

# A Postcolonial Comparative Analysis of India and Australia

Lillian Tracy

*Many studies have demonstrated the negative impacts of colonization on countries around the world. However, the literature generally does not discuss how colonization can affect societies differently based on the type of colony that they were, especially through direct comparison of countries. This study sought to answer the question of how India and Australia's colonial histories have led to their different foreign policy decisions in the modern day. The hypothesis was that Australia's history as a settler colonialist state has created a close alliance between the country and the English-speaking Western countries, whereas India's exploitation colonization led to a distance between India and the West. This was tested through comparative historical analysis, with three lenses of comparison: economic, political, and philosophical. The research showed that there was a direct line of connection between India and Australia's types of colonization and their current foreign policy decisions. In every lens of analysis, Australia embraced the West and India separated itself from Western countries or kept them at a safe distance, directly or indirectly due to their divergent colonial pasts.*

## Introduction

In today's postcolonial world, there have been many studies about the impact of colonialism on former colonies, colonized peoples, and on colonizing nations. The complex and singular relationships between each former colony and their colonizing nation is incredibly important, not just for the people of each country, but for international relations as a whole. The colonial history of a country shapes the way they interact with every nation and is a main factor of their overall outlook on international issues. The research necessary in this field cannot be overstated because colonialism shapes the past, present, and future of most countries today. However, there is a gap in the literature when it comes to a direct comparison of India and Australia, two former colonial states of Great Britain with vastly different pasts, presents, and futures. The question this research seeks to answer is how India and Australia's colonial histories have led to their different foreign policy decisions in the modern day. This researcher hypothesizes that Australia's history as a settler colonialist state has created a close alliance between the country and the Anglosphere, the English-speaking Western countries, as opposed to India's exploitation colonization, which has led to a difficult and fragile diplomatic relationship with the West.

The specific colonial background of a country influences the way that policy makers and citizens discuss current events, policies, and the character and legitimacy of certain governments. Australia and India have vastly different histories, cultures, and types of colonialism. This last point, this researcher argues, is most influential in determining their interactions with the West, or the Anglosphere more specifically, today. The Anglosphere is the grouping of Western liberal democracies that speak English,

namely, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the United States, and the United Kingdom. The reason why this expansion in terminology is necessary is because unlike in the colonial era, the United Kingdom is not the world's hegemon anymore, America is. The United States is a Western liberal democracy with a history of colonization, like in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Okinawa, and a close relationship to the United Kingdom, so former colonies of the British Empire tend to view the United States, and to a lesser extent other Anglosphere nations, in a similar light. Recently, as China has risen to power, the Anglosphere has turned to rapidly developing former British colonies, like India, to form strong alliances with. This discussion surrounding the Anglosphere is incredibly different in colonizing countries and in previously colonized countries. Even between former colonies, the discussion varies greatly. Indian scholars, for example, have been outspoken against the idea of an Anglosphere alliance, since they believe that the United Kingdom and the United States have "misinterpreted India in [their] effort to see it as 'just like them'" (1). On the other hand, Australian politicians, especially on the right, have largely embraced the idea of the Anglosphere, especially through the "veneration of the British legacy" (2). The backgrounds of each country lead their politicians to completely different conclusions. This study investigates why each country was led to completely different foreign policy decisions regarding the Anglosphere.

In this paper, the researcher asserts that the different aspects of India and Australia's colonial histories have led to their different foreign policy decisions in the modern day. This difference is due both to the nature of exploitation and settler colonialisms and the ways Britain colonized India and Australia. In India, Britain's greed, lack of infrastructure creation, and paternalism during the period of colonization created a vast chasm between Indians and

their oppressors. On the other hand, Britain saw Australia as an extension of itself, capable of governance and deserving rights and representation. Australia and Britain achieved this harmony through a settler colonialist ideology that erased Aboriginals from the continent, literally and figuratively. This study utilizes a comparative historical analysis of the colonial histories of both nations and their current policies toward Great Britain, and, by extension, the Anglosphere. This analysis is conducted through a focus on causal relationships between the character of colonization in each nation and current foreign policy decisions. Since the history of colonialism in India and Australia and the concept and implications of the British Empire are incredibly complex subjects, many research papers have been referenced (3-5). The literature review will first explain and define the British Empire, the 1931 iteration of the British Commonwealth, the Commonwealth of today, and exploitation and settler colonialism. Then, it will establish the nature of the British colonization of India and Australia and the character of each nation's current foreign policy. Finally, the comparative historical analysis section will compare the two countries' current foreign policy decisions as responses to the economic, political, and philosophical aspects of the British colonial legacy in India and Australia.

### Literature Review

#### ***Overview of the British Empire and the Commonwealth***

Without the British Empire, the world would not exist in the same form as it does today. Its colonial projects stretched across the entire globe. This means that the British Empire, and its eventual decline, or as some argue, its transformation into the Commonwealth, is incredibly important to the world order in general, and this research on postcolonialism in particular. The British Empire's preferential treatment of colonial states most similar to Britain, like Canada and Australia, eventually created the British Commonwealth, a precursor to today's Commonwealth that only included the nations that Britain trusted to lead themselves. Over time, as more British colonies declared, or were granted independence, this grouping became the Commonwealth as it is known today. The transformation from Empire to Commonwealth is incredibly important, as this direct line of evolution means that former colonies' relationship to the Commonwealth can illuminate how they feel about the British Empire in the modern day.

The British Empire was an incredibly powerful political unit made up of various colonies, protectorates, and territories that, in many ways, created the Western world order of today. At its height in the 18th and 19th centuries, the Empire controlled a quarter of the land on the globe and over a quarter of its population (6). It started in the

sixteenth century with the explorer boom. After Christopher Columbus discovered America for the Europeans, a massive struggle began between the European powers of Spain, Portugal, France, England, and the Netherlands for control of the world through sea-faring exploration and conquest. In the next century, as competition, especially with France, increased in speed and magnitude, England established its first few colonies in North America and the West Indies, quickly followed by India and the Straits Settlements (6). Importantly, many of those settlements and trading posts were established by private enterprises, not the English Crown itself. The Empire was created through piecemeal by companies, magnates, and the British government alike. While many of these efforts were not state-run, they were state-sanctioned and eventually state-assisted. However, sooner or later, sections of Central America, North America, Africa, Southern Asia, and Oceania would become part of the British Empire. Eventually, however, the Empire's colonial holdings ballooned beyond control, and there needed to be some manner of self-governance for the colonies. Self-governance was initially proposed for Canada in 1839, but it was soon extended to Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa (6). These areas became known as dominions, self-governing colonies the British government trusted due to their extensive settler populations and similarity to the mother country. As a group, these dominions began to be referred to as the British Commonwealth.

The British Commonwealth created the structure to transition between the collapse of the British Empire and the rise of the Commonwealth. The First and Second World Wars were a time of major change for the British Empire, as the imperial order became too hard to maintain in the face of the existential threat these wars presented. Going into World War I, Britain had loosened the reins on the colonies most like them in culture, race, and political structure, but kept a firm grip on colonial holdings with a large indigenous population, like India, Ghana, and Hong Kong (6). This created discord among the colonies, as Britain grouped the uncharitably-dubbed 'White Dominions' in a separate Dominions Division within the Colonial Office and allowed them access to exclusive imperial conferences (5). These 'White Dominions' created a group called the British Commonwealth of Nations, where they petitioned for, and eventually achieved the landmark Statute of Westminster, which officially acknowledged them as independent countries in 1931 (7). After the Second World War, colonies not in the British Commonwealth were increasingly pressuring the British government for freedom, since the dominions had been free for over a decade. Nationalist sentiment developed and spread quickly, and the fading British Empire could not spare the manpower or resources to keep them in line. Thus, beginning in 1947 with Indian and Pakistani independence, the colonies freed themselves from the British Empire. Importantly, however, the former

colonies were offered the choice to join the British Commonwealth of Nations, which was changed to the Commonwealth of Nations. This new organization turned out to be highly flexible and durable in the coming century of political and social change.

