

The White Man's Burden in India and Britain in the 19th century

By

Dr. Gopal Arora

Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Science, Sanskriti University, Mathura, Uttar Pradesh, India drgopalarora.chem@sanskriti.edu.in

Aman Bansal

Pro Chancellor, Department of Management, Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India Prochancellor@dbuu.ac.in

Usha Kiran Barla

Assistant Professor, School of Humanities, Arka Jain University, Jamshedpur, Jharkhand, India usha.kiran@arkajainuniversity.ac.in

Dr. Ashok Yadav,

Assistant Professor, Centre for Language and Communication, SGT University, Gurugram, Haryana, India ashok_clc@sgtuniversity.org

Abstract

This paper suggests at the history of Western countries' colonies, particularly India and how it was written and changed. In historical texts written by colonial forces, the word "colonial" does not appear. Furthermore, most works by colonial historians depict actual occurrences. Readers are also ignorant of the crucial event of 1858 when by parliamentary enactment Britain created an all-powerful secretary of state, governing India in the name of Queen and was independent of the British Parliament which controlled India. The statute refers to the whole Indian administration as an internal administration. The new dispensation under the secretary of state, based in London, also decided on most matters pertaining to India. Based upon analysis done in this paper, in the future studies historians and scholars will begin to think more on the period between August 2, 1858 when this Act came into force and August 15, 1947, when the country became independent.

Keywords: Book, Britain, Economic History, Foreign, India, London.

Introduction

Some of us thought that sophisticated usage indicated that the West was deleting "colonialism" from history for over a decade. It's possible that our children may never understand what this means to us. According to a historian acquaintance, the West would reach an accord if it did not defend the colonial past's actions. There are three evidence from 1800 to 2004, the first is a book unique to the American economist Charles Kindleberger. There is no way of knowing for sure. The World Economy Position 1500 to 1990, published in 1996 in the United States of America (USA). This work was approved by the European Institute of International Studies in Luxembourg. When discussing Kindleberger's work on a specific nation, we aim to avoid using the word colonialism as much as possible in this text. Was that one of the directions he'd received? Second, from the late 1980s, a new series of papers titled "The History of New Cambridge in India". Gordon Johnson, a famous researcher and editor, mentioned the early modern history of Cambridge, which was published in the early 1980s, in

his preface 1900. Many selected studies have been done since then, challenging the validity of his arbitrary classification and ways of splitting Indian history chronologically. As a result of the popularity of this series, the Cambridge History series has expanded to include a wide range of topics ([Cooper, 1996](#)).

The new series under the title “The Cambridge History of India” in which Volume 6 which is upon Indian Empire is organised into overlapping works in chronological sequence, each having eight short volumes on a certain theme. The new series, according to Johnson, clearly draws on an established academic tradition which is frequently delicate, humiliating, and hence disposable. The new series doesn't have any ugly old baggage, historical truths that are undervalued, or fake ignorance. Our third example is a new publication from India, an article by economist and economic historian Tirthankar Roy titled "Economic History: Dangerous Disciplines". He wrote on the last time of British rule, especially in the later decades of the nineteenth century (many of which have now vanished), the harshness of such government for the country's influence, and the economic history at play ([Roy, 2004](#)). Let's start with the Kindleberger book. The New Palgrave Economic Dictionary from 1500 to 1990 lists Charles Kindleberger who lived as an internationally known economist and historian. The institute's head, Armand de Brignac, utilised an interdisciplinary and international perspective to examine the country's growth and collapse and proposed a project of "national vitality". His book will be a key component of this endeavour. After the production of his work, eight significant conferences on particular themes occurred in different nations and areas and produced books, including the Harvard conference with 40 prominent economic historians. Kindleberger's work may be seen in cities all over the world, including Italy, Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, the United States, and Japan. After that, there are the conclusions and a 30-page bibliography ([Kindleberger, 1996](#)).

