger than many realise, also including areas such as Bhutan, Nepal, Afghanistan, Arabia, and Somalia. Whereby these areas included, the political Raj’s reach was quite extensive. British India’s primary objective making such relations was strategic, it meant protecting a protective sphere around India, protecting its northern and eastern border from invasion. British India established as sphere of influence in Siam, Tibet, and Chinese Turkistan, and convinced the Amir of Afghanistan to enter an exclusive trade treaty with the British Crown, turning it into a British protectorate (Onley, 2009, p. 44). Just as in the economic section “informal” empire in relation to India as a source for power in the Asian region is important, and the military machine that made it impossible to project “informal” empire control.

The colonial rivalry on the global scale continues only here with a changed relationship towards France:

“How, during the summer and autumn of 1853, a war which no Great Power desired became inevitable, forms an amazing history which may not be recounted here. The significance to Britain of the French alliance against Russia was illustrated when the Russians, bursting into the "Independent Tartary " of contemporary maps, triumphantly arrived at Khiva. Soon Afghanistan alone would stand between India and themselves, and, if French secret sources of information were to be trusted, they calculated on making short work of Afghanistan. France, acting on later German lines, could have made many profitable bargains for herself from our necessities, but she gave us full sympathy, and, when necessary, material assistance, towards the defence of our Indian Empire. In China and in the Pacific the entente likewise flourished. The French occupation of New Caledonia as a convict station perturbed Britain less than the smallest forward movement overseas in normal times. In Paris, indeed, everything was done in a hurry and without reflection, and none save Napoleon could bind the government? But though momentary execution wavered, the main principles remained unchanged and chief of all was loyalty to Britain. Napoleon's proposal that against Russia Britain should provide the fleet and France the army ought to have driven away all our doubts” (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 553)

Here India is again inserted into larger global conflicts, the fear of Russian expansion into India. What is interesting in this paragraph is the language used, sentences such as “she gave us full sympathy”, and “the defence of our Indian Empire” marks a sort of proudness and national belonging of the writer. A fondness and positivism over this Anglo-French alliance could be noticed, a positivism possibly coloured by the close relationship between Britain and France and their alliance during the publishing of this book, given the often intense historic rivalry between the two powers.

*Oxford*

The first chapter that focuses on military aspects in India bears the title “From Conquest to...Conquest”. Already the title provides a notion of the complex military enterprise to control such a large and diverse area.

The first section opens with:

“If the East India Company’s supremacy in India was signalled by the treaty of Bassein (1802) and the final defeat of the Maratha Confederacy in 1818, the process leading up to it had already been long and complex and riven with many contradictions. The foundations of the Company’s power in Bengal had been laid between the 1750s and 1770s by the likes of Robert Clive and Warren Hastings. Soldierly men, they had few illusions that the source of the Company’s dominance in India rested on anything

other than gunpowder and musket-fire. Both also eschewed visions of a society in 'British' India founded on anything other than inherited Indian institutions-most notably those of Oriental despotism', which would give their state (and its rapacious officials) virtually unlimited authority" (Porter, 1999, p. 399).

This paragraph focuses in on some of the aspects of Company rule in India, the initial stand on the power of military technology. An interesting point at the end is that Clive and Hastings did not want to realise a society building upon the existing power structures of the land.

"Oriental despotism" is an important word introduced here and will be further examined later.

Both *Oxford* and *Cambridge* point to military rule held by the Company.

As with *Cambridge* colonial rivalry is introduced:

"Following the defeat of Napoleonic France in 1815 Britain faced no significant international rivals (other than Russia in Central Asia) and built the framework of an Empire in the East which stretched from southern Africa, through South-East Asia, to Australia. One source of the power sustaining this framework was always the Royal Navy. But the second source was the Company's forces in India, which added to Britain imperial position an element previously lacking – a major land-based army. The Company's army and the British navy had first come together in India during the seven Years War (1757-63) to defeat the French and secure dominance over Bengal. Their relationship remained close and continuous during the various conquests leading up to the defeat of the Marathas, and demonstrated its extra-Indian significance as early as 1799, when the two joined forces to evict Napoleon from Egypt. Thereafter, they represent the hammer and anvil of British Imperial power in the world" (Porter, 1999, p. 401).

The lack of the old rival, Britain came to be the dominant force in the world. The Company's India as a successful element in the British military enterprise is paramount, and through the combination of forces led to greater power. Both *Oxford* and *Cambridge* are similar in the way of describing the increased power of the British Empire when France became a lesser threat to the security of the empire. India then becomes sort of a centre for expanding power over the region, an interesting dualism of two types of imperial centres, the British Empire and the Indian Empire. Looking at the prose of this paragraph symbolism like the hammer and anvil is a good play on words to describe this dualism.

"For India's own destiny, this was to be extremely consequential. Its most obvious implication was that, following the achievement of domestic supremacy, the vast war-machine the British had built up in the course of effecting their conquest was not dismantled. Rather, it was maintained intact and utilized for further conquest and 'police' duties beyond British-Indian borders and around the world" (Porter, 1999, p. 401).

Here we see more of the other centre of Empire emerge through the existing military infrastructure, and functions as a centre for control in the region. The writer's inclusion of India's destiny is important, because it ushers in a new period of Indian regional position. The use of the word "policing" here could be a reflection of the modern thought of regional or global influence, such as the "informal empire" influence of the US.

The reality of such military infrastructure ready to be utilized led to changing policies in the Company state:

"In the post-Napoleonic era, the, the Company state veered strongly away from the source suggested by Cornwallis's administration of Bengal and back to the 'military fiscalism' practised (and enjoyed) by Clive and Hastings. With this reversion went also reappraisal of the virtues of ruling India according to Anglicist rather than Oriental principles. The fathers of this second age of expansionary imperialism were broadly of one mind that India must be governed according to its own, and not British, precedents: they looked to 'traditional' aristocracies 'yeoman' peasantries, and the village community 'republic' as the foundations of India's future. But one aspect of supposed Oriental Tradition particularly attracted their attention, as it had done that of Clive and Hastings. This was the idea of an Oriental Despotism by which the state might exercise unitary and untrammelled authority. Whether and how far the theories of sovereignty actually informing previous Indian regimes met the criteria of this concept has, today, become a much-debated issue. However, in its neo-colonial form the concept provided an incisive tool for advancing the authority of the Company state – a state whose military victories now gave an unprecedented concentration of armed power. Appealing to the precedents of Oriental despotism, the new generation of British rulers now claimed a monopoly of legitimate coercive force within society and of authority over it. They also drew back together into the same hands the civil, military, and judicial functions which Cornwallis sought to separate; and they posited the sovereign (i.e. the Company) as ultimate possessor of all land and resources in India" (Porter, 1999, pp. 404-405).

This paragraph included important aspects. It shows how personal aspirations led to changes in the policy of the Company in India. An important and interesting part here is the policy of Clive and Hastings building upon principles of Orientalism both by practical reasons but more importantly by the means of power. The inclusion of terms such as Anglicanism and Orientalism is important because these terms exist to explain phenomena, as well as cultural societal building blocks. Orientalism was a European enterprise from the very beginning the scholars were European, the audience Europeans as well, and the Indians inert objects of knowledge. The Orientalist spoke of the Indian and represented the object in text. The Indian was separated by the Orientalist knower, the Indian as object and representation thus became construed to be outside and opposite itself, thus both the self and the other. Leading towards the two autonomous, ontological, and essential entities: the rational materialist British and the emotional and spiritual Indian. However, the two essential entities the spiritual Indian and the

rational West, only made sense in the context of each other and the traces of each in the other, which suggested the heterogeneity and the difference lay beneath the binary opposition.

Although the attempt of rendering India into an object external both to its representation and to the knower concealed this difference. It made the colonial relationship the enabling condition of British Orientalism appear as it was irrelevant to the production of knowledge.

The result and the effect of colonial dominance in creating the East-West construct, it appeared that the binary opposition did just predate this, but also accounted for it. In essence the Orientalist textual and institutional practices created the spiritual and sensuous Indian as opposite of the materialistic and rational British, and offered justification for the British conquest (Prakash, 1990, pp. 384-385). Chakrabarty shows that cultural theories, however much indebted by European sources, can be turned against Eurocentrism. The use of postmodernism to critique Eurocentrism has been labelled “postcolonialism” so called because it entails a challenge to colonial ways of thinking, especially, the supposed superiority of Western ways of knowing. The postcolonial historian Edward Said turned postmodernism back on the West, by relying on Foucault’s insights that power shapes truth. In Said’s view the West created “the Orient” in the image of its own prejudices. European culture gained in strength an identity by setting itself off against the Orient. The Orient was weak because it was effeminate, the West, strong because it was virile. The Orient, despotic, the West, parliamentary. The Orient, mysterious, secretive, and sensual, whereas the West, straightforward, open to the public, and gentlemanly. Western scholars, diplomats, and administrators developed this Orientalism as a tool of their Imperial power, and by using sought knowledge of Oriental culture to serve their needs (Hunt, 2014, p. 12).

The writer chose to include a much-debated issue which underlines the difficult theme of colonial history in India. The last section is interesting, because it points to the adoption of orientalist despotism under a despot, but here the despot is not actually a person, nor state, but rather a Company. The writer’s choice of inclusion of the Company here, could be to provide a notion on the lack of morality a commercial company actually contain when dealing with societal rule. The power held by the Company over so many different areas of rule is an interesting part of the control of India.

“The immediate corollary to this was that. At least outside Bengal, the military asserted itself as the dominant institution within the Company state. What Cornwallis had done in Bengal could not be undone, but in the new conquest territories it was certainly not to be done again. John Malcolm proclaimed the ethic of the post-Napoleonic era thus: ‘Our government of.....[India] is essentially

military and our means of preserving and improving our possessions though the operation of our civil institutions depend on our wise and politic exercise of that military power on which the whole foundation rests.' The Company's military power was now to be used, not merely externally for defence against Britain's enemies, but internally to inform institutions and ethos of its rulership" (Porter, 1999, p. 405).

The inclusion of Bengal as sort of a separate case is because of the institutional rule built there were established to such an extent that new policies of rule could not be implemented there. The Company did not want to replicate such policies in conquest territories because this would lead to lesser control of resources. The writer's inclusion of the quotations of Malcolm shows the awareness of this type of rule, this was no casual politics, but rather concrete form of rule exercised by the Company.

"Moreover, in at least one area the military offensive against civil society left a lasting impression on Cornwallis' key legacy – the rule of law – and also contributed to the changing image in Britain of India as a 'barbarous' society almost beyond the pale of civilization. After the conquest of the Napoleonic era, the Company state was left with the major problem in the deritius of the ancient regime's political and military economy. In the last years of the eighteenth century as many as 2 million men may have circulated in India's 'military market-place', looking for mercenary employment in the armies of regional potentates" (Porter, 1999, p. 405).

The inclusion of the changing image of India in Britain is an interesting inclusion. Could the changing view be constructed by tales of the necessity of military campaigns and control, and Indians as unruly? The word 'barbarous' for the Indians is not something to be heard today, but not uncommon in earlier centuries. The term which stems from ancient Greece which categories the uncivilised from the civil. The large circulations of military manpower show the chaotic sides of military campaigns and the industry of men who served for fortune rather than rulers. The Western classification of people into "barbaric" or "civil" has as well been criticised as Eurocentric. The writers highlighting of these words can be understood as a critique of such terms and the underlying motivations of using them in the past. The categorising of peoples into such categories could also function as the justification of rule as well as military force. As social Darwinist thought came to prevail in the nineteenth century, colonial wars were viewed as wars to spread "civilisation" to peoples that were said to be lacking in civilised rules of conduct (Osterhammel, p. 44).

"The Company's victories and subsequent dismantlement of the armies of defeated princes left employment in its own forces to barely a quarter of a million. What was to be done with the rest, and how could they be 'persuaded' to beat their sword into ploughshares and to 'settle' to pacific, peasant

ways of life? But a redundant mercenary soldiery was only part of the problem. Along the main arteries of communications, large numbers of semi-armed traveling peoples had circulated ... All this represented an affront and a potential threat to the despotic authority which the Company state now imputed to itself" (Porter, 1999, p. 405).

This paragraph shows us the troubles the Company faced when having large interior conflicts in India. The breaking up of traditions of warfare in the interest of restructuring manpower into pacifist peasants is an example of the interests held by the Company's aspirations for despotic control. This threat then could in turn be that the imperial rule in India which in turn is a form of "informal empire" given the reliance on existing power structures, is dependent on an extent of loyalty and control over the populace, and large quantities of uncontrolled armed people threaten that safety. The Raj functions through the loyalty of power structures to legitimise itself. This shows the complicated power dynamics.

"In response, it turned its military frontier inwards and began sustained campaigning against the society over which it ruled. Wars were launched against the pindaris, former soldiers who continued their 'adventuring' in Central India. The forest fringes were physically cut back and their peoples subjected to heavy military repression for pursuing their age-old livelihoods. Peasants were disarmed at gunpoint and travelling peoples fixed in their tracks – not infrequently to gallows trees. One consequence of this onslaught, not least to provide justification for the Company's swelling military budget, was the representation to British audience of India as a primitive and violent society. Most famously, perhaps, the campaign to restrict the movement of travelling peoples was attended by the attempts to whip up the popular hysteria against thuggee: supposedly, a cult of ritual murder on India's roads in the service of the goddess Kali. Phillip Meadows Taylor penned a popular contemporary novel on the theme, and the image which it presented fixed India in British minds ever after as definitely 'Oriental' in its fanaticism and cruelty" (Porter, 1999, p. 406).

