2023

Spilling the Tea: A Comparative Analysis of Development in Ex-British Colonies

Niamh L. Harrop
University of Central Florida

Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

SPILLING THE TEA:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DEVELOPMENT IN EX-BRITISH
COLONIES

by

NIAMH HARROP

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Honors in the Major Program in History
in the College of Arts and Humanities
and in the Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term, 2023

Thesis Chair: Sandra Sousa, Ph.D

ABSTRACT

The British Empire was the largest empire the world has ever seen, and as such, has significantly impacted many of the countries it formerly held as colonies. Imposing a Western style of governance would change the political operations of a nation and would fundamentally shift power dynamics within the country. Through a review of the existing literature on the subject, this thesis examines the effects that British imperial rule had on four different countries in both their social and economic development in the post-colonial era. Overall, the results indicate that Britain failed to set their colonies up for long-term development and success, instead creating a culture of dependency that would maintain the global balance of power. However, these impacts were much harsher in majority-minority countries and disproportionately affected marginalised populations around the world.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my grandparents. To Grandma, Grandpa, and Grandad, who were always proud of anything I did, and who I know would have been immensely proud of this work. To my Nanna, who is my lifelong best friend and the living vessel for all the love and pride of all four grandparents.

I also dedicate this work to the populations affected by British imperialism that still feel the impacts today. This work only scrapes the surface of the injustices my country has committed, but I hope it serves as a step in the right direction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Table of Contents

Part One: Historical Foundations

<u>Introduction: British Imperial Might</u>

The British Empire was the most expansive and powerful empire in modern history; at its peak there were 413 million people, or 23 percent of the world's population, living under its control (McCarthy). From the 16th to the 20th centuries, imperialism was the major trend across European nations. Britain became a large player in the colonial sphere in the 18th century and came to dominate this practice during the 19th and 20th centuries. Britain had colonies across the globe, and thus governed a great deal of different governmental systems, economic structures, and native populations. One of the major justifications of the existence and expansion of the British Empire was that it would eventually prepare its colonies for self-governance - a goal that was very different from other forms of European imperialism (Ashcroft, 2019). Imperialists held a steadfast belief that by colonising other countries, they were making the "primitive" indigenous populations "civilised." Such a stance has historically resulted in the oppression of racial and ethnic minorities and the imposition of white supremacist forces in colonies.

In working to identify patterns in European colonialism, recent research has focused on the development of nations in the post-colonial era, allowing for a greater understanding of the long-term consequences of colonialism on these countries. Development theory is an important component of political science. Halperin (2018) explains in the Encyclopaedia Britannica that development involves "innumerable variables, including economic, social, political, gender, cultural, religious, and environmental factors." Some recent researchers have argued that European colonialism caused a reversal in the levels of development of their colonies; the places

that were the most economically prosperous before colonialism were often the least economically developed after colonialism, while the poorest regions became the wealthiest (Lange et al., 2006). Other historians have made the case that the British Empire was only able to function in the way that it did because it handed a great deal of power to localised groups, and that independence did not fundamentally restructure the de facto practices of imperial power-sharing (Price, 2006). With this framing, it can reasonably be argued that any successes or failures in postcolonial development still fundamentally fall on the local leaders, rather than Britain as a colonising power. Therefore, it is imperative that we examine what the colonial administrations of these countries looked like, how they differed from one another, and to which degree the countries maintained such power structures after gaining independence.

There is a fair amount of literature, such as the aforementioned sources, that examines how ex-British colonies have developed socially, politically, and economically since gaining their independence. However, there is not a great deal of literature that undertakes a comparative analysis of these countries and how the British government set up their ex-colonies for success - or, in many cases, how they failed to do so. By examining four well-known ex-British colonies, this study aims to delve deeper into the different ways Great Britain left their colonies, and the extent to which they provided support in the transition to independence. A comparative examination of these concepts should allow for a more comprehensive understanding of how Great Britain viewed its colonies, and perhaps which ones it wanted to continue to have a strong relationship with after the colonial period.

This thesis will aim to further the general understanding of postcolonial development in ex-British colonies by undertaking a comparative analysis of four different countries: Australia, India, Nigeria, and Jamaica. These four countries represent the four key geographic regions of

British imperialism: Australia, South Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean, respectively. While it would be interesting to examine other regions of the world, it would limit the level of nuance this specific paper would be able to go into, and as such it shall focus on these countries. These four specific nations were chosen as a way to limit the variables and allow for the closest comparison possible, as all four nations gained their independence from the British Empire at a relatively comparable point in history, and all still have sizable populations in the UK and maintain strong relations with their former coloniser. Additionally, there is a racial and ethnic component to this study; Australia represents a majority white former colony with an indigenous population that must be given consideration, India represents a South Asian nation with dominant religions that are not Christianity, and Nigeria and Jamaica are both majority Black nations. However, it is important to note that Australia, like many primarily White British colonies, was initially established as a settler colony, which contrasts with the exploitation colonies established in the other countries in this study. To account for this difference, the thesis will address Australia's population at large, but will primarily focus on the Indigenous population of Australia and how it was affected by this colonisation. Thus, this paper should be able to provide some insight into whether race played a role in the level of support Great Britain provided to its former colonies. In conducting this comparison, the thesis will examine the development of each country after gaining its independence and will assess the unique issues that arose for each nation, offering a comprehensive analysis of Britain's role in the long-term consequences each country faced.