In the foreword, Cress states that the book is being published at a time when many people are concerned about the future of global economic leadership. The United States has emerged as the world's sole superpower, and it is progressively imposing its political standards. Japan is still a key competitor, but it does not appear probable that it will become a worldwide economic power. Germany's economy continues to expand, but it is nonetheless fragile and constrained worldwide. In international politics, the European Economic Union is unlikely to play a significant influence. We also have no way of knowing where China will be politically or economically in 15 or 20 years. Many terms, such as economic advantage, cannot be precisely defined, according to the Kindleberger introduction, but most people understand what they imply. This concept makes logic, and in the past, economic advantages have been reaped over time, possibly several times over. The author's substantial opinions are presented in the conclusion section. While some political analysts predict it will split the globe along development lines rather than geographical lines, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) itself "appears to be vanishing and disappearing from sight for the developed world. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) almost is not the primary decision maker anymore. The finance minister, the central bank, and the staff formulate the decisions that the president must sign ([Kindleberger & Greif, 1997](#)).

According to Kindleberger, without the less developed countries, anyone from the former Soviet bloc and China, the representativeness of the G-7 is questionable. In a paragraph labelled "Next", he stated that the United States' fall and the difficulties of correcting it would stifle Germany's and Japan's economic progress, which is hesitant to confront the global economy. What's the next logical step? "I discovered I'm not a pessimist," Kindleberger adds,

"but I'm perplexed". He believed that the country will eventually recover its position as the world's most powerful economy. When asked if his power was "one of the major ones discussed or a dark horse?" His response was "What are the chances? I'm not one of them". Is it true that the enormous amount of time and money spent on lectures, lectures, and seminars attended by some of the world's most gifted men and women contributes very little to the brightest and most in-depth in the know? Unfortunately, we think that the author's work includes the exclusion of the entire colony from the book in the United Kingdom, France, Spain, and Portugal. Why don't we get another point? Is this book well-known among our political thinkers and leaders? Western countries have expended a great deal of effort to figure out how to get an economic edge ([Roy, 2004](#); [Taylor & Francis Online, 1997](#)).

Literature Survey

Christopher Bayly presented in this volume which brings together some of the most important issues that have evolved from the recent emergence of the subject of India's colonial transition, demonstrating the involvement of Indians in early colonial politics and economy. It examines a new viewpoint on the "fall of the Mughal Empire" and the role of Indian capitalists in growing the East India Company's commerce and urban population. It not only examines why the indigenous peoples were unable to fight Britain, but it also shows the company's inability to turn India into a peaceful and lucrative colony. Finally, the author analyses the early nineteenth-century changes in India's ecology, social structure, and idealism, as well as the character of India's resistance to colonialism, especially the 1857 revolt ([Fisher, 1989](#)).

J. Lally presented in the article that before World War II, Britain ruled the Indian subcontinent for over a century and a half. A century and a half before, the British East India Company dominated the land outposts of South Asia. Conquerors and rulers have viewed themselves as heroes and improvisers over the past 300 years. The image of British authority and virtue has been sold off by the British people. However, British rule in India has bred anxiety, frailty, and restlessness as a result of its allure and splendour. Those who wanted to avoid humiliation and danger, gain limited experience, and earn enough money to live comfortably in Britain built the British Indian Empire. The systems they built, from the courthouse to the railways, were all designed to protect British power while remaining disconnected from the people they ruled. As a result, the tumultuous regime failed to provide direction to Indian society, oscillating between paralysis and extreme violence at times. The system eventually fell apart due to a lack of affection among the leaders. Large, however, continued to believe in the efficacy of centralised and authoritarian power even after his death. In response to the unique nature of British power, Indians took matters into their own hands, forming organisations and movements to establish their own order and prosperity. Conquered India challenged conventional wisdom about how to build a nation equal to an empire, demonstrating that many of the institutions that shaped India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh in the twentieth century were created in response to British power. The result is a gripping tale that is essential reading for anyone interested in the empire's history and the origins of modern South Asian society ([Lally, 2018](#)).