This paragraph provides information on the changes enforced by the Company on specific aspects of Indian ways of life. The writer includes Indian names like the *pindaris* and use of the term "age-old livelihoods" which in turn nods to how grounded in traditions such work was. The writer's inclusion of the British narrative construction of India as a dangerous oriental society is important towards understanding the types of "propaganda" to keep a heavy militarised state. As seen before Western manifestations of oriental societies are criticised to provide false pictures of life in the Orient.

And as the next paragraph shows could in turn be abused by the Company:

"However, the military onslaught also had another impact. It seriously questioned the principles of Cornwallis's rule of law. As the military frontier extended into civil society, army commanders were wont to suspend civil justice and enforce the rule of martial law instead – executing offenders on the most summary of charges. This gained part-institutionalization in the case of the travelling peoples and



'tribal' groups, who often became collectively proscribed and stripped of the individual rights and protections enjoyed by 'civilized' members of society. It was developed further by the claim of the state to prerogatives enabling it to exile 'undesirables' or 'dangerous' people at will and in a manner scarcely different from that of the Russian Tsar" (Porter, 1999, pp. 406-407).

Harsh militarised forms of control by the Company are well presented in this paragraph through the use of historical analogy, by providing similarities of the displacement and stripping of people's rights towards the often-criticised policy of the Russian Tsar. This type of historical analogy could be used to instil in the reader the level of atrocities provided by the colonial rule in India.

"Here, as in the colonial Empire more generally, the idea of rule of law became fatally confused with that of rule by law under which 'civil society', while perhaps directed by general legal principles, is denied any part itself formulating those principles; while the state may make law for its subjects, it posits itself as above that law and as unaccountable to it. British-Indian law became less a tool of liberty than an instrument of despotism" (Porter, 1999, p. 407).

This paragraph starts with information that the policies instigated in India were not necessarily exclusive towards India, but common around the Empire. Whether it was confusion or determination the Company did not have to answer to the law making it more and more classical despotic and tyrannical. The word "subject" and not "citizen" shows the lack of rights held by Indians. Frequently the British rule in South Asia has been criticised for producing two harmful forms of "neo-traditionalization": authoritarianism and communalism. Authoritarianism as a result of "despotic" rule held by British officials appointed from home, and with a rule of law easily dispensed by an array of emergency laws, backed up by a brutal police force, which foremost worked for the interest of the state and only secondarily to further justice, supported by any form of pre-modern inegalitarian forms of authority, like caste, and feudal authority of landlords, to enhance colonial rule (Wiener, 2013, p.11).

"While the fuller implications of this position were to become clear only later, for Indian society before 1860 its most obvious consequence was that rights to private property in land – offered by Cornwallis and subsequently talked up by the Company as Britain's greatest gift to India – remained indistinct from the state's revenue rights and therefore equivocal, at least outside greater Bengal. The revenue demand continued to be the prime determinant of both the value and the ownership of land. The Oriental despotic state lived on; indeed, given the greater power which the Company state was able to wield against civil society, it was much more potent than it had ever been before" (Porter, 1999, pp. 407-408).

### *Comparison and historiographical reflections*

Having looked at *Cambridge*, it hardly mentions any military aspects in relation to India, and few to non domestic problems. *Cambridge* focuses on larger picture conflicts which in turn mentions India. *Oxford*, on the other hand, has a much greater coverage of military aspects in India. The books focus mainly on domestic issues, and this is the largest difference between the books. The large focus on military aspects and effects on the local population is in turn more in tune with the post-modern historiography, and criticism of company rule. The *Cambridge* lack of focus on problems of domestic military issues in India could coincide with the Whig historic tradition of British exceptionalism and progress, and coverage of the more peaceful and cooperative aspects of the colonies. Although *Cambridge* is critical to the Company in other subjects, criticism of the Company's militaristic misrule is not found here.

Although different in both cover and narration some important similarities emerge. The first is the global military happenings effecting India, especially Britain solidifying power through the limitation of colonial rivalry. The second is the importance of India as a resource for both gaining and expanding power. This could be related to the concept of there being two imperial centres: the British Empire and the Indian Empire. Control of the empire becomes solidified through the stabilisation of colonial rivalry, which in turn makes it an empire projecting power into the region.

### Political description

This part will explore the political perspectives in the book. Although political aspects are sometimes touched upon in the other areas of focus, this part will focus more in depth. This area of focus is important because it tells us something about how the political framework of colonial rule took place. It is of course important to explain what the "political" scope of this section entails, since the word could be rather abstract. "Political" here is the consideration of colonial rule and policy, and the effects of it.

This section has in contrast to the others been easier to extract from, partly because of the larger scope of the “political” as a subject, many aspects of colonial rule could fall under this term.

Early in the book political aspects can be found:

“Partly as the consequence of historic accident and good fortune, but none the less on foundations laid (though not all happily) in this decade, Great Britain's second empire was constructed. Pitt was not, like his father, a great imperial statesman with words on his lips which could touch the hearts alike of America and Bengal. But he brought to the problems of the Empire a constructive talent, by which India benefited, and a generous breadth of view, which might have transformed our random warm Ireland. He regarded India as "an object of the greatest consideration to the Empire". Perhaps he remembered his father's words: the hearts and good affection of the people of Bengal are of more worth than all the profits of ruinous and odious monopolies." He would have made great concessions to reconcile Ireland. He would have given her equal commercial privileges in return for a proper contribution towards the burden of the Empire” (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 5).

One of the first encounters with India in the book underlines its importance. The importance of India in the Empire is highlighted through the account of Pitt. India is considered here as seen before to be perhaps the most important colony in the empire. Perhaps enforcing the idea of “The jewel in the crown” which has been used to underline Indian importance. He mentions regrets in the regard of Ireland, and perhaps if Ireland were treated the same way would be a more eager member of the empire. Perhaps the praise of India was necessary in order to soften the idea of imperial rule. The sheer importance in both resources as well as India’s strategic importance as seen in the earlier section does as well underline its importance.

Although *Cambridge* often praises Indian importance, it could be problematic to not treat India in specific chapters when dealing with a large period in Imperial history.

“It is not our business here to describe the changes in the government of India which transferred the responsibility from a commercial company to Parliament and instituted the dual control which was to last till 1858, or the wars by which British power was extended and established in Southern India. That story is told elsewhere in this history. But we have to remember that the affairs of India were continually before both Parliament and the public. Her hands forced by circumstances and men whom she had hitherto hardly tried to control, England in this decade definitely and deliberately accepted vast responsibilities in India. The British public had not welcomed the political activities of the East India Company, but they recognised in the work of Clive and Warren Hastings a great achievement and were

not discouraged by their failure in America from undertaking a far harder task. So the march of empire had not ceased in the West before it was heard in the East, and the same House of Commons and Ministry which resigned a great part of America accepted expansion in India. The Indian question proved large enough to bring about the downfall of Fox and North, but Pitt carried through in the following year a Bill reconstructing the government of British India. The displacement of the Company seemed to some a breach of faith, and Gibbon, balancing "such an Empire", not to be lost for trifles", against "the faith of Charters, the rights of property", hesitates and tremble" (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 13-14).

The covering of constitutional aspects of colonial rule is found here. The paragraph provides a picture of the complicated power relations between the Company and Parliament. Although it does not intend to provide a picture of the changing of government that led to the changing of power, the important point is exactly the changing from the more complete Company control to a more Parliament influenced rule. The writer is eager here to explain that "England" always had a hand in the rule of India, and that the British public was not onboard with the aspects of Company rule, but apparently carried a more faithful view to Clive and Warren Hastings.

It is interesting to find the sentence "England in this decade definitely and deliberately accepted vast responsibilities in India", a sentence that can provide a twofold understanding. 1. The idea of England as a moral and humane constitutional ruler, and 2. An understanding of imperial rule over other territories as something given.

"The awakened public conscience which delivered India from the misgovernment of the East India Company appeared also in the impeachment of Warren Hastings. Burke appealed from British power to British justice", and for eight years the greatest man England has sent to India defied his accusers in Westminster Hall. The House of Commons in 1773 had declared that Clive had rendered "great and meritorious services to this country", and the House of Lords in April 1793 acquitted Hastings on all counts. The plain fact was that the country was becoming proud of the conquest of India, and while anxious to prevent and reform the evils which had followed it, would not allow the splendour of the result to be obscured in the condemnation of the means. "It is astonishing how little impression is made on the public by all the strong matter that has been brought forward during the course of the trial", wrote Lord Sheffield to Air Eden, in July 1788" (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 14).

The writer starts the paragraph with "The awakened public conscience which delivered India from the misgovernment of the East India Company", which could bear criticism of the company and praise for the British public. The paragraph then proceeds with the impeachment of Hastings, but although there was not enough political motivation to get him convicted, a public consciousness awakens, viewing the problematic nature of a commercial

company holding governmental power. The impeachment of Hastings was highlighted as an important reshaping through the work of Nicholas Dirck in *The Scandal of Empire* (2006) in which he examines the changing place of the East India Company in British understanding of empire and sovereignty. He claims that Edmund Burke's condemnation of the former governor of Bengal, Warren Hastings, was pivotal in the reshaping of empire's meaning. This critique allowed the empire to be refashioned into a moral undertaking, where British sovereignty and commerce would be powerful engines for improvement, masking the real nature of imperial exploitation (Bellantyne, 2010, p. 430) The writer's inclusion of this is as seen before focused on public opinion and reform in domestic Britain and without the inclusion of opinion in the colonies themselves.

“The principle of relying on a strong local executive directly controlled from the metropolis was likewise applied to India. The de facto independence which had been gained by the British in India was from the imperial point of view even more menacing than that achieved by the thirteen colonies or by Ireland, for it threatened both to destroy the source of wealth and power to which Englishmen were looking as compensation for failure in the West and to imprint an indelible stain on the nation's honour. Unexpectedly a trading company had acquired a vast empire at a time when the State itself was engaged in a gigantic struggle with its European rivals. The interval between the Seven Years' War and the beginning of the American troubles proved too short to teach statesmen at home the nature of their novel responsibilities. When France and Spain joined with insurgent America, and Great Britain was fighting with her back to the wall, the Company's employees became indispensable and therefore masters of the situation. As soon as there was peace the realisation that the British name was held in general execration in India compelled a thorough reconstruction on material as well as humanitarian grounds. Instinctively British politicians of every party turned to centralised control as the remedy. For our present purpose it will be instructive to watch the mental processes of Fox and Pitt in their respective efforts to apply it” (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 139).

The rule of India is here explained by the difficulties of rule in other parts of the empire. The writer is highlighting the loss of the American colonies, and the stain on the imperial pride. The struggle and competition against other European powers is interesting and lays the groundwork for Company control in India. The Company is criticised as an inhumane ruler, and the British state is highlighted as the restorer of material and humane grounds. As seen before this fall down to the critical stand the book has on the Company as an immoral ruler, and the British state as the humane force for good. An important aspect of the Whig history perspective is the enlightened state's progressive development.

Government starts to take a notice to the unpopular direction of the company and the Fox's India Bill is introduced:

“Under the provisions of Fox's India Bill, the management of the territories, revenues, and commerce of the East India Company was vested in seven members of Parliament headed by Earl Fitzwilliam, who were to supersede the Court of Directors and the Court of Proprietors ... Vacancies among the Commissioners were to be filled by His Majesty and among the Assistant Commissioners by a majority vote of the Company proprietors. A quorum of five Commissioners was authorised to remove an Assistant Commissioner found guilty of neglect or misdemeanour; and no person could hold office who supplied shipping to the Company, who was concerned in buying or selling its imports or exports, or against whom a charge of speculation or oppression in India appeared in the Company's records within two years before his nomination. Commissioners and Assistants were to be incapable of holding any appointment with the Company or exercising any other place of profit under the Crown. All charges of corruption, extortion, or disobedience, transmitted by the Governments in India, were to be examined within twenty days of their receipt and if no action was taken against the accused, the Commissioners must put their reasons on record. Finally, the King was empowered to remove any of them upon an address of either House of Parliament” (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 139-140).

Fox's India Bill shown here is an important aspect of the attempted reorganisation of the colonial rule in India. The paragraph highlights the judicial sides of the what the bill entails and the restructuring of power. The state and crown become the controlling force. Although the paragraph does not mention much about the situation in India, it does provide a picture of misrule conducted by the Company, as well as possible consequences for Company employees. Although a new morality emerges in the form of removing corrupt officials, the time frame of twenty days in order for action to happen, could lead to limited means of actually removing officials.

