


6-2013

The Great European Empires: British and Roman Rule

Edward A. Tomlinson
Union College - Schenectady, NY

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalworks.union.edu/theses>

 Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#), [European History Commons](#), and the [Military History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tomlinson, Edward A., "The Great European Empires: British and Roman Rule" (2013). *Honors Theses*. 746.
<https://digitalworks.union.edu/theses/746>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at Union | Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of Union | Digital Works. For more information, please contact digitalworks@union.edu.

The Great European Empires: British and Roman Rule

By Edward A. Tomlinson

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
Honors in the Department of History

Union College
June 2013

Introduction:

The greatest European imperial forces ever to exist were Rome and Britain. They controlled much of their known world and subjugated many foreign peoples to their rule. Rome ruled lands from India to the Atlantic Ocean, while Britain had colonies across the entire globe. The British Empire was at the height of its power in the Nineteenth Century, nearly 1200 years after the city of Rome was sacked by invading barbarian tribes. Even with more than a millennia passing between the fall of one empire and the rise of the other; they still shared many similarities in their manner of rule. They had to balance military might and political action to prevent rebellions and to maintain profitable colonies. Rome and Britain had different reasons to annex new lands but each found their new possessions invaluable to maintaining their overall empire. Historians have often compared the two great empires, citing their similar strengths and the glory that each achieved. More important than their similarities are their differences, as these show us how Empires had changed to cope with new technologies and social trends.

Rome expanded from a small city state in Italy to control the entire Mediterranean Basin. This expansion began as Rome was forced fight the Etruscans, Sabine tribes, and other Latin city-states, and in the process annexed their territory and founded new colonies. In these wars the Roman legion was developed, and battle tested. With the conquest of Italy, Rome became a rival of the Carthaginian Empire located in Northern Africa. In a series of wars, aided by the man power of many Italian city-states, Rome added even more territory to its expanding realm and solidified its place as the strongest power in the western Mediterranean, with enough military might to rival the declining Hellenistic Kingdoms in the eastern Mediterranean. Even after the city of Rome fell and the Western Roman Empire ended, the Empire continued as the Byzantine Empire until 1453 when Constantinople was conquered by the Ottoman Empire. Roman ruins

can still be found throughout the lands they had control of and many of their engineering accomplishments still function today. Aqueducts, roads, theaters, and baths still function to this day. Roman concepts of law and education have also left their mark on modern societies. In classical times and in the modern day great emphasis is placed on establishing a system of law to settle disputes. The Romans valued education, and would travel to Greece to further their studies under the tutelage of Greek philosophers and scholars.

In its time the Roman Legion was one of the most feared fighting forces in existence. It was able to defeat enemies, sometimes with its superior size, and often with superior discipline, weapons, or tactics. The Legions defined the Roman Empire, as they were the ones that conquered lands or intimidated foreign leaders into submitting to Roman rule. While they were mainly a battlefield force, legionnaires and their centurions were used to maintain order and carry out the will of the Emperor throughout the Empire. The backing of several loyal legions could make a successful Roman general the next Roman Emperor.

Roman leaders gained fame and fortune through successful military campaigns. Roman Consuls, the highest position in the Roman Republic, were generals as well as politicians. They were assigned to raise Roman armies and lead them against those that were viewed as enemies of the Empire. After the fall of the Republic, most Roman Emperors personally led the most important military campaigns. The earliest of the Emperors had to be better generals than politicians to survive the civil wars that occurred in the transition from the Republic to the Empire. The regions that submitted to Roman rule, through the campaigns of these generals, were organized and divided into provinces, each with its own Roman Governor and quota of grain, taxes, and goods that were owed Rome. The Empire's provinces and territories helped feed the poor of Rome with large subsidized shipments of grain and provided the rich with exotic

luxuries. Rome expanded in a series of wars meant to gain glory for the commanding officers, and as a means to defend Rome's ever expanding borders.

Britain's colonies were founded to actively gain wealth from resources and new trade markets. When the Spanish and Portuguese started to accrue vast amounts of wealth from their newly discovered colonies in the Americas and the Pacific, other European nations tried to find their own supplies of gold and spices. The Thirteen Colonies along North America's east coast were Britain's most valuable early possessions. These colonies did not offer exotic riches of gold or rare spices, but provided furs that were popular in European fashion and raw material resources which were used throughout British industries. During the Seven Years War, and the American Revolution, the British gained control of large territories previously owned or contested by the French and Spanish. The small island nation of Britain controlled huge swaths of land across the world after these wars. Among its colonies were Australia, Canada, India, South Africa, and islands in the Caribbean and scattered across the world. In sparsely populated regions like Australia and the Thirteen Colonies, the British created settlements with colonists seeking riches or by creating penal colonies where they shipped condemned prisoners. In more densely populated areas with their own powerful governments, Britain tried to form trade relationships. By starting several small trading posts along the coast of India in the early 1600s the British were able to exert their influence over the different principalities in India.

The British East India Company did not have the power necessary to conquer the entire Indian subcontinent by force. The British military forces in India were powerful enough to determine the outcome of local conflicts though. They did this by using their technological superiority over the native powers in minor conflicts that they were certain to win. The British also spread their influence by forming treaties with local powers that would favor their economic

and political interests. By slowly expanding their influence over local governments they became the de facto leader of the region.

From the founding of the first British trading post in the region in 1612 until the Sepoy Mutiny in 1857, India was ruled by the British East India Company. This company had the authority to maintain armed forces in India and to form their own bureaucracy to run India. This “government” did not replace the local governments but oversaw them and made sure that the local powers followed British mandates. The EIC divided India into three main states, with a British Governor-General in each to make executive decisions for the region. The British capitals of these states were at Bombay, Madras, and Bengal. Eventually the Governor of Bombay was acknowledged to be the highest British authority in India, until the position of Viceroy was created. The large bureaucracy and armed forces the British needed to maintain control of India meant that many promising officers and politicians were employed by the EIC or the British government, and subsequently sent to India. It was known that a lifelong career and substantial fortune could be made in India through military, political, or economic avenues.

The Duke of Wellington, known at the time as Sir Arthur Wellesley, rose from the rank of Second Lieutenant to Major General while stationed in India. His actions in India proved his ability as a field commander. He understood the importance of the appearance of British authority. More important than the combat abilities of British forces in India was the power of their presence in the region. A small number of British regular soldiers could sway negotiations with local elites because they represented the larger power of the British Empire. British armed forces in India were always outnumbered and reinforcements would take a long time to arrive from Britain. It was therefore crucial the British prevent rebellions and dissent by maintaining

good relations with the locals, and the appearance that they could easily crush any opposition to their rule.

Rome and Britain had to balance military and police force with political and economic influence to effectively control their territories. Due to the different technologies and ideologies each empire resorted to different methods to achieve this balance. Rome tended to use military force to instill fear in their subjugated people. States that did not surrender to the Romans were made an example of, often resulting in the destruction of the city and the people being sold into slavery. The British, who did not have the same military advantages over their subjects as the Romans did, relied more upon making the local population their economic partner and appeasing the population by providing them with many of the “benefits” of European society. The British started universities and schools in India and many wealthy Indians even traveled to Europe for further education. These men created a wealthy middle and upper class that was politically active. They often received jobs as part of the British government in India, where they worked alongside British officials that they had gone to school with. However, the educated Indian officials often led or assisted political movements that eventually led to the decolonization of India. The case can be made that providing benefits, such as education, in colonies was as effective for keeping order as intimidation by force.

The two greatest European powers are often compared due to their prominence in Western history. These comparisons often are deserved because both powers used political maneuvering, military and police forces, and economics to control their territories. Remnants of the Roman Empire lasted for more than a thousand years after the founding of the original city. The British Empire only lasted a few centuries. However, the British Empire ended with the peaceful decolonization of the Empires possessions and friendly relations with most of the

previous colonies. Rome ended with sack of the city and the execution of the Roman Emperor by barbarians. It is hard to argue if one of these powers was more successful than the other due to the vast differences in their times and the technologies available to them. The Imperial state has evolved over time to reflect the changing technologies and the shifts in cultures. The similarities and differences of Rome and Great Britain are still noteworthy and relevant because they are a crucial insight into the operations of not only a successful empire, but of the effective administration of states of all sizes.

Chapter 1:

Rome was just one city-state among the Latin states in central Italy. Through a series of wars with its neighboring Latin city-states, the Sabine tribes, the Etruscans, and the Gauls, Rome developed a military tradition. Rome founded several colonies along the borders of its territories to spread its influence and provide security for Rome itself. Rome managed to become the most prominent of the Latin states through military conquests and a series of alliances. With the combined power of the Latin states Rome was able to subdue the entire Italian peninsula and begin to expand around the Mediterranean Basin.¹ By the middle of the Second Century BC the Roman Republic had become the dominant power in the Eastern Mediterranean and was about to begin a period of rapid expansion.

Rome's government at the time consisted of two consuls that shared the executive power of the state and acted as commanders in chief of the military. The Roman Senate determined the foreign policy and gave the consuls military assignments, if necessary. The Senate would also assign provinces to consuls, praetors, and other Roman magistrates to act as governors in these

¹ Boatwright, Mary T., Daniel J. Gargola, and Richard J. A. Talbert. *A Brief History of the Romans*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006. Pg. 45-49

conquered areas.² These governors would have term limits and were chosen from members of the Senate. A term acting as a governor could boost a politician's career and make him wealthy. Governors were responsible for military operations in their province. Rome's military culture heaped honors on the leaders of successful campaigns. Triumphal processions were held to honor generals returning from victorious campaigns. The fame and honor that were given to these generals greatly increased their political influence and often pushed their political careers to new heights. They were more likely to be elected or re-elected as a consul or to assume another influential public office. This made Roman Governors very interested in leading military campaigns from their provinces.

Julius Caesar was the Roman governor in Gaul when he led his army in a famous campaign against the Gallic Tribes. He used one tribe's transgression into Roman territory as an excuse to launch his campaign.³ The wealth he and his troops gained from conquering and plundering the area made them very wealthy and extremely loyal to each other. When the Senate tried to recall Caesar from Gaul, perhaps because of his success and fame, he decided to march his troops on Rome. By the end of the First Century B.C. Caesar's actions had led to the downfall of the Roman Republic and the rise of the Roman Empire. The Senate remained as a legislative body but now the Emperor had final say over all government actions. During the same period Rome's territory expanded to control not only the areas of Gaul and Germany that Caesar had conquered but Greece, Egypt, and most of Asia Minor.