Today, the Commonwealth is an international association of the United Kingdom and its former colonies, and territories of the British Empire that still pay allegiance to the crown. Member states are not bound by any constitution, only by “shared colonial histories, British institutions, and economic self-interest” (8). The Commonwealth is primarily a trade agreement between the fifty-four member states. In 2019, for example, 9.1% of the UK’s total trade was with the Commonwealth, most of that trade being with Australia, Canada, India, Singapore, and South Africa (8). This organization is incredibly important to small Commonwealth member countries and adds an additional avenue of diplomacy and trade for the larger countries. The organization has been particularly useful for the United Kingdom following Brexit, as the government hopes to create new free trade agreements with Commonwealth countries as a part of their independent trade policy. It seems to be an incredibly important trade agreement for all member nations, as talks of leaving the organization have been generally minimal in all countries involved. One of the only criticisms of remaining in the Commonwealth that former colonies face from their people, is the lasting association with the British Empire. There are some that believe that the Commonwealth is one final, gasping attempt to recreate or perpetuate the British Empire in the modern day (8). The post-Brexit assertions that British politicians made of a new “Global Britain” certainly did not soothe this fear (8). Considering the lasting effects that British colonialism has had on places like India and Australia, it makes sense that formerly colonized people would feel strongly that Britain and its allies must be kept at arm’s distance. India, as a former exploitation colony, is more inclined to keep Britain at a distance, while Australia, as a settler colony, embraces every form of Britain, including the Empire and the Commonwealth.

### ***Exploitation and Settler Colonialism***

While colonialism had adverse effects on every colony, the difference in impact between exploitation and settler colonialism cannot be overstated. This research paper seeks to answer the question of why Australia is so closely allied with Western nations, while India is decidedly forging its own path, if both countries were former colonies of the British Empire and are members of the Commonwealth. The hypothesis asserts that Australia’s history as a settler colonialist state has created a close alliance between the country and the Anglosphere, the English-speaking Western countries, as opposed to India’s

exploitation colonization, which has led to a difficult and fragile diplomatic relationship with the West. With this in mind, it is incredibly important to define each type of colonialism, how they are established, and how they achieve statehood.

Exploitation colonialism is the most well-known form of colonialism, and yet it is also the most nebulous. This is because of the difficulty in defining it. There are many ways scholars describe the phenomenon of exploitation colonialism, as imperialism, classic colonialism, or simply colonialism (9-10). Due to the fact that exploitation colonialism was thought of as the totality of colonialism until scholars started discussing settler colonialism, it is not as clearly defined in the literature. This paper defines exploitation colonialism as the form of colonialism primarily focused on the extraction of labor and resources from a colonized area and people (11). Exploitation colonialism typically occurs in areas with large indigenous populations, extensive natural resources, and systems in place for resource extraction. For example, the Spanish colonization of the Aztec and Inca Empires in Central and South America was an exploitative colonial endeavor, since these civilizations had high social development, large quantities of precious metals, consolidated agricultural systems, and a large labor force (3). In most exploitation colonies, the colonizing force only needed to send military forces and governing bodies to control these civilizations, since all of the infrastructure and labor were already there. Therefore, exploitation colonialism was the earliest form of colonization to develop, as settler colonialism is a much larger investment of personnel, infrastructure, time, and money, and therefore less desirable to a profit-maximizing colonizing nation. Another way to identify exploitation colonies is their lack of reliance on imported slaves, since the colonizing country could easily enslave the large indigenous populations (3). This is best demonstrated by British India, as not only were the Indians used as a mistreated labor force in their own country, but over 1.3 million Indians were sent abroad to colonial sugar plantations as indentured servants between 1840 and 1920 (5). The final way to identify an exploitation colony is their path to independence. Since most of the colony is still populated by indigenous, colonized people, most of the time their statehood is typically won through “revolutionary struggle against foreign colonial control leading to the exodus of the foreigners” (11). This is demonstrated by the Dutch East Indies, now Indonesia and some of Malaysia, who had to fight for their independence against Japanese occupation during World War II, and the Netherlands’ colonization afterwards (11). The other type of colonization is settler colonialism, which is set up, maintained, and ultimately concludes in a fundamentally different way than exploitation colonialism.

Settler colonialism is the structure of “political,

social, cultural, and territorial domination by an exogenous population over an Indigenous population” where the colonizing and Indigenous population are “co-constitutive” (12). This type of colonialism is characterized by the vast number of colonizing people that move to a colonized area to become permanent residents. Settler colonies were a specific type of colonialism that required a certain set of conditions in order to be created. Firstly, the indigenous people of that area must have “fragile pre-existing social formations” (13). In areas that were densely settled by indigenous people, the colonial force needed to, in some capacity, negotiate with the people living there, and were more likely to exploit these people for their labor and resources instead of developing the land themselves. Instead of robust trade and cheap indigenous labor, settler societies promise their potential citizens new opportunities and entrepreneurship, so there could not be a strong pre-existing social structure. Of course, this also meant that labor was provided for the colony through settlers, convicts, or imported slaves. Secondly, the area must have a port on a relevant or important trade route. This was especially true for British settler colonies, as the British naval control of the world between the 1600s and the 1800s was one of the most important aspects of their foreign policy (13). Finally, most settler colonialist societies were established in “temperate grasslands and woodlands,” not because it was something the settlers would choose for themselves, but because the only indigenous people that tended to live in these climates were “nomadic herders, hunters, and gatherers” (13). The culture of a settler colonialist society is also interesting, as people living under exploitation colonialism do not associate themselves so strongly with Europe in the way that settlers do.

All settler colonies share a few core traits: cultural and ecological determinism, a high level of mobility for both immigrants and capital, and a singular focus on international trade and capitalism. Cultural determinism is the idea that cultures determine how someone will behave or act. This was a deep and intrinsic part of settler colonial attitudes, as they thought of themselves partially as Australians or New Zealanders, South Africans or Argentinians, but mostly as their European heritage. For example, Ned Kelly, a famous bushranger and outlaw, despite having been born in Australia, identified himself as an Irishman and “swore to raise the green flag of Ireland in Australia” (7). Another aspect of settler colonial culture is ecological determinism, the idea that the climate that someone is living in determines their behavior. This diminishes the importance of politics in shaping the community, especially when combined with cultural determinism. This plays out in a comically tone-deaf way in a historical geography of South Africa, as N.C. Pollock and Swanzie Agnew argue, “Had South Africa been prolonged into higher latitudes...it is probable that the early settlers in their dispersal towards the interior would

have continued in agriculture,” essentially arguing that the development of apartheid is the fault of the latitudes South Africa occupies on the globe (13). Thirdly, settler societies have a fluidity and a mobility that other societies lack, as settler colonies depend almost completely on immigration and trade to provide their laborers and capital. When there is a boom of any sort, like the discovery of precious metals, the society is flexible enough to accommodate large numbers of people, with their copious amounts of cheap land, temperate climate, and ample opportunity for investment. This also created many opportunities to embrace technological advancement, like during the railway revolution of the late nineteenth century. Finally, settler colonies were singularly focused on international trade and capitalism. They were created and maintained as “way-stations en route to more lucrative opportunities in the tropical world” and yet also received startlingly high amounts of European overseas investment compared to exploitation colonies (13). For example, in 1913, Australasia and South Africa, settler colonies, respectively received £75 and £55 per capita of British overseas investment, while India, an exploitation colony, only got 24 shillings (13). In settler colonies, this created a fast-paced, adaptive environment filled with entrepreneurial settlers focused on making themselves and their mother country fabulously wealthy. Unfortunately, this came at the cost of the indigenous people whose land they had stolen, as well as the exploitation colonies they were not investing in. One of the exploitation colonies that Britain left underdeveloped in favor of developing settler colonies, was India. India, as a classic exploitation colony, was underfunded, exploited, and underestimated throughout its colonization.

