

The disunity characterized after the fall of the Mughal Empire and the Successor States following the decentralization of India proved key to the EIC's growth into colonial rule. With India as a powerful unified state, the British East India Company couldn't not militarily challenge or gain conquest over India, and they were only allowed to trade under the regulation of the Mughal Empire. Without the strong regulation of the Mughal Empire, conquest over India was a possibility.

- p. 20 paragraph 1 - The evidence shows in the unity of the Mughal Empire, revolt was not a possibility through the rotation of tax collections so no one person could get more power.
- p. 23 paragraph 2 - Aurangzeb's expansion led to insurgents through the Marathas, Sikh, Jat zamindars, and Rajputs. The rebellions led to unified state
- p. 23-4 paragraph 3 - Long term transitions - The insurgents were products of the Mughal empire, and the Mughals gave knowledge to insurgents on governing and military; this signifies that disunity within the empire was the long term product of Mughal rule. Also, economic factor, such as monetization and the production of cash crops, represents long term economic factors that may have helped lead to the decentralization and fall of Mughal Empire.
- p. 30-31 - Three 'fault lines' of Mughal empire - Zamindar, princely rulers, and provincial governors not loyal to Mughal empire, and this create disunity within empire.
- p. 30 paragraph 3 - rise of zamindar warrior states; "After Aurangzeb's death... zamindars across northern and central India rose up to resist imperial authority" - this signifies the disunity within the Mughal empire through the uprisings against the state on behalf of the zamindars. This example provides further evidence of the disunity that led to decline of power of Mughal Empire.
- p. 30 paragraph 3 - Regarding the zamindars: "Indeed to the contrary, local chieftains often contested with each other for mastery of the countryside." Shows that the resistance against the Mughal Empire was also not unified, leading to further decentralization of India that allowed for the British to create an empire.
- p. 47 paragraph 2 - "not allowed to fortify its factories, remained wholly dependent on the goodwill of the Mughal authorities for their trading enterprise" - shows while Mughal Empire still strong, EIC didn't have much power or ability to conquest, dependent on keeping good will with the Empire
- p. 51-52 paragraph 2-3 - Battle of Plassey; signifies the disunity within Bengal with Jagat Seths helping the British, and a "disaffected general Mir Jafar," helped bring down Bengal leader, led to British rule through Mir Jafar
- p. 53 paragraph 1 - new nawab, Mir Kasim, tries to unify parts of Bengal against British rule, got Nawab of Awadh and Mughal Empire against EIC, yet EIC still won. Signifies EIC's power and control of Bengal, shows that without a strong unified front of Mughal Empire, EIC could take control of not only the economic aspects for profit, but of rule. With the unification of all of India, EIC would not have won or even been able to challenge the state

I believe the British acquired an empire in India initially because of coincidences that turned their economic success into the desire to conquest and rule. However, beyond these initial coincidences, the British set out a deliberate spread into India economically, politically, militaristically.