Rome's conquests were often portrayed as defensive wars. Like Caesar's claim that a Gallic tribe had invaded Roman territory, Roman governors would often make questionable claims to justify a military campaign. When Cicero took over the Province of Cilicia he had

² Lintott, Andrew. *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration*. London: Routledge, 1993. Pg. 45-46

³ Boatwright Pg. 152

under his command a couple of old legions. He supplemented these by recruiting Romans that had settled in the area and other native troops. He planned on using these troops to attack the neighboring Parthian Empire. When Rome made a treaty with Parthia, Cicero was forced to find a new target to lead his forces against. He chose the people of Pindenissus. He claimed these people were enemies of Rome and proceeded to lead his army on a successful campaign against them. No previous governor had significant conflict with Pindenissus nor mentioned it as a threat.⁴ It seems that Cicero fabricated this threat to justify the army he raised and gain an easy victory that he could use in his political career. Another governor, C. Cassius, attempted to lead his forces from Gaul through Illyricum to enter into the Third Macedonian War. He was recalled by the Senate before his forces could reach the ongoing campaign and legislative acts were passed to prevent governors from entering neighboring provinces in the future.⁵ These campaigns, started by generals searching for honor and fame in Rome, led to the often rapid expansion of Roman territory.

Not all of Rome's territory was amassed through military conquest. Much of it was gained through alliances and treaties. Often Rome would simply make an alliance with a smaller kingdom or free city, allowing it to retain some autonomy provided it pledged Rome its support, obedience, and a set amount of tribute. These allied and freed states kept their government and leaders or had governments friendly to Rome installed. Often these alliances were formed when a state sought Roman help in a war or conflict with a neighboring state.⁶ In this way Rome gained an ally and added the lands of two states to its territory. These alliances were also formed when a state surrendered to Rome instead of resisting. The Empire was known to offer harsh terms to those that resisted their conquest, so that often states would simply surrender before

⁴ Lintott Pg. 53

⁵ Lintott Pg. 44

⁶ Lintott Pg. 30-36

hostilities began. Rome was known to sell their captured enemies into slavery and destroy the cities that resisted them. Before attacking, the Roman's would offer their opponents the chance to surrender with lenient terms, and this offer was often accepted to prevent the penalties that came from resisting Rome.⁷

The rulers and local elites of the areas under Roman control became clients to Roman nobles and a key part to the Roman bureaucracy. It was easier for Romans to maintain the local governments than completely replace them. This meant that the local elites kept their position in their society but also had a position in Roman society as well. These locals had access to positions in the Roman bureaucracy and military. It was not uncommon for men from the provinces to rise through the ranks of the Roman military and bureaucracy. The emperors Hadrian and Trajan were both born in a Roman colony in Spain. They rose through the ranks of the military until they became successful generals. Whenever an Emperor died without an heir to take his place, politicians and generals staked a claim to the imperial titles and used politics or legions to secure their position. These men often did not last long as Emperor, as they were sometimes assassinated or usurped by rivals.

These allied states and free cities were placed into provinces along with conquered states. The Governors of the provinces, besides being the military commander of the Roman forces stationed there, were also the highest executive power in the area. He was the only official besides the Emperor capable of issuing capital punishment to resolve judicial cases. When not preparing for military campaigns, governors were expected to travel around their province settling judicial affairs in different villages and cities. This practice was important to the provinces as it resolved many disputes between local villages that might have created tension between the two communities before they were united under the Roman Empire. Communities

⁷ Lintott Pg. 8

competed to host the governor and his entourage. Being selected as a host could be an economic blessing for a city or village.⁸ People from all over the surrounding area would travel to where the governor had decided to hold court. All the added people would be an extra source of money and profit for business owners in the host community. Communities also sought to be the host of the governor because it was thought that the governor would often settle disputes in favor of the host community in cases that involved the community against another settlement. It was also possible, depending on distances and other variable conditions, that the other party in these trials might not make an appearance and the governor would be almost certain to rule in favor of the party present. The governor had the power to appoint assistant governors that also had the authority to rule on judicial cases but could not issue the death penalty.

A governor's entourage could be quite large. It showed the power of his authority and consisted of central figures in his administration. Governors were allowed to have lictors in their personal entourages while in their provinces. Lictors were servants that carried a tied bundle of rods and an axe. These men were signs of authority in Roman culture. In Rome initially only the consuls could have lictors in their entourages and later the emperors did also.⁹ Governors, consuls, and emperors were the only ones that could issue the death penalty so the axe that their servants carried could be a sign of and a tool to implement this power. The governor also had quaestor, legati, high ranking military posts, his personal staff, friends, guards, slaves, and other attendants in his entourage. The quaestor was normally a younger Roman who was just beginning his career as a magistrate. The quaestor acted as a deputy governor as opposed to the equivalent in Rome, who acted as a treasurer. The legati were more experienced men than the

⁸ Lintott Pg. 65-69

⁹ Fuhrmann, Christopher J. *Policing the Roman Empire*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2012. Pg. 63-64

governor usually chose to be his chief advisors. In judicial matters they formed a counsel to advise the governor, or they could handle certain cases individually. They could also be appointed to minor military commands. The military posts consisted of tribunes of the soldiers, prefects of the cavalry, and a master of works, who acted as an aide-de-camp.¹⁰ These positions were often appointed by the governor, and they did not necessarily need any military experience. Caesar appointed nonmilitary men to these positions during his Gallic Campaign and noted that they were nervous before his battle at Vesontio.¹¹ Like most government appointed positions these could be given to people that the governor wanted in his debt or who were seeking experience in the provinces to further their political career. The governor's entourage was essentially a form of a Roman aristocrat's household with clients that was geared for running a province. This large group of people assisted the governor in administering the province, conducting military campaigns, and holding court. The governor could afford most of his travels and this large entourage due to a stipend that he was given by Rome. This stipend was determined by the Senate when the governor was appointed but was often a substantial sum of money.¹²

Governors' powers were limited by a series of laws and institutions. The governors were normally Romans who had been elected as consuls or praetors. These men were then assigned provinces by the Senate although they sometimes would allow each other to take preferred assignments. There were laws in place that prevented magistrates from becoming a governor for five years after they returned from a term as a governor.¹³ This allowed for more senators to gain experience in the provinces. Governors would remain in their provinces until the new governor

¹⁰ Lintott Pg. 50-51

¹¹ Lintott Pg. 50-51

¹² Lintott Pg. 48

¹³ Lintott Pg. 47

arrived but were then obligated by law to leave within thirty days forcing governors that did not wish to relinquish power to leave or face the repercussions under Roman law. Romans developed several sets of laws to prevent magistrates from taking advantage of people in the provinces. Governors were expected to follow Roman laws and behave in a manner that befit their position but this was not always the case. In response to the crimes that governors were committing in the provinces, regulations were created that did explicitly forbid governors from buying the required supplies of grain from locals at a rate he fixed, or collect taxes with his own praetors. There were also restrictions placed on the amount of land and slaves that he could buy while abroad.¹⁴ The laws that the governor had to follow were changed frequently at the end of the Republic and beginning of the Empire. The laws were written down in a series of *leges* in which each new version would add to and amend the old. The most substantial *lege* is the *lex Iulia*, or the Julian laws, which were created by Julius Caesar and his successor Augustus. Part of the Julian law defines the result in cases where the governor took bribes, committed brutality against Romans or their allies, and established how he could obtain money and transportation from the locals. The governor would have to submit copies of his expenses to two different cities in his province and another to Rome's treasury.¹⁵ If a governor was accused of a crime then he could be tried in front of a court in Rome. These trials were held in front of a court of Romans, which consisted of citizens that were not of the senatorial class. While the court often acted from the Roman perspective of the cases and not the provincials, a successful prosecution could be very rewarding to those bringing the case. If a magistrate was found guilty, he often had to pay twice the amount of damage he had caused. Convicted magistrates might also face capital punishment, but these were often avoided when the man retired to a provincial estate before the judgment was

¹⁴ Lintott Pg. 98

¹⁵ Lintott Pg. 105

made. In addition to the money received, provincial prosecutors obtained Roman citizenship and an exclusion from mandatory military service. Successful Roman prosecutors were granted special powers to gather witnesses and evidence.¹⁶ These systems helped prevent harsh treatment of provincials by Roman governors, since a successful prosecution could end a Roman political career or possibly his life.

Governors were mainly used to run military operation, settle disputes, and oversee the collection of taxes in their assigned provinces. They did not expect to nor were they prepared to run all aspects of the province. The Romans left this to the governments of local communities that they had left intact when they took over the region, or which had been established since then. This delegation of powers made it easier for the Romans to control large areas of land. Roman officials did not have to concern themselves with the minutiae of everyday life of the community in each province but could rely on the local leaders to take care of those problems. Roman magistrates would use these cities and communities as focal points for their administration. The governor would use these settlements as sites to hold court and to gather his armies. They were also used as points to collect taxes. Even the free and allied cities in Roman territory were expected to pay a tithe to Rome. It was easier for the Romans to collect taxes from city governments than individuals in all their territories. The Roman and local governments often relied on contractors to collect the taxes for them. It was thought to be a privilege to certain communities to be allowed to collect their own taxes rather than using a contractor. Taxes were collected in the form of grain stipends from farmers most often. This would be used to pay for and supply the local Roman military forces and any extra revenue would be sent to Rome.¹⁷ Rome also would lease out any public lands in the provinces as farms. These farms could be

¹⁶ Lintott Pg. 101

¹⁷ Lintott Pg. 74-76

taxed in the usual manner as well as the charge for leasing the land from the state. Rome taxed profitable industries such as silver or gold mining. The state took a substantial portion of the profits produced by such enterprises.¹⁸ Most of the taxes Rome gathered went to financing and supporting its large military with the rest going towards public welfare and Rome's grain subsidy.

Rome used the resources it gained from possessing the provinces to finance its legions. In return the military provided security and maintained the infrastructure of the provinces. Most of Rome's military strength was stationed along its borders in a series of forts and outposts. These were used as trading posts, deterred invasions, and were sometimes used as staging grounds for Roman military excursions. Many legions were posted on Rome's frontier with fewer scattered throughout the provinces. Most legionaries were kept with their units so that the legions could move quickly and with force to respond to any serious threat. Rome had specific soldiers that were used to police the provinces. These forces would man road posts, help in collection of taxes, oversee business and building projects, act as messengers, and perform special missions. Rome could not afford to splinter its military strength by giving every city a standing garrison, so most cities had to rely on locally raised night watches and militias to provide security.¹⁹ Only extremely large and important cities ever received garrisons and these were mainly used to deter possible rebellions and quell any rioting. Small numbers of troops were posted throughout the provinces to limit banditry and provide security.

One of the most beneficial aspects of Roman rule to provincials was the increased security that being within Roman boundaries provided. Most local disputes between communities were settled when the area came under Roman control, because Rome united the

¹⁸ Lintott Pg.79-80

¹⁹ Fuhrmann Pg. 162

foreign policy of all cities under their control. Roman outposts and naval stations greatly reduced banditry and piracy, making it safer and easier to travel and trade. This safety was a thing that few powers, especially local governments, could offer during that time period. To be able to live without fear of being attacked or robbed must have been one of the most appreciated contributions of Roman rule to average provincials. The term *milites stationarii* was used to describe the soldiers that detached from their units to serve special functions in the provinces. They would serve in out of the way locations for relatively long periods of time. They were normally stationed in response to a pressing issue or to consolidate state control over a region. They helped local militias keep the roads clear of bandits, and would often act as a form of police even though their policing powers were not clearly defined. Civilians would often turn to the local *stationarii* to ask for help in settling criminal disputes. The *stationarii* also collected fines and punished those caught breaking laws.²⁰ If crime was becoming a major concern in a particular city, then the governor might gather a special task force to counter it or bring his entourage to the troubled area so the soldiers under his command could patrol the troubled region more thoroughly.²¹

Some higher ranking soldiers had more specified tasks in maintaining the provinces. Centurions were often in command of *stationarii* or given their stations or offices to man. They were given some authority to deal with criminal cases and had minor judicial authority. The centurions could also be assigned special missions to carry out.²² A special category of soldier, called *frumentarii*, was organized under the emperors to help maintain the provinces.

