



Comparative History: Developing Relations between the Method of 'Writing' and Construction of the Historical Narrative

Souradip Bhattacharyya

Assistant Professor, Amity Institute of English Studies and Research, Amity University, Kolkata

The author is Assistant Professor at the Amity Institute of English Studies and Research in Amity University, Kolkata. He received his doctorate in Arts and Social Sciences from National University of Singapore in 2020. The objective of his doctoral thesis was to trace the construction of Serampore's neighbourhood spaces through different periods of history into the present through different parameters of socio-economic and religious dynamics between the resident communities of the town. His current research areas include the study of politics in the construction of heritage spaces, caste politics, study of objects in the construction of colonial histories, and the study of religious memoirs in colonial spaces. He has published in the fields of colonial literature, religious practices and community politics, the role of sanitation in constructing cityscapes etc.

Abstract

One of the primary concerns of studying historiography is to assess the quality and technique of history writing. We must also pay attention to the structure embedded in history writing, useful in making a historian/critic aware of the politics of representation. Twentieth century debates on the technique, structure, and theme of history writing have recorded the emergence of "oriented" history, by which I mean, history writing has been transformed and rearranged along multiple sub-disciplines and genres. The objective of this paper is to analyze historical writing to show that history can at the same time be a correlation between the *conjuncture* and the *event*. Rather than being watertight compartments or superior to the cultural space of the individual, social life and socioeconomic relationships are realized through various cultural practices and modes of cultural production. In fact, as I shall study in this paper, socioeconomic relations and cultural practice are co-constitutive. In this sense, my intention is to remodel/restructure the compartmental structure of analysis—as history post Annales has done—to propose a more mutual interaction between the two. I propose to do that through a comparative analysis of two texts, *Smuggling as Subversion* (1998) by Amar Farooqui and *Smuggler Nation* (2013) by Peter Andreas. The focus of comparison shall be the way each historian studies the socioeconomic significance of smuggling in each context, and the role smuggling played in redefining/reproducing the social relations between the colonizers and the colony. It is imperative for such comparative study to understand that the historical method of analysis and thematic content of history depends on authorial intentions and the historical context in which it is put.

Keywords

writing, narrative, method, history, social relations

Knowing the Historical Method and Developing Connection with Historical Narrative

One of the primary concerns of studying historiography is to assess the quality and technique of history *writing*. By asking the question, "what is a good history book?", we do not just move towards an evaluation of thematic representation of history. We must also pay attention to the structure embedded in such history writing, useful in making a historian/critic aware of the politics of representation. Twentieth century debates on the technique, structure, and theme of history writing have recorded the emergence of "oriented" history, by which I mean, history writing has been transformed and rearranged along multiple sub-disciplines and genres. Some historians like E.H. Carr have taken the opportunity to establish a canon of more socially oriented history (Hunt 1). Others like Fernand Braudel and the "Annales" school have taken a more "total" approach to history by distinguishing along three specific levels of historical enquiry following specific units of time: the *longue durée*, the *conjoncture*, and the *event* (Hunt 3). The *longue durée* is concerned primarily with the geographical milieu, the *conjoncture* with social life and relationships, while the *event* is considered as the political and/or intellectual life of the individual and hence a passing fancy, a fleeting moment that does not need much attention (Hunt 3). History writing through the influence of the Annales, even into the later generations, kept this distinction intact and prioritized the first two levels over the third. The Marxist influence in history writing with the hands of the likes of E.P. Thomson changed the course of history towards the cultural realm and the sociopolitical space of the individual. Marxist history, however, in the words of Stedman Jones (1983) failed to distinguish between "social being" and "social consciousness" (101), relying in turn on the extra-linguistic aspect of "social relations of production" (Hunt 5). Fourth-generation Annales historians almost echoed Stedman Jones' sentiments and focused in turn on the more micro-historical aspect of the *mentalites*, or the mentality of the individual by placing it within an ideological context, and inspiring historical study along the hitherto untraveled realm of oral history, narratives, and memory.