M. A. Women presented in the article that as a sport aimed at increasing the armed forces of the "dominant" race, fighting with pigs was crucial to the British survival in India. When various local and major anxieties threaten the empire, soldiers are said to be made younger by hunting with treacherous Indian pigs. The goal of the male glasses is to symbolically dominate the recalcitrant Indian masses. The sport has also helped vulnerable

soldiers improve their mobility by allowing them to compete with British and Indian aristocrats in hunting. Hunting critics have examined masculinity and symbolic rule numerous times, but the movement's contribution to natural history has been limited. The native pig-trapping intricacy has allowed a superior knowledge of the Indian boar, a cunning and unpredictable customer who is prone to attacking those who follow him. The stick has a mixture of land and people, as well as hybrid knowledge, which is modelled on the contact point between indigenous and colonial experiences. Furthermore, author puts the great game beyond anti-colonialism in a larger examination of the quest of celebrity, agreeing with postcolonial critique of sport and imperialism. It is recommended that a connection be made between high-end brands and human civilization (Oommen, 2021).

The New Cambridge History of India Series

He described how the series got started, as well as Johnson's guarantee that the initiative is based on "existing academic tradition". Let's have a look at three different novels the establishment of the British Empire and the first CA Bailey Indian business. "In a way, the Western concept of history striving to overrun India is somewhat dubious," Bailey writes in the prologue. In particular, the East Indies Company's acquisition of the Bengal chronicle in 1765 kicked off a crucial time, and in 1772 as a collector and his European official "Opportunity for the Company and its Employees." It had begun. We were able to maximise the value of the rights and privileges market". Later, he claimed that the firm had imported relatively little gold into Bengal since 1757, resulting in a serious credit constraint. There are so many details, for example, that readers are left wondering why, when, and how much money London transferred to Bengal at the time. Second, there is the issue of individual traders and corporate leaders investing the majority of their earnings in insider trading. Questions emerge about how this revenue is created, whether it is legal, who benefits the most from it, what public investments are made, and so on. Everything requires a response. Bayly Marshall did not fully convey the fact that remittances paid to the London East India Company (EIC) have been a common example of withdrawal as a formal investment in land revenue for decades (Logan, 2012).

Bailey criticised the military after the revolt and stated that the soldiers had "avoided the wicked Hindi speaking people". The mainly Hindi Bengal army, which was among the first to rise up in favour of the revolt, was dubbed "boring". Aren't most of the inhabitants from Indian villages? Today, "India Taxes", which is well respected by the new Indian office and the British Treasury, continues to foot the bill for that costly rebuilt unit "fair, courteous, and a means of expressing concerns about other things", says the new Indian office. Bailey was frequently employed by Indian families to help the British Empire at the expense of India, whether for combat or to suppress turmoil beyond Indian boundaries. He was well aware that the army devoured a third of India's little yearly income during these years, with the most of it being transported to London in pounds, according to real military expenses. If that's the case, I believe India House is totally reliant on Indian money. Third, Bailey briefly highlights European investors' substantial capital investments in Indian railways. Did you know that the phrase was invented by Dalhousie and James Wilson in London in the 1850s with the help of Indian taxpayers? He could be on the lookout for it. The Migration of the British Capital to 1875, by Leland Jenks, is a well-known book (The Migration of the British Capital to 1875, Nelson London, 1971) (Lambert, 1997).

These calamities have had a long-term impact on India's budget. Finally, Bailey claims that after the revolt, London dissolved the EIC. Under the Indian Governance Act, India is now controlled "from London" (though not always) by India's Minister of Foreign Affairs, who is backed by a 15-member council (1858). Bailey was certain that this was British law, not Indian law, and that the Mandarin of Whitehall had established an office to govern India with iron claws. Because the statute was passed by the British Parliament, few educated Indians are aware of it, even now. Later on, we'll go through some key terminology. Now we'll look at the Marshall novels in the series. Bengal the British Bridgehead: East India, 1740-1828 was written by PJ Marshall, who admitted in his introduction that he had a "severe gap" in his understanding of India. He was a strong person, unlike Bailey, and Clive was an easy win since the majority of the Nawab's force, led by Mir Jafar and Lai Darlab, was gone while Clive planned. Marshall says that since 1765, (a) the collecting of corporate rents has dominated the movement of British money from investments to London (under Diwani). (b) The wealth amassed in Bengal subsidised most of the trade between Europe and Britain, as a result, he declared, East India Company has drained Bengal ([Kindleberger, 1996](#)).