- p. 51 paragraph 2 - British abuse free trade and expanded “fortifications into Calcutta,” therefore Nawab Siraj-ud-daula, leader of Bengal, “marched on Calcutta, defeated the garrison, and imprisoned those who were unable to flee. Some forty or more of those imprisoned, confined in a small airless room, died overnight of suffocation” - signifies a decision of Bengal ruler that led to the chance for revenge on British part. Led to Battle of Plassey that began British colonial rule, though it may not have seemed that way at the time because British were concerned more with money than rule.
- p. 52 paragraph 3 - British secure revenue rights - signifies British control over economic matters of tax collection, led to increase in power. Never would have happened without incident in Calcutta that humiliated British General Clive. Also, the securing of revenue rights over certain districts emphasizes the British’s greedy attitudes towards India as an “‘an inexhaustible fund of riches’”, which later led to direct British rule.
- p. 53 paragraph 1-2 - Battle of Buxar, securing rights of Diwani over Bengal, Bihar, Orissa - The British deliberately secured Diwani rights over the areas listed above to obtain more wealth, showing that in their initial goal to retrieve solely mass amounts of wealth through trade and the original revenue rights, they now had official positions of leadership that not only allow them to obtain even more wealth through the control of taxes, but that it allowed them significant power over the people of East India.
- p 53-54 paragraph 3 - The Seven years war “justified military adventure around the globe,” and “the importance to the Company of the Bengal trade, together with, on the other side, the threat its size, and the privileged position of the British, posed to the nawab” were all outside circumstances leading to the British seizing control over Bengal. These circumstances coinciding with the right period of time in India provide much of the motivation for economic success and military success that leads to British seizure of rule
- p. 54 paragraph 2 - “As it moved into Bengal, the Company took advantage of those strategies of ‘military fiscalism’ that were key to success in the political system of eighteenth-century India. Among these were a titular obeisance to the Mughal emperor in Delhi, utilization of trade monopolies in such goods as saltpetre that local nawabs had developed, the deployment of a disciplined professional infantry (which Europeans pioneered in India), and close ties with newly powerful banking and financial groups, such as the Jagat Seths, whose auto- nomous position gave them an unprecedented importance within the political system.” The military fiscalism employed by the Company in Bengal signifies the move from circumstances surrounding the initial gain of rule through acquiring Diwani into a deliberate agenda known for effective rule.
- p. 57 paragraph 1 - Regulating Acts established; The establishment of Regulating Acts in East India signifies the beginning of deliberate political agendas as rulers over these areas, showing the British’s shift into the mindset of rulers over this area.
- p. 60-61 paragraph 3 - “...dramatically increased the recruitment of Indian soldiers...to fight for the Company.” The Company’s establishment of a military force to defend Bengal implies not only the defense of its already acquired territories, but its intention for military expansion.
- p. 68 paragraph 4 - “ moved against Tipu Sultan in Mysore,” defeat in 1799; signifies Company’s political expansion.
- p. 69 paragraph 2 - “Wellesley extended the frontier of British India northwards in the Ganges valley, and began the process of incorporating the Marathas into the empire,” signifies Company’s political expansion from Bengal into other parts of India.

Discussion 1

- p. 72 paragraph 2 - "Substantial further acquisitions came about through the working of the subsidiary alliance system," shows that the Company not only forcefully acquired new territory through military force, but through agreements with other leaders of states. This signifies not only more political expansion but also economic policy towards paying for an army.
- p. 73 paragraph 1 - signifies through the collection of taxes the debt facing Indians, and how powerful the debt was in keeping British colonial rule, which was a deliberate way of staying in power for the Company economically and militarily.
- p. 75 paragraph 1-2 - Indirect rule through defeated rulers who were allowed to keep their throne was a deliberate political maneuver by the Company that allowed for less conflict between the Company and those feeling discontent at their expansion across India. By deliberately veiling their power the Company allowed for states to still feel independent while actually expanding and creating a larger empire.
- p.75-76 paragraph 3 - Continuation to see India as a commercial, market investment and the beginnings of the Company's raw cotton and opium trade; The Company's economic ventures through viewing India as a marketplace and the incorporation of raw cotton and opium into trade signifies the ways in which the Company payed for the government and controlled trade.
- p. 76 paragraph 2 - The shift in trade from exporting from India to importing from Britain signifies the power of Britain and the reliance on India for raw materials to manufacture in Britain to bring back to India. It also signifies new reliance on British manufactured goods and the need for more money to pay for government finances.
- p. 77-78 - The privatization of land and demand for cash crops changed the way India economically prospered. British colonial rule even controlled the land now where previously it was unregulated.

The 'common Indians', or the peasant class of India, had reason to feel most disgruntled under British Colonial rule because of the implementation of harsh taxes, the monetization of lands, and the implementation of cash crops to pay taxes to the government.