Frumentarii were higher ranking soldiers that were mainly stationed in Rome. They were originally used to help with the collection of taxes but became messengers and errand runners for

²⁰ Fuhrmann Pg. 207-211

²¹ Fuhrmann Pg. 181-184

²² Fuhrmann Pg. 224-228

the emperor. Since they were often on the move from Rome to the provinces and were found throughout the empire they were useful to quickly deliver messages. They were known to have acted as a fast response team for the emperor. In one mission a group of *Frumentarii* arrested a governor who the emperor thought might stake a claim to be his heir. *Frumentarii* with their duties as tax collectors were often subject to the criticism of local populaces. It is thought that *frumentarii* also acted as a secret service for the emperor. They were sent on missions to spy on people, commit assassinations, arresting high profile targets, and committing other low profile missions.²³

The Romans were not afraid to use their military forces within the provinces although they preferred to use them as a deterrent. By the time Rome had become an empire, there was no single rebellious force within its boundaries that could rival its military power. The Roman legion was better organized and equipped than many of its opponents. Rome also had the advantage of having a large source of manpower to replenish the ranks of the legions when needed. With the addition of auxiliary forces to supplement the legions, the Roman army could easily overwhelm most opposing forces with just numbers, let alone their superior tactics and weaponry. By stationing legions strategically throughout its empire, and not just on the borders, Rome provided a deterrent preventing rebellions from starting, and could quickly gather multiple legions together to combat any rebellion that did occur. When the Romans did crush rebellions they did so in a manner which would send a message to anyone else contemplating rebelling. The threat of Roman retribution often kept cities and people from turning against Rome. Romans could afford to be heavy handed when it came to keeping order because there were no internal threats that its military had to fear. It was an effective tactic therefore for the Roman military to appear as an unbeatable and relentless force.

²³ Fuhrmann Pg. 153-155

While keeping the appearance of an unstoppable power, the Roman military provided many benefits for the provinces. As stated earlier, small detachments of soldiers served as police officers, kept the road free from brigands and thieves, and served as a messenger service. The legionary forces on the borders prevented invading armies and raiding parties from attacking Roman territory, maintaining the *Pax Romana*. Roman soldiers also oversaw many construction projects in the provinces. It was believed that it was necessary to keep soldiers busy at all times if they were to be kept fit for battle. Therefore besides detaching troops as *stationarii*, others were assigned to oversee industries and engineering feats. Many of the public buildings that Rome built throughout its empire were built by Roman soldiers. Many of these construction projects are still visible today and some are still functioning. Roman roads built by the legions were found throughout the empire, allowing for faster movement of military forces, messages, and general travel and trade. As their territory spread Rome wanted to take advantage of strategic sites or resources, so Roman forces helped construct planned cities. These cities were built on grid patterns with many public spaces pre-planned, such as a forum, theater, and baths. If the site the Romans wished to build a city on lacked a clean water supply they could build aqueducts to bring fresh water from miles away to the new site.²⁴ Roman frontier forts were formidable obstacles to invading forces, and became important trading post between the Empire and neighboring communities. Many of these forts and trading outposts became important enough that cities formed around them.

The Roman army helped the provinces transition through a phase some historians refer to as “Romanization”. Romanization was the process by which Rome civilized the “barbarian” provinces. The term is analogous to the newer term “modernization”. While in many cases the

²⁴ MacMullen, Ramsay. *Romanization in the Time of Augustus*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000. Pg. 104-105, 109

areas of the world that Rome conquered were civilized for centuries before Rome rose to power, they ruled over many areas, such as Gaul, that appeared to be barbaric compared to Rome. The Gallic tribes shared the elements of the same culture, but were not united until facing the threat of Roman invasion. These tribes lived in the relatively sparsely populated area between Germany and Spain. Rome created three provinces in the area that was known as Gaul; Aquitania, Armorica, and along the southern coast a province that became known as Narbonensis. Each area was distinct from the others. Narbonensis had long been in contact with the Roman and Greek world through trade, and had adopted aspects of Roman culture long before they were assimilated into the empire. This area was also more urbanized than the other two provinces. Gallic tribes usually had developed their settlements on hill tops and some of these also had extensive defensive fortifications.²⁵ Under Augustus and Agrippa, a plan was developed and implemented to build a series of roads and colonies that would allow Rome to better control the area. The main capital of these three provinces would be at Lyon. Originally a Roman military encampment, it was developed into a city with an aqueduct, defensive walls, a theater, amphitheater, forum, and other Roman structures. Lyon also became a major mint for Rome, and coinage pressed here was used throughout Gaul. The road system that Rome built often ignored preexisting Gallic settlements, which led to some old settlements being abandoned and new settlements founded along the road. The cities that roads went through often flourished. In total the three provinces were controlled by sixty-four civic settlements that represented the majority of the tribes in the region.²⁶

Rome thought that by bringing the Roman way of life to Gaul they were performing a service to the local people. Romanization had mixed results. It is questionable how much impact

²⁵ MacMullen Pg. 88-90

²⁶ MacMullen Pg.93-94

Roman rule had on the day to day life of the average provincial. Their effect of Roman rule was more significant to the elite and influential classes of the population. The local nobles that had surrendered to Roman rule were allowed to keep their positions in society. They became part of the Roman patron-client social system, adopting Roman nobles as their patrons. Many elites from the countryside became officials in the Roman government. After being granted their citizenship they could be elected to positions in Rome. Many provincials also joined the military where they could rise through the ranks.²⁷ If a person became a successful enough general and had the loyalty of his legions he could make a claim for the throne. This often happened in the late empire and led to several of the Roman Emperors being from non-Roman, and non-Italian descent. The druids were also a major part of Gallic culture before Roman conquest, and had some influence throughout Roman rule. The druids were known to be philosophers to many before Rome conquered Gaul, but in fact they were teachers, doctors, and high priests in Gallic society. According to Caesar, the druids would meet once a year to elect a leader and to settle civil and secular cases.²⁸ They were a strong political and religious force in Gaul that the Romans had to overcome while conquering the area. Rome often adapted local religions by making comparisons between the local deities and the Roman pantheon, but the druidic religion was banned altogether under the reign of Augustus. The druid religion was foreign to Roman culture, and it was often difficult to make associations between the druidic pantheon and the Roman pantheon.²⁹ The longer Rome ruled Gaul the less influence the remaining druids had in the area. Most authors after Caesar no longer viewed the druids as philosophers but instead as

²⁷ Lintott Pg. 165-166

²⁸ Webster, Jane. "At the End of the World: Druidic and Other Revitalization Movements in Post-Conquest Gaul and Britain." *Britannia*, 1999: 1-20. Pg. 1-5

²⁹ MacMullen Pg. 88-90

sorcerers and magicians.³⁰ The average Gallic tribesmen were thought to be relatively poor before the coming of Rome. There was little wealth in the northern areas of Gaul, and coins were not widely used. Very few luxury items are found in archaeological digs that can be dated to this time period. With the introduction of Roman influences to the area, the increase of trade, and the stationing of Roman soldiers to the area, the amount of capital also increased. As soldiers spent money in the towns near where they were stationed and trade flourished, the people in northern Gaul could afford more of the luxuries that were available.³¹

Rome was very successful in incorporating new provinces into the empire. In a relatively short period of time Gaul had been fully subdued and demilitarized. Many people in Gaul quickly came to associate themselves with the Roman conquerors and forget their past as the conquered. Rome offered citizenship as reward for service to the state to many people throughout its empire. Being a citizen gave a person more rights under Roman law, and allowed them to vote. By gradually giving provincials the right to vote they established a group of locals that had a vested interest in the Empire. Rome also allowed citizens from the provinces to be elected to certain offices in the bureaucracy. It was common for Rome to settle military veterans in the lands they had recently conquered. This led to an infusion of Roman culture into the surrounding areas and added a population that would be unlikely to join or aid any rebellions. These retired soldiers could also be quickly conscripted back into the military if any emergency arose. In a short time Rome was able to demilitarize and successfully rule an area that it had conquered violently. It is thought that “Romanization” of the provinces may have been so successful because instead of the provinces merely becoming Roman, the empire also changed to

³⁰ Webster Pg. 10-12

³¹ MacMullen Pg. 85-85

adapt to the new culture of the conquered area.³² Since Rome often left local governments and societies intact when taking over an area, it had to find a way to incorporate these new entities into the Roman Empire. Instead of forcing the provinces to do everything the Roman way, the provincial communities were allowed to retain some of their traditional culture while being exposed to Roman culture.

The effect of “Romanization” on the lowest social classes is considered to be negligible. Day to day life for the average person probably changed little under Roman rule. The most noticeable benefits were the prevention of war, crime, and banditry by the presence of the Roman military. While public buildings were built in many cities around the Empire, most of its people remained farmers and probably had limited access to such luxuries except on special occasions. Roman roads and way stations did make travel and trade easier, but their intended purpose was for military use and due to the requirements of farming, most people would not travel far from their homes during their lifetime. Most people retained their professions that they had before Roman rule, and did not see significant changes for the better or worse.

The Roman Emperor also had considerable influence with the stability of the provinces. The Emperor was the absolute power in the Roman world and could overturn any decision made by a lesser official, while any decision he made could not be overruled. A strong and confident emperor often led to stability throughout the empire while a weak emperor would suffer rebellions and instability. Even if the emperor did not personally contribute to the running of the provinces, the weakness or strength of the emperor’s administration was felt throughout the empire. Weak empires often had to deal with political intrigue in Rome, and poor decisions by bad rulers could create tension within the provinces to rebel. Most actual governing decisions

³² Woolf, Greg. "Beyond Romans and Natives." *World Archaeology*, 1997: 339-350. Pg. 147

were left to the Emperor's advisors, the provincial governors, the Senate, and the local governments. The symbol of power and authority for all these powers was the emperor. Most emperors were more concerned with expanding Rome's frontiers, and gaining military glory than running the empire. If the emperor failed in his military campaigns it made him and the rest of the empire appear vulnerable. The Roman emperor was treated as a god and even had his own cult of worship. While most people in the empire would never see the emperor, his face was known by most people. His face was imprinted on coins throughout the empire and statues and busts of the emperor were often portrayed in public spaces. It was the emperor who guaranteed the peace in the empire, and much like governors, his rule was judged by how successfully he managed to keep the peace throughout the Roman Empire

The Roman Empire eventually fell due to external threats, and political corruption. Unlike more modern empires the colonies remained fairly loyal to Rome at the end of the empire. The empire was weakened by civil wars between rival emperors. These wars weakened the Roman military, and depleted the Roman treasury. Also with multiple civil wars and political assassinations, there was a lack of stability at the highest level of the Roman government, further weakening the strength of the Empire. With the treasury and Roman military depleted, Rome used more auxiliary troops to help defend its extensive borders. These troops were not of the same quality as the legionnaires and their loyalty to Rome was not always guaranteed. In the late empire many enemy tribes had broken through the Roman frontier and had ravaged the provinces and Rome itself. By 480 A.D. the Western Roman Empire had collapsed after Rome had been sacked by the invading barbarians and the last of the Western Emperors, Romulus Augustus, died as a child.³³ At this point in time the Eastern Empire declared the end of the Western Roman Empire. The Eastern Empire consisted of many of Rome's richest provinces, including Greece,

³³ Boatwright Pg. 302

Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. This area, ruled from the Emperors in Constantinople, lasted until that city was conquered by the Ottoman Empire in 1453. Segments of the provinces that Rome united were able to exist as a continuation of the Roman Empire for hundreds of years after the city of Rome had fallen to internal conflict and barbarian invasions.