“A candid comparison of this bill with that worked out by Pitt and Dundas and placed on the statute book in the following year leads to the conclusion that Fox's measure was on the whole the more workable of the two. The bill illustrates two constitutional trends of great importance in the development of imperial administration. The exclusion of the Crown from Indian patronage and the proposal to establish a new executive authority for India, separate and distinct from the Cabinet, were gross blunders; but they exemplified a movement to assert the sovereignty of Parliament over colonial dependencies (as opposed to the claims of royal prerogative) which had been spasmodically in progress since the Revolution settlement. The extinction of the Board of Trade in 1782 had been similarly aimed at the Crown in its relation to the Empire. In the Whig tradition Fox was feeling his way towards a system of government for the Empire in which an omnipotent Parliament would itself control executive action overseas. When challenged on the constitutional orthodoxy of his India Board, he retorted that the argument "deprives you, at one stroke, of all the manifold advantages which result from every possible modification of colonization. What system of government can be applied to any foreign

settlement or territory whatever, which is not proscribed by the same reasoning?" Fortunately the ascendancy which Pitt afterwards acquired over the mind of George III made the acts of the Crown, in fact as well as in theory, the acts of ministers responsible to Parliament, and so removed the rivalry between the two in the government of dependencies" (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 140).

This paragraph is could be another example of constitutional history, and the writer's attempt here is to highlight a development of imperial administration. The writer's own stand on this subject shines through in two instances: 1. He is negative to the two administrative changes, but admit they were useful in the further development of imperial administration. 2. The use of "fortunately" of the acts of Crown during the leadership of Pitt. The effects explained in the last parts: ministers having control and a more effective administration without revelry between the two constitutional entities, which seems to be a better outcome than strictly following Fox's India bill. Constitutional history which is interested in the progressive and liberal forces of the constitution, is highlighted through the writer's own stand, and could be linked to the balance of the constitutional entities the Crown and Parliament. An imbalance between the two institutions would not fall in line with the constitution and be viewed through the constitutional lens as something not in tune with progress. The stability of the British constitution seems to be an important aspect of constitutional history, because of the belief of the constitution reflecting political virtues that had turned Great Britain into an empire (Brundage, Cosgrove, 2007, p. 21).

*Oxford*

The first mainly political chapter in this book in relation to India, has the title "The Traditionalization of Indian Society". The title provides a direction on how which type of politic may be relevant. Earlier this thesis talked about how the Company played upon Oriental traditions as a tool to obtain despotic rule:

"It is perhaps against the background of neo-Oriental despotism, economic depression, and the displacement of Indians from the leading offices of wealth and power, that Indian society's passage towards 'backwardness' and 'traditionalization' can most clearly be seen. Their combined effects were, first, to promote forces of 'peasantization'. Peasants petty-commodity production became even more widespread as other employments – in artisan crafts, soldiering, and 'service' - weakened. Secondly, society also tended to become noticeably more 'sedentary'. This followed both from military policies aimed at dismantling the market in mercenaries and restricting the movement of travellers, and from

revenue policies aimed at trying taxpaying peasants to the land. The new ryotwari settlements in Madras and Bombay, for example, threatened the peasant who failed to cultivate his fields (or, at least, to pay revenue on them) for a single year with the loss of his lands. And thirdly, many parts of the social structure became flattened and 'homogenized' as once-complex sets of distinctions, which had articulated networks of status within pre-colonial Indian kingdoms and been sustained by differential tax immunities, were crushed by the weight of the Company's revenue machine. In the Permanently Settled tracts, admittedly, tenurial law continued to permit greater social diversity. None the less, the rental offensive of the 1830s and 1840s had something of the same effect here too. The pressures of epoch beat down the agrarian order and rendered it static and 'fixed'" (Porter, 1999, pp. 412-413).

This first paragraph starts with the thread from the last chapter of contributing reasons which in turn provide meaning to the chapter name "The Traditionalization of Indian Society". The writer used highlighted terms to describe the impact of Company policies. This in turn led to changing structures in Indian society, as well as new professions of past endeavours to include the displaced mercenary populace. The writer early on wants to provide information that India's new "backwardness" was not characteristic of India, but rather the resulting direction of development following Company policies. A great difference here between the books is the different narrative emerging, where *Cambridge* contain a progressive narrative focusing on the constitutional betterment of colonial rule, *Oxford* is here explaining how the colonial rule in order to effectively maintain control had to put in a strategy not necessarily viewed as either progressive or western, hence the word "oriental despotism".

"Of course, rural society did not necessarily accept its fate passively and many of its members tried to take action. Local rebellions regularly punctuated the peace which Company rulers liked to present as their gift to India and reached their apogee during the 1857 Mutiny. But age-old methods of defending local autonomies and distinctions were becoming difficult to apply: disbarment reduced possibilities of successful revolt and growing pressure on the land curtailed opportunities of migration. Moreover, the Company state conducted as subtle ideological campaign directed at persuading rural society that its new structure of relations was based upon its 'true' past, which had been disturbed by the 'anarchy' of the war-torn eighteenth century. Particularly important in this regard was the idea (borrowed from medieval Europe) that Indian civilization was founded on the self-sufficient and unchanging 'village community'. This concept regarded as 'natural' the immobilizing of Indians in their birthplace and also offered the Company a curious form of legitimation of its new revenue practices. On the theory the village communities were self-sufficing, the state could both remove all their surplus and deny them outside investment resources without, in any way, impairing their imagined ability to self-reproduce themselves and the agrarian economy" (Porter, 1999, p. 413).



This paragraph is a good example of providing Indian perspectives on the matter. The writer intends to show that Indians were not merely passive subjects that could be swayed by every means, but rather people not necessarily happy about the effect these policies had on them. Highlighting this has been important for Subaltern historians. As research progressed in the seventies, there emerged an increasing set of difficulties with past narratives of Indian struggle. It was clear that the “Cambridge version of nationalist politics without the ideas of idealism” would never sound true to historians of the subcontinent who themselves had experienced freedom from colonial rule. Although the nationalist narrative of there having been a “moral war” between colonialism and nationalism wore increasingly thin as research by younger scholars in India and elsewhere brought new material forward. New information of the mobilisation of the poor (peasants, tribals, and workers) by elite nationalists in the course of the Gandhian mass movement in the twenties and thirties, for example suggested a strongly reactionary side to the principal nationalist party (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 13). The paragraph also shows how effective Company policies were in controlling attempts of revolt against society. The inclusion of ideological campaign is an important point, it introduces a power tool not instigated by war-faring technology, but rather a mode of control more and more relevant in the following century.

“Yet not all of Indian society was flattened and immiserated in this way. The Company state could not, in fact, function without the support and ‘collaboration’ of certain Indian groups. In the 1830s the number of Europeans in its territories was less than 45,000 (including soldiers) among a population of 150 million – and its efforts to stimulate greater ‘white’ settlement proved a failure. In order to rule, the Company needed to draw on the resources, skills, and energies of at least some of its indigenous subjects, who necessarily profited thereby. As a result, it became involved in building structures of power and hierarchies of authority within Indian society as well as over and above it. But the way that it did this marked a departure from the past and also carried strong implications for the processes of ‘traditionalization’.” (Porter, 1999, p. 413)

As seen before in order to maintain control over such a vast diverse territory, a reliance on local aristocratic elements were needed. The paragraph does as well show a departure of thoughts on increased “white” settlement. This type of colonialism and reliance on existing power structures as well as building/enhancing of them create an interesting dynamic. The British collaborated with groups of people having heightened status, collaborating as well as enhancing:

“One set of groups who came to enjoy particular Company favour was the ‘tribal gentries’ who – mostly of high-caste and Brahmanic status – possessed traditions of literacy and had long served as

administrator to previous regimes. Now they filled the subordinate positions in the Company's revenue bureaucracy. A second set comprised certain 'martial' communities, especially the Rajputs and Bhumihars of North India, whom the Company decided made the best soldiers for its army. A third set consisted of residual Indian princes and warrior-noblemen who had allied with the Company during the wars of the eighteenth century. They became its 'aristocrat', retaining varying degrees of independence over their domains." (Porter, 1999, pp. 413-414)

"Such groups, needless to say, had possessed prominent positions in society previously – but never so predominant as they were now to become. Then, all had faced competition and challenge in the fluid world of pre-colonial politics, Brahmin scribes may have possessed high status, but political power was the prerogative of warrior and wealth that for merchants. Rajputs and Bhumihars might have chased military employment, but they had constantly to prove their superior skills against warriors from other backgrounds. Princes and noblemen rose and fell with remarkable rapidity depending on the fortunes of war, imperial succession, and the tolerance of still-armed peasantry. But under the Company Raj, power and privilege – once they had been gained – became much more secure and less susceptible to challenge." (Porter, 1999, p. 414)

A scholarly view criticised by Chakrabarty (2000) was that of the historians Seal and Gallagher, who in their writings discounted the ideas and idealism in history and foregrounded an "extremely narrow view of what constituted political and economic "interests" for historical actors. Their argument was that the penetration of the colonial state into local structures of power in India, a move prompted by the financial interests of the Raj rather than altruistic interests, that eventually and gradually drew Indian elites into the colonial governmental processes. According to this argument, the involvement of Indians in colonial institutions instigated a scramble amongst indigenous elites who combined opportunistically and around factions formed along "vertical" lines of patronage for the aspirations of power and privilege within the limited opportunities of the self-rule provided by the British (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 12).

The writer's inclusion of the elite does not include any altruistic or ideological motivations for the Indian elite seeking power and privilege and may be lacking in the descriptions of such aspirations. However economic gain as a driving force may be a logical one.

"Reflecting its sense of India as a static Oriental society. Company institutional practices defined and recruited would-be collaborator largely according to criteria of caste and racial ascription and the heritage of blood. They then put the unprecedented power of the new state machine behind the maintenance of their collaborators' authority, ruling out competitors for their honours as illegitimate parvenus and challengers to their positions as contumacious rebels. Princes and noblemen who gained the Company's approval were redefined as members of an 'ancient aristocracy' to be protected against rivals, recalcitrant subjects, and even creditors for all time. Rajput and Bhumihar castes benefited for

privileged access to the army...While higher bureaucratic office was notion-ally open to competition, de facto engorged by family dynasties of Brahmin clerks. Privilege and power in Indian society became frozen in prescriptive and immutable forms, insensitive any longer to imperatives of achievement and change.” (Porter, 1999, p. 414)

“Under the circumstances the cultures associated with privilege and power also underwent a metamorphosis, making it more arrogant and oppressive. Rajputs and Bhumi-hars responded to their new status by appropriating to themselves as collectively the habits and attitudes which once were the prerogative only for kings. Brahmins, especially in southern and western India where their positions had been equivocal, created greater distance between themselves and low-caste Sudra society.” (Porter, 1999, p. 415)

The first paragraph starts “reflecting its sense of India as a static Oriental society” which means that in order for the Company to maintain or meet such a society in despotic form, as mentioned in the military section, the company needed to build upon hierarchical assistance of local elements. These “collaborators” were important elements in Indian society who gained aristocratic status. The writer’s use of “ancient aristocracy” shows how the Company needed to insert legitimation through a concept that could provide a notion of this “new aristocracy” being old and legitimate, perhaps a pre-colonial element. The inclusion of family names and the results of hereditary positions in society may be results of the Anglo influence rather than pre-colonial systems, however the use of the already existing caste-system may be an important move by the Company. However, the writer is clear that some elements of power existed before, but new elements emerge, such as the heightened status of the high caste. The process of and structures of collaboration were crucial determinations in the British framework of rule in South-Asia. In both urban centres and rural hinterland, the Raj was anchored at a local level by the connection to powerful men, bearing high-status titles such as rajs, rajas, taluqdars, and zamindars. These connections were so central to the framework of the colonial system that they also defined the nature of indigenous resistance at the system itself (Yang, 1989, p. 3).

“The nature of the caste system, for example, was profoundly affected by the actions of the Anglo-Hindu courts of law. Although previously effective caste status had been subject to multiple influences and flexible interpretations, the Company’s lawcourts looked largely to the authority of Brahmin pundits and Sanskritic scriptural sources, which they accredited with guardianship of society’s mores. The Brahmanic theory of caste (or varna) was extremely rigid and hierarchic, and its influence had largely been confined to élite circles before. However, now and as instrumentalized by the courts, it penetrated deeper into society, restructuring the relations of public worship, physical mobility, marriage, inheritance, and even property ownership. The Anglo-Hindu law sketched out an immobile,

status-bound social order perfectly in keeping with the Company state's dreams of Oriental despotism and European imaginings of a 'different' Oriental civilization." (Porter, 1999, p. 415)

The Company needed to build upon already established elements, but in the process influenced them. The writer's inclusion of this provides a view that caste was not something eternal that existed in its same form pre- and post-colonial, rather it did contain influenced that changed it. The Company however needed to play on existing forms of structures, such as "Brahmin pundits", "Sanskritic scriptural sources", and "Brahmanic theory of Caste".