It is important in the case of this paper to know these recent debates in history writing because the intention here is to propose that a historical text, can at the same time deal with two of the three distinguished levels that the Annales school makes in history. Indeed, the *longue durée* as Braudel explains, demands a different historical context altogether. However, history can at the same time be a correlation between the *conjoncture* and the *event*. Rather than being watertight compartments or superior to the cultural space of the individual, social life and socioeconomic relationships are realized through "cultural practice and cultural production" (Hunt 7). In fact, as I shall go on to show through my study of history in this paper, socioeconomic relations and cultural practice are co-constitutive. In this sense, my intention is to remodel/restructure the compartmental structure of analysis—as history post Annales has done—to propose a more mutual interaction between the two. I propose to do that by focusing primarily on the principal text, *Smuggling as Subversion* (1998) by Amar Farooqui, which is a history of socioeconomic relations between Indian merchants and the colonial government (the East India Company) about the politics of producing and smuggling opium. To study historical method and history writing comparatively—because only through comparative

study can we get a concrete idea of historical approach/method across similar themes but different sociopolitical contexts—I also plan to compare such historical study with the history of the role smuggling played in the American War of Independence. My focus for this shall be on Peter Andreas' book, *Smuggler Nation* (2013). The focus of comparison shall be the way each historian studies the socioeconomic significance of smuggling in each context, and the role smuggling played in redefining/reproducing the social relations between the colonizers and the colony. It is imperative for such comparative study to understand that the historical method of analysis and thematic content of history depends on authorial intentions and the historical context in which it is put.

Smuggling as Subversion: Method and Text

Smuggling as Subversion (1998), at first glance, may be regarded as economic history. It claims to be one of the first historical enquiries into the tremendous potential of the Malwa region of modern-day Madhya Pradesh in producing and smuggling opium for the colonial government of India (the East India Company, hereafter EIC) to the opium market of China. The word "subversion" in the title carries double meaning and shows how "smuggling" as adjective, as negative connotation of a particular practice could change depending on social and political relations, and economic interests. The British EIC on one hand participated in illegal narcotic export (smuggling of opium) to China, as the Chinese imperial government had forbidden the consumption of opium by law (Farooqui 4). On the other hand, the EIC itself imposed various restrictions on the indigenous opium producers and suppliers from Malwa, tried to fix the price of opium and restricted the various routes through which the indigenous suppliers could make profit on their own. The EIC labelled any opium dealing outside its purview as illicit, and hence "smuggled", thereby trying to establish monopoly in Malwa opium as it did with Bengal opium. Subversion was, therefore, occurring both ways and it is interesting to note how the agent responsible for such subversion in one case tried to disseminate and tighten the screws of legality on the other. It is therefore necessary in this context to situate the historical method. As mentioned before, the book is a comprehensive study of the economic and social relations in the production and marketing of opium between players/agents operating at various levels in the opium business. The historian, however, produces this economic and social history through its interplay with the realm of the "event" by juxtaposing general social relations of production with specific events, issues, individuals, and conditions. As I shall explain later in my paper, interplay between these two levels helps strengthen the historical narrative.

The trade of Malwa opium was initially discouraged by the EIC since any form of challenge to the hard-won monopoly of Bengal opium trade to China was not desired (Farooqui 8). However, the proof of indigenous prosperity with an already existent Malwa opium trade within India—prevalent since the Mughal Period and the rule of the Peshwa—ignited the desire of colonial traders and government officials under the EIC, posted in central and western India to try their luck in Malwa opium trade. Farooqui's social history shows how the approach of the EIC shifted gradually over time from complete negation of competition from Malwa opium to that of limited allowance under the supervision of the company to finally one of compromise and "formalization of

private participation in the Malwa trade" on the payment of a specific duty upon entering British territory (142). This abstract account of the gradual transformation of social and economic relations is substantiated by actual, ground-level analysis of material relations and transactions between specific parties (the indigenous producers and dealers on one hand, and the British administrators cum overseas traders on the other). As a result, Farooqui's historical analysis is a combination of a detailed study of the manufacture of opium, the settling of price between the farmer and dealer, adjustments and negotiations between the indigenous wholesale traders and government, detailed accounts of land measurements, quantity of production, and economic transactions, as well as accounts of individual indigenous traders and their resistance to and subversion of colonial restrictions.