### ***The Colonization of India***

British India is the textbook example of exploitation colonialism. The colonizers drained India of its resources, exploited its labor force, and refused to build infrastructure that could make the native people’s lives easier in any capacity. In this way, the British Empire became incredibly wealthy from India, while refusing to invest any of that money back into the people and land that provided that wealth. The British colonizers destroyed the Indian people’s quality of life, labor force, culture, and refused to allow them to adopt technological advancements.

The British people saw India not as a partner, but as a marketplace and a labor force. Originally, India was colonized by the East India Company after the collapse of the Silk Road and the rise of the Ottoman Empire in the 15th century. Britain sought to trade with India for its spices. They were able to establish a base for the East India Company in India, which was a company formed in 1600 to participate in the spice trade. The East India Company was able to control most of the Indian subcontinent by the

early 19th century, as it owned a lot of the land and had even installed a puppet government to ensure they had a monopoly over Indian trade. In 1857, however, there was a revolt against the East India Company due to their alleged anti-Hindu and anti-Muslim practices. According to some sepoy troopers, the official term for Indian soldiers, the new bullet casings that the East India Company had sent to them were greased with pig and cow fat. The casings required the soldiers to bite the cartridges to release the bullet, which would cause an indirect consumption of pig and cow lard, which were forbidden to Muslims and Hindus respectively. This revolt, called the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, caused the British government to seize direct control of the colony (14). After this event, the British allowed India to practice Hindu and Islam without interference, mostly due to their fear of more revolts. Instead, the British ruling class largely removed native Indians from its day-to-day lives except for service roles. The British people that lived in India were fabulously wealthy and considered themselves better than the natives due to their money and whiteness (14). In some British people's minds, "Britain's mission was to save India" from itself (15). In others', "the Indians were, as a race, inferior and...primitive" (15). Regardless, they refused to let India govern itself, and excluded the native people from upper class and ruling life, despite promises of racial equality of opportunity. The Indian people could practically never advance to positions of authority, as their main task from the British was to produce agricultural goods and manufacture cloth in factories. The British did attempt to establish some Western freedoms in the colony, like property rights through a landlord system called Zamindari. Established in 1793, the system gave landlords property and made them taxpayers, which was meant to motivate the landlords to improve productivity and become entrepreneurs. Unfortunately, the landlords did not reinvest their new wealth and instead spent it all on consumer goods (16). This just exacerbated the already devastating effects of poverty and famine on the population. The food was scarce and unreliable, as the country was forced to hop from one flash-in-the-pan good to another to keep up with the changes in the global market around the turn of the 20th century. The Indians farmed cotton, tea, indigo, and coffee until they were forced out of each market by technological innovations, disease, or global competition (14). Amidst the turmoil of the Industrial Revolution, the British rulers did very little to support the Indians and stimulate their economy. Britain did build an extensive railway system in India, but this had mixed results for the actual population. They cared very little about the Indians' happiness, standard of living, or quality of life, and did practically nothing for their economy and infrastructure beyond what directly benefitted Great Britain.

British colonial rule hurt the Indian economy and quality of life greatly. The first data sets on Indian quality

of life come from before British control of the region. For example, when comparing the purchasing power of an unskilled worker in 1595, before British colonization, and 1961, twenty years after becoming an independent country again, the worker from 1595 was significantly wealthier (16-17). Around the same time, the real wage of India was around 80 percent of Britain's wages, making the Indian standard of living well above subsistence (16). However, as soon as British colonization occurred, first through the East India Company, and then through direct British rule, the average Indian person lived at the "bare bones subsistence level from the middle of the eighteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century" (16). The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of India from 1600 to 1871 declined absolutely, in terms of pure amount, and relatively, in comparison to other countries, specifically Britain. This is especially shocking when compared to Britain's economy, since India was a colony. India's economy was so closely linked with Great Britain that it would be difficult to go from a GDP around sixty percent of Britain's, to a GDP only around eighteen percent of the mother country (16). This stark difference was due to the lack of British investment in India, which, in 1938, only equated to about eight dollars per capita (16). In addition, the change in technology that the Industrial Revolution brought about tanked India's ability to compete in the global market, especially in the textile industry. India's economy suffered greatly under colonial rule. This is, in part, due to the British prioritization of industrialization over agriculture.

British rule over India prioritized industrialization infrastructure over agricultural infrastructure, which led to its inability to compete economically with other colonized Asian nations. Specifically, the British people prioritized building a railway system over building irrigation canals. If the British had chosen to invest in an irrigation system, it is likely that India's yield in pounds per acre would have increased. In 1900, the United Provinces of India could produce around 1,250 pounds of wheat per acre if the land was irrigated, and only around 850 pounds per acre if the land was not irrigated (16). A widespread irrigation system would have helped stabilize the Indian economy in the transition period of the Industrial Revolution, as well as helped the country's GDP grow. For example, from 1870 to 1900, agricultural exports increased. Those same years, there was "0.5 to 0.8 per capita growth" (16). After 1900, when agricultural exports slowed down, the economy stagnated. Due to the lack of investment flowing in from outside of the country and the faulty landlord system, Indians themselves were reluctant to invest in irrigation systems that would have a widespread effect on the agricultural output of the country. If the British had seen the weaknesses in Indian agriculture and corrected them to benefit both the Indian people and the colonizers, they would have seen an increase in profits and a society less

prone to famine. Instead, British authorities invested in the railroad system, which did help the colony decrease the risk of famine and reduce price gaps. However, the railway did little to help agricultural productivity, which had long term effects on India's economy, especially going into the 20th century (16). India was not able to capitalize on the railroad in the same way other countries did because it relied mostly on imports from Britain and lacked the technical skills to create intermediate goods industries, further crippling the economy (16). Since Britain colonized India for agricultural resources, the Indian economy became overly reliant on agricultural exports. A society almost wholly reliant on agricultural exports that is not able to implement agricultural advancements is one doomed to fail, and British colonizers refused to invest more in other sectors of the economy to counterbalance this. In addition, British overseers did not understand the economic climate of India and engaged in severe mismanagement. They left India to essentially rebuild itself entirely after its independence, thus creating a postcolonial environment for distrust, and supporting the thesis that India's political distance from the Anglosphere is the fault of its exploitation colonial legacy.

### ***Indian Foreign Policy***

As a result of the exploitation colonialism that India was forced to endure, it has distanced itself from allying with Western countries as much as it can, as opposed to Australia, a settler colonialist state. In the modern day, India is becoming increasingly valuable to the Western countries who wish to contain China's influence on Asia. Right now, India is being discussed on the global stage as a rising power, even as a rising superpower, as its population, economy, and influence continue to grow. This has been embraced happily by the United States and the United Kingdom, since a new superpower that can compete with China and has historical ties to Western nations could be a great asset to these countries. In fact, Indian leaders in foreign policy have even linked the nation to the US, the UK, Canada, and Australia explicitly, through "an emphasis on the English language, 'shared history', democracy and 'values'" (18). This appropriation of Western values has been used in specific contexts in Indian politics, namely nuclear agreements and technology exchanges with the Anglosphere (18). Indian politicians use India as an example of the values of Western liberal democracies, both as a bid for connection with the other countries and to shine a spotlight on their own achievements. This might seem like it goes against the hypothesis that India's colonial history has driven the country away from the Anglosphere. However, in truth, these politicians only use the language of liberalism to promote their own country and its political actions when it serves them, building on their history of non-alignment established by the first Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal

Nehru and the importance they place on sovereignty.