The following chapter contains an interesting title: "The West strikes Back". The chapter contain some important ideological colonial aspects:

"Yet such dreams and imaginings were not the only ones affecting the development of Indian society. The Anglicizing impulse lived on, especially in Britain, and survived the Company state's reversion to military fiscalism and 'Orientalism'. Periodically, it offered contradictory promptings: advocating the spread of Western learning, the reform of caste, the virtues of meritocracy, and the competitions of the market economy. But until the later 1840s its influence remained circumscribed and many of its initiatives ended up heavily compromised... Persian might have been displaced as the official language of the state but, in North India, it was replaced with Urdu, not English. Company officials were repeatedly warned that, whatever their own Christian beliefs, their government was to be strictly neutral in matters of religion." (Porter, 1999, pp. 415-416)

The first sentence can function as a follow up from the former chapter and sets on the continued discussion of Indian society. Here the word Anglicizing is used again. The writer includes this to show certain ideological intentions towards Indian society. It its interesting how there were contradictory movements in regarding Anglicizing, being that the British public were interested in it, but the Company moving into "Orientalist" direction for control. The writer includes these interesting phenomena of European values wanting to reform aspects of Indian society versus the reality of profit and control catering to those same aspects. The inclusion on the official language and the neutrality in matters of religion shows the careful approach instigated by the Company. The language is an interesting aspect, the historian Farina Mir (2006) described language, specifically that used for local administration, was crucial in releasing governmental ideals. From the turn of the nineteenth century onwards colonial officials in India insisted on the use of languages the Indians understood in local colonial courts. Partly this reflected a desire for the ease of not having to translate between vernacular languages and the language of the court Persian. This however does not account for all the reasons, and a more convincing argument is that the political ideals of just and

legitimate governance alongside efficiency, accounted for the consistency with which colonial officials voiced this demand (Mir, 2006, p. 398).

“Indeed, the tangled web of cultural meanings represented by colonialism led many attempts at Anglicizing reform to produce social consequences which actually strengthened Oriental 'tradition'. For example, the legislative attacks on 'abominal' Hindu customs, especially regarding the treatment of women, were aimed mainly at the practices of the upper castes. They served to associate those customs closely with the possession of high-caste status. In a society becoming increasingly conscious of caste hierarchy, the result was perhaps inevitable. Many lower castes, who previously had not followed such practices, now began to adopt them...Equally, evangelical pressures to force the Company state to abandon the role which it had inherited from previous regimes in the patronage and protection of Indian religions had the effect of strengthening the latter. The state was obliged to pass the powers and properties, which it had exercised and enjoyed on their behalf, directly to authorities—priests and trustees—constituted within them. In effect, such authorities absorbed the erstwhile prerogatives of the state and became king-like in their own right: their rulings absolute, no longer subject to royal mediation, and their 'private' wealth enormous.” (Porter, 1999, p. 416)

That Anglicizing had an opposite effect on society could have been because: 1. It made parts of the Indian continent aware of cultural aspects of the high caste and thereby helped with adopting it. 2. Be a way to mark a cultural stand on enforcing existing traditions. The evangelical pressure having the effect of making collective Company power personified into powerful official roles is an interesting side effect, and could again place Orientalising in the personal interest of powerful individuals.

Although *Oxford* is not necessarily as interested in the constitutional reforms carried by “great men”, this next paragraph is an example of this:

From the 1840s, however, a sea-change began to set in and the pressures of Anglicization to become more forceful and effective. The change was partly associated with the decade-long Governor-Generalship of Lord Dalhousie (1846-56), who pronounced himself an uncompromising Westernizer. Dalhousie readdressed the issue of private property right, calling for revisions in the ryotwari settlement in order to reduce taxation and promote economic growth ... He also spurned India's newly 'ancient aristocracy', threatening to liquidate its landed estate-holders for bankruptcy and to reduce its 'independent' maharajas to extinction by annexing their principalities. In other domains, Dalhousie repudiated caste and sought to reform the military—in the case of the Bengal Army, both at the same time. He reduced neo-Oriental privileges giving special status to Bhumihars and Rajputs, and attempted to produce a more disciplined, European-style fighting force. Finally, he reactivated the causes of both Western education and evangelical Christianity. His government committed itself to promoting mass education and laid plans for the first Indian universities (enacted in 1857); and it licensed wider missionary criticism of Hinduism and Islam. (Porter, 1999, pp. 416-417)

Dalhousie marks a change in the more careful approaches done by the Company. The writer's inclusion of Dalhousie in person shows how much leading officials in the Company could impact Indian society. Instances like this makes the necessity of highlighting reform projects carried out by Company officials.

Such changes in policy had impacts on Indian society for better and for worse, and made an interesting change in the relationship between the older administrative forms of rule, in relation to the newer, as highlighted here:

“That reforms were effective ... First, in the Company bureaucracy the generation of the Napoleonic Wars was dying out, being replaced in the higher offices of the state by the products of Haileybury and, following further service reforms in 1853, of Oxford and Cambridge. This, in turn, undid the close relationship between 'military' and 'civil' service, which had coloured the nature of Company government. The new leaders of the 1840s were long-trained in England as bureaucrats and had fewer inclinations towards Oriental despotism than their predecessors.” (Porter, 1999, p. 417)

The Company policies needed to be reformed and new means made this easier. As talked about in the military description chapter a new generation of officials emerged, merging civil and military closer, as well as being more inclined towards Oriental despotism.

“The success of reform, however, perhaps owed most to technological changes which brought Europe much closer to India and created broader possibilities for social transformation. Under Dalhousie, steam-shipping, telegraphs, and railways began to make a major impact. They facilitated a near-doubling in the number of Europeans working in India in the army, the bureaucracy, and the economy between 1830 and the mid- 1850s. They also broadened the channels of trade” (Porter, 1999, p. 417-418).

The inclusion of new technology is important in explaining the changes in not just India but the world. The framework of what was possible before changes when new methods emerge. Technology as an historical factor highlights many of the successes of European colonialism, and the changing of distance and forms of rule. Technology is an effective tool in the process of colonialism in that it makes the process easier.

Dalhousie and his reforms have been important in these few paragraphs. The impacts on Indian society are explained in broader terms, but criticism follows in this next paragraph:

“The reforms so forcefully implemented under Dalhousie nevertheless had problematic consequences, which checked Westernizing initiatives in the years following his retirement in 1856. Most obviously, they were involved in provoking the Great Mutiny and Civil Rebellion of 1857, which threw not merely Company India but the entire British Empire into turmoil. The revolt of the Bengal Army neutralized British power in the central Ganges valley, the heartland of northern India, and opened the way for widespread attacks by the civil populace on the institutions and symbols of Company rule. These

rebellions, no doubt, had many discrete causes. But one, indisputably, derived from the way in which Dalhousie's eager Westernizing policies rubbed up against sets of vested interests built up under the previous neo-Orientalizing Raj” (Porter, 1999, p. 418).

However successful implementations of stricter policies, and the westernizing project, carefulness should perhaps be a rule of conduct. As discussed earlier in this section large changes could lead toward civil unrest and pushbacks. The writer places the rebellion as not just having an impact on India but the entire British Empire, which showcase the importance of India’s role in the British Empire. The last sentence confirms the view of breaking with older policies were not necessarily a wise step for control.

“This was clearest in the case of the military mutiny, where the Bengal Army's high-caste soldiers had acquired many privileges, not least that of avoiding flogging. When these were threatened with abrogation, as a new European officer corps sought to impose British military discipline, tensions exploded. Dissatisfaction was further fed by Dalhousie's annexation of the Kingdom of Oudh in 1856, which led many soldiers on detachment from the Oudh army to lose their personal perquisites” (Porter, 1999, p. 418)

Revolt was not limited towards the common peoples of India; people of status could also invoke such means when acquired privileges comes under pressure, it also exposes the potential dangers of having colonial subjects in military service.

“It was true also of aspects of the civil rebellion, where Hindu and Islamic priesthoods, whose authority had been enhanced by the withdrawal of state control over them, responded to more intensive goading by an expansive missionary Christianity. They utilized the moment of collapsing British military power to seek revenge on their self-avowed religious enemies. It may also explain the attacks by residual peasant communities on various institutions—especially the courts and the revenue treasuries—which had strengthened the assertion of landlord proprietary right and threatened their continued occupation of the land.<sup>73</sup> The contradictions of British rule—caught between inventing an Oriental society and abolishing it—were manifested in many of the complex patterns of revolt witnessed in 1857” (Porter, 1999, pp. 418-419)

The inclusion of the hard policies’ impact on so many different levels of Indian society is important. The cause-effect is highly visible. The conflict of Anglicizing or Orientalizing is problematic and leads in many ways in creating tensions and revolt in Indian society. This last section provides a critical picture on colonial policies and showcase that steps made were not made by masterplan but rather attempts in one direction or another. The mighty Empire was not a flawless almighty institution but also prone to mistakes. Cause and effect are important

aspects of historical analysis and breaks with earlier forms of historical narration focused on mechanistic narration.

The following chapter contains the title: “After the Mutiny”. The mutiny itself is not heavily focused upon in the book, even though it is a large subject, but it is put into the context of the challenges of rule and misrule and the consequences proposing changes to a complex society. The word “Indian mutiny” has been a debated topic amongst historians and challenged by some Indian historians as incorrect in understanding the situation. To many in the sub-continent the mutiny is better known as the “The First War of Independence”, a war for national liberation. To contemporary Britons it is better known as “The Great Rebellion”, “The Sepoy Revolt”, or “The Great Mutiny”. Whatever word is used to describe the event, there is much debate around the scale, whether it was national or not, because it effected only a portion of people in service of the military. The allegiance to or against the British varied, but nonetheless featured a real threat to British rule. Some of the cause for this could also be attributed to the struggle between rival cultural and religious perspectives, especially the thought amongst Hindus, and Muslims as well, that British rule threatened their respective faiths (Fremont-Barnes, 2007, p. 9).

“These contradictions continued after the Mutiny, although taking on different forms. Technological transformation increased in intensity. Railways expanded greatly; new port facilities encouraged steam-shiping; factory production established itself in several urban centres. These developments enabled Indian primary products finally to find outlets on world markets. Product prices steadily rose, and occasionally, as during the American Civil War, the Indian economy enjoyed periods of 'boom'. New policies of restraint on land revenue and rental demands—introduced more urgently after the terrors of the Mutiny—also permitted more resources to remain with agrarian society” (Porter, 1999, p. 419)

Contradictions is an interesting word, highlighting that although rapid technological transformations brought progress to the Indian economy, mutiny and rebellion could occur. This shows the complexity of India, and that policies executed by the Company did not always had the best outcome. Making the Indian economy boom might have eased the tensions, but more importantly post-mutiny marks a return to more careful policies.

“In social policy too, the Mutiny added complications. After 1857 colonial rulers regarded the overt attack of the Dalhousie years on religious traditions and customs as the primary cause of revolt. They therefore eschewed further 'interference', leaving Indian society with its neo-Orientalist ethics and social



forms frozen for all eternity. They also returned to many of the traditional institutions which Dalhousie had rejected. India's 'ancient aristocracy' was rendered immutable once again and bound to the British Crown as a pillar of the new Imperial establishment.” (Porter, 1999, p. 420).

Dalhousie’s policies were to blame, and a return to older policies emerge. Here neo-Orientalist come back into play. A return and to Orientalist principles and the securement of Indian aristocracy seemed to be necessary steps in returning to a normalcy in India. This paragraph is especially interesting because it shows how fragile the colonial control of India was, and how necessary collaboration with local structures of power, and institutions were.

“After the Mutiny, the Westernizing and Orientalizing propensities of colonial rule thus still remained in tension, although as the century advanced a new element also began to enter their relationship. The Brahminic scribal gentries, whose social authority had been so greatly enhanced by British rule, began to consolidate themselves as a national intelligentsia and to seek the liberation of their nation from Imperial tyranny. But, as quintessential products of the contradictory processes by which colonial India had been made, they—no less than their British opponents—remained unclear of the direction in which true liberation lay. Indian nationalism was itself to be torn between attempts to pursue a modern Western future and to evoke a glorious, unchanging, and distinctively 'Oriental' Indian past.” (Porter, 1999, p. 420)

The last paragraph of this chapter contains many important aspects. It marks the Mutiny as a changing factor: “a point of no return”. Although returning to Orientalising elements, the tension remained. The Brahminic scribal gentries as product of enhanced privilege are important, and the writer introduces them as a starting factor of Indian nationalism. Their status as intelligentsia makes them more critical toward colonial rule. It is as well ironic because of the connection to the British policies heightening their status. The last paragraph showcases an early instance of the leading historical problem in post-colonial India, what direction should the country take, modern Western versus ‘Oriental past’. In history as discussed, it has been problematic choosing how to view the colonial history of India, when faced with the difficult options on what to rely on: The Western post-colonial views, the Marxist historical doctrine, or that of the “subaltern”.