The historian, in his analysis, spends considerable time on the setting/background of the historical milieu. To write a history of Malwa opium is to also write a history of the various districts, their jurisdiction, and the number of villages producing opium. This is because, Malwa and by far the current state of Madhya Pradesh has had a long history of territorial conflict between the various Maratha sardars who were powerful enough to assist the Peshwa to the throne and could often dictate matters regarding government. In the large-scale Maratha expansionist program in the 18th century, this is how certain sardars rose to prominence and in dividing and governing their own territories seized to become mere revenue collectors or military commanders in the Peshwa army (Farooqui 30). Conflict over territorial boundaries and exertion of power became more prominent between the sardars, especially the two most prominent ones of the Sindias and the Holkars in the Mandsaur district of Malwa region, due to struggle over opium business. The reason this part of social history is important is because the conflict between the colonizers and indigenous groups on one hand, and that between the Malwa merchants and bankers (on the Sindia-Holkar divide) on the other played decisive roles in the production and marketing of opium (Farooqui 50). Concerned with social relations of production, Farooqui portrays an elaborate structure of the levels involved in such production and the consequent effect on the opium farmers. The great demand for opium in the internal market of central and western India as well as the pressure from Company merchants to produce more opium to increase export business had negative effects on the farmers. Not only could they not produce other crops throughout the year (opium was a seasonal product) but also the high expense in the production of opium and little profit from selling it to indigenous dealers left the farmers with no capital for reinvestment. Farmers had to rely on the Sahukars who were moneylenders cum opium dealers for capital to be invested in opium farming, and in return had to supply them with the entire farm produce. The rapid circle in opium production left therefore little scope for the farmers to profit. Apart from alienation from production operating at full flow, transactional relations between the indigenous opium dealers and big opium traders decided the price of opium.

A major realization the Company had after entering the Malwa opium trade was the impossibility of dealing directly with the farmers for opium produce. The strong hold of opium dealers was impossible to annihilate more so because the raw opium juice collected needed elaborate processing that was done by the dealers, and the colonizers

found it impossible to pierce this network of process and supply prevalent in Malwa since the 16th century. Historical documents are replete with proof of the fact that in the struggle for supremacy between the Sindias and Holkars, there indeed were internal contestations between opium dealers and money-bankers in each territory because each "on account of Partnership (had) shops at either place" (Farooqui 50). However, contrary to the wish of the Company and at times their active participation in igniting the conflict, it resulted in increased competition between the two groups rather than a slack over the hold on opium business. Driven with the intention of establishing monopoly over Malwa opium, the EIC officials produced a strategy through which it hoped to conquer most of the opium produced. On one hand it made a detailed ground survey of the farmland, preparing a report on the quantity of opium produced in each village. On the other hand, it proposed a treaty with the indigenous opium dealers and traders through which it planned to buy out most of the opium produce at a fixed rate (leaving a certain meagre amount for the personal use of the dealers as part of the treaty), leaving little scope for the dealers to rake profit through clandestine trade. The treaty presented this deal as fair exchange of providing a ready market for opium against putting an end to all forms of opium trade labelled illicit as they ate into the profit of the EIC. Furthermore, the local governing bodies of the Sardars had to seal off all illegal routes through which clandestine opium trade could be carried out. The report acted as data for the Company, based on which estimates could be made and such elaborate actions could be carried out. It provided an elaborate account of each village under each authority of the Malwa region, the area sown for poppy under each village, and increase in area under poppy in certain regions between a period (Farooqui 79-83). The policy was not successful for the Company and backfired in certain cases. There was discrepancy among the various reports prepared and the quantity of opium ordered by Company officials exceeded by far the potential for opium production.