Indian foreign policy in the last decade, and for the last seventy-five years, follows in the footsteps of Prime Minister Nehru's strategy of non-alignment. Prime Minister Nehru was the first leader of independent India. From 1947, when India declared independence, until 1962, when the Sino-Indian War forced India to compromise some of the strategy, India was firmly focused on a strategy of non-alignment in the Cold War (19). Indian political leaders like Nehru would describe non-alignment as similar, but distinct from the idea of neutrality, as non-aligned countries "reserv[ed] the right to criticize" America and the Soviet Union (19). There are two different theories as to why India chose this foreign policy strategy: the 'Gandhian' theory and the 'self-interest' theory. The 'Gandhian' theory believes that India, following in the footsteps of the famous peaceful protester Mahatma Gandhi, adopted the non-alignment strategy as a "counter-hegemonic critique of contemporary world order" (20). This theory draws a direct line from anti-colonial thought to non-alignment, which is partially true, but does not explain India's close relationship with the Soviet Union in the late 1960s onward, and other inconsistencies (20). The 'self-interest' theory posits that India developed this strategy as a way of playing both sides of the Cold War against each other to advance India above all else. While there certainly were times that non-alignment allowed India economic leverage, it also left it uniquely vulnerable at other times. The 'self-interest' theory does not fully explain some of India's foreign policy decisions regarding non-alignment, like the formation of the non-aligned movement (NAM) to advance the interests of developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America (19). In short, both theories have some explanatory power, but the truth is somewhere in the middle. Nevertheless, India's non-alignment strategy has been one of the pillars of its foreign policy since its independence and is still incredibly relevant today, just like its emphasis on sovereignty.

As a way of championing their independence from colonialism, one of India's pillars of foreign policy is a focus on maintaining the sovereignty of India and other postcolonial states. While they were emerging from colonial rule in the 1940s, the world order was changing drastically. The era of colonial powers was ending, and it was up to postcolonial nations to ensure their own survival and independence in a tumultuous international landscape. A lot of this struggle for sovereignty, something that had motivated India for centuries, was fought through a subtle struggle for control over international norms (21). As discussed in the section *Overview of the British Empire and the Commonwealth*, the transformation from Empire to Commonwealth kept the old tenants of the British Empire intact under a different name. Countries like India were already not treated equally, like the fact that membership of the British Commonwealth was reserved for settler

colonies. This was predicated on the “different ‘standards of civilization’ premised on racial colonial logic” that had animated the British Empire, and the Western world, for so long (19). The only example the British Empire had of independent colonies that still associated themselves with their colonizer were the Dominions, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the Irish Free State. These dominions were mostly free to rule themselves, but “allegiance to the Crown was a fundamental dimension of dominionhood and hence a fundamental expression of Commonwealth membership” (21). India did not want this pseudo-independence and thus pushed for Commonwealth membership while keeping their republic. To strike this balance, India advocated for equal sovereignty by contributing to the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Bandung Charter, which eventually paved the way for equality for postcolonial countries in Asia and Africa (19). India became a champion for anti-colonial movements throughout the latter half of the 20th century. In this way, the struggle to join the Commonwealth on their own terms has characterized Indian foreign policy, as they strive to maintain their independence above all else. To this day, sovereignty has remained top of mind for Indian citizens and politicians, as the country acts decidedly in its own interests despite pressure from the Anglosphere to conform.

Indians have been very outspoken against the concept of the Anglosphere, both before and after the West decided that India would be their defense against China in Asia. When countries like the US and the UK reached out diplomatically to India, they seemed to highlight only the positives of colonial occupation, namely democracy, which is an “unacceptable proposition” (1). Indian scholars purport that the reason Western countries try to connect with India on the basis of Western values is because they cannot connect on shared interests or goals. After India achieved its freedom, it has consistently chosen not to align itself with the desires of the world’s powers, despite its liberalism and democratic government, two pillars of Western ideology. It has entered talks with Russia, refused to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and rebuffed close alliances with the West (1). India has spoken out against hegemonic world order and refused to fall in line due to its mistreatment as a colony of Great Britain. These two aspects of Indian foreign policy, non-alignment and sovereignty, are purposefully not pro-West, since India has its own values and goals. However, in a hegemonic world order dominated by countries like the United States and the United Kingdom, not being vocally pro-Anglosphere means a dangerous middle ground, where powerful countries could turn hostile quickly. India has done it before, during the Cold War, but invoking Western values at all, good or bad, risks inciting wrath. Knowing this history, Indian scholars have cautioned their politicians not to promote

Anglosphere values, even just to use them to highlight Indian success. In addition, any support of Western ideology seems to prop up the very institutions that colonized them, and this cannot be forgotten. In contrast to India’s complex and guarded relationship with Great Britain and the Anglosphere, Australia’s colonial history has been one of alliance and support. Australia’s legacy as a settler colonial state has had the opposite effect on the country’s foreign policy as India, as their shared culture and language with the Anglosphere has created a close bond between Australia and the West.

### ***The Colonization of Australia***

Australia’s status as a settler colony has made it closer to the West, whereas India’s exploitation colonialism has only driven it further away. Australia is unequivocally a settler colonial state. It began as a penal colony, of course, which has massively shaped the country’s cultural understanding, but at the base of it, Australia is quite connected to the Anglosphere in general, and to this day, the British monarch remains the Australian head of state. There are two ways to approach the history of Australia as a colonial state: detailing the overall historical narrative or highlighting the oppression in Australia’s past. Australia’s historical narrative, while becoming more open to discussing topics like the genocidal actions towards Aboriginal people, largely is about the story of Australia’s beginning rather than the facts. This narrative is extremely important because it defines the characteristics Australians pride themselves on. The postcolonial literature on Australia, in contrast, closely looks at the evils that the country has perpetrated. It is important to discuss both perspectives when looking at the history of Australia, because both the narrative of Australia and the reality of how Australia has treated people within and without its borders throughout history, have affected the country’s relationship with the English-speaking West.

Australia’s historical narrative revolves around a national identity of criminals, entrepreneurs, and explorers. In the very beginning of its colonization, Australia was an incredibly difficult place to live. The establishment of penal colonies began in 1788, allegedly to relieve the pressure on Britain prisons and augmented by the recent loss of the United States during the American Revolution. This is certainly at least true in part, as convicts were part of the first colonization efforts of Australia. However, some historians have argued that a secondary goal for the British Empire was establishing a base in the Pacific to augment their sea power in the region (22). Australia’s history as a penal colony is incredibly important to the Australian narrative, as it differentiates it from its British influence. For many years, and arguably to this day, Australia’s culture was founded on Britain’s. However, its history as a society of

convicts has markedly separated it from its colonizer. This is born out of “twin pressures to forget and mythologise,” as the society attempts to cover up its rough history while remembering its rugged individualism, often thought of as absent today (23). Before the 1960s, Australians were ashamed of the “stain” of convict heritage, but today, it is increasingly “fashionable” to claim this ancestry (23). In contrast, Australians have always been unafraid to claim the entrepreneurial and exploratory spirit of their shared national history. The entrepreneurs and explorers of early Australia certainly were incredibly important for the formation of the nation, as the path to consistent economic development was fraught, to say the least. The perseverance of the colony’s economy was, in those early years, left to “individuals with some vision” in the face of a “lack of infrastructure, a concerted effort by citizens, [or] a coherent long-term economic policy” (24). For example, the two major exports of Australia were not fully developed or discovered until around the 1840s, which were wool and minerals, especially copper and gold (22). Explorers also contributed greatly to the cultural landscape of early Australia, both nationally and internationally, as they achieved “literary grace” through their writings catering to European tastes, such as David Collins’ *An Account of the English Colony in New South Wales* from 1798 (22). In Australian culture today, the grit and curiosity that entrepreneurs and explorers respectively exhibited are claimed as a part of the people’s national identity, despite the negative side of this colonial legacy.