### *Comparison and historiographical reflections*

During the 1930s and especially after the 1940s as historical research and writing increased, newer approaches emerged. These stressed a more local, bottom-up or Indosentric

perspective. Research drawing upon new sources showed that, whatever British aims may have been, they had almost always been shaped by hard realities of events occurring on the ground. A recognition that Indian realities, not British or national purposes, had shaped the course of events, began to spread. Local conditions and circumstances as reflected in local conflicts between social entities rooted in family, caste, and village, language, culture, and religion, received closer attention. Indigenous institutions, rather than high Imperial policy or national aspirations, were examined more carefully. English-language materials were no longer deemed sufficient. Local vernacular-language materials again, as in Company times received greater attention (Winks, 1999, p. 200). This explains many of the differences in the sections, but particularly this one. Oxford is much more influenced by the coverage of Indian aspects. Reasons for the differences of narrative and focus could lie in the different paths taken by British historians vs Indian historians. Indian nationalism is different than for example Australian or New Zealand. For Indians it was a movement of protest against foreign colonial rule rather than self-assertation within the framework of self-government. Before the First World War Indian historians took one line, while British historians took another. Indian historians featured repressive aspects of colonial rule, unethical administration, and the Indian rebellions against it. British historians on the other hand seemed to write history, of, for, and sometimes of administration. Constitutional, political, and legal developments were given special attention. The administrative actions of the rulers were emphasised at the expense of the social consequences affecting the subjects. Although there were exceptions the British Raj was often represented at the end of the long road of Indian history, rather than the latest of a myriad of epochs, and a passing one at that (Curtin, 1959, p. 83). Much of the divide and differences in the subject of India is then perhaps grounded in that one was written in a time with few to no influences from non-western historiographies, and through the progressive-linear constitutional history, and the other written in a time with many such influences as well as the postmodern historical critique. Although there are differences in the narrative and presentation in this section a main debate is about Company rule. The same criticism exists of the Company, but it unfolds in two different ways. *Cambridge* highlights criticism against the Company as an institution of misrule and not in tune with the progressive and humane British parliament. *Oxford* on the other hand does as well criticise the company, but those so in by explaining the methods of rule such as traditionalization through Orientalism, and how this directly affected India. Here a significant historiographical difference emerges, *Oxford* utilised the concept “Orientalism”, which in turn was not a concept of post-colonial criticism during the writing of *Cambridge*.

It could be interesting to discuss the possible influences of subaltern studies in *Oxford*, a concept not invented during the *Cambridge* release, due to the more recent emergence of subaltern studies. Even though the *Oxford* book is not written by subaltern historians, the type of research and intellectual debate initiated by subaltern historians is bound to have some influence. The post-modern critique alongside the subaltern way of viewing history drives the introduction of new perspectives. Even though *Oxford* differs from *Cambridge* in the manner of covering other sides of colonial policy rather influenced by historiographical movements that demand such changes, *Oxford* has been criticised for not putting enough importance on aspects such as gender and sexuality, subjects more prominent in recent releases (Bellantyne, 2010, p. 433). Scholars concerned in rethinking Britain's imperial history, and the relationship between metropole and colony, have taken approaches such as drawing on transnational feminist histories, post-colonial studies, anthropology, and cultural studies. Historians such as Antoinette Burton, Catherine Hall, and Kathleen Wilson questions whether conventional narratives of imperial history, including the not so new *Oxford History of the British Empire*, have the capacity to "account for non-elite and non-western parts. Their work, now called the "new imperial history" (or "histories"), attempts to blend post-structuralist understandings of race, class, nationality, sexuality, and gender, with the attention to detail and historical context of imperial history. This can be summed up to exploring the "lived experience" of ordinary individuals, and "microhistories of empire's reach and impact" (Laidlaw, 2012, pp. 810-811). As the *Oxford the History of the British Empire* starts to season, just as its older counterpart, it too comes prone to historiographical criticisms. This is an example of the ever-changing historiography of historical subjects, and the introduction to newer concepts that highlights other aspects of history. It can, however, be problematic to cover such a large historical scope by featuring large history as well as microhistory, and the question of the possibilities of covering such an array of different histories emerges. The interesting point from this is the constant change and evaluation of historiography, and how even though the *Oxford* book is not old, it already becomes the subject of criticism from other subjects. It also challenges the historiographical scope of the book and the historiographical "lenses" in which it exists. An example of the ever-changing concept of objectivity and how historiographical influences change it.

Closing the India part of the analysis it could be important to stress the problematic nature of the subject of India not once again not being covered in assigned chapters in *Cambridge*, this

makes it harder to compare the two books. One can however be critical of the lack of coverage of India due to its important place in the British Empire. Of course, the *Cambridge* making of a separate two volume of India as partially integrated part of *The Cambridge History of the British Empire* could be credited. However, it could be necessary to include India as part of the other works in order to highlight its importance as well as not to create confusion around its place in colonial history. The placement of India into its own volumes may be more linked to an attempt of Indian national history, rather than linking to the Empire historiography. *Oxford's* inclusion of all colonial possessions into the same book series could be a way to address this, treating imperial history in its entirety instead of fragmenting it. Although the difference of the treatment of India as a subject in the books, the information provided by the books are sufficient to provide a picture of the different historiographical influences and narratives. If this thesis were to examine only India as subject of enquiry this however would not be sufficient, and perhaps the comparison between the current *Oxford* volume with the *Cambridge History of India* would be more relevant. This thesis, however, focuses on the differences between two books that contain the same subject name, and then important to cover other subjects as well.

## The description of Anti-Slavery and Humanitarianism

This section takes on the anti-slavery movement and abolition of the slave trade. The inclusion of this area of focus is important to provide an outline over differences and similarities in the books. An area such as this is prone to contain some changes through the years. This is as well an area more equally covered in both books. The intentions of showing the different coverage of India, makes it necessary to give insight into an area more specifically outlined in both books. This analysis will focus on two aspects:

1. Humanitarianism and anti-slavery
2. Abolition of the slave trade

The chapter will include one research question:

## 1. How are the movements of anti-slavery described?

*Cambridge*

In contrast to the difficulty of extracting information about India, this subject is covered in a large chapter specifically about the abolition of the slave trade. Perhaps because of the idea of the importance of this subject in the progressive betterment of society through the liberal constitutionalism of the British, and the abolition as a proud moment of humanitarianism. The first paragraph introduces a historiographical context of this subject.

“In the middle of the eighteenth century the problem arising from the contact between the peoples of the different continents – problems which loom so large at the present day – had scarcely been envisaged, till less discussed or dealt with. If the relations between Englishmen at home and Englishmen in the American colonies under the old Commercial System were conceived as mainly an economic question, the relations between Englishmen and the coloured races seemed to be still more simply an exclusively a matter of business. Trade and nothing else was their concern in Asia. The conduct of the Englishmen in India was regarded as the private affair of the East India Company, and public opinion in England was chiefly interested in the maintenance of the Company’s property ... The question was apparently never discussed in parliament until 1773, when enquiry was held into the ill-treatment of the Caribs at St Vincent. Englishmen at home, in fact, only cared about their Indian silk or American tobacco or West Indian sugar; they did not care, and hardly knew, at what human cost it was obtained. And this indifference to any other than the commercial aspect of the old imperialism, this lack of interest or imagination as to the dealings of their white kinsmen with the brown man of India or the red man of America, is the chief explanation of their attitude to the relations between white and black, to the connection of Britain with the third continent, Africa. It is in this last field that the dominance of the old commercialism is revealed in its most naked and repulsive form. For Englishmen went to Africa, not merely, as they went to Asia, to trade, but to trade chiefly in Africans.” (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 188).

This paragraph opens the context of problems amongst peoples. It starts with the eighteenth century as a rise of tensions which then follows on. The writer provides a context for racial tensions by including many areas, especially the commercial. The imperial opinion at the time was about commercial concerns, mostly because of the unaware populace on the inhumane exploits of the empire. As Drescher (1987) points out, in the world economy there were no competitive alternative to slave-grown cotton or sugar during the age of British abolitionism (Drescher, 1987, p. 9). With that in mind the economic factors can be an important understanding of the initial problem, and the system of commercialism as almost an ideology of empire. John Darwin (2009) used the headline “Commerce or Empire?” when examining

the British imperial system. The union of commercial and imperial muscle was the foundation of the British world system. The large-scale trade, the fleets of merchant shipping, the large economic of overseas investment and its resources it commanded were widely seen as the real embodiment of British world power. This commercial power sustained the many aspects that maintained and extended British power (Darwin, 2009, pp. 141-142). The great importance of commercialism as a way of empire could indeed make for difficult transitions to humanitarianism. Commercial aspects have been explored as early as the first chapter in this thesis, and it seems that such a focus makes itself relevant in many of the pages of the *Cambridge* book. As talked about earlier the two aspects of imperial control “formal” and “informal” are important here, the latter being motivated through the expanding commercialism and search for markets.

“But if, for these reasons, the idea of interference with the slave system was so long neglected by the British statesmen, and ruled out of practical politics, the consciousness of the individual Englishmen could not be silenced. Protests were audible in early days, and presently they multiplied. It was in religious circles, naturally, that the first voices were raised, and George Fox may perhaps be regarded as the originator of the Humanitarian Movement.” (Rose, et al., 1940, pp. 189-190)

The writer does something very interesting in this paragraph, he mentions the British statesmen as a sort of opposite of the individual Englishmen. Here the Englishmen has sort of a separate function than the British statesman. As Mandler (2006) suggests at one end of the spectrum lie forms of national consciousness that strive to be very specific about what qualities are most characteristic of, or unique to the nation. The “idea” of a national character based on the people forming the nation have some common psychological and cultural characteristics that bind them together and separate them from other peoples, is one of the most intensely focused forms of national consciousness because it implies specificity both about the people in question and about other peoples. As a horizontal bond binding people together and not only vertically to a common leader or geographical expression, “national character” is one of the forms of national consciousness historians have confined to the modern era. Before the eighteenth century, it was possible for people to feel strong patriotic attachments to land or leader, but difficult for them to be aware of the commonalities because of barriers such as distance, dialect, literacy, and immobility (Mandler, 2006, p.8). Religions is as well counted as a factor in the humanitarian movement. Religious thoughts on anti-slavery are as well old ones. The theological strand of anti-slavery thought has a somewhat

longer pedigree and is generally more strident and systematic. When religious condemnation of slavery began to emerge in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, it drew inspiration from broader theological trends that placed particular emphasis on divine providence, personal obligation, and the transformative powers of moral conduct. The writer introduces George Fox as the perceived originator of the Humanitarian Movement and that could be true given that George Fox was the founder of the Quakers, a nonconformist religious movement in the seventeenth century, who were chiefly responsible for the early development of theological anti-slavery arguments (Quirk, 2011, p. 32).

“Meantime the general current of thought was moving in the same humanitarian direction as the special teaching of religious communities and leaders. The slave system was clearly incompatible with the ideas of the eighteenth-century Renaissance in England and in France. Locke denounced it with curt logic and Montesquieu with elaborate sarcasm. And when the theorists proceeded from the rights individuality to the natural goodness of man and discovered a dubious proof of the latter doctrine in “the noble savage”, the anomaly of slavery became still more obvious. A new interest, moreover, in the primitive peoples of the world was excited and a new sympathy aroused on their behalf by a new phase of overseas exploration.” (Rose, et al., 1940, pp. 190-191)

The religious aspects were not the only ones to be considered, and the inclusion of enlightenment ideals are important. This paragraph is effective in providing meaning to the divergence of the slave system in relation to the enlightenment ideals, and as a result initiating a critical stance. Liberty in a society is at least indirectly the legacy of the Enlightenment through liberalism and rationalism as intertwined and mutually reinforcing legacies. At least, if not freedom itself, then liberalism as the ideal system of liberty, hence liberal democracy, society, and modernity, is the true legacy of the Enlightenment. Jefferson’s “Liberty for all” is probably the most cherished single ideal or value, and thus a parameter in America and its corresponding formulations, in other Western societies (Zafirovski, 2010, p. 29-30). The ideals of freedom and liberty thus cannot condone slavery, which was against all that it stood for, and the inclusion of this by the writer is paramount in forming an understanding of the origins of anti-slavery. Slavery as not compatible with the ideas of enlightenment could entail that the only reason and motivation to have slavery in the first place was through commercialism.

“The evils of the slave system were thus becoming steadily better known and more discussed as the eighteenth century drew on: by any definite or effective attack on it might still have been long delayed if

the slave-owners themselves had not precipitated the conflict by introducing slavery into England. It was doubtless natural that planters coming home on holiday or to settle down on retirement should prefer their old black servants to new white ones; but they failed to realise how the presence of an increasing number of slaves – there were at least 10,000 in England by 1770 – would affect opinion in the Old Country. Slaves ran away sometimes in England just as in the colonies; and if they knew what was supposed to be the law, they appealed to kindly Englishmen to get them baptised and give the godfatherly protection from their pursuing masters. This method of escape became indeed so popular that as early as 1729 the West Indian community appealed to the Law Officers of the Crown, Yorke and Talbot, who declared that neither residence in England nor baptism affected the master's "right and property" in the slave and that "the master may legally compel him to return to the Plantations". Still more decisive was the judgment of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke in 1749 that a runaway slave could be legally recovered. So slavery continued, nor longer far away beyond the range of Englishmen's imagination, but under their very eyes.....The forcing of the hard facts of the slave-system on the attention of Englishmen had a more practical effect than the appeals of divines, the arguments of political theorists, or the humane sentiments of novelists and poets. It was hard facts that inspired in one Englishman such a fierce and preserving hatred of slavery, and its concomitants that he was able presently to achieve the first definite step in the abolition of the whole system." (Rose, et al., 1940, pp. 191-192)

In this paragraph the writer includes an interesting point of information: the elements of slavery in Britain itself. Providing an insight into how the citizens' unawareness and distance in relations to the ongoings of slavery in the empire moves towards an awareness when facing it in greater proximity. The enforcing of slavery laws on British soils only made the awareness and campaign against it stronger. The distance of slavery as initially overseas and not a part of life in Britain, nor Europe, could have hidden the realities of what slavery was. A public not aware makes for less activism, the awareness made through such a situation here made more people aware.