Marshall needed an emissions definition to compare emissions to local rent estimates in order to assess its efficacy. Isn't draining a one-sided process? Lord Clive and a corporate servant kept a huge secret by selling commodities or jewels through the Netherlands, Denmark, or France, as well as any products delivered to the London EIC as investments for such portion of Bengal's private interest does not get foreign cash or goods of comparable value. Unfortunately, K N Chaudhuri's concept of a sewage line and computation perplexed Marshall. Since 1765, Marshall's drainage ditches have been neglected. He mentions NK Shinha's 1970 work as an example. In his book Economic History of Bengal from Plussy to Permanent Solutions, Volume 2, Chapter 2, Shinha presents a famous and well-researched study (Calcutta, 1965). Scholars wish Marshall had done more study and supplied a specific investment dataset from the Indian Office Library's vast resources. His plan to compensate the first manufacturer of the commodities to be sent from Bengal for unloading was doomed to fail. This money is derived through Bengali land income. It was not acquired until 1757, similar to the one obtained by the London EIC ([Kindleberger, 1996](#)).

It's possible that the time owing to the perplexed Marshall of 1740 is correct, but is it 1828? He is responsible for Dalhousie's tremendous tyranny and its terrible impact on India, including the joblessness of many Indians in various occupations and the imposition of additional taxes in the combined nation to compensate the corporations stationed there. Unless it was covered, I stayed away from it. Demoralization and resentment of society are widespread. Marshall's career came to an end in 1828, but Tom Linson's began in 1860. Johnson made sure that the works were thematically and chronologically connected. Tom Linson was mentioned in this work's text "Economic Growth, Change, and Stagnation". What causes this shift? Is the 1860–1970 transition to the contemporary Indian economy justified, given that isolated states should be avoided in this series? Tom Linson went through a difficult time that concluded in 1947 with a partition. This might explain some of its flaws: you have no idea what to include or exclude. 1860 has no special significance as 1858 would have. References to the revolt, its origins, its rapid development and elimination, and, equally essential, the exceptional legislation for India's highest government, should be totally avoided. The British Parliament approved the Indian Act in 1858 ([Fisher, 1989](#)).

The real per capita income of Indians remained almost unchanged between 1900 and 1947, yet Tomlinson mentioned evasion from India in his "Introduction" and accepted KN

Chauduri's incorrect definition. Tomlinson's book came out in 1993, a year after Marshall's. This misunderstanding will be averted if he sees the latter. Tom Linson's inability to find Cauduri's fault seems odd. He probably spent more time gazing at the Indian landscape than he did looking for what he was looking for. As a result, Tom Linson did not engage in the India-specific integrated financial and exchange system. The Indian office is in charge of the Indian foreign exchange reserves in London. In return for rupees, London sold a parliamentary note obtained from a large foreign exchange bank and delivered to the Indian Treasury. Until 1935, the government had not permitted any Indian banks to convert foreign money. This system was not acknowledged at the time, but Keynes examined it in 1913 with the help of the Department of Indian Affairs. Most individuals treat it as if it were a genuine account, complete with half-hearted errors and approvals. The Indian office has done little to assist Indian banks in their expansion. Great Britain controlled most of commerce and industry, as well as the banks that exchanged foreign currencies (Alessio, 2017).

Sir Carzon, the Governor General at the time, was clearly irritated by the bank's secret borrowing from the President's bank in 1890. Agriculture, which employs the bulk of the people, is generally overlooked, as is the pressing need for short-term financing for seasonal operations. As a result, farmers were forced to rely on users, with the following results: Marshall encouraged the government to take the required remedies on this issue, citing information provided before the Fowler Commission on Indian Currency in 1899, claiming that only private persons could do so. However, despite the passage of time, no action has been taken. To pay off their pawnshop debt, most farmers continue to sell their crops at cheap rates right away, even before harvest. Critics may claim that the state's exclusion is intended to assist purchasers, especially European exporters, in supplying low-cost grains and fibres like jute and raw cotton to its consumers. Between 1893 and 1925, Tomlinson required his work because London designated three and two powerful Indian monetary and financial commissions that were tightly linked in India. He doesn't say anything about campaigning for ambiguity. Nonetheless, decades later, the situation has not improved (Daunton, 1999).