Australia was, without a doubt, a settler colonialist project for Great Britain. Settler colonialism is the structure of “political, social, cultural, and territorial domination by an exogenous population over an Indigenous population” where the colonizing and Indigenous population are “co-constitutive” (12). From the beginning, this was the goal for Great Britain, as official statements from the time list the creation of a penal colony, necessarily requiring settlement and displacement, as the primary goal of the endeavor (22). Part of what started the cultural, social, and political destruction of the over one million Aboriginals living in Australia pre-1788 was, of course, the attitude towards the natives at the very beginning. When Captain Arthur Phillip arrived that year, he stated his intentions to “punish all who should ‘wantonly destroy them or give them any unnecessary interruption in the exercise of their several occupations’” (25). The trouble with this was defining what ‘wantonly destroy’ and ‘unnecessary interruption’ were in the mind of the settlers. The main conflict with the Aboriginals started with the development of the wool industry in the early 1800s, as the cultivation of herds of sheep required increasing swathes of land that were previously left for the natives. The sheep destroyed the delicate ecosystem the Aboriginals relied on for food, and they retaliated accordingly. In areas like Tasmania, this led

to state-sponsored acts like the Black Line, a human chain of settlers that pushed Aboriginals south and, ultimately, out of the island altogether (25). In the next few decades, the number of Aboriginals in the whole of Australia declined dramatically, partially due to direct violence, partially due to new European diseases, and partially due to malnutrition. In essence, the violence of settlement, occupation, and steady encroachment did most of the work for the Australians, who from the beginning regarded Aboriginals as “doomed to extinction” because of their status as an “inferior race” (25). These attitudes persisted for over a century, with the remaining Aboriginals finally gaining some rights back in the Aboriginal Land Rights Act of 1976, which granted them some access to their traditional land in the Northern Territories (22). Overall, however, it must be acknowledged that the country of Australia would not exist in the form it does today without the direct and indirect slaughter of almost a complete race of people.

### ***Australian Foreign Policy***

While India has moved away from the Anglosphere in terms of rhetoric and politics, Australia has only moved further toward the other member countries. Despite its history of colonization by Great Britain, Australia has not shied away from a close relationship. Throughout Australia’s time as a colony and a state, there have been multiple opportunities to distance itself from the United Kingdom, but it never took them. For example, after Australia became an independent country, it took until 1942 to ratify the 1931 Statute of Westminster that removed the British Parliament’s ability to legislate for the country (26). Throughout the Cold War, Australia fell in line with the United States’ world order. The longest serving Australian Prime Minister, Robert Menzies, once described Australia’s foreign policy as the fostering of strong relationships with “great and powerful friends” (26). Today, the establishment of AUKUS, made up of Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, solidifies this relationship. This agreement, signed in 2021 by Joe Biden, Boris Johnson, and Scott Morrison, delivers nuclear-powered submarines to Australia in exchange for cooperation in the development of defense technology (27). Throughout these close diplomatic and military agreements, Australian, American, and British politicians have used the language of Western liberal democracy to explain this to their people, especially as each country’s relationship with China has worsened (27). Further, the support of AUKUS by both the Liberal and the Labor Party governments in recent years could mean a general support of Australia’s relationship with the UK and the US by Australian people, not just its politicians. Australia has stuck close to the Anglosphere, diplomatically, militarily, and culturally, since its conception as a nation.

The close relationships between Australia and the

Type of Comparison	Cause	Indian Effects	Australian Effects
Economic	Infrastructure Creation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)</li> </ul>
Political	Paternalism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Russia-Ukraine War</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aboriginal policy</li> </ul>
Philosophical	Liberalism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nationalism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Middle power</li> </ul>

**Table 1. Comparative Effects of British Colonialism in Modern India and Australia**

rest of the Anglosphere are explained by Australia's identity as one of the British Empire's settler colonial projects, so the country turns back to the Anglosphere for shared culture and political organization (26, 28). The motivating factors for the colonizers that move to a settler colonial society are both to uphold and extend the colonizing culture to a new area, and to break free from the history of the colonizing country (28). Over time, the culture of the settler colonial state becomes empty, in keeping with the second motivation, while also having a deep desire to connect to their historical roots in the colonizing nation, in keeping with the first motivation. Within Australia, this manifests as the desire to project the myth of the 'Quiet Continent,' the idea that there is no political conflict within Australia, while at the same time frequently engaging in and commemorating conflict overseas (28). In this way, Australian political culture is, at least partially, built on the legacy of the Anglosphere due to its settler colonial history.

### Comparative Historical Analysis of Indian and Australia

#### Methodology

The methodology used in this research paper is comparative historical analysis, which is based on the establishment of a causal link between dependent and independent variables, based on the "method of agreement" and the "method of difference" (29). The method of agreement is the comparison of two examples that have in common both the same phenomenon and the same causal factors being studied. On the other hand, the method of difference is the comparison of two factors that do not have either the same outcome or the same causal factors (29). This second method is the one that will be utilized in this paper, because it not only fits the subject matter the best, but because this method has greater "explanatory power" (29). The manner in which the cause is linked to the phenomenon is called "process tracing," which is the "practice of linking a casual factor to the phenomenon by tracing its trajectory over time" (29). Process tracing allows the cause to be directly linked, through historical evidence, to the outcome or phenomenon being studied. Due to this,

comparative historical analysis looks at macro-level causes and effects, which makes it a broad lens of analysis by its very nature. This is the most appropriate type of analysis for a paper that must content with centuries of history and vast amounts of foreign policy.

This comparative historical analysis will be threefold: an economic, political, and philosophical comparison of India and Australia's foreign policies and the colonial causes of each. Considering India and Australia had the same colonial ruler but vastly different experiences due to their respective type of colonialism, they now approach foreign policy drastically differently. For the economic comparison, the difference in colonial infrastructure creation had vastly different effects on each country's Foreign Direct Investment countries. For the political comparison, the British Empire's use of paternalism created the Indian non-alignment strategy that eventually devolved into neutrality in the Russia-Ukraine War, while Australia weaponized paternalism in its treatment of Aboriginal people. Finally, the philosophical comparison is based on the British Empire's liberalism, and how India shied away from the West through increasingly nationalistic policies, while Australia embraced it by only striving to become a middle power.

#### Economic

In the *Colonization of India* section, the lack of helpful infrastructure creation was highlighted as a massive downside of British colonization. Instead of building an irrigation system that could help increase agricultural output and reduce the risk of famine long-term, the British built a railroad that primarily helped the colonizers. India was not able to capitalize on the railroad in the same way other countries did because it relied mostly on imports from Britain and lacked the skills to create intermediate goods industries (16). In addition, Indians themselves did not have the resources to do an agriculture system overhaul, mostly because there was not enough foreign investment to promise returns. After colonization ended, this meant that India had to work extremely hard to catch up to other countries. The years between independence in 1947 and

the 1980s were characterized by state-led development, which ended the colonial economy's stagnation, but were overly regulated, and thus India was not able to fully catch up to its surrounding countries (16). Finally, in the 1980s, pro-market reforms jump-started India's economy, and it has now become the country with the 5th largest GDP worldwide, with a value of 3.57 trillion US dollars (30). On the other hand, the British Empire invested a lot in Australia's infrastructure when it was a colony.

Australia's time as a colony was marked by extensive foreign investment, from the British Empire especially. From 1865 to 1914, Australia received eight percent of British total foreign investment, which was fourth in the world at the time, only behind America, Canada, and Argentina (31). Since Australia's most important industry at the time was mining, it is no surprise that this industry alone made up almost forty percent of private borrowings from Britain during that same time period (31). The colonizing nation did not just invest in the industries making the most money, they also invested in infrastructure, like electric lighting, tramways, canals, telephones, and more (31). Instead of treating Australia like a place to wring dry of resources before abandoning, Britain believed Australia to be its partner. Development in Australia meant both Australians and British benefitted, and since they thought of themselves as the same group of people, this did not bother them. Where Indians were treated standoffishly and with suspicion, Australians were embraced wholeheartedly, and their economy flourished for it. In the modern day, this different colonial attitude means completely different economic attitudes towards Western nations.