The legacy of the Roman Empire lasted in the provinces long after the Empire itself had fallen. In the East where the Roman government remained intact the provincial governing system remained relatively unchanged for over a thousand years. Not only were the provinces profitable for Rome but they also became loyal to the power that had conquered them. The benefits of peace, prosperity, and possibility for social advancement for the elite under Roman rule outweighed being taxed and serving a foreign government. By the end of the Roman Empire most provinces more closely identified with the Roman Empire than their pre-conquest past. Throughout Europe after the fall of Rome until modern times, multiple nations have claimed descent from the Roman Empire. Titles of European rulers such as Tsar and Kaiser are derivations of Caesar. Rome managed to create one of the world's largest empires and maintained it successfully for centuries.

Chapter 2:

The British Empire was not as reliant upon military force to control its territories as the Romans were. The British were more interested in the potential economic gains that their territories provided. There was also a sense that they were bringing civilization to barbaric regions of the world and that instead of being tyrannical conquerors they were saviors helping humanity around the world. There was an understanding among many British officials that it was therefore important to maintain an appearance of immense power to back up their authority,

while providing the locals with European goods, technologies, and education. During Britain's occupation of India, there was only one major rebellion and the educated elite of the province eventually managed to form their own country after Britain peacefully decolonized the area. While the British military was ever present in India and was necessary to effectively rule the area, British rule over India was better maintained by forming an economic relationship that was often mutually beneficial.

Perhaps the greatest European empire since the fall of Rome was the British Empire. The islands of Great Britain were forced to become a naval power due to conflicts with nations on the mainland. This sea power helped them develop an empire that spanned the globe. Due to the change of territories that were owned by the British Empire caused by wars, rebellions, and additional annexation of new lands, the empire is often talked about as two distinct empires. The "First" British Empire was mainly focused on New World territories, in particular the Thirteen Colonies and the Caribbean Islands. After the Seven Year War and the American Revolution they lost their prized Thirteen Colonies, but gained the colonies of the defeated French and Spanish. These wars ended the "First" Empire. The "Second" British Empire controlled large swaths of North America, Asia, Africa, the entirety of Australia, and many islands and small territories throughout the world. Even as Britain lost the Thirteen Colonies, India quickly became the most important and profitable colony in the British Empire. The "Second" British Empire was the envy of all other imperialistic governments at the time as it brought immense wealth into Great Britain, and made Britain one of the most formidable economic and military powers in the world. It lasted from the late Eighteenth Century to the middle of the Twentieth Century when

the British Empire went through a period of decolonization after surviving and emerging victorious in the two World Wars.³⁴

The Thirteen Colonies were claimed and largely settled by Europeans who quickly overpowered and displaced the scattered, unorganized, and technologically inferior Native Americans, but the native powers in India were too large and powerful for the British or other European nations to conquer outright. With its large population and established industries, India was more valuable as a place to trade for raw resources and to sell European manufactured goods. The British East India Company was therefore established to set up trading posts in India to compete with the French and Dutch trading posts on the subcontinent. During the Sixteenth Century many European nations were claiming lands throughout the world to establish colonies that could be exploited for valuable resources. After seeing how profitable the Spice Islands were for the Portuguese and the riches South America gave up to the Spanish, most other European countries tried to claim equally profitable territories and trade partners. India was not only important for its own resources but as a strategic stopping point on many trade routes from the Orient west to Europe.

The British East India Company was established in 1600 as a corporation to provide profits for its members through trading ventures in the Orient.³⁵ They established permanent trading posts to further their interests and negotiated their own treaties with native governments. These early settlements were mere trade outpost and “factories” in which the local governments allowed foreigners to practice their business.³⁶ To protect their interests and “servants” they raised forces, called Sepoys, from native tribes and trained them in European military tactics and formations. They built forts in order to protect their interests and would send ambassadors and

³⁴ Darwin, John. *Britain's Empire*. Blackwell Publishing, 2008 Pg. 5

³⁵ Carlton, Eeric. *Occupation*. London: Routledge, 1992. Pg. 30

³⁶ Darwin Pg. 5

advisors to local rulers to further their own political and economical goals. As the EIC expanded its presence in India to counter the rival French, Portuguese, and Dutch trading companies, the British slowly became the most dominant power in India.³⁷

The first British settlement was founded at Surrat in 1612 after defeating a Portuguese naval force. This led to settlements in Bengal in 1630, Madras in 1640, and Bombay in 1668. The British successfully limited Dutch interest in the area to trading posts on Sri Lanka (modern Ceylon). After the Seven Years War the French were reduced to possessing only two trading posts in India, essentially ending their presence in the area. In 1757 the Nawab of Bengal attacked the British in Bengal and imprisoned the British survivors in what became known as the “Black Hole of Calcutta.” Robert Clive, who had proven his military experience in defeating French military forces in India, led a relief column from Madras and defeated the Nawab’s army at Plassey. The Nawab army was left without any military animals or equipment and the Nawab was soon replaced by a British appointee. With the decline of the powerful Moghul Empire in the Eighteenth Century and more autonomous rulers gaining power throughout much of India, the East India Company became the dominant power in the area. After Plassey the East India Company gained control over most of the cities and princedoms in southern India, and quickly began annexing territories. Most of the remaining princedoms deferred to the British policies but retained some degree of their autonomy.³⁸

The British never had the resources or intent to colonize India like they had with many of their other territories. Instead the British came to control the entire subcontinent through treaties and small wars that were meant to do no more than protect the EIC’s trade interests. The East India Company’s Court of Directors ruled India from London with the only British Government

³⁷ Carlton Pg. 30

³⁸ Carlton Pg. 30-32

supervision coming from the “Board of Control.” Due to the long time required for news and messages to travel between London and India the Company “Servants” in India were de facto given the freedom to govern India as they saw fit.³⁹ The EIC essentially therefore had direct rule over India from 1757 until the British Crown took over the sovereignty of India in 1858. Even after the EIC’s authority was replaced, the bureaucracy and infrastructure that the Company had set up was retained by the Crown to rule India.

As the East India Company gained more influence in India they created three governorships to control their interests. These governors were located at Bombay, Bengal, and Madras and were appointed to the position by the EIC. They were normally men of merit, often Lords or officers in the British military. These men had the authority to deal with the native rulers diplomatically or by force if necessary. Initially all three governors were considered equals but slowly the governor in Bombay became the accepted top British authority in India. The position of Governor-General was therefore added to be the principle British authority, while maintaining the other governing positions.

Young British men sought positions in India because it was thought to be an effective way to make money, develop political skills, and demonstrate their leadership ability. Wealthy families often bought commissions for their sons in the British Army or in the EIC. Since British rule in India was still being solidified, it was a territory where British officials could become famous as military field commanders or as diplomats. As it became a more peaceful colony there were still opportunities to advance in the bureaucracy, and to make money as corruption became rampant. Corruption was a problem throughout the British administration of India, especially in

³⁹ Darwin Pg. 6

the Eighteenth Century, but not to the degree that it was a serious problem.⁴⁰ The most notable corruption scandal in India occurred in 1783, when members of British Parliament accused Governor-General Warren Hastings of selling princedoms and breaking treaties for his own gain. After years of trial he was finally acquitted of the charges brought against him but he had already been removed from office and had spent a small fortune on his legal defense.⁴¹ The charges brought against Hastings seem to have been fabricated by members of the East India Company as their actions came under scrutiny. Hastings was known to be a well intentioned civil servant who actually took steps to counter corruption while in office.⁴²

In the 1870s when a new income-tax on Indians was being brought before Parliament the budget of the British administration of India came under scrutiny. This income tax was to be an immense burden on most of the farmers in India, as they would have to pay this new tax on top of what they already paid in tribute to their local rulers.⁴³ It was shown that this tax was unnecessary at the time as when the budget in India was properly balanced it produced a surplus and the war debt caused by the Sepoy Mutiny had already been paid off in the preceding decade. The budget had been poorly estimated for years with different estimates for each year showing massive profits or deficits that never existed.⁴⁴ These estimates involved the collection and distributions of millions of British Pounds and were crucial for British rule in India. These wild predictions were caused by inaccurate departmental budgets within the British administration and by poor record keeping. In the Department of Public Works, the estimates costs and timelines for the completion of projects were normally wrong. It was assumed that projects

⁴⁰ Brunt, P. A. "Reflections on British and Roman Imperialism." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 1965. Pg. 268

⁴¹ Lyall, Sir Alfred. *Warren Hastings*. London, Macmillan and Co., 1889. Pg.154-155, 217-218.

⁴² Carlton Pg. 33

⁴³ Hutton, James. "A Royal Commission for India" *Bristol Selected Pamphlets*, 1871. Pg. 12

⁴⁴ Hutton Pg. 17-26

would be finished earlier than they usually were, and this meant that more money had to be spent on each project that was behind schedule. Since these projects were being worked on by contractors, it was conceived that they often fell behind on purpose to exact more money out of the British government.⁴⁵ In this way exorbitant amounts of Indian taxes were being spent on projects that they did not necessarily want, but were deemed to be good for the country.