Observations on the three books: Johnson's claims of long-standing academic traditions are found to be true by readers. The incidents were embarrassing and even hidden on purpose. People only get a few reminders for highlighted events and times, even if they are erased from the history. For greater coverage, Tom Linson, number 110 on the cover, requires an explanation from the editor. I'm not sure how the publishers were able to allow such a large gap between 1828 and 1860. Aren't these books, according to the editor, out of date? Is this series, once again, regarded reliable for undergraduate study? I'd want to ask you a question. We don't believe they do so by assisting them in the abolition of colonialism or, as they call it, British domination, but if they do, more volumes in the series than we see may harm British historians' reputations. One of this machine's best characteristics should be noted. Each chapter in the book contains a lengthy bibliographic essay (Heller, 2018).

Economic History: An Endangered Discipline

The bulk of the population is nearly totally reliant on the primary requirement for short-term loans to finance seasonal activities. As a result, the farmer was forced to go out and lend money, and the outcomes were frequently repeated. Marshall offered to highlight the necessity for the government to take the required steps to do so, citing prior evidence from the Fowler Commission on the Indian rupee in 1899. But, despite the passage of time, no action has been taken. Even before the harvest, most farmers continue to sell their crops fast and inexpensively

to repay their loans. Critics may claim that the state's exclusion is intended to assist purchasers, such as exporters to Europe, in obtaining low-cost grains and fibres like jute and raw cotton. Between 1893 and 1925, London appointed three and two high-powered commissions on Indian currency and finance, all of which were intimately connected in India. He made no note of the media's insecurity. Nonetheless, decades later, the situation has not improved. Observations on the three books: Johnson's guarantees of long-standing academic traditions have only been broken, according to readers. The incidents were embarrassing and even hidden on purpose. Even when separated from history, revolutionary epochs and occurrences receive little attention.

The editor had to notify Tom Linson, who has been making covers for 110 years, in order for a better cover. We're baffled as to how the publishers managed to leave a 32-year gap between 1828 and 1860. The chronology of these publications, according to the general editor, should be reproduced. Is this series, once again, deemed reliable for undergraduate research? I'd want to ask you a question. I'm not sure I agree with trying to eradicate colonialism, or, as we say, British control, but if many of the books in the series are similar to what we've seen, British historians' reputations may suffer. Each book in the series includes a comprehensive bibliographic essay for each chapter, which is a fantastic feature. The Pune researchers produced this essay in July 2004 titled *Economic History: Endangered Discipline*. It chastised everyone who wrote in the latter decades of the 1800s (many of whom are no longer living). He emphasised the significant disadvantages of foreign influence over the country "India, in order to endanger economic history as a discipline. He placed them all in an "Old School" basket and spoke to them in a soothing tone. Let's have a look at its theory and its viability. Four international economists responded to EPW shortly after, endorsing Roy and his "path forward".

Pomeranz is one of them. The notes he wrote in the opening paragraph of his essay appear to detract substantially from his endorsement (EPW, December 2004). Roy does not particularly identify the scholars who make up the old school in his essay. Author was referring to other authors who published before 1947. He was pointing out other governments' flaws, such as their rejection of any measures to promote business and their imposition of free trade. Since 1947, the powers that be have filled in the gaps in what Roy considered to be upstream policy. And, according to Roy, leaders have been influenced by what the old school wrote decades ago since 1947. These policies continued to harm the country until 1991, when they were repealed. In the last 40 years, who has dared to oppose these policies? Roy, on the other hand, claims that no one is against these measures (should we blame the old schools?). And when liberalism arrived, economic history remained intact, resulting in the discipline's "stake." Roy's argument has a few problems that we have pointed out (he did not go into detail). Roy's facts soon showed a more significant problem. He retracted his writings, freeing future generations of researchers from the false accusations he had made. Roy is most likely unaware of how Britain promotes free trade in India.