India and Australia's Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) data reveals the economic relationships each country values the most, which mostly consist of Asian countries for India, and Anglosphere countries for Australia. The chosen point of analysis is foreign direct investment because this measures the amount in dollars of foreign asset purchases in a given country. This directly links the two countries, as the foreign investor needs to have confidence in the host country's economic and political state, as well as a firm belief in the continued partnership of the two countries. In 2015, Australia's leading countries in FDI were the United States, with about 28% of the market share, the United Kingdom, with about 17%, Belgium, with about 8%, Japan, with about 7%, and Singapore, with about 3% (32). In contrast, in 2016, India's leading countries in FDI were Mauritius, with about 40% share, Singapore, with about 22%, Japan, with about 12%, the Netherlands, with about 9%, and the United States, with about 6% (33). Clearly, the countries Australia has fostered a close economic relationship with are much different from the ones India has. This is partially due to Australia being politically and culturally closely aligned with the West, and therefore more likely to receive direct investment from those countries, but also due to the head

start that they received from British colonial investment. India received no such boost, so it has an overall lower level of FDI, partially due to "inadequate infrastructure facilities" that discourage foreign investment (33). In addition, India's colonial history has made them extremely concerned for their sovereignty and safety, so some Indian scholars worry about FDIs "increas[ing] foreign dependency" and "affect[ing] overall development" of domestic industries (33). This direct point of comparison demonstrates the colonial history still present in both countries, as well as their different economic alignments. Australia routinely chooses to align itself with Western powers, while India chooses neighboring Asian countries to establish close economic relationships with. This demonstrates the cultural difference between a settler colony and an exploitation colony, as one sees itself as an extension of the colonizing nation, while the other sees itself as an independent nation and allies itself with its neighbors.

### ***Political***

The political aspect of this comparative historical analysis will tackle the British colonial political tactic of paternalism, how India and Australia reacted to it, and how the consequences of using this tactic still affect these countries today. One of the major differences between Britain's treatment of India and Australia, and exploitation and settler colonies for that matter, is which areas are on the receiving end of racist paternalism, and which adopt it as a tactic themselves. Paternalism is a coercive social practice that imposes the will of the paternalistic party on the subjugated one for the supposed greater good of the subjugated (34). India, as an exploitation colony, was treated with paternalism for centuries, and thus turned away from the Anglosphere and fought for other countries' sovereignty. Australia, on the other hand, co-opted the tactic for use against its indigenous population, the Aboriginals.

The British Empire used paternalism to moralize and justify the occupation and possession of India's vast resources. Paternalism, as a political strategy, is, by its nature, coercive and moralizing. It creates a narrative about the colonizing nation and the colonized that elevates the colonizing nation above the colonized. European colonialism was filled with paternalism, as countries described their colonial exploits as "civilizing missions" (35). For example, William Hodges, a British painter, while on a trip to British India, emphasized "the unmanageable, the dangerous, the ruinous, and the chaotic" of India, while arguing that "British rule has transformed [it] into [a] cultivated and prosperous landscape" (35). In this way, the colonizers believed that they were ruling India for its own good, and the country would fall into ruin without them. Of course, a lot of this paternalism stemmed from

racism, as British leaders in India believed the white race to be superior in judgment to the “child races” of Asia and Africa (5). This extended to the Indian legal system, education, and governmental structure, and, by extension, the promotion of Western values as superior to Indian cultural values and ways of life. British colonizers taught Western values of liberal democratic capitalism, as well as Christian morality and ethics, to “elevate [Indians] in the scale of social and moral being” close, but never equal to, that of the inherently superior British (34). Australians, on the other hand, were seen as equal to the British, and thus did not face this paternalistic racism.

Australia, due to its nature as a settler colony, did not experience paternalism in the way that India did. There could be no racial hierarchy in the white settler parts of Australia, since there was no distinction between European leaders and Australian ones. Australians tended to identify themselves by their European country of origin long past their immigration and could simultaneously hold their European identity and their Australian one without conflict (7). In fact, Australia identified itself as a white Anglosphere country centuries before referring to itself as an Asian, or even an Oceanic country. Eventually, with the introduction of dominionhood and the British Commonwealth, which was willingly given to them by Britain, they were free to govern themselves. Britain trusted them to rule themselves, since Australia was seen as an equal. In the modern day, this has affected both countries greatly, as India doubles down on their position of non-alignment, and Australia adopts paternalistic tactics for dealing with Australian Aboriginals.

India’s legacy of paternalism has led to its emphasis on neutrality above all else in the Russia-Ukraine War. British paternalism was based on the deeply held belief that India could not govern itself. Due to this, India’s pillars of postcolonial foreign policy have been non-alignment and sovereignty, as discussed in the *Indian Foreign Policy* section. India is incredibly dedicated to maintaining a healthy diplomatic distance between itself and the West, to preserve its sovereignty and ability to act in its own self-interest. India believes that the years of colonial rule have “cost it wealth and status” and is determined to “avoid domination by another imperialist power,” the United States (36). In this manner, India does not want a close relationship with the United States or the United Kingdom because the country is intimately familiar with how quickly its freedom can be taken away in the name of the good of the world. However, India still needs powerful allies, like every country. Instead of the US or other Western nations, India has allied with Russia. This alliance stretched back to the Cold War, but today, this relationship is more important than ever. The Indian government under Prime Minister Narendra Modi believes Russia to be key to national security, considering its reliance on Russian arms and ammunition and their collaboration on nuclear submarines, aircraft

carriers, and other cutting edge military technologies (19). Additionally, India’s major security threats, Pakistan and China, have been consistently vying against India for Russia’s affections (37). For these reasons, India has refused to outright criticize Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. It has abstained from votes in the UN Security Council, General Assembly, and Human Rights Council that condemned “Russian aggression in Ukraine,” and has refused to acknowledge Russia as the instigator of the war (37). In the minds of the Indian government, this is simply the best out of a group of bad choices, as they cannot alienate their close ally, but this decision goes against their long-standing advocacy for sovereignty (19). Without the use of paternalism in their colonial history, India would not have been forced to remain neutral and compromise their values, because they would have been open to allying with the West. Australia, on the other hand, instead of being pushed away from the Anglosphere by paternalistic tactics, has embraced these tactics wholeheartedly.

Australia’s treatment of Aboriginals has been a continuation of British paternalism. While this is certainly still present in modern Australian domestic policy, it began during the colonial period itself. Settler Australians have always thought of indigenous Australians as “subjects in need of support, protection, or salvation” (38). This has resulted in a long history of exclusion for Aboriginal Australians, especially since the 1967 Referendum, which allowed the Australian government to “introduce laws specific to the Aboriginal race” (38). This referendum was seen as a good thing at the time, because it started to introduce some semblance of Australian citizenship to the Aboriginals, who would be counted in the census and beholden to certain laws. However, there were two critical blind spots of this supposed step towards equality that would become emblematic of Australian Aboriginal policy to this day. The referendum assumed that becoming part of Australia would materially benefit Aboriginal people, and, more importantly, that they wanted it. In fact, the Aboriginal populations across Australia had not been consulted, and this referendum would continue a long tradition of silencing indigenous voices in the name of their ultimate betterment (38). Many of the programs meant to help the indigenous people in the modern day have to do with the expansion of welfare in these communities. In 2017, for example, Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull introduced the ‘Indue Card,’ a card linked to a digital amount of welfare. This card, while created with good intentions, ultimately had a negative impact on Aboriginal people, as the card was a physical marker of otherness. This card became associated with negative stereotypes of Aboriginal people as “incapable of self-sufficiency and self-determination” (38). At the core of it, settler Australia believes it can determine what is best for the indigenous population better than they themselves can. This harmful notion stretches across political lines,

since both sides, regardless of their plan, are, critically, still “solutions from the outside” (39). Ultimately, Australian politicians and citizens must contend with the fact that their treatment of indigenous people is founded in British paternalism, and, unfortunately, they are still championing that legacy today.