James Hutton, the author of “A Royal Commission for India” complains that the British Government of India was wasteful and too large. He thought the purchasing of railways and canals as a means to control the Indian economy was the equivalent of throwing the money into the Thames River. Hutton also complained that the income tax is being levied for things that Indians should not have had to pay for, such as the traveling expenses of British officials and gifts from the British to the Indian Princes.⁴⁶ Hutton believed that making the Indians pay high taxes would only lead to resentment and discontent towards British rule, which would otherwise be appreciated for bringing “...a degree of peace, security, and material prosperity to which they were strangers prior to the establishment of British supremacy.”⁴⁷

In 1858 it was said in parliament that there never existed a “more corrupt, more perfidious, and more capricious” civilized government than the East India Company’s government of India from 1758 to 1784.⁴⁸ While the charges brought against Warren Hastings may have been fabricated, he was merely the scapegoat put on trial for the corruption throughout the rest of the EIC’s administration at the time. Corruption in the government slowly faded as the British officials and the British public gained a new ethical code, which led to the development of the “White Man’s Burden.” Corruption still existed and many individual brought home vast

⁴⁵ Hutton Pg. 31-33

⁴⁶ Hutton Pg. 38-39

⁴⁷ Hutton Pg. 49-50

⁴⁸ Brunt Pg. 268

fortunes from their time in India, but most British officials in India, were of outstanding character and performed their duties honestly in an attempt to bring their ideas of civilization to India. The British Government continued to try and exact as a great a profit as possible from India by passing laws like the 1871 Income-tax. James Hutton was right when he said in 1871 that, “the British rule has become odious to all alike, and though no actual rebellion is immediately to be apprehended, the old sentiment of loyalty is fast waning, and in yet a few years the Government will have to face a passive resistance far more disastrous and formidable than an appeal to arms.”⁴⁹ He predicted the rise of influential political parties within India, such as the Indian National Congress. The Indian National Congress was founded in 1885 by educated Indians, and would go on to be the most important political group in India into the 1970s and be one of the most influential advocates calling for more rights from the British government.⁵⁰

Not all British efforts in India were for economic gain, many British officials produced works that proved to be important to the cultural and scientific understanding of the peoples and lands of India. India was both romanticized and scientifically documented for the British public by the reports coming back from the men there. British officials in India often spent their spare time writing journals or articles that they would publish in magazines in India and Britain. These stories often exaggerated the qualities of life in India, making it appear as an exotic land of wealth and adventure. Men sent to survey land often wrote factual histories’ of the local cultures and scientific articles about health, climate, and wildlife as well as the geographic reports and maps they were sent to make.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Hutton Pg. 51

⁵⁰ Metcalf, Barbara D. Metcalf and Thomas R. *A Concise History of Modern India*. 2006. Pg.136-137, 201.

⁵¹ Peers, Douglas M. "Colonial Knowledge and the Military in India, 1780-1860." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 2005 Pg. 158-158

The studies made by these men helped the British control India. Studies of the local populations helped them understand the different cultures, and geographical surveys resulted in maps of India. When these maps were combined with health studies, they showed the areas in which Europeans were most likely to contract tropical diseases such as malaria. This allowed the British to reduce the health risks to their soldiers by stationing them in low risk areas or relocating them during the different seasons when health risks changed.⁵² Diseases, like malaria, were deadly to Europeans who were in tropical regions for their first time. Europeans were not used to the climate in India and did not have the resistance to diseases that the natives had. Before vaccines and medicines were created for these diseases the studies done by British officials were useful in preventing illness. The British dislike for the foreign climate and its intense heat during summer months led to the creation of hill stations. These were resorts where people could get away from the crowded and hot cities.⁵³ There was also a sense of imperial authority derived from these hill stations as the British were able to look over the lands and population centers in the plains that they ruled from the hill tops.⁵⁴

It was a standard policy for the British in India to use their military only when they were certain of victory, and therefore it was more common for the British to use diplomacy and military “shows of force,” to influence local magistrates and autocrats. By mediating or partaking local disputes the British were able to place advisors in the councils of many Indian rulers or replace the rulers with men favorable to British rule.⁵⁵ This kept the same structure of government that had been in India in place, while making it loyal and subservient to the British.

⁵² Peers Pg. 163

⁵³ Peers Pg. 159

⁵⁴ Kenny, Judith T. "Climate, Race, and Imperial Authority: The Symbolic Landscape of the British Hill Station in India." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 1995: Pg. 696

⁵⁵ Darwin Pg 5-6

For most of British rule of India, the British army was better trained and equipped than any rebellious native force. This advantage was nullified by the numbers of men that could be fielded by their opponents, and these forces were often highly loyal to their leaders and fairly well equipped.

The Sepoy Mutiny (1857-1859) was the largest rebellion the British had to deal with.⁵⁶ It began when the Sepoys mutinied when new cartridges containing pork fat were issued to them. These cartridges were opened by tearing off the top. This was done by biting and ripping the top off which led to the ingestion of the pork fat that was used to seal the cartridges. Eating pork violated many religious traditions of the Sepoys, and they refused to use the new equipment. The Sepoys had British training, equipment, and the support of the local populace in many areas on the edge of British control. When some British Officers forced their Sepoys to use the cartridges they mutinied against the British Officers and garrisons. As Sepoys across India rebelled they often massacred, imprisoned, or besieged local British garrisons. The British relief forces were able to quell the rebellion by destroying isolated mutinous forces and by responding with the same intensity and brutality that the mutineers had displayed. After a British force discovered the remains of a British garrison mutilated and thrown down a well, they responded by tying captured mutineers to the mouths of cannons and executing them. This act was especially brutal as it destroyed the body which many of the mutineers believed was needed intact at death to enter the afterlife.⁵⁷ After the Mutiny, the British Crown took over control of India, and created a council in Parliament to replace the East India Company's Court of Directors. They also reduced their dependence on using Sepoys in India. Instead they raised taxes in India to pay for

⁵⁶ Boyce, D. George. "From Assaye to the Assaye: Reflections on British Government, Force, and Moral Authority in India." *The Journal of Military History*, 1999 Pg. 650-651

⁵⁷ Boyce Pg. 654

stationing a much larger percentage of the British Army and Navy in India.⁵⁸ This tax paid for most of the British standing army throughout the Empire, and relieved the burden of paying for these forces from the British people themselves.

Even with large number of Sepoys used by the British in India, the core of their power was the British Army. The British Regulars were well trained and experienced veterans that were proven to stand in line during battle. British diplomatic efforts often relied upon the perceived power of the British military. Even though the British forces in India would struggle with a rebellion the magnitude of Sepoy Mutiny, they could easily be used to intimidate or influence the actions of individual princedoms. When the British first entered India local rulers often sought their aid in conflicts, because it was known that their presence would determine the outcome of the conflict. The reputation of the Regulars became impressive enough that the appearance of a relatively small force of them could keep a much larger and possibly stronger rebellious population in check.

Since India was relatively peaceful many young officers were sent to command British troops in India. A young Arthur Wellesley, later known as the Duke of Wellington, was stationed in India from 1797 to 1805.⁵⁹ He entered India as Lieutenant and left as a Major-General, and gained a reputation for his exceptional skills as a military leader and for his awareness of what his military actions meant for British rule in India. He realized that the force and authority were related and dependent on each other and that British Sovereignty of India could only be maintained by balancing the two.⁶⁰ Force was the presence of the British Regulars and their enforcement of British rule by confronting those that opposed it. The British army was given the authority to use this force by the British Crown, which legitimized the use of force as a necessity

⁵⁸ Metcalf Pg. 125

⁵⁹ Boyce Pg. 644

⁶⁰ Boyce Pg. 646

to protect its own interests and the people under its rule. The civil authority was supposed to be responsible for making sure that people were treated fairly and justly and its tool for making sure this was done is force. If the British military suffered a major defeat in India then it would cripple British rule in the area, as they would appear weak and people would begin opposing them. Conversely the use of too much force could cause a backlash against the state, so it was crucial for the British troops to use no more force than was necessary.

Only once was the use of force truly abused in a manner abhorrent to the Indian people. In 1919 General R. E. H. Dyer opened fire with modern weaponry on an unarmed crowd in the city of Amritsar. This incident, which became known as the Amritsar Massacre occurred when Dyer led his troops to disperse a crowd in the unruly city. He claimed the crowd was a challenge to British authority and he therefore ordered his troops to open fire. He left at least 380 people dead or dying when he marched his troops away from the scene.⁶¹ Most British tended to be sympathetic towards Dyer, while Indians were outraged by his actions. In a joint commission set up by the British to examine Dyer's actions and determine a punishment if needed, it was concluded that his actions at Amritsar were flawed by the he was not severely punished. He was not removed from service, so he kept his pension and his honors, and in order to not make a martyr out of him the commission tried to hinder any criminal actions brought against Dyer.⁶² The tribunal decided in his favor 11 to 1 and he was absolved of responsibility for the massacre. To appease the Indians he was sent back to England.⁶³

The British rule in India was very successful as it faced relatively few rebellions, especially after the Sepoy Mutiny. Most Indians were loyal to the British Crown, and even when movements in the early Twentieth Century for the right to self-government started to become

⁶¹ Boyce Pg. 657

⁶² Boyce Pg. 659

⁶³ Boyce Pg. 668

violent, millions of Indians still volunteered to fight for the British in both World Wars. Part of the reasoning behind the loyalty and peaceful conditions that benefited the British came from the development of India's infrastructure, and creating an upper and middle class that had a European style education.

British companies, in an effort to make trade and commerce easier to conduct within the interior regions of India, financed the construction of rail lines, roads, and telegraph wires. This allowed farmers that produced cotton, indigo, and other crops important for India's own textile industry to cheaply transport their goods to the coast, where it could be shipped to the large textile factories in England. The British tried to maintain the system of land ownership that existed in India before their arrival. This system was composed of hierarchies of land-owners and tenants. Due to rental fees associated with tenant farming, moneylenders often would give loans with high interest rates to poorer farmers. To help this debt trapped class of farmers the British passed the Punjab Land Alienation Act in 1901 that banned the selling of farm plots to anyone outside of the traditional agricultural classes.⁶⁴ While protecting some poor farmers this also protected landlords from urban investors that had been speculating in land, and allowed these landowners to accumulate more land of their own. There also tended to be a reluctance to risk profits on improving their crop yields through new technology or new types of crops, which meant the only way to make more money for the landowners, was to purchase larger plots of land.⁶⁵ These actions forced many Indians to search for jobs outside of farming.

Some Indians started local heavy industries that used the British infrastructure but avoided competing with British industrial interests by selling their products to foreign markets. Several prominent Indian steel manufacturers were formed during this time period, and they sold

⁶⁴ Metcalf Pg. 134

⁶⁵ Carlton Pg. 40

mainly to the Chinese market.⁶⁶ The manufacturers also became important to the British during the World Wars when the industry shifted to military production. India was Britain's primary trading partner and even if Britain had a deficit after balancing its trades with foreign countries, that deficit would often be negated by the surplus from its trade with India. To insure that Britain would always have an advantageous trading relationship with India, they prohibited Indian businesses from directly competing with British companies.⁶⁷ Trade with foreign powers was outlawed into the Twentieth Century, and the British controlled the taxes and tariffs charged on goods in India. The British tax on salt was particularly unpopular. The unnecessarily high taxes on salt being sold in India, forced people to buy salt manufactured by the British. One of Mahatma Gandhi's most famous nonviolent protests was against this particular tax. He led thousands of Indians on a march to the sea and when they arrived there, they started producing their own salt.⁶⁸ The British could do nothing against this open act of dissent because they were doing nothing illegal.