Sir John Straychi's budget speech explains this in great detail (*Financial Statements, 1874-1880 Government of India*). According to Strachey, India has a lot of resources but not enough money. As a result, India has a range of clever and powerful management services, foreign military capital, and all of the expenditures of the Indian office (Sir John could believe it was a bad idea to put in), while others must import a variety of goods. Is she required to pay on a yearly basis? 20 million people. This necessitates deploying its resources in the world's major economies and, above all, removing any potential barriers to free trade. As a result, India

enjoys free trade since it needs to cover its living expenditures. On the opening page, Roy makes the crucial assertion that "economic history's fall" has been "driven in part by economic history's instability." The words used have been chosen with care. They make it apparent that (a) Roy is aware of other significant elements that have led to India's economic history being jeopardised. (b) At his discretion, he assigns them approximate weights and (c) finally reaches his conclusion: the words of the preceding quotation, plus the weights of additional variables that he feels have contributed to India's economic woes for the reader. Although not revealed will emerge more, maybe more than what was obvious and easy the previous method.

Discussion

It might end here, but I'm curious to see what the remainder of his post has to offer. Let's start with the concerns that Pomeranz has raised. "We could toss the baby out with the bath water," he says, implying that "we may assess what it is worth in the ancient and old literature." The gloomy condition of economic history Roy witnessed was "not only in Indian colleges; you can't just lay on the doorstep," according to the Research Directorate. It is accessible in both Europe and the United States. It is obvious that colonialism did not end in the late 1800s. It must begin in 1757 to play a significant part in Southeast Asia's economic history, with statistics considerably better in the late 1800s. Pomeranz is to be thanked. What was Roy's response? Returning to Roy. On page 3238, he expresses his dissatisfaction with the fact that "in the past," unique monographs on Indian economic history were rarely published in international journals, and promising theses were uncommon. It acknowledges the predicament of many colleges, as well as the move from the humanities to a field with greater job prospects. He can use the fact that he is whining to his advantage. We next illustrate how two Nobel Laureates in economic history, Douglass North and Robert Fogel, have revitalised economic history in other countries (McCabe, 2019).

The Nobel Prize is given to exceptional scholars who have had a long and fruitful scientific career. For a summary of these scholars' careers, see Roy's *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1994), which includes extracts from a citation from the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences when the prize was granted. We get at Roy's attempt to disprove the old-fashioned "major stylized fact" of colonial India's low growth rate for middle-income workers. It was in a section headed "History of Power," and the opening sentence featured irritating phrases that didn't seem fit for scholarly treatises. Roy begins by noting that near the end of the nineteenth century, India's economic growth was equal to or greater than the global average (double negative). In 1914, India's agricultural revenue averaged slightly over 1% each year, according to the "best" data available between 1865 and 5 years. Why is it that the "best" is present rather than the "average"? What does a little "more" cost? What is the source of this information? Is the exchange rate accurate or up to date? Converting this rate to a per capita figure would be disturbing. Because it's frequently close to zero or a negative number, author hopes for incorrect. The third point is: what is the extremely unreliable 50-year average, given that crop kinds may have changed over time?

Even little changes in where they are grown and eaten can have an impact on statistics. Second, consider that the fastest-growing economy at the time had agricultural growth rates ranging from 1.5 to 2.5 percent per year. How can you explain such a broad spectrum? These interest rates are considered to be accurate. Is it feasible to compare the data Roy supplied with other speeds? The economy of colonial India was the first to raise ordinary earnings. Second, India's agricultural income growth averages slightly over 1%.

Most nations' agricultural growth has accelerated since then, rising from 1.5 to 2.5 percent in most cases. We acknowledge that drawing any Indian colonial inferences from these data is difficult, save that they follow the major stylized features of the "old school". Dean and Cole's books predicted a further acceleration in United Kingdom (UK) agricultural growth in recent years due to India's strong commercial ties with the UK, however there are concerns with comparability. I'm not going to discuss Roy's five minor treatises. The first three are ruled out. Finally, we requested that Roy read page 27 of the 1982 book "Guaranteed Railroads." Also, watch for these fantastic phrases in Jenks' India book if he wants to acquire a railway line or a firm that sells railroads in India. We don't claim to be experts in the mining sector. However, we were pleased with NK Sinha's well-informed and well-researched paper.