Part Two: Australia

Historical Background

Australia's colonial story is markedly similar to that of the United States, and thus will sound familiar to many Americans aiming to understand Australia's colonial origins better. It was initially a British colony that was established in the late 18th century. The first fleet of convicts arrived in Port Jackson – now Sydney – in 1788, and the country was gradually settled by British colonisers, who displaced Indigenous Australians from their lands (Parliament of New South Wales, n.d.). The early years of the colony were harsh, with food shortages and disease outbreaks causing high mortality rates among both settlers and Indigenous populations. Over time, however, the colony grew and prospered, with agriculture and mining becoming major industries. The legal system and political institutions of the colony were modelled after those of Britain, with governors appointed by the Crown and a bicameral legislative body, the New South Wales Legislative Council, established in 1824. Other Australian states and territories subsequently adopted similar governance structures.

As mentioned in part one, Australia's status as a settler colony makes it different from the other colonies examined in this thesis. As such, we will focus on the Indigenous population of Australia and how they were treated by the British settlers to better understand how British colonial policy impacted the native population. The colonial period was marked by conflict between settlers and Indigenous Australians, who were displaced and marginalised by the expansion of the colony. Violent clashes, forced relocations, and discriminatory policies such as the "stolen generations" policy that forcibly removed Indigenous children from their families and communities, are some of the dark legacies of this period in Australian history. There was a great

deal of frontier massacres that amounted to "state-sanctioned and organised attempts to eradicate First Nations people" (Sentance, 2022).

Australia gained independence from Britain through a gradual process throughout the 20th century, with the Constitution Act of 1901 establishing a federal government, levels of autonomy being granted in the 1940s, and the country becoming fully independent with the passage of the Australia Act in 1986, but still maintains close ties with its mother country and is considered an important part of the Commonwealth (Cader, 2020). Despite its geographic location, Australia is considered to be aligned with the West, and strives for a culture reminiscent of the rest of the anglosphere. It could almost be considered the estranged relative of the anglosphere, given that it models itself after British-American-Canadian ideals, but there is a clear separation between it and these other countries, primarily due to its location.

<u>Development</u>

In terms of the development of Australia, there is a clear distinction between the way the entire country developed versus how the country allowed its indigenous population to develop. It can be understood that Australia is a country reminiscent of the industrialised west; it is democratic, capitalistic, and has high standards of living (Cunningham, 2018). Australia is considered an advanced nation and has developed to become comparable to its former coloniser in many ways, achieving a feat very few former colonies have been able to accomplish. Much of this may be due to the fact that it was a settler colony, meaning the British did not have to adapt to an existing form of governance; instead, it transplanted its own form of government that it knew to be successful in Britain.

Australia has a complex history with its indigenous population, and this is something that cannot be overlooked when analysing the effects of colonialism in Australia as a whole. When British settlers arrived in Tasmania, an island region of Australia, in 1803, they found between 4,000 and 15,000 Aborigines. By 1835 - just 32 years later - there were fewer than 400 "full-descent" Aboriginal Tasmanians left in the region (Madley, 2008). British authorities then incarcerated almost all of these survivors, leaving only 47 left alive by 1847.

Australia is the only Commonwealth nation that did not sign a treaty with its indigenous peoples (Robbins, 2010). The settlers clearly did not feel that legal specificities were necessary, and instead engaged in battles with the Aboriginal population. For decades in Australia, indigenous people were disappearing and dying at incredible rates, and it was finally decided that Christian missionary intervention was the only solution to this issue (Mitchell, 2011). Unfortunately, this emphasis on Christian intervention meant that indigenous people were considered "savages" in need of civilising. While this may have saved lives, it did not preserve Aboriginal culture, as Indigenous people were forced to assimilate into the settlers' way of life.

As with many countries in the 21st century, Australia is grappling with its colonial past and the way it has historically treated its indigenous population. Many of the effects can still be felt today, and attempts to right the wrongs often fall short, or can even exacerbate inequalities. Today in Australia, indigenous incarceration and child removal have risen to record levels, and in Australia's Northern Territory, indigenous people under 25 years of age have the highest suicide rate in Australia and one of the highest rates globally (Grewcock, 2018). Through genocide, assimilation, forced removal of children, and other such practices, white Australian leadership has kept the Aboriginal population oppressed. The idea of self-determination for indigenous populations is still being debated in Australia today.

Britain's Role

With Australia being a settler colony, Britain was able to transplant its form of governance and many institutions to Australia, and essentially found a workaround by creating something anew rather than trying to adapt the existing population to British customs. For that reason, the research on development in Australia is primarily centred around its Aboriginal population, as we have observed. It is clear that many of the problems this population faces today can be traced back to the genocidal actions committed against them by the British settlers in an effort to gain control of the land. The drastic reduction in the Aboriginal population in Tasmania is evidence of this; there is a causal link between when settlers arrived and when the population dropped, and the incarceration of the survivors by the British undeniably places blame on them. Even when a solution was proposed, it consisted of forced assimilation of the population, which harmed the culture and legacy of the Aboriginal population.