The fact that it continued to exist on British soil overseas was over-shadowed for the moment by the War of the American Revolution; but after 1783 all the circumstances were propitious for a further attack on it...With the coming of peace, more-over, British politics entered on a new phase. Sobered by their humiliating defeat, Englishmen, with the younger Pitt as a new kind of leader, began to set their house in order; and, if retrenchment came first, reform was also in the air—free trade, the conciliation of Ireland, Parliamentary Reform, a new regime for British India. Alongside such liberal causes the abolition of slavery could find a natural place, and alongside the last of them particularly. In the years between the suicide of Clive in 1774 and the impeachment of Warren Hastings in 1788 public opinion on the question of British rule in India was transformed. The idea that the British connection with India could be regarded as a mere matter of commerce, which, except for the requisite minimum of



regulation, lay outside the purview or control of Parliament, was abandoned; and in its place, by the combined influence of Burke's passion, Fox's humanity, and Pitt's sense of justice, a new system of ideas was established—that the commercial connection involved for the stronger of the two parties a moral obligation to ensure, as far as might be, that the weaker party did not suffer from that connection; that this, in turn, involved the exercise of direct control by Parliament over the East India Company's Indian administration; and that all such exercise of political power was, in Burke's words, "in the strictest sense a trust". In other words the modern doctrine of "trusteeship" with regard to weak or backward races had taken its place in British politics. And obviously it could not be limited to India. If the British people had awakened to a new sense of duty towards Asiatics they were bound very soon to feel the same sense of duty towards the weaker, more backward and far more brutally treated Africans. Nor, lastly, must it be forgotten that the Evangelical movement was now at the climax of its power over English minds, strengthening the new humanitarian impulses, demanding the application of Christian principles to all human relations, seeking everywhere for a salutary sense of sin. That sense was awakened, in some degree, by the scandals in Bengal. (Rose, et al., 1940, pp. 193-194)

The American revolution overshadows the issue, but nonetheless the people working for the Humanitarian Movement press on. It is as well interesting how the critical view of the treatment of Indians and other Asian peoples lead toward strengthening of the humanitarian impulse towards Africans as well. The paragraph frames the context well and could indeed be viewed Global Historic in this context. The important point here is the loss of commercial validity in maintaining the slave trade. An awakened public in combination with changes in parliament seems to be important in making a shift towards more humanitarianism. It is also interesting to see the relation between the new policies and humanitarianism towards Indians as a catalyst for an expanding humanitarianism encompassing other groups as well.

It was in a promising atmosphere, then, that the Quakers, once more to the fore, took the first step towards an organised abolition movement. In 1783 they opened their campaign with a petition to Parliament against the Trade; and in the same year the "Meeting for Sufferings"...purpose of considering "what steps they should take for the relief and liberation of the negro slaves in the West Indies and for the discouragement of the slave trade on the coast of Africa"! The efforts of these two bodies resulted in some effective propaganda. &fore long they secured a place in some of the London and provincial newspapers for any articles they chose to supply. (Rose, et al., 1940, pp. 194-195)

This paragraph points to the Quakers active political role in the abolition movement. Especially interested in what steps they took and the aim. The inclusion of the Quaker cause is an interesting choice by the writer, what made Quakers ignite the abolitionist movement? Globalisation is often thought about as something fairly recent, but the eighteenth-century economy was already integrated internationally, and it raised some of the same moral

questions about exploitation, equity, and greed faced today. Although there existed words such as liberty, freedom, and equality in that time, such as in the founding document of the United States, large portions of the world lived in bondage. The Christian faith of antislavery reformers like Woolman, inspired a critical outlook on the growth of an international market economy. Global market relations allowed for an environment in which an expensive sense of responsibility and universal humanitarianism blossomed, but economic self-interest, race prejudice, and indifferences did not want to hear the abolitionist cause until the 1760s and 1770s. By that time the enhanced spirituality and the rhetoric of independence and natural rights, and the recalculation of slavery's profitability, had made the moral logic of emancipation more compelling. Quakers then emerged as the first group in North America to take a collective public stand against slavery, and steadily this movement grew to a movement against slavery throughout the world (Slaughter, 2009, pp. 7-8).

The propaganda in which this little group of philanthropists had so far been engaged had been aimed at the whole slave system—at slavery as well as the slave trade. As time was to prove, the two evils were inseparable; the Trade could not be completely killed as long as slavery survived. But in the course of their discussions the Abolitionists determined to attack the Trade first. It was the easier part of their gigantic task. Public opinion might be convinced that slavery was a necessity in the West Indies and yet be persuaded that it could continue to exist by means of natural reproduction without the importation of more negroes from Africa . . . But the operations of the Trade—the seizure or purchase of free men and women and the brutalities of the "Middle Passage"—were morally indefensible. Nor would concentration against the Trade leave slavery unharmed: the attack on the one stronghold would go far to undermine the other. But even if the objective were thus limited, its attainment remained immensely difficult. The act of abolition could only be an Act of Parliament, and the propaganda might be wasted if it were not brought to bear inside as well as outside Parliament. Its members, so far, had shown no eagerness to right the negroes' wrongs. (Rose, et al., 1940, pp. 195-196)

The relation of two intertwined aspects are shown here: The slave trade and slavery. The intention to abolish both, and interestingly enough the reason for going after the slave trade was the easier route to start, most likely because it was the “milder” option, not tearing the entire institution down straight away. The use of the word “propaganda” is interesting because here it functions as a positive word. Here “propaganda” is the tool intended to abolish the slavery, in which the writer uses the connotation “evil”, which also creates and understanding of the moral standing of the writer. The positive use of the word “propaganda” which often is so negatively viewed today would not necessarily be so at the time of the book's release in 1940.

The writer also provides the context of downsides and redistribution of the economic impacts by an abolishment.

While the progress towards its primary goal of abolition was thus at this time almost imperceptibly slow, the Humanitarian Movement was quietly strengthening its inner forces behind the scenes and finding less obstructed outlets for its energies. It gained greatly in force and cohesion by the concentration of its leadership in one community, which, since its most prominent members lived in the same suburban village, became known as "the Clapham Sect". (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 208)

The writer introduces a new element in the Humanitarian movement called the "the Clapham Sect". There is a theory that for some people in this period of evangelical conversion was a way of dealing with the psychological burden of new wealth, something that could result in unaccustomed leisure time, which led to introspection, guilt at undeserved fortune, and a crisis of identity, which could result in viewing oneself as a sinner, accepting God's forgiveness, and channelling that new fortune and position into doing good. This fits the pattern of Wilberforce's life well. Whatever the explanation the trio of the Clapham sect were determined to use their wealth and influence to change their society. Britain's problems, as they saw it, were the same threefold problems: material, moral, and spiritual. They took this campaign from the personal level to the national turning it to a matter of government (Tomkins, 2012, p. 50). Here commercialism becomes an object of criticism from a religious movement, ironically this came as a result of self-criticism.

It has been said that abolition was unattainable as long as Pitt was alive; but this is only true on the assumption that circumstances would never have forced George III to permit Pitt to form the coalition he desired with Fox and so to create a national Government in which the supporters of the Trade, if any, could have been safely overridden. As it was, Pitt's death provided precisely those compelling circumstances. The King could not evade the Coalition of "All the Talents", with Grenville as its chief and Fox as Foreign Secretary. And a first instalment of abolition, a comprehensive Foreign Slave Trade Bill, applying to annexed as well as foreign colonies, was brought forward as a Government measure and quickly passed through both Houses. It was followed by a resolution for total and immediate abolition. (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 215)

None the less, the vigour and rapidity of the achievements of 1806 were mainly due to Fox; and when he died in the autumn of that year, it was fitting that his last hours should be cheered by the knowledge that the triumph of his favourite cause was certain. On 2 January 1807 the final Abolition Bill was read a first time in the House of Lords. In its ultimate form, the first clause stated that "all means of dealing and trading" in the purchase of slaves in Africa or in their transport to the West Indies or anywhere else was thereby "utterly abolished, prohibited, and declared to be unlawful", and that any British subject acting to the contrary should be fined £100 for every slave so purchased, sold, or transported. Clause II

declared that British ships engaged in the Trade would be forfeited to the Crown. (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 215)

The paragraph here is complex and highlights power relations in the British parliament, as seen before in the India section. The handing of power onto different individuals with different aspirations is an important factor in the shaping of legislation. Dealing with a subject as this calls for the description of the parliamentary process that leads to its abolishment.

The political rivalry between Pitt and Fox becomes relevant in the process, and Fox's struggles in the abolishment are highlighted. Although the writer does not mention much in terms of the main political substance in the rivalry between them, this could perhaps be the struggle of commercialism against humanitarianism.

Thus closed in victory the first period of the Humanitarian Movement. It had made an effective entry into the vast field covered by the relations between the white and coloured peoples of the British Empire. And, if much remained to be done in the coming century, if even on the one issue of the slave trade the pessimism of Windham and Castlereagh was to be fully justified, if the shadow of the Arab slave trade loomed beyond the European, at least the "Saints", by single-minded devotion to one cause through the dark days of war, anti-Jacobinism, unpopularity and personal abuse, had achieved the first and hardest step towards the destruction of an evil seemingly indestructible, had wakened the conscience of the British people and planted a humanitarian tradition in the heart of British politics. (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 216)

This paragraph provides an interesting view of the narrative of this subject. The closing of the first period of the Humanitarian Movement marks the successful first chapter, and the awaiting of the abolishment of slavery itself. The movement is praised as the bettering of relations between white and coloured peoples. One can get a sense of the inevitability of this occurring, as not just the occurrence of complex processes of humanitarianism and legislation, but as almost a natural evolution in the progressive linear development.

The Evangelical revival in the Church of England, which had inspired the philanthropic activities of "the Clapham sect", made rapid progress in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. As late indeed as 1808, the year after the abolition of the slave trade, the Christian Observer estimated that not more than a tenth of the clergy, perhaps only a twentieth, were Evangelicals; but in 1828 Keble regretfully noted "the amazing rate at which Puritanism seems to be getting on all over the kingdom" Being mainly a middle-class movement and closely allied with Dissent, it could not but expand with the new alignment of social forces which foreshadowed the Reform Bill; and its influence can be discerned in the growth of missionary and humanitarian enterprise. (Rose, et al., 1940, p. 308)

The Evangelical revival is especially important here. British antislavery's long and fluctuating history as a reform cause ultimately commanded the support of leading political and religious figures and the assent of a mass of ordinary citizens as petitioners. It channelled the energies of leading figures in local communities whose passage through antislavery constituted a prominent aspect of their more complex engagement in moral and social improvement. It also contributed to the continuous working out of changing relations of power in particular localities in favour of some and to the detriment of other elements in a growing but heterogenous middle class (Turley, 2004, p.1). Given that Turley (2004) wrote much later, a consensus on the aspects of the abolition could exist. Could this be in turn be the fact that much of the decision to remove slavery happened in the British parliament with Anglo activists? Then the next part could be interesting having this in mind.

### *Oxford*

Just as *Cambridge, Oxford* covers the subject of abolition in a specific chapter. Based on the outlook much of the two chapters a structured in a similar way with a linear progress towards abolition. It starts with an introductory paragraph providing context:

Throughout the nineteenth century, territorial conquest, white settlement, commercial growth, economic development, and above all issues of slavery and the slave trade, raised questions about the ethics of economic exchange, the politics of equal rights or racial differences, and the purpose of Imperial power. It was often and widely assumed that Imperial authority had no object other than the narrowly defined organization and defence of Britain's insular interests. Nevertheless, how far those interests required governments' intervention overseas was always debatable, even in wartime. Still more contentious was the idea that British interests might depend on direct action to advance the interests (however defined) of indigenous peoples. There were even those prepared to argue that possession of Empire, wealth, and power brought obligations, irrespective of British interests, wherever opportunities existed to promote the welfare of less fortunate societies. (Porter, 1999, p. 198)

The introductory paragraph begins by introducing concepts of the debate that arose. The thoughts that there was no resistance against all aspects of imperial control were wrong. The last part is important because it contains information about the imperial guardianship sort of speak, the civilizing mission upon the colonies and peoples. One key difference between the

books in the introductory paragraph is that the former uses the term “Englishmen”, while the latter uses the term “British” in referring to the people of the British Isles. An interesting aspect is the difference in the two books between the use of “English/Englishmen” vs “British” in situations regarding the empire or the “motherland” subjects. This is in turn a part of a larger debate on the empire as “English” or “British”, and the place of Scotland, Wales, and Ireland in relation to England. There existed uncertainties on the definitions on the “internal” and “external” empire lack of definition and fluency, with extensive settlement of some parts of the empire extending political, economic, and cultural commonalities for many within Britain, but also underlying the imperial citizenship was differentiated and tiered. British national imperial-imperial identity therefore developed as an extension of the English national group, founded on “Whiggish” narratives which stressed the continuity of freedom, liberty, and often the importance of “English” stock. This afforded some acknowledged commonality with for certain other national groups, such as the Scots, Welsh, and Irish, though the “civilising” qualities of the English were continually stressed. The intensity of the British national-imperial identity was therefore substantially defined by the degree of national, ethnic, and religious commonality acknowledge and the perceived proximity of imperial subjects to the English core (Mycock, Loskoutova, 2010, p. 50).