Many Indians who had been forced out of their jobs due to the changing economic climate in India found employment through the British; either in the military, in the government, or as indentured labor in other British colonies. Poor farmers who had been forced off their land due to high rents could find work as indentured laborers in other British Colonies. They could find work for a number of years on the sugar plantations in the British West Indies.⁶⁹ Due to the abolishment of slavery there was a need for a source of labor in the West Indies, which coincided with rise of the unemployed in India.

⁶⁶ Metcalf Pg 126

⁶⁷ Eacott, Jonathan P. "Making an Imperial Compromise: The Calico Acts, the Atlantic Colonies, and the Structure of the British Empire." 2012 Pg. 731-732

⁶⁸ Metcalf Pg. 191

⁶⁹ Metcalf. Pg. 126-127

The British created new schools and universities throughout India. This along with a rise of a wealthy merchant class due to the trade with the British led to an intellectual middle and upper class. These people were often encouraged to further their studies abroad, either in Britain or elsewhere in Europe. Upon returning to India they formed literary clubs, political groups, and entered the British bureaucracy in India.⁷⁰ This intellectual class was crucial to the development of British-India relationships. They called for more rights for Indians and the right to have their own government in India or at the very least a voice in the British Parliament. Their time spent in Europe meant that they often had better working relationships with the British officials in India. The Indians that studied at British universities often shared classes and met British students who would later become members of the British government in India. This shared experience helped them learn about the desires and interests of each other as the British tried to retain control of India economically and politically, and as the Indians were trying to gain more rights in their own country.

The most famous of these educated Indian nationals was Mahatma Gandhi, who led peaceful resistance movements against the British that led to the eventual decolonization of India. From his experiences in England and British South Africa he learned that the British government could be manipulated by controlling the public opinion in the British Isles. His peaceful protest would antagonize the British rule but would not be openly illegal. Instead of buying British clothes and salt which were heavily taxed, he had his followers produce their own. If the police or military responded with force they would appear to be a tyrannical power, forcing their rule on India. The British people believed to some extent that they were not exploiting India but bringing it the benefits of European Civilization. If news got back to Britain that excessive force was being used to control the Indian populace it was feared that the British

⁷⁰ Carlton Pg. 36

people would stop supporting the British rule of India. This left the British officials with the dilemma to either allow Gandhi to continue his movements, defying their authority, or crack down and lose public support. Gandhi was arrested twice by the British, once when a demonstration became violent and the second time when it was thought that he was supporting movements detrimental to the British war effort during World War Two.⁷¹ His movements along with the actions of fellow political activists led to a peaceful end of British rule in India.

Great Britain's rule of India was full of contradictions. They exploited the Indian economy and marketplace for large amounts of wealth, considered themselves superior to local population, and secured their rule using military force. They placed a large tax burden on a relatively poor working class, and used these funds on projects that enabled Britain to exact even more money out of the colony. The British used Indian laborers in far off colonies, and used Indian soldiers in wars across the globe. While taking advantage of the wealth and manpower of India, the British claimed that they were civilizing the territory. Public work projects such as the canals and railways helped develop India's economy into one that rivaled most European nations. The schools and universities that were built by the British Administration educated large segments of the population, including many that previously did not have access to the luxury of education. While a sense of superiority was prevalent throughout the British officials in India during their occupation of the region, the respect that the British and the Indians had for each other eventually helped the peaceful decolonization of the subcontinent. Even if decolonization is viewed as an economic move by the British to continue its trade with India while no longer providing its costly military and bureaucratic presence in the country, it cannot be doubted that educating the Indian people helped create a lasting sense of good will between the two nations.

⁷¹Metcalf Pg. 184, 192

Chapter 3:

The previous chapters have discussed how the Rome and Great Britain conquered, maintained, and eventually lost their empires. These great powers are frequently compared to each other, but their differences are as important as their similarities. These differences indicate the effects that modern technology and an educated populace have had on the longevity and maintenance of empires. While the Roman Empire lasted longer than the British Empire, it relied on violence to maintain order. When the power of Rome faded and the city was sacked, the areas it ruled were divided and many fell into disarray. Great Britain was weakened by the Two World Wars, but its possessions did not openly rebel against the weakened British state. Instead the educated populations in Great Britain and in the Colonies worked out ways to peacefully decolonize the Empire and create stable new nations.

Great Britain and Rome used different methods to control the populations of their respective empires. Rome often relied on its military force to crush rebellions and intimidate the local populace into obeying the will of the Emperor or Senate. While Great Britain kept a military force in India, politics and economics were more influential in maintaining order. Britain had a vested interest in keeping India under its control, as it was the most valuable source of income for Britain in the entire Empire. The two empires used different methods to achieve the same goal throughout their respective empires, but similarities do appear in their governing methods.

The two empires relied heavily on existing local governments and traditions to help them control the total populace of newly annexed regions. Rome's Empire was created through military campaigns led by political leaders in search of fame, against real or supposed threats to Rome's existing territories. Any opponent that did not submit would be destroyed by Rome's

military might. This created lasting animosity between Romans and the existing population. After defeating an opponent Rome would replace the vanquished ruler or governing body with a new one that would be loyal to Roman interests. Often they would leave the local form of government and bureaucracy intact. If the opponents submitted to Rome peacefully, the leaders were allowed to retain their positions of authority. These local ruling bodies retained their traditional powers and authority but had certain obligations to Rome. They had tax quotas that were to be paid in grain or gold, they had to provide for any Roman military force in the area, and they had to submit to the authority of the Emperor or the local Roman Governor. By allowing locals to keep the traditions, government, and rulers that did not oppose their authority, Rome was able to avoid creating a massive bureaucracy in all of their provinces. Instead they used Governors, the Governors personal entourage, and a garrison of troops to control fairly large areas of land.

The British entered India looking for an advantageous trade relationship. To this end the British East India Company founded several forts and trading outposts along the coast. The EIC was not powerful enough to conquer any of the local states upon their arrival. However local leaders realized that the British would be useful allies in conflicts with their military technology.⁷² The EIC would sign treaties with these leaders promising military aid and in return would place advisors in the courts of the ruler. These advisors would ensure that the local government acted in line with British interests. The East India Company's influence led to British backed states gaining prominence in the area. Indian states on the borders of the EIC's sphere of influence soon saw the benefits of having alliances with the Europeans, and signed their own treaties with the British. In this way the EIC's influence spread from the coast inland

⁷² Carlton, Eeric. *Occupation*. London: Routledge, 1992. Pg. 30-32

until the British were rulers of the subcontinent. To control the area with their limited military presence the EIC created a large bureaucratic government to oversee the still existing Indian principalities and determined the policies that all of these local governments would follow. This government was created in the manner of a European monarchy with the Viceroy and governors acting as the chief executive and judicial figures instead of kings. Most of the legislative functions of the government were performed by the EIC's Court of Directors, or later the British Parliament.⁷³ The Indian states had signed over control of their country to the British willingly to further themselves in local affairs. They still collected the usual taxes from their subjects but most of the funds gained from taxes now paid for the British bureaucracy and army. The British allowed Indians of all religions to follow their traditional beliefs and maintain their customs. This meant for most Indian peasants, there was not much change in their lifestyle after the British established themselves as the local power. The local princes and governing bodies still managed the local communities and most of the civil functions of government, just as the Romans allowed the rulers of the lands they conquered to maintain their authority over the local populace.

While relying on local governments to perform the basic functions of government in most villages and cities, Roman and British policies for overseeing these local governments differed greatly. Great Britain relied on a relatively large bureaucracy that was established throughout India. Rome was more reliant on their traveling Governors. The Roman Governor and the men he appointed performed many of the judicial and executive duties of the government in the provinces. They traveled in and around their provinces settling disputes and cases as they went. If a specific region of the province was becoming disorderly, the Governor would travel there

⁷³ Darwin, John. *Britain's Empire*. Blackwell Publishing, 2008 Pg. 6

with his entourage to try and calm the area.⁷⁴ The entourage normally included a significant military guard that would help to police the area. The Romans did not garrison most of their cities with military forces, relying on the local watchmen to keep order. Most of the Roman Legions were located along Rome's frontiers, or in rebellious regions. They did station small groups of legionaries and centurions at important resources and roads, to counter banditry. These outposts often helped locals settle small disputes even if they did not have the technical authority to do so.⁷⁵ The Romans also relied on *frumentarii* who were special messengers and operatives of the Roman Emperor who often were sent to arrest people opposed to him.⁷⁶

The British posted officials in most cities and villages in India. These officials often worked in conjunction with local police forces. George Orwell wrote of his experiences as a British police officer working in Burma in his story *Shooting an Elephant*. In this book a local's elephant went berserk and was damaging a section of the town. Orwell was the only person with a gun strong enough to kill the elephant so the locals sought his assistance. When he found the elephant he did not know where to shoot it to kill it quickly, nor did he wish to kill the animal. The elephant in question was a valuable piece of property and was the owner's main way to produce a living. Killing the creature would be a waste if it could be calmed down and brought back to its owner. Orwell's actions when he found the elephant became a spectacle for the locals to watch and soon a crowd of hundreds gathered around him.⁷⁷ Even though the locals did not fully respect him, they did respect the overall authority of the British.⁷⁸ Orwell could do nothing by himself to impede the will of the crowd if they were to turn violent, but most people

⁷⁴ Fuhrmann, Christopher J. *Policing the Roman Empire*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2012. Pg. 181-184

⁷⁵ Fuhrmann Pg. 224-228

⁷⁶ Fuhrmann Pg. 153-155

⁷⁷ Orwell, George. "Shooting an Elephant." *New Writing*, October 12, 1936. Pg. 4-5

⁷⁸ Orwell Pg. 1

understood that if they harmed or went against the will of a member of the British administration they would soon face repercussions by a much stronger British force. It was only the respect they had of British authority that protected isolated British officials throughout India and kept the local population in order.

The respect of the local populations was gained through public services provided by their ruling governments. The presence of powerful governments to provide oversight for entire regions ended local conflicts. No longer could rival principalities, cities, and kingdoms fight among themselves, because they were all united under the British or Roman Empire. Their energies were no longer wasted in small conflicts but now were put to bettering the Empire and with the end of these local wars came relative peace. Only enemies of the empire would dare to attack, and then there would surely be a response by imperial forces, whether British Regulars and Sepoys or the Roman Legions and their auxiliaries. British and Roman forces also helped reduce the crime rate in the areas where they were stationed.

Rome provided many services that most other powers of the time could not provide. Roman engineering was superior to any other Mediterranean power at the time. Rome could establish cities where they wanted and then bring water to the city through aqueducts from water sources miles away. This allowed them to create cities in strategic centers of their provinces and then connect them with roads to other cities and towns throughout the empire. Roman roads crisscrossed the Empire, and were built superior to any other roads at the time. Romans also brought their luxuries and customs with them as they expanded their empire. They built bath houses and theaters in the towns they founded and captured.⁷⁹ With peaceful conditions

⁷⁹ MacMullen, Ramsay. *Romanization in the Time of Augustus*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000. Pg. 104-105, 109

established along secure roads and sea-lanes thanks to the Roman Legions and navy, trade flourished across the Mediterranean and throughout Europe.