It must be noted that Australia should also be held accountable for its treatment of Indigenous peoples, and that many of the problems today can be attributed to failures in governance in the post-British period. This can help us assess to what degree the blame should be placed on Britain's shoulders. Since Australia took so long to gain full independence from the United Kingdom, British policies and precedence should be considered as framework for Australia's self-governance. Since Britain began its colonial period in Australia with the extermination and oppression of the Aboriginal population, that framework existed for Australia to copy upon gaining the ability to make its own policies. Further, the drastic reduction in the Indigenous population as a result of British colonisation greatly inhibited Aboriginals from being able to advocate for themselves and fight back against this oppression. The small and discouraged force Britain turned the Aboriginal population into stood much less of a chance

against one of the great military powers in world history, allowing Britain to truly conquer the

land and put its own systems in place.

Part Three: India

<u>Historical Background</u>

The colonial period in India was known as the British raj, and lasted from 1858 to 1947, when both India and Pakistan gained independence. The raj gained power over the Indian subcontinent after mutinies against the British East India Company spread across the nation. These mutinies forced Britain to assess the structure of the Indian government, and it took possession of the company's assets and imposed direct rule (Wolpert, 2022). Contrary to popular belief, India was a thriving nation before Britain colonised it. It was a primary supplier of luxury items such as muslin, ivory, carpets, steel, pearls, and precious stones (Thakur, 2013). However, during British colonial rule, India became a major importer of English fabrics, indicating a clear shift in India's geopolitical role during this time (Faleiro, 2012).

It is well understood around the world that the British period of colonialism in India was a cruel one, and that Britain was often less than kind in its treatment of the native population. In the 144 years of British rule in India, there were 33 major famines, and food scarcity was a constant threat (Bandyopadhyay, 2005). It has been estimated that famines caused the starvation deaths of around 15 million people in India between 1860 and 1900. In a recent study, Mishra et al. (2019) write that the Benghal Famine of 1943 resulted in 2-3 million deaths and was "a result of a complete policy failure during the British era." They later note that famine deaths have been essentially eliminated in India in the post-independence era, which appears to be due to increased efficacy of government responses.

Lord Louis Mountbatten, the last British Indian viceroy and uncle of Prince Philip, did not prioritise meeting with Indian leaders in the months preceding independence. He was initially

given a date of June 1948 to accomplish his mission in India, but he advanced that date to August 15, 1947, ignoring the words of Gandhi and other leaders who tried to convince him to slow down the Partition process, knowing it would be difficult and deadly (Wolpert, 2011). Gandhi had suggested another leader for the prime ministership and had wanted to take the time to work with Hindu, Muslim, and Sikh communities to establish boundaries that made sense for everyone, but Mountbatten did not listen, instead drawing boundaries right through those communities. Meyer (2003) explains that as a result of the viceroy's negligence, the Partition of India and Pakistan uprooted more than 10 million people, and estimates of those murdered range from around 200,000 to 1 million. This number could be even higher, as Meyer adds, "Having agreed to the carve-up, its perpetrators had little incentive to reckon its mortal cost."

<center>Development</center>

Towards the end of the British raj, British rulers in India were increasingly being pressured to admit that their economic policy inherently favoured foreign interests at the expense of Indian interests (Tomlinson, 1982). It was eventually determined that Britain had held a belief that India was archaic and impoverished, and that it required a modern infrastructure that Britain could provide (Robb, 1981). This method of thinking inhibited growth within India, instead creating a dependency on the British for any amount of sustainable development they aimed to establish in the nation. Eventually, Indian leaders came to believe that people in a country far from them with no understanding of their culture or society should not be making the important decisions that affected their country (Rajan, 1969). This led to an independence movement across the country, with the Indian population pushing for the right to govern themselves and manage their own issues.

The economic issues brought about by colonialism are evident when looking to India; as previously mentioned, India was a thriving nation before it was colonised, and British imperial practices only served to harm the population. Sullivan and Hickel (2023) find that "the 1950s saw higher wages than any decade under British rule." Moreover, award-winning economist Utsa Patnaik claims that the British Raj drained around $45 trillion from India, adding in an interview with Indian economic journal *Mint* that there was virtually no increase in per capita income between 1900 and 1946, even though India registered the second largest export surplus earnings in the world for three decades before 1929" (Sreevatsan, 2018).

Socially, there are problems of sexism in Indian society. Britain claimed they represented a liberalising force, especially for women, but they often did not resolve existing issues and in many cases exacerbated them. For example, Britain introduced conjugal rights, which meant that a person could sue their spouse for refusal to fulfil the sexual "obligations" of marriage. This meant that many women, especially young women and girls, who were previously able to stay with their parents were now unable to refuse sexual intercourse without facing criminal punishment (Liddle and Joshi, 1985). Many policies that were similarly enacted with the aim of liberating women only served to increase child marriage, prostitution, and other practices that were incredibly harmful to women.