The process began in 1782, when lobbying from the British printer Calico resulted in a four-year prohibition on London importing printed goods from India. Another issue appears to be crucial, and it appears to demolish Roy's "old school" argument. The primary writers of "Old School" are identified by Roy. This is explained on page 3243 in the note. This demonstrates a significant discrepancy between what he claimed in the paper and the facts in footnote 2, and it was definitely not an oversight on his part. Roy gives the following timeline of writers and their works: March 1968: [Bipan Chandra](#). (3) [Sumit Sarkar](#), 1983. (2) [Irfan Habib](#), 1975 and 1985. (4) [A.K. Bagchi](#) (1982, 1996), [Amit Bhaduri](#), 1999. These authors worked for 30 years, from 1968 to 1999. Since 1947, when Roy tainted the credibility of economic history, none of these factors have affected policy. Here are some suggestions to help steer the conversation in a more practical direction. Roy stated that India's actions since 1947 are based on the idea that educated and sensible Indians are just as devoted to political economy as India? What is the history of the economy? This is not a watershed moment, but rather the long-term emancipation of India from foreign dominance, instilling in people possibly impossible goals and desires and discovering methods to realise them. The alternatives available to India during British rule were not severely limited: 16th of August, 1947? Let us go back to the year 1931. India exported 30.7 billion rupees of gold during the Great Recession, probably with British assistance. Then, in 1931-32, London made an unexpected loan to India of Rs 12.6 billion.

Conclusion

The history of Western countries' colonies, notably India, and how it was written and modified, is the subject of this article. The term "colonial" does not exist in historical documents produced by colonial powers. Furthermore, the majority of writings by colonial historians represent real-life events. The significant event of 1858, when a legislative decision formed the Almighty Foreign Minister, who was independent of the British Parliament that controlled India, is also unknown to the readers. The whole Indian government is referred to as an internal government in the legislation. The new pope, who is led by the London-based Secretary of State, makes the majority of decisions affecting India. This paper suggests to relook on the historical period from first war of Independence to the last war of Independence of India from Britain with overall socio-political impact most significantly the economic impact from the perspective of colony not the colonizer. The major provisions of the Acts of Parliament of 1858, as well as various particular legislation linked to it, are discussed in this section. In the future it is apparent that the history of British rule from August 2, 1858, to August 15, 1947, would be rewritten.

References

- Alessio, D. (2017). *Empire by treaty: negotiating European expansion, 1600–1900*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2015.1110364>
- Cooper, R. N. (1996). World Economic Primacy, 1500-1900. *Foreign Affairs*, 75(5), 139. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20047761>
- Daunton, M. (1999). *Empire and others: British encounters with indigenous peoples, 1600-1850*. University of Pennsylvania Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4053695>
- Fisher, M. H. (1989). *The New Cambridge History of India. Volume II. 1. Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire*. JSTOR. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2760295>
- Heller, H. (2018). *Book Review: How the West Came to Rule: The Geopolitical Origins of Capitalism*. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0486613417707841>
- Kindleberger, C. P. (1996). *World economic primacy: 1500-1990*. Oxford University Press on Demand. <https://www.abebooks.com/9780195099027/World-Economic-Primacy-1500-1990-Charles-0195099028/plp>
- Kindleberger, C. P., & Greif, A. (1997). World economic primacy: 1500 to 1990. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(4), 2083-2083. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2170631>
- Lally, J. (2018). *India Conquered: Britain's Raj and the Chaos of Empire*, by Jon Wilson. In: Oxford University Press UK.
- Lambert, T. (1997). *Book Review: World Economic Primacy: 1500-1990*. *Review of Radical Political Economics*, 29(2), 103-105. <https://doi.org/10.1177/048661349702900207>
- Logan, W. (2012). States, governance and the politics of culture: World Heritage in Asia. In *Routledge handbook of heritage in Asia* (pp. 126-141). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780203156001-15>
- McCabe, J. (2019). *Lizzie Collingham. The Taste of Empire: How Britain's Quest for Food Shaped the Modern World*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/rhz172>
- Oommen, M. A. (2021). Colonial pig-sticking, imperial agendas, and natural history in the Indian subcontinent. *The Historical Journal*, 64(3), 626-649. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X20000308>
- Roy, T. (2004). Economic history: an endangered discipline. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39(29), 3238-3243. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1061066>
- Taylor & Francis Online. (1997). *Book Reviews. The Historian*, 59(3), 633-722. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6563.1997.tb01009.x>