- p. 59 paragraph 1 - "'fixed' body of law, necessary if the British were to administer Hindu law, inevitably privileged Brahmanical texts over local usages that varied by caste and region, and gave Brahman pandits, attached to the courts as 'law-finders' until 1864, an unprecedented role in decision making"; this signifies the stronger emergence of caste with Brahmin's on top and peasants on the lowest level; example of how Brahmin's benefited from colonial rule and the peasants were more emphasized on being one of the lowest castes in society.
- p. 80 paragraph 1 - "The tribal peoples were subsequently either confined to the forest, but deprived of control of its resources, which were now to be 'scientifically' managed, or encouraged to abandon their 'wild and wandering ways' for cultivation" signifies the change in India due to monetization of land, leading to the inability to people previously using these lands to use them any longer
- p. 77-78 paragraph 3-4 - "Throughout, the heaviest burden India had to bear was that of the land revenue demand. Essential to the support of the army and the administration, these payments, rigorously collected in cash, lay at the heart of the British impact upon the Indian countryside." Several Company policies instituted to collect cash to put into the

government such as the auctioning the rights to collect taxes and the Bengal Permanent Settlement reveals ultimately the devastating effects such as the Bengal famine Company policy had on peasants. Peasants, who used to hold value in items such as food they farmed, were then required to produce cash, so the introduction of cash crops and the monetization of land came into effect to get cash.

- p. 80 paragraph 1 - Forest dwellers “were treated by British officials not as occasions for negotiations but rather as acts of aggression on territory on which they had exclusive sovereignty,” revealing how people who led different life styles, such as hunting and gathering, were negatively influenced by the British presence in such a way that they had to abandon their previous lifestyles for one that was Company approved, such as cultivation.
- p. 80 paragraph 2 - Due to creation of private property rights, herders and grazers were no longer able to simply herd and graze animals or hunt and gather, which signifies not only the disruption of ‘traditional’ common Indian practices but also the change in views on certain peoples due to British intervention.
- p. 83 paragraph 2 - Country side people unable to receive education, which was established in the cities. To live in a city connotes more wealth and a less likelihood of being lower class, which perpetuates the inequalities between people and emphasizes the caste system.

The British brought what they believed to be as civilizing institutions, such as the abolition of sati and education, yet the supremacist ideas as Western ideas prevailing over Eastern ideas permeated a seemingly positive reform.

- p. 78 paragraph 1 - Bengal Permanent Settlement led to idea of property rights, putting a cash value on the land and emphasizing that the land could be sold if the peasant ‘tenants’ and the zamindar ‘proprietor’ did not pay the ‘rent.’ This is significant to India in the sense that previously, land was not given monetary value or ownership. Instituting this idea into Indian culture changed the relationship the Indian’s working the land had with the land itself.
- p. 80 paragraph 1 - “Forest dwellers, often hunter-gatherers who periodically raided into the areas of settled agriculture, these tribals, such as the Bhils of Khandesh, were subjected to a series of armed incursions during the 1820s,” signifying the British ‘civilizing’ influence on native tribal peoples, changing their ways of life to one considered to be civilized and “abandon their ‘wild and wandering ways’ for cultivation.” This reform reflects on the Company the supremacist type view that these hunter-gatherer peoples were not civilized because of their lifestyle, turning the actions to get forest dwellers to become cultivators even more of an unappreciated sentiment.
- p. 81-82 paragraph 3 - ‘Liberal’ Anglicist ideologies emerge, “the entire native literature of India and Arabia’ was not worth ‘a single shelf of a good European library’” signifies not only the belief in British superiority, but the permeation into education to learn English
- p. 82, paragraph 2-3 - abolition of sati, signifies the permeation of British beliefs and ideals into the Indian culture, reform met with criticism because it was not widely practiced and a part of Indian culture, why should British change Indian society?

Jessica Hudson

HIS 312

9/23/11

Discussion 1

- p. 83 paragraph 2 - transfer from Sanskrit and Arabic education to English education, used to promote Western thought and ideology on what civilized and modern society should look like, signifies the implementation of Western thought into education and the supremacist views of the British. Education could be a great reform, but instead of teaching tradition and Indian culture, teaching English and British culture.