Farooqui, in producing this social and economic history, has relied hugely on the importance of the *event*, or singular events and characters whose role in the socioeconomic relations concerning opium has reshaped such relations of production. Not only do these singular events complement the larger socioeconomic history, but the historian's projection of such events as integral and pivotal to the course of such history accentuate the importance of events and their study in history for the cause of history writing. The failure of the EIC policy is narrated through the dealings of the Company opium agent Mr. Swinton, and assistant opium agent Mr. Dangerfield. Swinton, as Farooqui explains, could not cope with the changing role of the opium agent: from a dual role of handling commercial as well as political duties to what was majorly political in nature, of negotiating with the indigenous states over the acceptance of the treaty (Farooqui 103). Dangerfield on the other hand was an expert with ground survey and preparation of statistics about the production of opium. Swinton's lack of concern with Dangerfield's statistics was not the only reason the opium agent's excessive demand was not practicalised. Here lay a quite different power-relation and a case of excessive negotiation with opium dealers. Swinton found it impossible to gain monopoly over Malwa opium without offering special concessions and attractive rates to the traders leading to dealings that proved financially risky for the EIC. As he would later justify to

the EIC Headquarters in Calcutta, the opium traders played a decisive role in fixing the quantity of opium that the Company agents should buy from them, and in turn took advantage of the concessions to *force* the agents into ordering more opium than was produced. Swinton was *made to* comply with indigenous sources of data on the quantity of opium than consulting Dangerfield's figures. Notwithstanding Swinton's own desire to monopolize opium trade, the control of the Malwa Sahukars/opium dealers cannot be overlooked. Such a power-relation transcends the colonial desire for domination and on a transactional space portrays how one *agent* (in the theoretical sense) can make use of its *authority* to subvert the dictates of the other. Authority for the former originates from a history of *being* in the space of production and developing linkage, over time, with the grass-root level of opium trade, therefore making it possible for them to turn colonial agenda on its head.

Subversion of colonial authority reached its peak when, following orders from the EIC Headquarters in Calcutta, the Company officials in Malwa revised their policy towards opium and imposed certain new restrictions. It included lowering the amount of opium ordered, cutting down upon the concessions provided earlier to the opium dealers, and a stricter imposition of rules and surveillance over the illegal trade of opium by the indigenous traders. This sudden change in socioeconomic relations was not received well by the Malwa Sahukars, and it resulted in open conflict between the two parties. Farooqui traces this change through a study of certain events and role of indigenous opium dealers/traders in conflict with colonial officials. Names like Appa Gangadhar, Tatyia Jog, and Bahadur Mal become important in this case. They were few of the most prolific opium dealers from the rich opium producing areas of Malwa who went into open dissent with the British in obstructing or countering their opium policies. Farooqui also pays special attention to their roles in carrying out clandestine opium trade. Tatyia Jog, according to opium agent Wellesley, refused to the amount of opium to be delivered despite having already “negotiated and signed the opium treaty on behalf of Indore” (Farooqui 97). Appa Gangadhar, the powerful opium dealer from Mandsaur district of the Malwa region participated in the treaty with the colonizers and on the other hand, had an impressive fleet of equestrians and soldiers/guards to protect his clandestine supply of opium to the Portuguese traders in Daman and Diu, who would then send it to the Portuguese hub of the opium market in Macau. Bahadur Mal from Kota who was equally powerful, similarly participated in extensive smuggling of opium by dictating terms of the Raja (local ruler) of that region and sent the drugs mostly via Portuguese colony of Daman and Diu. Such traders along with multiple others from places like Ahmedabad (Gujarat), Kota (Rajasthan), and Bombay invented new meandering routes via central and western India for transporting smuggled opium. Against the power of the colonizers to seal trade routes, there existed a definite alliance among the Malwa Sahukars of the various districts, what Farooqui calls “temporary alliance,” so that merchants could keep other options open besides supplying opium to the Company (101).