The practice of skin bleaching is common around the world and is widely considered to be a consequence of colonialism and slavery; racial hierarchies constructed during colonial periods allowed some form of privilege to lighter-skinned people over darker-skinned people (Brown-Glaude, 2013). This practice is incredibly common in India, where fairness products represent 60% of skincare sales in the country, with a growth rate of 25% per year (Picton, 2013). This kind of practice demonstrates the colonial legacy in the country, illuminating the

11

racism that was evident during the imperial period that created the country's fear of darker skin tones.

India is now considered a developing nation, highlighted by its classification in the BRICS group. In the 63 years since it gained independence, India has surpassed the United Kingdom in economic development and global power (Wolpert, 2011). Of course, the nation has its problems, and many people criticise the government. However, considering it is the most populated nation on the planet, this amount of growth should be seen as impressive.

<center>Britain's Role</center>

Any analysis of Britain's role in India's postcolonial development should first begin with the Partition; there are many components to discuss, but the brutality after the Partition was the clearest and most immediate effect of British rule. If Mountbatten had taken advice from Gandhi and the other leaders who were advocating for peace in their country, this level of violence may have been avoided. Additionally, Mountbatten could have chosen to work with local leaders who better understood the country and its intricacies, but he elected to leave without allotting enough time to properly set up a new government. Britain did not care to leave India in a good position for long-term development, and it must be understood that the development India has seen in the postcolonial era has happened in spite of Britain, not because of it.

Considering it is an entirely different continent, it cannot automatically be assumed that Asian development, if unimpeded by colonialism, would naturally follow the same path and rate of development as Europe. This makes it more difficult to assess the role British colonialism played on Indian economic development; it simply cannot be known with absolute certainty how India might have developed economically without British interference. This is why scholars

<center>12</center>

advise taking a before and after approach. Instead of looking to where India might have ended up, we should instead examine how it fared before colonialism versus whether it maintained that power during and afterwards (Robb, 1981). There are some key events that very clearly can be attributed to British policy – the multitude of famines, and particularly the Benghal Famine of 1943, are at least partially the result of British policy failings. The ability of the Indian government to find more effective responses in the postcolonial period demonstrates its ability to successfully function without British influence. Additionally, it is evident that British policy had a large economic impact on India; the huge increase in wages in the 1950s is proof that Britain was suppressing the Indian population. India's quick recovery and growth in the years since it gained independence demonstrate that they understand how to govern their people much better than Britain did.

Part Four: Nigeria

Historical Background

Nigeria has an extensive and rich history. The area was first inhabited by ancient African civilizations, and by the 16th century, the country was divided into various Islamic states. The British initially attempted to establish a colony in Nigeria in 1849, but this effort was unsuccessful. In 1861, Britain annexed Lagos, giving themselves a strong hold on the country and formally established colonial rule in 1900 (Iweriebor, 1982). The British continued to expand their control over Nigeria throughout the late 19th and early 20th centuries and united the Northern and Southern Protectorates of the country in 1914, an event known as the amalgamation (Oladipo Ojo, 2014).

British rule in Nigeria came to an end in 1960, when the country gained independence. Nigerian leaders spent a great deal of time crafting a constitution with advisors from Britain who knew Nigeria and had experience governing within the country (Perham, 1970). As such, the unity and authority central to this constitution were heavily influenced by British principles.

Nigeria is composed of over 300 ethnic groups of different history, culture, language, and organisational structure (Okupu, 1982). The British governors of Nigeria did not consider these differences when structuring government within the country, and instead created a plan that worked for them and their experience. With as many different ethnic groups as Nigeria has, it makes sense that there would be the potential for intergroup conflict. Agitations began in the 1950s, when ethnic minorities began to form political movements in a push for the creation of states for each group (Okupu, 1982). These groups highlighted the discrimination, oppression, intimidation, and victimisation they faced from the dominant ethnic groups, but they were not

granted their states and instead were provided with reforms and guarantees of human rights. Without a resolution, these problems continued after Nigeria became independent. Political instability and tensions between ethnic groups persisted, which in 1967, after two failed coups the year prior, broke out into a civil war. While economic structure and a push for socialism were important components of the war, a great deal of the disagreements revolved around the idea of separate states to acknowledge the different ethnic groups.

Although initially neutral in the civil war, Britain eventually sided with the federal government, partially because the odds favoured them and partially because Britain viewed this as the safest way to preserve its oil interests in Nigeria (Uche, 2008). Only two Commonwealth nations in Africa supported Biafra, and those nations, Tanzania and Zambia, were the two most critical of Britain (Perham). This demonstrates clearly how the Nigerian Civil War was seen as a result of British imperialism.