### ***Philosophical***

The final point of comparison for the effect of British colonialism on India and Australia is the philosophy of liberalism, and how each country reacted to it. The philosophical structure of liberalism is the largest lens of analysis, because it encompasses the entire philosophy of the Western world. Just like economically and politically, India has turned away from the Anglosphere philosophically, distancing itself from liberalism as much as it can through its nationalistic approach to foreign policy. Australia, on the other hand, has wholeheartedly embraced liberalism as a way of life, as demonstrated by their continued pursuit of the status of ‘middle power.’

British liberalism in the colonial era, otherwise known as classical liberalism, is deeply tied to imperialism. While liberalism can refer to any number of things in the modern day, this specific ideology, characterized by thinkers like John Locke, John Stuart Mill, and Adam Smith, believes in tenants such as the free market, civil liberties, and the rule of law (40). John Locke, for example, in his exceptions to universalist assertions about human nature, states that “lunatics and ideots [sic] are never set free from the government” (41). While this might seem innocuous, this had huge consequences in the British colonial application of liberalism, as claims that people of overseas colonial holdings were, by their nature, “as irrational as lunatics or as immature as children” (42). In this way, the paternalism discussed in the previous section is one of the political applications of British liberalism. Another major thinker of liberalism was John Stuart Mill, who was similarly deeply tied to imperialism, specifically developmental liberalism. Developmental liberalism is the idea that a colonial project should be a civilizing mission focused on progress (40). Firstly, in Mill’s perception, colonialism should be civilizing. This is important because it obviously assumes a ‘barbaric’ nature to all non-Western cultures and philosophies, and it justifies mistreatment of colonized people. Secondly, Mill asserts that colonial societies, like all societies, should be focused on economic, social, and political progress (40). Social and political progress, in this understanding, means increased cooperation, the rule of law, and “the conditions for the cultivation of individuality and enjoyment of the higher pleasures” (40). In this way, progress, to the colonizing mind, is the process of becoming culturally similar to the West. Mills also believed that different cultures would require different paths to progress, and the

culture could only know this path through the application of a few “enlightened” people who “possess[ed] the kind of knowledge and judgment capacity necessary to pursue the delicate and lengthy process of reform” (40). This second point connects back to paternalism, since, according to this mindset, only ‘enlightened’ people were allowed to have opinions about a country’s governance. In this way, the philosophy of liberalism in the British colonial period was closely linked to imperialism, greatly influencing the world order, and, of course, India and Australia.

Since India was an exploitation colony, its version of nationalism is antithetical to British liberalism, causing their nationalistic foreign policy to be overly aggressive. Indian nationalism was created as an anti-colonial movement around the turn of the 20th century. This nationalism stood for the opposite of everything the British espoused, including liberalism. At the same time, Indian nationalism adopted liberalism as a tool against British hypocrisy, repeating back the concepts of democracy, and self-rule (43). In this way, some concepts of liberalism got to stay embedded in Indian political thought, especially democracy and capitalism (43). However, the aspects of British liberalism that overlapped with imperialism, especially the moralizing ones, are rejected completely. This moral liberalism consists of ideals like that states should act according to a certain set of codes in war and peacetime, and the world order is the best it could possibly be, and any attempt to upset it, especially through violence, is incredibly frowned upon. This is rejected by Indian nationalists, and their attempts to distance themselves philosophically and politically from liberalism can sometimes lead to aggressive, militaristic tactics in the name of advancing India, including compromising other states’ sovereignty. For example, in 2023, the Indian government covertly assassinated a Sikh Canadian national in Canada (44). The man was declared a terrorist by the Indian government, but the circumstances around this declaration are murky. Instead of admitting that this showed a blatant disregard for Canada’s sovereignty, the Indian government accused Canada of “harboring Sikh separatists” and “pledged to protect India’s security” (44). For the past few years, there have been many more examples of aggressive nationalistic behavior by India, like the public air strikes of Pakistan in 2019, which was obviously a major diplomatic risk. Indian nationalists in the current government proudly support a diplomatic strategy based on a willingness to threaten or use military force and a transactional approach to politics, which is in many ways a philosophical backlash to colonial moralistic liberalism (44).

In contrast to India, Australia is content to remain in its place in the world order and is currently aiming to maintaining its position as a ‘middle power.’ One thing that liberalism is incredibly good at as a philosophy is defining a ‘world order.’ The country with the most economic capital,

military power, and political influence is the hegemon, and every other country fits in line behind this. Australia, as a settler colony, believed in this world order from the very beginning of its colonization, and thus is incredibly willing to accept its place. Of course, this does not mean that Australia is willing to be led around completely by the hegemon, first Great Britain and now the United States, but that there is no questioning of their location in the hierarchy or attempting to become a larger power (45). Australia is, without question, a middle power, and is perfectly fine with that. The term ‘middle power’ is at the same time intuitive and difficult to define, since other scholars have shown there is no correlation between population or geopolitical position and type of diplomacy (46). In some ways, this means a ‘middle power’ country is one that chooses to act in the manner of a middle power. A middle power has “a preference for working through multilateral institutions and processes, a commitment to promoting international legal norms and a pro-active use of diplomatic, military and economic measures to achieve selected political outcomes” (46). Australia, due to its close cultural ties to the Anglosphere, fits perfectly into this ‘middle power’ slot as it is already predisposed to embrace the liberalist status quo. In its foreign policy today, it is still acting as a middle power, including its advocacy for climate change reform, free and open trade, and nuclear disarmament (45).

### Conclusion

The question that this paper sought to answer was how India and Australia’s colonial histories have led to their different foreign policy decisions in the modern day. Clearly, as demonstrated by their different economic, political, and philosophical reactions to colonial phenomenon, their histories are completely different. Their current foreign policy decisions are directly related to their colonial histories. By tracing each country’s relationship to their colonizer, Great Britain, and by detailing the differences between the two types of colonization, it is clear why India and Australia have such divergent foreign policies. Australia’s history as a settler colonialist state has created a close alliance between the country and the Anglosphere, the English-speaking Western countries, as opposed to India’s exploitation colonization, which has led to a difficult and fragile diplomatic relationship with the West.

### REFERENCES

- Davis, Alexander E. 2018. *India and the Anglosphere: Race, Identity and Hierarchy in International Relations*. 1st ed. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781351185714.
- Wellings, Ben, and Zareh Ghazarian. 2023. “The Origins of the Anglosphere Idea and the Contestation of Australian Nationhood, 1991–2007.” *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*: 136914812311696. doi:10.1177/13691481231169643.
- Lange, Matthew, James Mahoney, and Matthias Vom Hau. 2006. “Colonialism and Development: A Comparative Analysis of Spanish and British Colonies.” *American Journal of Sociology* 111, no. 5: 1412–1462. doi:10.1086/499510.
- Maddison, Sarah. 2012. “Postcolonial Guilt and National Identity: Historical Injustice and the Australian Settler State.” *Social Identities*, 18(6), 695–709. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2012.709000>.
- Metcalfe, Thomas R. 2007. *Imperial Connections: India in the Indian Ocean Arena, 1860–1920*. University of California Press.
- The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. “British Empire.” *Encyclopedia Britannica*, March 25, 2025. <https://www.britannica.com/place/British-Empire>.
- Clarke, Frank G. 2002. *The History of Australia*. Greenwood Press.
- Peters, Michael A. 2023. “The Geopolitical Rebirth of the Anglosphere as a World Actor after Brexit.” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 55(11): 1193–96. doi:10.1080/00131857.2021.1991791.
- Kohn, Margaret, and Kavita Reddy. 2006. “Colonialism.” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Summer 2024. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/colonialism/>.
- Veracini, Lorenzo. 2013. “Understanding Colonialism and Settler Colonialism as Distinct Formations.” *Interventions* 16 (5): 615–33. doi: 10.1080/1369801X.2013.858983.
- Coté, Joost J. 2020. “Colonial Education: Colonials and the Colonized in “Colonies of Settlement” and “Colonies of Exploitation.”” *Handbook of Historical Studies in Education: Debates, Tensions, and Directions*, Springer International Handbooks of Education, p. 259–276. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-2362-0\_17.
- Clayton, Kate, and Katherine Newman. 2023. “Settler Colonial Strategic Culture: Australia, AUKUS, and the Anglosphere.” *Australian Journal of Politics & History* 69(3): 503–21. doi:10.1111/ajph.12941.
- Denoon, Donald. 1979. “Understanding Settler Societies.” *Australian Historical Studies* 18, no. 73: 511–527. doi:10.1080/10314617908595611.
- Wolpert, S. A. 2023. “British Raj.” *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/event/British-raj>.
- Udayon Misra. 1984. “Nineteenth Century British Views of India: Crystallisation of Attitudes.” *Economic and Political Weekly* 19, no. 4 (1984): PE14–21. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4372887>.
- Gupta, Bishnupriya. 2019. “Falling Behind and Catching Up: India’s Transition from a Colonial Economy.” *The Economic History Review* 72. no. 3.
- Duara, Prasenjit. 2006. “Nationalism, Imperialism, Federalism, and the Case of Manchukuo: A Response to Anthony Pagden.” *Common Knowledge* 12, no. 1: p. 47–65. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/191683>.
- Davis, Alexander E. 2014. “The Identity Politics of India–US Nuclear Engagement: Problematising India as Part of the Anglosphere.” *Journal of the Indian Ocean Region* 10(1): 81–96. doi:10.1080/19480881.2014.895483.
- Verma, Raj. 2024. “Interests Trump Principles and Values: India’s Neutrality in the Russia-Ukraine War.” *Contemporary Security Policy* 45, no. 4: 585–598. doi:10.1080/13523260.2024.2388003.
- Abraham, Itty. 2008. “From Bandung to NAM: Non-alignment and Indian Foreign Policy, 1947–65.” *Commonwealth & Comparative*