The opium dealers also knew how to destabilize the coordinates of power-relation by using the colonizers' tool of cost analysis itself as bait. Farooqui narrates a particular incident whereby tricking the Company opium agent into buying opium at a much lesser price than in the market, the Bombay firm of a certain Premji Purushottam purposefully

stranded the former, buying in turn all the opium from the market for clandestine trade (Farooqui 115-116). Another form of resistance to Company monopoly came in the form of the local tribes from Malwa, the Bhils and various other tribes that underwent a process of detribalization under the Peshwa rule and was absorbed in the army of the Sardars, or directly under the Peshwa. Widespread British campaign to destroy state formation among the tribes left the latter without shelter or any source of income, resulting in such absorption or their usage by opium dealers—on account of their thorough knowledge of the areas around which smuggled opium was transported—to participate in illegal drug deals or act as guards. The extent of resistance provided by such tribes to British crackdown upon illegal opium is exemplified by Farooqui with the case of a Lalla Patel, a man from the Aheer Caste, a “disturber who calls himself the miracle performing Raja,” who gathered a considerable army and swore to defeat the British and take control of the Soondwarah region of Malwa (149). That Lalla Patel was defeated and killed was another thing, as he had managed to successfully intimidate the Company officials who now had to be careful about the “lawless character and predatory habits” of the indigenous tribes (Farooqui 149).

Smuggling as Subversion is an effort from Farooqui to write a social and economic history of Malwa opium with his focus not just on the economic importance of that opium but what it stood for the indigenous benefactors of central and western India. As the title of the book suggests and his historical analysis shows, study of *subversion* remains incomplete without a history of the agents of subversion. Farooqui has done justice to it through a meticulous account of the role of agents, and recognition of the importance of the "event" so that the essence of the socioeconomic history could be fleshed out completely. Lynn Hunt is right in pointing out in this case that the social and economic histories are embedded in the event, the history of the individual, or the cultural space and a study of that history/space helps in reproducing the social and economic more efficiently (7). Farooqui's history is a "history from below" that uses individuals and events to portray an alternative history of socioeconomic relations between the native traders and the colonial officials. The notes on individuals and the detailed accounts of events are the historiographic methods through which Farooqui contests the repressive apparatus of the colonizers and succeeds in reproducing a social and economic history that urges the reader to think differently, changing the historical course of Malwa opium.

Developing the Comparative Link with Smuggler Nation

Comparing this primary text with Peter Andreas' *Smuggler Nation* (2013) throws several challenges. First, the geographical milieu is completely different. *Smuggler Nation* is interested in studying how the connotation, role, and importance of smuggling have changed over the last 250 years in the context of the United States of America. Hence, the historical agenda is also quite different in the two cases. Andreas' historiographical method is defined by a temporally expansive sociological study of the effect and appeal of smuggling in American society and how its relationship with the discourse of "nation" and "nation-building" has changed over time. Although my focus here shall be only on the colonial era of that temporal range, it is worth mentioning here that, unlike Farooqui, Andreas does not focus on any spatial limit of a (sub)territory but is