These passionate public debates spawned powerful pressure groups. From the 1780s until the First World War they significantly influenced the approach of colonial and Imperial authorities to Britain's role in the Caribbean, India, Africa, and the Pacific. Although the immediate results of so much righteous fervour were often disappointing, its indirect and long-term consequences were considerable. By the 1840s, humanitarianism had become a vital component of Britain's national or Imperial identity and, along with missionary work, channelled much female activity into public and Imperial enterprise. In the mid-nineteenth century, the apparent failure of humanitarian expectations reinforced pessimistic views of 'non-European' capacity and racial hierarchies. By the early 1900s, however, humanitarians' continued watchfulness and criticism of Imperial governments contributed to a positive re-evaluation of non-European cultures and a new scepticism about colonial rule. (Porter, 1999, p. 198)

The Humanitarian Movement is introduced and put into the historical period of 1780s until the First World War. The paragraph inserts this into a context and provides both positive movements as well as struggles. In contrast to the former book, the humanitarian movement is mentioned more in the greater context while the former focuses more on specific influences, especially religious humanists, such as the Quakers and George Fox.

“Burke's interpretation of Imperial trusteeship was conservative and defensive. He wished to prevent British subjects who acquired power abroad from abusing it for their own private advantage and to the moral or material detriment of Britain and India. The East India Company's government, 'one of the most corrupt and destructive tyrannies that probably ever existed', and its servants, 'the destroyers of India', should be reined in by Imperial controls so that Indians should again enjoy what he understood as their traditional rights and freedoms. His object was restoration by means of reform, with Britain preventing the recurrence of abuses and correcting the systemic problems of Company government by a parliamentary act 'intended to form the Magna Charta of Hindostan.’ (Porter, 1999, p. 199)

The work of Burke becomes the important here. The use of quotation provides a close touch on the ideas of Burke. He carried anger against the company, and pushed for humanistic ideas on the trusteeship of the British Empire and the preserving of individual rights. It could be effective to highlight the views of a prominent British citizen. In terms of Natural Law, of the eighteenth-century English thinkers, it is Burke who brings the discussion to practical applications. Burke is not necessarily concerned with precision or the truth, rather he measures natural law by its workability as a political idiom. By this standard, Burke found that the vocabulary and syntax of natural law was too impoverished to adequately reflect the reality of moral choices in political society. The current idioms of natural law “are all extremes, and in proportion as they are metaphysically true, they are morally and politically false.” For choices in government are of a different sort: “The rights of men in governments are their advantages; and these are often in balance between differences of good, in compromise between good and evil, and sometimes between evil and evil” (Cover, 1975 p. 24).

“Eighteenth-century enlightened thinking thus influenced Britain's renewed expansion after 1790 in important ways. Debates about Imperial-colonial policy confirmed the ruler's duty of benevolence or obligation to accept responsibility for the well-being of the Empire's subjects. Influential members of Britain's political and administrative elites shared that commitment in varying degrees. It became likely that where those responsibilities were flouted or ignored, public attention would be alerted, and calls heard for wrongs to be righted. Blinkered expediency or neglect as the unprincipled outcome of British expansion stood a greater chance of being checked. Finally, certain activities were acknowledged as inadmissible and illegal within any area where Britain's control or even influence prevailed.” (Porter, 1999, p. 201)

The emphasis on enlightened thinking is important in understanding the role of that concept in the British ethical consciousness. The key to the timing of slavery's demise in the Western economy lies not in its economic functioning but in its social peculiarity. In contrast with

other systems of slavery, the Atlantic Slavery was a highly differentiated intercontinental system (Drescher, 1987, p. 5). This paragraph correlates well with the *Cambridge* book, which as well places the eighteenth-century enlightenment thought at the base of the Humanitarian Movement. It could as well be argued that *Oxford* places less importance on the religious movement than *Cambridge*. *Cambridge* does as well talk about enlightenment values but places them closely to the religious antislavery movement. Perhaps a lesser focus on the religious movement in Oxford comes as a result of the more secularised society in which it is written.

“Notwithstanding India's importance, no issues did more to make principles of Imperial trusteeship explicit, implant them in the public mind, and compel Imperial and colonial governments to act upon them, than those of the slave trade and slavery itself. By the 1780s the intellectual argument against slavery had been won, in that it was no longer generally regarded as defensible on grounds other than material expediency. Its economic efficiency was questioned. It was represented as irreconcilable with secular ideas about the proper end of government and the constitution of legitimate authority; its existence defied notions of government as being in the interest of the governed, promoting subjects' happiness, and resting on their consent. It had also come to be seen as incompatible with a properly Christian existence. Slave-ownership, for example, conflicted with the obligations of charity and evangelization; slave status removed the liberty for moral choice and ethical behaviour. For British evangelicals especially, slavery and sin were regarded as synonymous, equally individual and national evils to be rooted out.” (Porter, 1999, pp. 201-202)

Imperial trusteeship as an ideological factor for change is highlighted. The ideas of slavery as something incompatible with Christian virtues, especially the protests of British evangelists are important here. Trusteeship in itself has been problematised by many. The success of the anti-colonial movement suddenly destroyed the legitimacy of trusteeship, and along with it, the hierarchical organisation of international society that was characteristic of the age of empire. Critics of empire often viewed the concept of trusteeship with great criticism, especially critical to the limitation of self-determination (Bain, 2003, p. 65).

“The results of abolition were far less striking than humanitarians had hoped. Others took up the trade in Britain's place, and British diplomats were felt to have failed when the peace settlements of 1814-15 produced no general abolition treaty. Continuing clandestine participation necessitated introducing stiffer penalties for British slavers in 1811, and capital punishment in 1824. Slave conditions in the Caribbean colonies appeared unaffected, suggesting widespread evasion of the restraints on the trade. New strategies were therefore devised: humanitarians battled to establish effective colonial registers of



slaves. From 1823 they increased demands for direct Imperial intervention, even in colonies with their own Legislative Assemblies, to secure improved conditions for the slaves. Continuing colonial resistance and slave discontent, most graphically illustrated in rebellions like that of 1823 in Demerara, destroyed the remaining patience of Imperial ministers and humanitarians alike. When T. F. Buxton, Wilberforce's successor as leader of the parliamentary movement and the Anti-Slavery Society, seemed insufficiently aggressive, provincial activists such as James Cropper and Joseph Sturge made the running. From 1827, with the assistance from the Anti-Slavery Reporter and increasing numbers of women and children, the petitioning of Parliament greatly increased, and at the urging of the ever-more independent Agency Committee, radical abolitionists busied themselves at parliamentary elections. As the superior efficiency of free labour finally emerged as conventional wisdom, adding a 'capitalist' argument to the humanitarian armoury, so 'immediatism' – emancipation now – took hold. (Porter, 1999, p. 203-204)

This first section of ending the slavery differs from the *Cambridge* one greatly. *Oxford* presents facts in a more rapid fashion including more historical lines of impact. One main difference being that *Cambridge* includes a whole chapter on the abolishment while *Oxford* structures it the latter half of one chapter. An interesting difference here is that one gets a notion that the last paragraph is much more parliamentary in a sense highlighting political processes of the abolition, something more in tune with earlier paragraphs of *Cambridge*. *Cambridge* on the other hand contains almost a romantic final paragraph, a notion of humanism beating the terrible system of slavery.

#### *Comparison and historiographical reflections*

In contrast to the two other chapters, this chapter contain much more similar build. The selection of this area of examination is important because it contrasts the India content by being covered of specific chapters in both the books. The selection of this was then important because of the more equal treatment and to test differences between them. It also contains one key difference, and that is that it takes much more on British processes and legislative changes to end slavery, and therefore the analysis examines the divergence or convergence of the ideas in the process towards abolishment.

In 1940 there was a general consensus on the abolition of slavery in the Empire. Reginald Coupland maintain that the British abolished the slavery because of strong religious feeling and humanitarianism. For Coupland the abolitionists were able to mobilise public opinion in the campaign against slavery, in the end, they convinced Parliament to pay 20 million pounds

in compensation to free the slaves (Wink, 1999, pp. 322-323). This is in tune with the *Cambridge* book wherein much of the narrative reflects on the religious and humanitarian movements. However, the weight on the same concepts is also reflected in *Oxford*. In the analysis several movements working for the abolishment has been detected. *Cambridge* highlight religious, humanitarian, and enlightenment ideals. *Oxford* includes the same three categories. This could mean that the movements are well established as important movements for abolition. Although the books do not differ much in that regard, they do differ in the emphasise on the movements. While *Cambridge* focuses more on the religious aspects of anti-slavery, *Oxford* focus more on the humanitarian movement.

This chapter differs from the content regarding India because of the highlighting of public opinion on slavery in the *Oxford* book. However, this exist more as domestic British opinion which in turn would be more common when writing constitutional history. Public opinions and movements shape legislation, and the chapters take pride in the notion of Britain as the abolisher of slavery.

Products of their time: Cambridge: The extension of Whig traditions – Oxford: postmodernism.

#### Whig and Constitutional history

Historiographical terms familiar and relevant for their respective times. But how can one conclude on these two? Let us examine findings and the characteristics of the two books examined in this thesis. *Cambridge* is a large book divided into many chapters structured chronological, carry many aspects of imperial history. Although the three selected subjects are covered differently in the book, especially India which is written about, but not in assigned chapters, they all contain certain characteristics that aid in identifying historiographical tendencies. But why does the period in which the *Cambridge* book is published have an influence from and older historiographical movement? To make a claim that the historiography of this time had to be influenced to a large degree by the Whig interpretation of history one must go to the term Constitutional History. Although one would initially think that the work could fall under the subject of “modernist imperial history”, the work contains

elements that can be characterised as Constitutional history. Why then Whig history? Whig history itself was outdated after the first world war, but not the extension of it in the form of Constitutional history. Bentley (2005) writes that the syndrome of Constitutional history lasted into the 1960s in most universities, including Cambridge, though the compulsion remained varied and on decline (Bentley 2005, p. 21). The Whig interpretation of history has a direct bearing on Imperial history, in which it forms a respected tradition, early on historical works reflected the belief of progress in the Empire. Historians in the nineteenth century generally held the belief of the British Empire as a civilising force (Winks, 1999, p. 7). Whig history had been largely dominant in the Victorian era, and the bedrock of colonial history. The writing of such an extensive work on the British Empire in early days of modernism has to be influenced by Whig history to some degree. It comes the term Constitutional history which characterise the book well, and a way of writing history reflected through Whig historiography. The third subject considered carries elements of the Whig tradition linked to the progressive bettering of society. This manifest itself most solidly in the many paragraphs heightening the progressive betterment of society through the British parliament. Legislation and politicians move the empire further and further into a more enlightened and humane direction.

Having established the influence of Whig history upon through the concept of “constitutional history” the modernist tradition must be examined. Although the book's style of linear progression, and betterment of society through legislation, something more in tune with Whig history, modernist history has a more critical nature than Whig History. Modernist history then is more inclined to criticise elements of colonial history, something that the heyday of Whig history not necessarily would do, such as *Cambridge* heavy criticism of the East India Company. However, although the book could be put into the modernist period of historical writing, there exist few traces of it. Richard Drayton (2011) explains that The Whig programme was at the centre of British Imperial History well into the 1950s. There existed a remarkably coherent ideology among those who secured posts in imperial subjects in major universities. Historians responded to the ideological attacks of Germans, international socialists, and colonial nationalists by making two main arguments: 1. They asserted that the spread of constitutional freedom was at the core of the British Empire. 2. From the early nineteenth century, British imperial power was identified equally with free labour instead of slavery, free trade instead of inefficient autarky, and good government opposed to anarchy and barbarism (Drayton, 2011, p. 676). Many of these concepts are reflected through the

analysis and show that Whig History has such a long claim on Imperial history that it extends beyond its own lifetime in a way. Then *Cambridge History of the British Empire: The Nineteenth Century* cannot be held as a modernist work, but a product of the Whig interpretations of history's legacy Constitutional history.

Postmodern and post-colonial history.