Britain introduced India to many of the advances of European technology. The British built schools and universities in India as they consolidated their control. The upper classes of India were customarily educated in their own societies, but the new schools taught using European methods. These introduced the Indians to European values, literature, and scientific advances. This led to Indians taught in this manner looking at problems with a European perspective, and a growing appreciation of European values and science. By educating the local populace the British created an upper echelon of society that was easier to interact with. In 1885 seventy English-educated Indians started the Indian National Congress and would emerge as one of the most powerful Indian political powers after India gained its independence from Britain.⁸⁰ Organizations like the Indian National Congress, and the multiple newspapers and political movements founded by educated Indians, pushed for more Indian representation in the rule of their own country and for new economic legislation to create more opportunities for Indian industry. They pushed for change through action by the government instead of forcing a change in government with violent rebellion. Their actions were successful in pressuring the British government to pass favorable legislation.⁸¹ Numerous other European colonies overthrew their imperial rulers through wars of independence, while most British colonies were peacefully decolonized after World War Two.

The British also updated the infrastructure of India as new technologies became available. They installed railroads and canals throughout the interior of the subcontinent, built telegraph wires, and established an electrical grid in major cities. Along with the increased use of

⁸⁰ Metcalf, Barbara D. Metcalf and Thomas R. *A Concise History of Modern India*. 2006. Pg. 136,201

⁸¹ Metcalf Pg. 203

ocean going steamships these improvements helped industry to prosper in India by allowing news and goods to travel faster and cheaper.⁸² Many of these public works were built with the money collected from the Indian people through taxes. While they often benefitted India and the local populations, they were mainly built to benefit British endeavors and help consolidate British control over the region.⁸³ In case of emergency news would travel faster around the country and the government could shift troops around the country faster, or request support from Britain faster. During the Eighteenth Century, Britain's colonies replaced European nations as the primary trading partners of the island nation. It was therefore in Britain's self interest to develop the country along economic lines to increase the profits that could be made from trading with India.

Britain focused on the economic development of India, while Rome focused on bringing its own culture to the provinces. Both empires improved the infrastructure in the areas they controlled, with the result that troops and news could travel faster and therefore make the outlying provinces easier to rule. The increased infrastructure had also boosted local industries and increased the amount of trade into and out of the region. Rome's cultural buildings like theaters and baths were creature comforts that could distract the local population from the troubles they faced in their lives. The Roman baths, aqueducts, and sewers benefited the health of the local populations that did not have access to these amenities beforehand. While Rome used local elites in their government and some provincial elites made it into the Roman government, the Romans did not actively encourage education in the provinces. The wealthiest elites would educate their children in Latin and possibly send their children to Rome but this was only in rare cases. Romans valued Greek education more and the upper classes of society knew Greek as well

⁸² Metcalf. Pg. 126

⁸³ Hutton, James. "A Royal Commission for India" *Bristol Selected Pamphlets*, 1871. Pg. 38-39

as Latin. Wealthy Romans went to Greece to learn from renowned scholars and philosophers. While Rome was known for its engineering feats, and powerful military, they also used the ideas and technologies of the people they conquered.

Rome relied on adapting the local technologies and the cultures of occupied territories to improve their own society. Perhaps this can best be seen with the changing nature of Rome's religious practices. Rome's religion changed as it conquered new areas, to include the gods of the new cultures into the existing Roman pantheon. Normally this meant adding new myths to the existing deities to give the local god a persona of the Roman god. This allowed provincial cultures to worship the same deities without conflicting with Roman religion. The clearest example of this is between the Greek and Roman pantheons, where the major gods share most of the same qualities and myths, and differ only in their names. This tactic of combining religions proved to be unsuccessful with the followers of monotheistic Judaism and Christianity.⁸⁴

While building projects and cultural sharing helped build strong relationships between the empires and their colonies, high taxes, corrupt officials, and arbitrary violence could ruin that same relationship. The British maintained the traditional system of tribute in India, where the peasants paid their lords portions of their profits or crops and then the British took a portion of what the lord had collected. This worked until the industries became more prevalent throughout India Britain began using income taxes instead of the original tribute system. It was feared when income taxes were first being introduced that if the tax system was employed along with the traditional system that most farmers would go bankrupt. They would not be able to pay both the tribute and the tax, while retaining enough food and money to provide for themselves and their

⁸⁴ Brunt, P. A. "Reflections on British and Roman Imperialism." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* , 1965. Pg. 283

families.⁸⁵ While there were many opportunities for corruption in British India, most of it had stopped by the mid Nineteenth Century, and after the Sepoy Mutiny there was only one major act of violence from the British towards the Indians. The Amritsar Massacre caused hundreds of deaths, and the general responsible for the tragedy was acquitted of the blame. This accident created political problems for Great Britain but did not lead to open rebellion.⁸⁶

Rome also maintained a land based tax system, where the people paid a percentage of what they produced each year to hired tax collectors, who would then send what they had collected to Rome after taking their collectors fee. These tax collectors were often corrupt, taking more than was required and pocketing the additional funds they collected. They often had the assistance of the *Frumentarii* and other local soldiers when they collected the taxes, leading locals to resent the taxes, its collectors, and the Roman military. In addition to this tax, provincials were also supposed to provide for the needs of any nearby Roman military units. This meant that Roman armies traveling through the Empire could cause large amounts of property damage by merely feeding themselves on the local produce.⁸⁷ Rome used violence to its advantage to counter any ill feelings the populace had. The Roman legions protected most of the Roman population from bandits and outside threats, creating peace throughout the Empire. If a rebellion did occur the Romans would brutally crush it, and make an example of those that challenged the Empire.

Romans did use religious propaganda to depict their enemies as beastly or inhuman. At the height of their power, the Gauls and the Carthaginians rivaled Rome's power and were serious threats to its continued existence. Romans distrusted the Gallic Druids who were believed

⁸⁵ Hutton Pg. 6-8

⁸⁶ Boyce, D. George. "From Assaye to the Assaye: Reflections on British Government, Force, and Moral Authority in India." *The Journal of Military History*, 1999 Pg. 659, 668

⁸⁷ Lintott, Andrew. *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration*. London: Routledge, 1993. Pg. 74-76

to be magicians and sorcerers. The Romans claimed that Carthaginians practiced human sacrifice and would ritualistically kill children. After Rome conquered Gaul, the Druids lost most of their influence over the local people and were no longer a threat to Rome. After the Third Punic War, the city of Carthage was destroyed and salt was sown into the soil so that no one could live on that land in the future.⁸⁸

Roman culture changed as the Empire grew. As it expanded it absorbed the technologies and cultures of those it annexed. In return Rome brought its own culture and those of foreign lands to newly conquered regions. In regions that had been newly added to the Empire, Rome would take the traditional gods and traditions, and incorporate them into the mythology of the Roman Pantheon. This amalgamation of cultures made it easier for newly conquered people to integrate into the Empire.

Great Britain did not adopt any of the traditions of the people they conquered. British soldiers and officials stationed in the colonies were enthralled by the customs and habits of the local populations, but relatively few indigenous habits made their way into British society. The British thought they were superior to the people they conquered and therefore had to help them become more civilized. This “White Man’s Burden” determined the way Britain ruled its colonies. This desire to help the inferior local populations was prominent throughout the British population, and unreasonable acts of aggression or harsh legislation from the British administration towards the Indians frequently caused public outrage in Great Britain. Britain focused on bringing its own culture to those that it ruled, through public works projects and providing a European style education for Indians.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Carlton Pg. 18

⁸⁹ Brunt Pg. 279-280

The Roman and British military forces in the occupied territories were supplemented by recruits drawn from local militaristic tribes and societies. These local soldiers could not be relied upon and were normally not given assignments as important as those given the Roman Legions or British Regulars. The Roman Auxiliaries and the British Sepoys did prove invaluable to their respective empires. As the Roman Empire expanded, the Roman Legions could not protect the entire border alone and auxiliaries were often stationed in their own frontier forts. By the end of the Western Roman Empire, the Roman military was relying chiefly upon auxiliary units drawn from the provinces.⁹⁰ The Sepoys were often drafted from more militaristic castes of Indian society. They were given British officers, equipment, and training and were used extensively during the East India Company's rule of India. The Sepoy mutinied in 1857 after being issued the new cartridges for their rifles which were sealed with animal fat. After the Sepoy Mutiny, Britain reduced the number of Sepoys it used in India, and increased the Regular British force stationed there.⁹¹ When the First World War started, millions of Indians volunteered to join the British armed forces. The Indian troops fought in the Middle Eastern Campaigns and on the Eastern Front during the war. Thousands of Indians died fighting for the British during the war. Many Indians thought that their sacrifices would convince Britain to give more rights to the Indian people.⁹² In the interwar period, many political movements gained momentum in India, pushing for reforms in the Indian Civil Service and for more rights. The Indians also served the British in large numbers during the Second World War, especially since the Japanese were trying to invade India through Burma and French-Indo China. During these two wars the Indians served the British loyally, and most political dissension in India stopped for the duration of the war.⁹³

⁹⁰ Carlton Pg. 24-25

⁹¹ Metcalf Pg. 125

⁹² Metcalf Pg. 188

⁹³ Metcalf Pg. 163

It was commonly thought that locally raised soldiers could not be relied upon as much as soldiers from the heart of the empire. They did not have as large a stake in the well being of the empire and might even secretly wish to see it fail. Often these troops did not have the same amount of training and discipline as the standing armies did, and were given old or inferior weapons as well. The officers chosen to lead such men were normally not of the same caliber as the men that led the regular units as well. All these disadvantages made it more likely that the auxiliaries and Sepoys would be more likely to falter in actual combat, furthering the myth that they could not be relied upon. This was often proved to be a myth since these units tended to be just as loyal to the empire they fought for as the regular units, and would fight just as hard even with their disadvantages. During World War One more than a million Indians served in the British armed forces, while poor monsoons and the significant resources being devoted to the war effort led to harsh conditions for the people in India. During this period, when most British forces were fighting in the war, and few were left to garrison India, there were no uprisings against the British.⁹⁴

The biggest differences between the two Empires are related to the time period that each existed in. By the time that the British Empire reached its peak, most citizens of Great Britain did not wish to be seen as overlords conquering lesser peoples, but rather as a force bringing education and prosperity to those less fortunate. The Romans tended to have a belief that they were a superior force and they were destined to control the entire world through the use of their armed forces.⁹⁵ The technology available to the British, especially at the start of the Twentieth Century, made running their distant lands easier as steamboats and ocean liners were developed and telegraph wires were laid down. India was Britain's greatest trading partner and the British

⁹⁴ Metcalf Pg. 168

⁹⁵ Brunt Pg. 271

invested large amounts of money into the development of Indian industry and infrastructure. This capital investment, along with a highly educated and political population, rapidly turned India into a modern industrial power. By educating the people, and teaching them of European ideas on political philosophy, especially the idea of representation of the people in government, indicated that the British expected to eventually give the Indians sovereignty over their own country or at least representation in Parliament.⁹⁶ The importance of India to Britain's economy led to the incremental steps of giving India more freedoms while ensuring it was still a British possession. After the World Wars bankrupted Britain, it was no longer feasible for the Empire to maintain large standing military forces abroad and they were forced to give the Indians the freedoms and sovereignty that they had been seeking.