concerned with the general change in social relations between the merchants/traders and the colonial authority of America concerning the role of smuggling. However, as I have explained below, this has not prevented Andreas from using events and historical accounts of individuals to accentuate his larger claim of the social history. Finally, the authorial intentions (based on historical documents of course) are different from each other. Andreas looks at how apparently local issues of conflict and dissent between the merchants and colonial government regarding clandestine trade spreads rapidly between states leading to a consolidated effort on behalf of the merchants in the American War of Independence to overthrow colonial rule. Farooqui's history in that sense is much more local, and although it narrates the subversive role of indigenous opium dealers, there is no claim to widespread effective collaboration throughout the nation, that could pose all-round challenge to colonial rule. For Andreas, smuggling was not just a tool for subversion, but a lifeline to an all-round alternative mode of expression and resistance. However, what connects the two histories is their method of structuring the historical narrative. Andreas, like Farooqui, intertwines social history with the 'event', and individual accounts that helps to express the social and economic implications of smuggling more distinctly. I propose that the similarity in the structure of the narrative is connected to the political and social implications that colonialism had in the context of both America and India. The reader should keep in mind that in both cases the governing bodies were also at the same time corporate bodies (Stern 6).

Philip Stern in his book *The Company-State* (2011) argues that the British Colonial Empire in the form of trade in the American territory or South and South-east Asia through the EIC were all corporate bodies that apart from commercial roles had active governmental and political duties, the "corpus politicum et corporatum" that aimed at performing all the functions of an early modern government (4, 8). Its main motto was to consolidate common people under a "legal singularity" and maintain governance through an "artificial person" that could function on behalf of the community (Stern 8). The structure of the corporation existed at the level of society, culture, and economy and was therefore multiple in nature. The multiplicity of corporations and their unique ways of creating social bonds and cultures produced their own forms of allegiance that ended up conflicting with each other or as threat to central governing body (Stern 9). In case of both Farooqui and Andreas, this political structure has left a prominent mark. With Farooqui, the central authority of the EIC in Calcutta after great initial reluctance decided to finance the Company's section in Malwa with the investment in opium trade, only to encounter later with a fiscal crisis. There was subversion of instructions by the colonial officials itself at every step, not to mention how the indigenous traders subverted Company's own policy and provided active resistance to colonial restrictions. With Andreas, the merchants and traders of America who were parts of the different corporations loosely connected with the colonial governing bodies rebelled once the government became actively engaged in wiping smuggling out of the face of America's economic scenario. The academic purpose behind comparing these two histories is twofold: a) to show how colonial economic policies and policies of governance bear a lot of commonalities between apparently unconnected geographical spaces, and socioeconomic relations with the people follow common dynamics, as they fall under the

basic governmental structure that was functional even in the imperial heartland, and b) how the commonality in such structure, forms of governance, and policies influence history writing itself, in the adoption of common historical methods and narrative structures. Such academic purpose is to strengthen the course of comparative history.

Smuggler Nation as Narrative

In *Smuggler Nation* we get a clear idea that the laws of the colonial government that looked after their vested interests were not accepted silently by the merchants and traders. With change in policy from the government, the merchants of America too changed their attitude towards the former. For example, the government's silence over clandestine trade to woo the support of the people was broken after the Seven Years' War with France when it woke up to the tremendous economic loss it had suffered. It now wanted to recover by tightening the screws of the system of trade in America since laxity by the imperial government towards the collection of revenue did more harm to it than good. The corporate nature of the government however, had till then established a different socioeconomic relation between the merchants and customs officers/colonial officials. Laxity by the imperial government had made corruption an everyday affair for both, the merchants, and customs officers. Not only was a change in that system not taken well by the merchants, but also, they resisted such changes openly through acts of violence and by flourishing their clandestine trade with other colonial settlements. Thomas Hobbes, as Philip Stern mentions, had said alluding to his concept of the Leviathan that the multiple corporate bodies that originate from the central system and develop functional autonomy of their own, retune back to plague the central governing body itself (9). The American case was something similar. As noted by Andreas, there was a definite struggle for power and supremacy in trade and profit extraction in America, post the Seven Years' War.