<div align="center">Development</div>

It is difficult to know the full extent of colonial impact on social dynamics in Nigeria, but there is a level of analysis we can aim to conduct. While we don't have many sources on the role of women in Nigerian society before the colonial period, we can see clear hallmarks of Western gender power dynamics in the way Nigerian society was structured during the colonial period (Okeke, 2000). Women entered into colonial society as subordinates to the men in their lives; their access to social mobility was inherently tied to their roles as wives and mothers, and the support they provided to the men in their lives.

The colonial system had a direct negative impact on the Nigerian economy. Britain invested only where it believed it had to in order to profit and prioritised making a profit over

sustaining the colony (Ezugworle et al., 2020). This practice prohibited the native populations from industrialising in any way, making them increasingly dependent on its colonial master and the global economy. The immediate economic impact of the Civil War was substantial; the total military expenditure was around ₤N 300 million (in prices at the time). Further, if the real growth rate of GDP had continued unchanged by anxieties around war, GDP would have been ₤N 825.4 million higher (Nafziger, 1972).

As in many countries, particularly ex-colonies, corruption is rife in Nigeria to this day. Nigeria is a country with a great deal of national wealth, but its problems with corruption have increased poverty across the nation. From 2000 to 2014, Nigeria earned about $50 billion from Liquefied Natural Gas alone, but the country is also home to 7% of the world's poor, and the poverty level is as high as 72% in some regions (Oladipo Ojo, 2014).

<div align="center">

Britain's Role

</div>

Considering that Nigeria gained independence in 1960 and its civil war broke out seven years later, the war could understandably be isolated from the colonial period and viewed as its own event. However, this would be ignorant of the important role colonialism played in Nigeria's development. In Nigeria, Britain aimed to supplant the Nigerian forms of governance with its own, failing to account for the cultural and societal differences between ethnic groups. This was, ultimately, the key reason for the civil war. It is comparable to the Partition in India; when the differences between groups are ignored and the groups are forced to exist under one form of government, it often creates tensions that result in the unnecessary deaths of thousands of people.

The country has seen a great deal of economic growth in recent years, transforming it into a middle-income country with much to offer its allies. However, there is still a large issue with

hunger and poverty. It is important to recognise that while may have begun with British policy, Nigeria has been independent for over 60 years, and has long had the ability to change things that harmed their population. India has seen an impressive amount of growth in its postcolonial period, and Nigeria has not. However, Nigeria did spend a considerable amount of time working with British experts to create a new system of governance after independence, which India did not. Therefore, it could be argued that working with Britain actually damaged Nigeria in the long term – but again, the collaboration with Britain seemed only to prolong the inevitable civil war.

Part Five: Jamaica

Historical Background

Colonial Jamaica follows the typical path of British colonies. First colonised by the British in 1655, Jamaica was immediately under complete control by the British; its land was taken and divided, and its indigenous population was enslaved and put to work cultivating sugar cane (Lemonius, 2017). Britain utilised Jamaica and the rest of its Caribbean neighbours as a way to facilitate the slave trade and add more wealth to the British Empire. Many people, both at the time as well as at present, considered Jamaica to be one of the wealthiest British colonies in existence; in actuality, however, the wealth was so unevenly distributed that Jamaica should really be seen as a place of great wealth inequality and poverty, as many of its citizens never saw the purported benefits of colonialism (Burnard et al., 2017).

During the early years of the 20th century, Great Britain controlled many aspects of Jamaica's political, economic, and social life. However, the country's growing nationalism and desire for sovereignty eventually led to the establishment of a constitutional framework for self-government in 1944 (National Library of Jamaica, n.d.).

In 1958, Jamaica became a member of the short-lived West Indies Federation, which aimed to unite several Caribbean territories under a single political entity. However, the federation dissolved in 1962, paving the way for Jamaica to become an independent nation. The process of gaining independence was characterised by intense debate and negotiation between Jamaican leaders and British officials. Jamaica gained full independence from Great Britain on August 6, 1962, marking the end of a long struggle by Jamaicans for self-rule.

<u>Development</u>

Jamaica is seen by many to be an early example of globalisation, and often put its relationships with other countries above caring for its own people. In the postcolonial era, Jamaica maintained a healthy trading relationship with Britain, but the US became its major trading partner and primary investor in tourism (Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d.). As a result of this friendly relationship, the US provided a great deal of aid to Jamaica. Problematically, however, this push for integration into the global economy was resisted by much of the island's population, who worked in more local and self-sustaining communities (Phillips, 2010). The Jamaican economy became heavily reliant on services, particularly tourism, is susceptible to economic shocks, and has had to implement austerity measures in order to support its population (World Bank, 2023).

Colourism is, unfortunately, highly prominent in Jamaican society. This has led to skin bleaching practices similar to what can be seen in India. There is ongoing debate about whether those who engage in skin bleaching do so from a standpoint of racial self-hatred, or whether they have simply internalised European beauty standards and are trying to emulate these (Brown-Glaude). Either way, this practice can be traced back to colonial trauma imposed on the population by their colonisers.