- Politics* 46, no. 2: 19-219. doi: 10.1080/14662040801990280.
21. Khan, Raphaëlle. 2021. "Sovereignty After the Empire and the Search for a New Order: India's Attempt to Negotiate a Common Citizenship in the Commonwealth (1947-1949)." *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 49, no. 6: 1141-1174. doi:10.1080/03086534.2021.1950322.
  22. Ride, W., et. al. 2024. "Australia." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/place/Australia>.
  23. Tranter, Bruce. & Donoghue, Jed. 2003. "Convict Ancestry: A Neglected Aspect of Australian Identity." *Nations and Nationalism*, 9(4), 555-577. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8219.00127>.
  24. Westrip, Joyce and Peggy Holroyde. 2010. *Colonial Cousins: A Surprising History of Connections Between India and Australia*. Kent Town: Wakefield Press. p. 266-267.
  25. Barta, Tony. 1987. "Relations of Genocide: Land and Lives in the Colonization of Australia." *Genocide and the Modern Age: Etiology and Case Studies of Mass Death*, New York: Syracuse University Press.
  26. MacDonald, David, and Brendon O'Connor. 2010. "Australia and New Zealand – America's Antipodean Anglosphere Allies?" *SSRN Electronic Journal*. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1664698.
  27. McDougall, Derek. 2023. "AUKUS: A Commonwealth Perspective." *The Round Table* 112(6): 567-81. doi:10.1080/00358533.2023.2286841.
  28. Veracini, Lorenzo. 2007. "Historylessness: Australia as a Settler Colonial Collective." *Postcolonial Studies* 10(3): 271-85. doi:10.1080/13688790701488155.
  29. Ferragina, Emanuele. "15. Comparative Historical Analysis." *Éditions Science Et Bien Commun*. Pressbooks.
  30. "GDP (current US\$) – India, Australia." 2023. *World Bank Group*. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.CD?locations=IN-AU>
  31. Ville, Simon, and David Merrett. 2022. "Foreign Investment in Australia Before World War One." In *International Business in Australia before World War One: Shaping a Multinational Economy*, pp. 17-35. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.
  32. Pandya, Viral, and Sommalia Sisombat. 2017. "Impacts of Foreign Direct Investment on Economic Growth: Empirical Evidence from Australian Economy." *International Journal of Economics and Finance* 9, no. 5: 121-131. doi:10.5539/ijef.v9n5p121.
  33. Shalini, Dr S. 2020. "The Role of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in India-An Overview." *IJRAR-International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews* (IJRAR), E-ISSN: 2348-1269.
  34. Nicolaou, Claire. 2018. "Countering the Narrative on International Interventions: Paternalism as a Constant of British Interventionary Discourse and Practice from the 19th Century Onwards." PhD diss., University of Sheffield.
  35. Poudel, Uttam. 2022. "Paternalistic Colonialism in William Hodges' Travels in India." *Haimaprabha*: 2-4. doi:10.3126/haimaprabha.v21i01.44829.
  36. Miller, Manjari Chatterjee. "India Will Carve Its Own Path." *Foreign Affairs*. 11 December 2024. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/india/india-will-carve-its-own-path>.
  37. Tellis, Ashley J. 2022. "What Is in Our Interest: India and the Ukraine War." *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*, April 2022. <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2022/04/what-is-in-our-interest-india-and-the-ukraine-war?lang=en>.
  38. Jeffes, Emily. 2019. "Who Knows Best? Paternalism in Aboriginal Policy." *NEW: Emerging Scholars in Australian Indigenous Studies* 5, no. 1. doi:10.5130/nesais.v5i1.1554.
  39. Probyn-Rapsey, Fiona. 2007. "Paternalism and Complicity: or How Not to Aton for the 'Sins of the Father.'" *Australian Literary Studies*, 23 (1), 92-103. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/lhapapers/2550>.
  40. Williams, David. 2018. "Liberalism, Colonialism and Liberal Imperialism." *East Central Europe*, 45(1), p.94-118. doi:10.1163/18763308-04501005.
  41. Locke, John. 1690. *Second Treatise of Government*. Hackett Publishing Company. p. 34.
  42. Chatterjee, Partha. 2012. *The Black Hole of Empire: History of a Global Practice of Power*. Princeton University Press. p. 178.
  43. Desai, Prakash. 2020. "Nationalist Thought in Modern India: Exploration of the Idea of Freedom." *Journal of Human Values*, 27(2), 99-108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971685820943395>.
  44. Mukherjee, Rohan. 2024. "A Hindu Nationalist Foreign Policy: Under Modi, India Is Becoming More Assertive." *Foreign Affairs*. 4 April 2024. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/india/hindu-nationalist-foreign-policy>.
  45. Evans, Gareth. 2025. "Australia's Middle Power Diplomacy Matters." *East Asia Forum*. 13 January 2025. <https://eastasiaforum.org/2025/01/13/australias-middle-power-diplomacy-matters/>.
  46. Ungerer, Carl. 2007. "The "Middle Power" Concept in Australian Foreign Policy." *Australian Journal of Politics & History* 53, no. 4. p. 539. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8497.2007.00473.x.



**Author**  
**Lillian Tracy**

Lillian Tracy is a recent Honors graduate from Villanova University, where she earned a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and Humanities, with a minor in Peace and Justice. She now applies her passion for research and analysis to consumer advocacy as a Consumer Watchdog Associate at the Public Interest Research Group. Outside of work, she enjoys reading, listening to podcasts about pop culture, and spending time with her cat.



**Mentor**  
**Dr. Vonya Womack**

Vonya Womack is a Visiting Professor in the Political Science Department at Villanova University, where she teaches courses on research, human rights, global leadership, and forced displacement. She brings over 20 years of experience in international business, finance, and strategic planning, along with a publishing record in human rights, refugee studies, and leadership. As Executive Director of Refugees Unknown Stories Untold (RUSU), she leads advocacy and education efforts globally. Womack has directed programs in more than 20 countries, collaborating with NGOs, diplomats, and civil society leaders. Her work bridges academic theory with real-world impact, promoting intercultural dialogue, inclusive education, and ethical leadership in post-conflict and transitional contexts.