The inclusion of many aspects and covering of many areas in the Oxford book reflects the growing interest in imperial history. Gascoigne (2006) explains that one of the driving forces for the revival of imperial history is the increasing need to make sense of the world in which the borders of the nation state are increasingly diminished, an ever-expanding globalised world. Empire history offers a route to understand why the world has become a smaller place. Imperial structures, ideologies, and rituals provides insight into the reshaping of the world in which one culture can dominate others. Such a global perspective brings with it the possibility of constructing a less Eurocentric history, as events can be viewed from different angles and as an outcome of different forces not solely European expansionism (Gascoigne, 2006, p. 591). *Oxford* adds to this foundation, and as *Cambridge* was that "large work" before, *Oxford* is the new. Both books large and detailed but in different times, when thinking of the share quantity of colonial history in the post-colonial era. The work could be placed securely into the post-modern era of historiography because of sheer dominance of that concept in history and most human endeavours at its publishing and at the current point in time. There have been no new concepts to challenge the post-modern, mainly because the post-modern functions as an umbrella for a large quantity of subjects. The tradition of *Oxford* then is found in the post-modern through the newer concept post-colonialism. Postcolonialism quite literally meaning "after colonialism", the time in which *Oxford* finds itself in, and which contrasts *Cambridge* which finds itself still in colonial times. Post-colonial studies stand in many ways in the extension of the postmodern focus of discourse, power, and knowledge (Melve, 2010, p. 111).

The modern historical bias could easily favour the newer of the two, given the familiar historiographical tradition, the inclusion of what the historian has learned and deems necessary, but could the post-modern tradition be a problematic appliance in writing such a work? There will always in the post-modern be a call for more subjects, more history covering topics not covered before, microhistory, macrohistory, global history, local history. Something that could easily make even recent publications outdated and debatable. Perhaps

*Cambridge* released in a time before the “deconstructualist” nature in postmodernism maintain a safer outset and longer unchallenged claim. Critics of postcolonial theory have criticised it for too much dependence on post-structuralist or post-modern perspectives. The claim that the insistence on multiple histories and fragmentation withing these perspectives has harmed in thinking of the global operations of capitalism of today (Loomba, 2015, p. 13).

The influences of subaltern studies and other histories.

The influence of subaltern history has at times been examined before. The books are primarily written by Western historians for a Western institution, but nonetheless the work is bound to have influences from subaltern history. Criticism against Eurocentrism and the large historiography of subaltern history was already well established at the time of the release in 1999. A large quantity of work was produced during the latter half of the twentieth century, and new research in oriental studies enhanced historical understanding as never before (Winks, 1999, p. 207). The preface did indeed say that it would include imperial history in other histories, and indeed *Oxfords* covers of many domestic aspects, and how colonial policy had impacts on Indian society comes as results of the changing way of writing history in post-modern time, influenced by former colonised subjects themselves. Representation of many aspects of imperial history and its place in other histories is something *Oxford* strives for, and which shines through particularly in the chapters on India, where many aspects of Indian society are examined.

Global history is newer concept and could be put as an influence on Oxford, because the books covers many sides an area of the globe touched by imperialism. Although a more recent concept, one could argue that Cambridge is a global history in the sense of covering many areas of the globe, just as Oxford. However, such a cover, are more in tune with the representation of empire from the British perspective. Although Cambridge include areas one could consider global it is hard to categorise it as global history, it would more in tune with the concept world history. The works then could also contain elements of the old and new way of dealing with the world: World History and Global History. Competing term, the first one putting Europe as the central driving force of world history, while the second criticise the first, as well as trying to change the terrain of viewing the world (Conrad, 2016, p. 4).

## Summary and Conclusion

This thesis explored two empirical objects. Three subjects have been examined through analysis and comparative analysis to discover similarities and differences between two books covering the same area but distanced by publishing date. The purpose of the thesis was to examine differences in the works and the changing of objectivity, through the historiographical influences, through the research question:

*Which stories are told about British colonial enterprise in these two books, and how does the historical selection vary based on different historiographical traditions and historical writings changing relationship towards objectivity and content?*

The examination of the three subjects was selected based on possible subject that may contain great variety in the books. As to what was found, the two first subjects contain many differences that reflects the varied historiographical traditions, and although the third also contain differences, were surprisingly similar in the two books.

The first subject: the description of Imperialism and Colonialism was examined by viewing parts of the preface and introduction. Both books had a different initial tone to the Empire. *Cambridge* written during the still existing empire, and *Oxford* after the empire. The fundamental difference was the presentation of the empire: *Cambridge* had a progressive outline of the betterment of the empire through the period covered by the book. *Oxford* had a more historiographical outline of the realities of and extent of the empire, as well as positive and negative sides to it. Both works already reflected some historiographical trends of their respective periods, such as the progressive narrative of the Imperial History associated with constitutional history, and the postmodern representation of histories.

The first subject on India was the economic description. Both contained a significant material but, varied greatly. India is not treated in specific chapters in *Cambridge* and the time material collected comes from more sporadic places in the book. The major distinction lies in the treatment of economy: *Cambridge* is more focused on the general economic happenings of the Empire as a whole, and India is a piece in this enterprise of colonial economy. *Oxford* is more focused on economic policies in India itself, and how these directly influenced India.

The second subject on India was the military description. Although the cover of this subject was harder to find in *Cambridge*, but the analysis showed interesting differences in the treatment of military aspects: *Cambridge* has similarly to the previous section a more overall

imperial picture, by that India is inserted into the more “global” happenings of the empire, and the strategic important place of India as a vital piece in the Empire. *Oxford* covers military aspects in much more critical way, as the previous section the impact of military policy is reflected through the impact on Indian society, this is especially reflected on the focus of the harsh military rule of the Company and the term “despotic control”. Despotic control to build upon existing structures in the Indian society to gain legitimacy and control.

The third subject covering political matters contained much information in both books. One of the key similarities in both books was the consensus of misrule by the East India Company. Framed differently, *Cambridge* showed criticism towards the company by viewing it as a force of misrule, in contrast the British parliament as a force for good, and increased influence over the India was a betterment of rule. *Oxford* framed it in terms of by highlighting how the Company played on the ideological method of orientalism in order to gain despotic power, just as the previous chapter. *Oxford* tries to highlight this by showing existing power structures played upon in India, as well as the effects of colonial rule in India.

The last subject on the abolition of the slave trade carried the most similarities in the two books. Both stories feature much of the same historical process. The overlying story told: the struggle between commercialism and humanitarianism. This struggle unfolds in much of the same way, through the legislative process and parliaments role in eradicating it. The movements of humanitarianism are the point where some differences was found. *Cambridge* highlighting the humanitarianism through the religious movements, while *Oxford* also containing this, is more focused on the enlightenment ideals.

Returning to the research question and concluding on which stories are told about the imperial enterprise. The answer becomes manifold. As seen through the analysis chapters aspects and tendencies of historiographical traditions emerge. Some are exclusive to one, some appear in both, and some appear in both, but through a newer concept of a newer tradition. The analysis confirms that there exist differences in the works, and although the same carry different stories and outlooks on empire. The differences come down to two different outlooks on empire as a concept: an “old” imperial history, and a “new” imperial history.

*Cambridge* tells the stories of the progressive history of Britain and its Empire, the nineteenth century stand as progressive bettering of the empire through free trade, humanitarianism, and parliament taking control of its empire as a humanitarian benefactor.

*Oxford* tells the stories of the complex empire, the many sides of empire through representation. Imperial enterprise effecting colonial happening, colonial happenings effecting imperial enterprise. Empire as an object of critique, through the cover of the many sides and concepts, ideology, orientalism, humanitarianism, local histories, and global histories.

Imperial history a complex and debated subject of historiography, and although the many years between the books, the two histories: The “old” and “new” Imperial History, are in essence the struggle of representation. The view of the Empire from the Eurocentric or the view of the Empire from many stories, both European and non-Western. Objectivity then stands atop as an unreachable goal, because of society and historiography’s ever-changing views and traditions.

#### Future perspectives

What is the future of imperial history? What historiographical tradition could exist in the year 2058? The old Whig hold on imperial history was breached by the postmodern child of postcolonialism, both containing strengths and weaknesses. What could be the breaching of the postcolonial? Perhaps the postconstruction nature of history continues carrying a myriad of microhistories of every aspect, or perhaps a turn to a largescale globalised history containing long lines and complexities. Only time will tell.



## Literature

### **Empirical objects:**

John Holland Rose, Benians, E. A., & Arthur Percival Newton. (1940). *Cambridge history of the British Empire*. C.U.P.

Porter, A. N. (1999). *The nineteenth century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### **Sources:**

Aldred, J. (2004). *British Imperial and Foreign Policy, 1846-1980* (Vol. 192004). Heinemann.

Armitage, D., & David, A. (2000). *The ideological origins of the British Empire* (Vol. 59). Cambridge University Press.

Bain, W. (2003). The political theory of trusteeship and the twilight of international equality. *International Relations*, 17(1), 59-77.

Ballantyne, T. (2010). The changing shape of the modern British Empire and its historiography. *Historical Journal*, 429-452.

Beiser, F. C. (2011). *The German historicist tradition*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Bentley, M. (2005). *Modernizing England's past: English historiography in the age of modernism, 1870-1970*. Cambridge University Press.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2), 27.

Brundage, A., & Cosgrove, R. A. (2007). *The great tradition: constitutional history and national identity in Britain and the United States, 1870-1960*. Stanford University Press.

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). Subaltern studies and postcolonial historiography. *Nepantla: views from South*, 1(1), 9-32.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography: a School of American Research advanced seminar*. Univ of California Press.

Conrad, S. (2016). *What is global history?* Princeton University Press.

Cover, R. M. (1975). *Justice accused: Antislavery and the judicial process*. Yale University Press.

Curtin, P. D. (1959). The British Empire and Commonwealth in Recent Historiography. *The American Historical Review*, 65(1), 72-91.

Darwin, J. (2009). *The empire project: The rise and fall of the British world-system, 1830-1970*. Cambridge University Press.

Drayton, R. (2011). Where does the world historian write from? Objectivity, moral conscience and the past and present of Imperialism. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 46(3), 671-685.

Drescher, S., & Bolt, C. (1987). *Capitalism and antislavery: British mobilization in comparative perspective*. Oxford University Press on Demand.

Fremont-Barnes, G. (2014). *The Indian Mutiny 1857-58*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Gascoigne, J. (2006). The expanding historiography of British imperialism. *Historical Journal*, 577-592.

Hunt, L. (2014). *Writing history in the global era*. WW Norton & Company.

Kjeldstadli, K. (1999). Fortida er ikke hva den en gang var: En innføring i historiefaget. *Universitetsforlaget AS*.

Kumar, K. (2009). *From post-industrial to post-modern society: New theories of the contemporary world*. John Wiley & Sons.

- Laidlaw, Z. (2012). Breaking Britannia's Bounds? Law, Settlers, and Space in Britain's Imperial Historiography. *The Historical Journal*, 55(3), 807-830.
- Lloyd, T.O. (1984). *The British Empire, 1558-1983*. Oxford University Press.
- Loomba, A. (2015). *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. Routledge.
- Macintyre, S., Maiguashca, J., & Pok, A. (2015). *The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Volume 4: 1800-1945 (Reprint ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Mandler, P. (2006). *The English national character: the history of an idea from Edmund Burke to Tony Blair*. Yale University Press.
- Melve, L. (2010). *Historie: Historieskriving frå antikken til i dag*. Dreyer.
- Mir, F. (2006). Imperial policy, provincial practices: Colonial language policy in nineteenth-century India. *The Indian Economic & Social History Review*, 43(4), 395-427.
- Mycok, A., & Loskoutova, M. (2010). Nation, State and Empire: The Historiography of 'High Imperialism' in the British and Russian Empires. In *Nationalizing the Past* (pp. 233-258). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Novick, P. (1988). *That noble dream: The 'objectivity question' and the American historical profession* (Vol. 13). Cambridge University Press.
- Onley, J. (2009). The Raj reconsidered: British India's informal empire and spheres of influence in Asia and Africa. *Asian Affairs*, 40(1), 44-62.
- Osterhammel, J & Frisch, S.L. (2010). *Colonialism a theoretical overview*. Princeton, Nj Markus Wiener Publishers.
- Owram, D., Friesen, G., & Berger, C. (2011). *Thinkers and Dreamers: Historical Essays in Honour of Carl Berger*. University of Toronto Press.
- Parker, C. (1990). *The English historical tradition since 1850*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd.

Prakash, G. (1990). Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 32(2), 383-408.

Quirk, J. (2011). *The anti-slavery project: From the slave trade to human trafficking*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sarkar, S. (1999). Post-modernism and the Writing of History. *Studies in History*, 15(2), 293-322.

Slaughter, T. P. (2009). *The beautiful soul of John Woolman, apostle of abolition*. Hill and Wang.

Tomkins, S. (2012). *The Clapham Sect: How Wilberforce's Circle Transformed Britain*. Lion Books.

Turley, D. (2004). *The Culture of English Antislavery, 1780-1860*. Routledge.

Tyler, S. (1986). Post-modern ethnography. *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*, 122-40.

White, H. (2014). *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth-century Europe*. JHU Press.

Wolfreys, J. (Ed.). (2017). *New critical thinking: criticism to come*. Edinburgh University Press.

Wiener, M. J. (2013). The idea of “colonial legacy” and the historiography of empire. *Journal of the Historical Society*, 13(1), 1-32.

Winks, R. W., & Louis, W. R. (1999). *The Oxford history of the British Empire: Volume V: Historiography*. Oxford University Press.

Yang, A. A. (1989). *The limited Raj: Agrarian relations in colonial India, Saran district, 1793-1920*. Univ of California Press.

Zafirovski, M. (2010). *The enlightenment and its effects on modern society*. Springer Science & Business Media.