The British Empire utilised a system of fear in Jamaica to keep the population subservient to the colonial powers, and this left behind a divided system that is so deeply entrenched in Jamaican society that it ensures that violence remains an epidemic on the island to this day (Lemonius). Jamaica has one of the highest homicide rates in Latin America and the Caribbean, leading to it being named in the top ten most dangerous places in the world (OSAC, 2020). Since gaining independence, Jamaica has faced numerous challenges, including ongoing economic

disparities, political instability, and social inequality. Nevertheless, Jamaicans remain fiercely proud of their country and its accomplishments, celebrating their independence each year with parades, cultural events, and other festivities.

<div align="center">Britain's Role</div>

Jamaica presents an interesting case as it is still so closely linked with Britain. There are large Jamaican populations in a few different areas in the United Kingdom, particularly in London, and Jamaican heritage is celebrated by these populations. There is a level of relative dependency Jamaica maintains on the UK to this day and has never really had the "breaking off" point that most other colonies have had. The UK and the US are both heavily involved in the Caribbean through their various connections to places such as the Virgin Islands, and both still maintain strong ties with Jamaica through tourism and trade, so the Anglocentric influence has not disappeared entirely from the region. While the other countries in this thesis also have sizeable immigrant populations in the UK, Jamaica never really had a point of disconnect from Britain, and instead transitioned fairly smoothly from colonialism to postcolonialism.

Jamaica is also difficult to examine fully because it was colonised by Britain so long ago, meaning it spent so much of its recorded and remembered history as part of the imperial regime. With countries like India, we are able to compare the pre-colonial area with the post-colonial era, but that kind of comparison is more difficult with Jamaica. Instead, we must understand that Britain's policy of total domination of the Jamaican population meant they were subjugated for centuries, and since Britain did nothing to prepare Jamaica for self-governance, many of Jamaica's present-day issues can be traced back to the colonial period.

However, it also must be noted that Jamaica is different from the other countries in this thesis in its relationship with Britain, primarily because it began the transition to globalisation and self-governance while it was still a British colony. It also maintains close ties with Britain and the US today, which means it is difficult to analyse how much of Jamaica's development is due to its own leadership versus the aid it receives from other nations and international organisations. Jamaica is heavily dependent on tourism and trade with other nations, making its economy vulnerable. Truthfully, Jamaica has never really become fully independent, as so much of its developmental success relies on other countries.

Part Six: Analysis of Britain's Role

<u>Discussion of Findings</u>

The literature examined throughout this thesis focuses on the development of ex-British colonies, and many of these sources do not shy away from naming imperial Britain as a brutal and unforgiving coloniser that can be blamed for many present-day problems in its ex-colonies.

Two key goals were outlined to be accomplished with this paper: developing a better understanding of Britain's role in the postcolonial success of its ex-colonies and examining the extent to which the racial and ethnic makeup of a country contributed to this. Through examining each country individually, this paper has established the ways in which Britain set up or failed to set up its colonies for success after the colonial period. Generally speaking, Britain did not adequately prepare its colonies to govern themselves, and instead tried to shoehorn colonial societies into the pre-established western framework Britain embodied. As discussed in part four, Britain did not consider the unique ways in which indigenous populations governed themselves and the many rituals and practices they had, and instead had the countries adapt to the British way of doing things.

Additionally, it is clear that there is a racial and ethnic component to the way Britain conducted its imperial operations. Of the four nations studied, Australia was the only one where information on its postcolonial development and link to Britain was difficult to obtain – except when regarding its Aboriginal population. The literature that does exist examining Britain's link to its former colonies and their long-term development all pertains to marginalised populations and how Britain mistreated them. One commonality between all four nations examined is the idea of "civilising" the indigenous populations. This demonstrates precisely why the majority

white population of Australia was supported and provided the resources necessary for it to thrive, while the Aboriginals were left behind, as were the majority-minority nations studied in this paper. Britain clearly made a decision in which nations and populations it felt were worth supporting and did what it could to support those over the others.

Another critical question this thesis addresses is whether working closely with British representatives better enabled governmental forces to be prepared for self-governance in the long term. With India, we saw Britain pull out of the country without any real engagement with local leaders and no preparation for the aftermath, which resulted in a bloody and brutal Partition. With Nigeria, however, Britain worked much more closely with the country to prepare it for this transition, and it still ultimately resulted in civil war. With Jamaica, Britain began the transition to self-governance early, while Jamaica was still a colony, and this may be a key reason why Jamaica continued to be dependent on other nations and the aid they provided for most of its independent existence. Therefore, it seems that we can draw the conclusion that Britain harmed its former colonies from the moment it imposed its own form of government on the Indigenous population. It is reasonable to say that it did not matter how long Britain spent trying to develop a plan for self-governance with its former colonies; the damage had already been done.

It is also important to note the limitations of this study; of course, the thesis cannot cover every component of this area of research, but concerns must be acknowledged. With only four countries being studied, many are excluded from this thesis, and thus their unique interactions with the British Empire are not covered here. There are some former British colonies that have succeeded or failed in self-governance in the postcolonial era in ways that may not demonstrate the trends seen or fit the conclusions reached in this paper. These four countries were chosen in particular for this analysis to limit the variables between them, as mentioned in part one, though

the British Empire contained a great deal of countries with their own unique backgrounds and experiences with development. Therefore, further research in this area is necessary to better identify the extent to which these trends can be observed in other former colonies.