The Romans did not have to deal with an educated modern society, and because of this they were successful using intimidation to control their territories. During Roman times people did not seek the amenities and public services from their government as people expect from modern governments. The Roman government was not obligated to provide welfare, health services, or even regular policing and fire protection. These things were left to city and local governments to establish if necessary and only in the special cases mentioned earlier were Roman military forces used as police.⁹⁷ When Rome conquered an area it meant to the average person that the taxes they raised went to a different ruler, and one that was large and powerful enough to deter the threat of major crime or foreign invasion. Most kingdoms and cities at the time could not provide the simple protection from foreign threats that the Romans did and this caused many people to remain loyal to Rome. The Roman Empire did maintain a representative senate, but only people of substantial wealth and who were considered to be Roman Citizens

⁹⁶ Metcalf Pg. 135

⁹⁷ Fuhrmann Pg. 224-228

could vote. The Romans did grant some people in the provinces this right but most people did not call for vast political changes or the sovereignty of their province from the Roman Empire.⁹⁸

Rome and Britain each used military force, political maneuvering, and the establishment of economic and cultural ties to their territories in order to control the local populations. It was the different priorities of each Empire that created different styles of ruling. Rome's power was based on its military and it used force and intimidation to control unruly populations. Great Britain used India for its own economic gain but in the process of developing the industry and educating the people they created the foundation for what became the sovereign nation of India.

Conclusion:

Rome and Britain conquered large areas of their known world for different reasons. Roman generals seeking glory and fame sought wars with neighboring states, which led to the expansion of Roman rule from their own small city-state in Italy to the entire Mediterranean Basin and beyond. Beginning with the discovery of rich new lands by explorers at the beginning of the Sixteenth Century, European nations rapidly started claiming these lands for their own economic gain. The island nation of Great Britain had relied on its navy to protect its own shores from its mainland rivals, and this navy was put to use securing lands around the world. The small island group eventually controlled the largest empire of its time. Rome and Britain each ruled their respective empires successfully for centuries. Rome used its military strength to ensure peace through intimidating foes both foreign and internal. The British were more interested in economic wealth, and to that end created a state in which they could profit immensely from Indian industry while appeasing the local population through improvements to the infrastructure and education system. Each system of rule had its own advantages and disadvantages but each

⁹⁸ Brunt Pg. 271

worked well in its time. The differences in the systems indicate the changes in era, public opinion, and technology. The similarities illustrate what is needed to maintain a successful empire.

The methods of conquering and the subsequent use of military force in the provinces prove that each power had different goals in establishing their empire. Roman society glorified victorious generals. Successful generals not only kept large amounts of wealth that they plundered while on campaign but could expect to have successful political careers based on the fame their victories had gained them. Even during the Roman Republic the highest political figures in the government were also field generals. Consuls and Emperors were expected to personally lead Roman armies in the most important campaigns. In times of peace Roman officials would often find a cause to start a war, claiming that it was defensive and protecting Roman interests. Romans benefited from the resources gained by controlling new territories but the expansion occurred not to provide economic advantages for Rome, but for personal glory and sometimes the protection of Roman lands.

Britain began claiming foreign lands in order to compete economically with its European rivals who had established their own empires. Spain and Portugal had become extraordinarily wealthy from operations in South America and the Spice Islands, and the other European nations hoped that they could find the same wealth by annexing other parts of the world. In lands that were sparsely populated or had societies that were relatively disorganized and weak, the Europeans simply annexed the land, displacing, killing, or enslaving the local populations. Where stronger societies existed the European powers sought trade agreements, and established trading outposts. In India the French, Dutch, and English all established trading outposts and competed for dominance in the regions trade markets. By allying with the local powers and

through a series of successful wars the British East India Company established dominance along the coasts of southern India. From the outposts established there, their influence began to spread inland. The East India Company was not powerful enough to conquer all of India through military force but used treaties and minor conflicts to slowly spread their control until they were the de facto rulers of the Indian sub-continent. The military forces that the EIC and the British government deployed in India were tiny compared to the region's total population, and in the British were often outnumbered in the few major conflicts that did occur. To maintain control they made India economically dependent on British trade.

The two great imperial powers relied on local governments and soldiers to help maintain order in the provinces, and each allowed locals access to positions in the government. Rome and Britain each kept the local governments in place, as long as they followed the rules and instructions of the imperial government. This allowed an easier transition between powers and less resentment among the people towards the empire. If a government did not suit the needs of the Empire, it was replaced by one that did. Local governments dealt with the routine operations of government that the system the empires established was not intended to deal with. The Romans used a Governor and small outposts of troops to maintain their presence in their territories. They allowed a great deal of autonomy to the cities in the regions, as long as they obeyed the will of Rome and they respected the authority of Roman officials, particularly the provincial governor. The East India Company and the British Government established a large bureaucracy in India to maintain control of the large population. This bureaucracy became known as the Indian Civil Service. While British operations in India were technically under the control of the British Parliament, due to the time necessary for news and instructions to travel, this bureaucracy effectively operated as the Indian government. Educated and prominent Indians

were allowed to join the Indian Civil Service, and some were even elevated to higher levels of the bureaucracy. No Indians were in the British Parliament or were appointed governor or Viceroy. In Rome prominent locals could rise successfully through military ranks and could potentially seize the power and title of Emperor if they had sufficient political and military support. Great Britain needed to ensure its continued control of the Indian economy and therefore could not afford to allow locals into the most important areas of the government. The Romans relied on local support to maintain the vast lands they had conquered and would allow provincials into the government if they proved themselves worthy.

Two aspects of British and Roman rule stand out as keys to the success of their empires. They both relied on a military force that could enforce the authority of the civil government when needed, and they each employed the support of the local elites to establish and maintain peace in the territories. The Roman Legions were feared because of their discipline, organization, and leadership. If their superiority in those aspects was not enough, Rome could field massive armies, and could quickly draft more citizens into the ranks when needed. The legions were supported by local auxiliaries that were used to bolster the Roman standing and expeditionary armies. It was the Roman Legions that conquered the land between India and the Atlantic for the Roman Empire, and the legions that maintained the empire's border and its peace. The British relied on their own highly trained professional army. The British Regulars were well trained and equipped, and were often veteran soldiers. These troops could be relied upon to stand in a firing line even when faced with a numerically superior adversary. When the East India Company first began spreading its influence over India, these soldiers were used to support allied Indian states in small conflicts. While the British could not afford to and did not have the men available to conquer India, the Regulars could determine the outcome of these local conflicts. The British did

not send their soldiers stationed in India into any conflict they were not assured they would win. This led to the appearance that the British Regulars were nearly impossible to defeat on the battlefield, which in turn meant that fewer people would join rebellions against the British.

These two powers proved that to be successful you also need to keep your subjects happy. In Roman times this was done by allowing people to keep their customs, traditions, and government, while maintaining peace throughout the Empire. The Romans also settled veteran Legionnaires in newly conquered land. This spread loyal Romans throughout the Empire and they helped to ensure that the provinces did not turn on Rome. Britain formed a trade relationship with India that made the economies of both regions dependent on the other. Raw materials from India were used extensively throughout British manufacturing centers, and the finished goods were often sold back to India. To maintain a favorable balance of trade, so that British industries profited, the British government frequently passed unpopular trade legislations in India. In part to counter this negativity and because the British had a notion that they were bringing modern “civilization” to India, they built schools and universities to educate the population. Some of the wealthiest Indians continued their education in Britain, and formed working relationships and friendships with the British. When India was decolonized in 1947, there was little violence between the Indians and British, and the beneficial trade partnership continued.

The two great European Empires helped to form much of our modern day society. Many modern European nations were built from the remains of the fallen Roman Empire. Latin is used in science and in religion to this day. Roman law, education, commerce, government, planning and development, architecture, and military each left their own important mark on Western society. People still travel around the world to see the ruins of this once great empire. The

British Empire spanned the globe. On every settled continent they had annexed land where British rule was recognized, and they owned trading posts and refueling stations on remote islands in every ocean. English, spoken originally only on the British Isles, is now the most “common” language in the world. The British Empire played a crucial part in the Allied victories in World War One and World War Two. The British Empire seemed to lead colonies into nationhood more successfully than any other contemporary empire. Most British possessions either split with the empire peacefully like India did or joined the Commonwealth. They are now relics of a lost time, as modern day societies would no longer tolerate such an imperial power.

All successful empires need to have the tacit support of the people they rule and the military force required to enforce the authority of the civil government. The attempt to simultaneously educate and economically exploit the Indian population shows a conundrum with modern empires. Educated people in modern democratic societies wish to have representation in their government. In a world where most people are educated, and have been indoctrinated with the ideas that the government is meant to help the people, the classical idea of an empire is no longer relevant. In place of traditional empires, economic empires have emerged where the will of one country’s economy can affect the political decision making of foreign states. Neither the British Empire nor the Roman Empire could exist today even though they once successfully controlled massive foreign populations and large territories.

Bibliography

- Boatwright, Mary T., Daniel J. Gargola, and Richard J. A. Talbert. *A Brief History of the Romans*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Boyce, D. George. "From Assaye to the Assaye: Reflections on British Government, Force, and Moral Authority in India." *The Journal of Military History*, 1999: 643-668.
- Brunt, P. A. "Reflections on British and Roman Imperialism." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 1965: 267-288.
- Carlton, Eric. *Occupation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Darwin, John. "Britain's Empire." In *The British Empire: Themes and Perspectives*, by Sarah Stockwell, 1-20. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2008.
- Eacott, Jonathan P. "Making an Imperial Compromise: The Calico Acts, the Atlantic Colonies, and the Structure of the British Empire." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, October 2012: 731-762.
- Fuhrmann, Christopher J. *Policing the Roman Empire*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2012.
- Hutton, James. "A Royal Commission for India." *Bristol Selected Pamphlets*, 1871.
- Kenny, Judith T. "Climate, Race, and Imperial Authority: The Symbolic Landscape of the British Hill Station in India." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 1995: 694-714.
- Lintott, Andrew. *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Lyall, Sir Alfred. *Warren Hastings*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1889.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Romanization in the Time of Augustus*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000.
- Metcalf, Barbara D. Metcalf and Thomas R. *A Concise History of Modern India*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Orwell, George. "Shooting an Elephant." *New Writing*, October 12, 1936.
- Peers, Douglas M. "Colonial Knowledge and the Military in India, 1780-1860." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 2005: 157-180.
- Webster, Jane. "At the End of the World: Druidic and Other Revitalization Movements in Post-Conquest Gaul and Britain." *Britannia*, 1999: 1-20.
- Woolf, Greg. "Beyond Romans and Natives." *World Archaeology*, 1997: 339-350.