Andreas' research moves through a constant interplay between evaluation of the general social conditions and social relations of production on one hand and examination of events and individual roles on the other. Actions by the imperial government included revision of the Molasses Act to the Sugar Act of 1764, declaring any flag of truce as invalid, replacing government officials involved in illicit trade by newer officials/customs officers who were now given more power (writs of assistance) to crack down on the smugglers, and imposition of embargo on illicit trade, bringing charges against smugglers and compelling them to sign a treaty with the government (Andreas 31). The smugglers/traders retaliated by going into open violent and nonviolent resistance like attacking patrol ships, engaging in gunfight with the imperial army, feathering customs officers, conducting mass protests against seizure of goods, as well as influencing law courts to drop charges against such traders. Another innovative mode of resistance was always inventing newer sea routes and ways of smuggling goods into other colonies by carrying out smuggling in the neutral spaces of other countries. Such a narrative account of action and counteraction from an abstract, general viewpoint is complemented by Andreas with special focus on certain events and individuals. I shall refer here to two such instances: a) the Boston Tea Party of December 16, 1773, and b) the figure of John Brown.

Andreas gives an elaborate account of the Boston Tea Party as a group of Boston colonists on the evening of December 16, 1773 boarded the EIC ships and dumped 342 chests of tea into the Boston Harbour. Such an action was applauded by the colonial opposition leaders and the voice of dissent spread rapidly into other States (Andreas 41). The agenda behind the attack was to protest the widespread marketing of EIC tea in America by the government than the Holland tea that the merchants smuggled at a lower rate from Holland (Andreas 41). It is through the narration of such accounts that the mood of the situation as well as the emotive quality of events can be captured. In the age of oral history and the *mentalites*, historical narrative has a fundamental duty of capturing or projecting an event in its full effect, as historical enquiry now delves deep into the human psyche. Capturing the emotive quality of an event through narration strengthens its significance. Andreas achieves this further through elaborate portrayal of individuals. I shall be concerned here with the figure of John Brown. Andreas gives full effect to his description of the technicality of the clandestine trade through figures like John Brown, who did not just conduct open resistance against government policies or clandestine trade with other colonial settlements. Merchants like Brown also had a specific economic and political agenda as they knew how to tactfully conduct business with British and French settlements during the Seven Years' War, instigating both the parties but never letting go of the opportunity of trading with them. Also, as Andreas delves into their psyche through their attitude towards America itself during war of independence, we get acquainted with the nature of blatant profiteers rather than patriots who rarely let go an opportunity to rake in cash, very often taking advantage of the adverse situation of supply.

Conclusion: The Benefit of Comparative Research

Andreas' juxtaposition of such singular events and individuals in his larger agenda of penning a social and political history for America shows how such history can be transformed into an attractive narrative. Comparison with Farooqui's *Smuggling as Subversion* does not seem far-fetched as both, dealing with almost contemporary history from two different geographical spaces and experiencing similar governmental structures redefine the limits and connotations of legality and illegality. As I have shown during my paper, history writing itself benefits from such comparative study as adoption of historical methods in constructing a narrative can itself be part of historiographical research. Comparison in this sense also brings the history of these two spaces closer to each other, and in this age of "oriented" history can establish a cannon for itself where historical method shall be researched vis-a-vis the socioeconomic and political context of such history. By developing a connection between the context of the histories and the historical method that is used by the historians, I have tried to project this relation of mutual constitution between the two factors, which I hope can be developed as a scope for further research in studies of history.

Works Cited

- Andreas, Peter. *Smuggler Nation: How Illicit Trade made America*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Farooqui, Amar. *Smuggling as Subversion: Colonialism, Indian Merchants and the Politics of Opium*. New Age International Publishers, 1998.
- Hunt, Lynn. "Introduction: History, Culture, and Text." *The New Cultural History*, edited by Lynn Hunt, University of California Press, 1989, pp. 1-24.
- Jones, Gareth Stedman. *Languages of Class: Studies in English working class History 1832-1982*. Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Stern, Philip J. *The Company-State: Corporate Sovereignty and the Early Modern Foundations of the British Empire in India*. Oxford University Press, 2011.