<u>Conclusion</u>

By examining the information presented, we can understand that there are clear differences in the colonial administrations of Australia, India, Nigeria, and Jamaica, and the ways in which the colonial periods of these countries came to a close. Each of these countries faced their own unique difficulties after obtaining independence from the United Kingdom, and throughout this paper, the unique conditions of each country have been explored and given proper attention while also finding common ground between them. No matter the feelings an individual may have about a country's failures or success in the postcolonial period, it is clear that Britain treated some of these countries favourably while leaving others behind. Britain's role in the long-term success, or lack thereof, of its ex-colonies has to be examined and understood, and hopefully this paper is just the beginning.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Ashcroft, Richard T., and Bevir, Mark. "British Multiculturalism after Empire: Immigration, Nationality, and Citizenship." In Multiculturalism in the British Commonwealth: Comparative Perspectives on Theory and Practice, edited by Richard T. Ashcroft and Mark Bevir, 1st ed., 25–45. University of California Press, 2019. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvr7fcvv.5.

Bandyopadhyay, D. "The Raj and Good Governance: A Story of Acronyms." Economic and Political Weekly 40, no. 37 (2005): 4021–23. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4417136.

Brown-Glaude, Winnifred. "Don't Hate Me 'Cause I'm Pretty: Race, Gender and The Bleached Body in Jamaica." Social and Economic Studies 62, no. 1/2 (2013): 53–78. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24384496.

Burnard, Trevor et al. "Sugar and slaves: Wealth, poverty, and inequality in colonial Jamaica." Centre for Economic Policy Research (2017). https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/sugar-and-slaves-wealth-poverty-and-inequality-colonial-jamaica

Cader, Adil. "What the History of Australian Independence can tell us about Britain's Journey ahead." OxPol – The Oxford University Politics Blog (2019). https://blog.politics.ox.ac.uk/what-the-history-of-australian-independence-can-tells-us-about-britains-journey-ahead/.

Cunningham, D. "Modernity to Makarrata: Australia Through the Post-Colonial Lens." Emerging Scholars in Australian Indigenous Studies, 2-3:1 (2018): 38-43. http://dx.doi.org/10.5130/nesais.v2i1.1471.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. "Jamaica - Self-government." Encyclopaedia Britannica. n.d.

    https://www.britannica.com/place/Jamaica.

Ezugworie, Chikwado et al. "The Political Economy of Development in Nigeria: From the

    Colonial to Post-Colonial Eras." African Political Science Review, Vol. 12, No. 1 (2020):

    55-64.

    https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355145201_The_Political_Economy_of_Devel

    opment_in_Nigeria_From_the_Colonial_to_Post-Colonial_Eras.

Faleiro, Eduardo. "Colonialism, Neo-Colonialism And Beyond." World Affairs: The Journal of

    International Issues 16, no. 4 (2012): 12–17. https://www.jstor.org/stable/48566252.

Grewcock, Michael. "Settler-Colonial Violence, Primitive Accumulation and Australia's

    Genocide." State Crime Journal 7, no. 2 (2018): 222–50.

    https://doi.org/10.13169/statecrime.7.2.0222.

Halperin, Sandra. "Development theory." Encyclopaedia Britannica, December 17, 2018.

    https://www.britannica.com/topic/development-theory.

Iweriebor, Ehiedu E.G. "STATE SYSTEMS IN PRE-COLONIAL, COLONIAL AND POST-

    COLONIAL NIGERIA: AN OVERVIEW." Africa: Rivista Trimestrale Di Studi e

    Documentazione Dell'Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente 37, no. 4 (1982): 507–13.

    http://www.jstor.org/stable/40759619.

Lange, Matthew et al. "Colonialism and Development: A Comparative Analysis of Spanish and

    British Colonies." American Journal of Sociology 111, no. 5 (2006): 1412-1462.

    https://doi.org/10.1086/499510.

Lemonius, Michele. "'Deviously Ingenious': British Colonialism in Jamaica." Peace Research

    49, no. 2 (2017): 79–103. http://www.jstor.org/stable/44779908.

Liddle, Joanna, and Joshi, Rama. "Gender and Imperialism in British India." Economic and

     Political Weekly 20, no. 43 (1985): WS72–78. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4374973.

Madley, Benjamin. "From Terror to Genocide: Britain's Tasmanian Penal Colony and

     Australia's History Wars." Journal of British Studies 47, no. 1 (2008): 77–106.

     http://www.jstor.org/stable/25482686.

McCarthy, Niall. "Infographic: The Biggest Empires In Human History." Statista Infographics

     (2021). https://www.statista.com/chart/20342/peak-land-area-of-the-largest-empires.

Meyer, Karl E. "The Invention of Pakistan: How the British Raj Sundered." World Policy

     Journal 20, no. 1 (2003): 77–92. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40209850.

Mitchell, Jessie. "´This Bitter Reproach´: Destruction, Guilt and the Colonial Future." In In

     Good Faith?: Governing Indigenous Australia through God, Charity and Empire, 1825-

     1855, 23:173−94. ANU Press, 2011. http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt24h7xh.13.

Nafziger, E. Wayne. "The Economic Impact of the Nigerian Civil War." The Journal of Modern

     African Studies 10, no. 2 (1972): 223–45. http://www.jstor.org/stable/159964.

National Library of Jamaica. "1945-1962 Jamaica Struggle for Independence." National Library

     of Jamaica (n.d.). http://www.nlj.gov.jm/Ja50/1945-

     1962%20Jamaica%20Struggle%20for%20Independence.htm.

Ojo, Emmanuel Oladipo. "NIGERIA, 1914-2014: FROM CREATION TO CREMATION?"

     Journal of the Historical Society of Nigeria 23 (2014): 67–91.

     http://www.jstor.org/stable/24768942.

Okeke, Phil E. "Reconfiguring Tradition: Women's Rights and Social Status in Contemporary

     Nigeria." Africa Today 47, no. 1 (2000): 49–63. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4187307.

Okupu, Ugbana. "THE POLITICS OF STATE CREATION AND THE OUTBREAK OF THE

 NIGERIAN CIVIL WAR." Transafrican Journal of History 11 (1982): 147–66.

 http://www.jstor.org/stable/24328538.

OSAC. "Jamaica 2020 Crime & Safety Report." Overseas Security Advisory Council – U.S.

 State Department (2020).

 https://www.osac.gov/Country/Jamaica/Content/Detail/Report/d4b8403a-3feb-427b-

 bd36-18f1af0b746a.

Parliament of New South Wales. "1788 to 1810 - Early European Settlement." Parliament of

 New South Wales. n.d. https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/about/Pages/1788-to-1810-

 Early-European-Settlement.aspx.

Perham, Margery. "Reflections on the Nigerian Civil War." International Affairs (Royal Institute

 of International Affairs 1944-) 46, no. 2 (1970): 231–46.

 https://doi.org/10.2307/2613824.

Phillips, James. "Democratic Socialism, the New International Economic Order, and

 Globalization: Jamaica's Sugar Cooperatives in the Post-Colonial Transition." The

 Global South 4, no. 2 (2010): 178–96. https://doi.org/10.2979/globalsouth.4.2.178.

Picton, Oliver. "The Complexities of Complexion: A Cultural Geography of Skin Colour and

 Beauty Products." Geography 98, no. 2 (2013): 85–92.

 http://www.jstor.org/stable/24412204.

Price, Richard. "One Big Thing: Britain, Its Empire, and Their Imperial Culture." Journal of

 British Studies 45, no. 3 (2006): 602–27.

 https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-british-studies/article/abs/one-big-

thing-britain-its-empire-and-their-imperial-

culture/DC64E141F42CB0D5AB03AB304F3C6E94.

Rajan, M. S. "The Impact of British Rule in India." Journal of Contemporary History 4, no. 1

(1969): 89–102. http://www.jstor.org/stable/259793.

Robb, Peter. "British Rule and Indian 'Improvement.'" The Economic History Review 34, no. 4

(1981): 507–23. https://doi.org/10.2307/2595587.

Robbins, Jane. "A Nation within? Indigenous Peoples, Representation and Sovereignty in

Australia." Ethnicities 10, no. 2 (2010): 257–74. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23889863.

Sentance, Nathan. "Genocide in Australia." The Australian Museum (2022).

australian.museum/learn/first-nations/genocide-in-australia/.

Sreevatsan, Ajai. "British Raj siphoned out $45 trillion from India: Utsa Patnaik." Mint, 2018.

https://www.livemint.com/Companies/HNZA71LNVNNVXQ1eaIKu6M/British-Raj-

siphoned-out-45-trillion-from-India-Utsa-Patna.html.

Sullivan, Dylan and Hickel, Jason. "Capitalism and extreme poverty: A global analysis of real

wages, human height, and mortality since the long 16th century." World Development,

Volume 161 (2023), 106026, ISSN 0305-750X.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.106026.

Thakur, Kundan Kumar. "BRITISH COLONIAL EXPLOITATION OF INDIA AND

GLOBALIZATION." Proceedings of the Indian History Congress 74 (2013): 405–15.

http://www.jstor.org/stable/44158840.

Tomlinson, B. R. "The Political Economy of the Raj: The Decline of Colonialism." The Journal

of Economic History 42, no. 1 (1982): 133–37. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2120507.

Uche, Chibuike. "Oil, British Interests and the Nigerian Civil War." The Journal of African

History 49, no. 1 (2008): 111–35. http://www.jstor.org/stable/40206616.

Wolpert, S. A.. "British raj." Encyclopaedia Britannica, January 5, 2023.

https://www.britannica.com/event/British-raj.

Wolpert, Stanley. "A Mixed Legacy: From the Raj to Modern India." Harvard International

Review 32, no. 4 (2011): 36–39. http://www.jstor.org/stable/42763418.

World Bank. "The World Bank in Jamaica – Overview." World Bank (2023).

https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/jamaica/overview.