

## Archaeology, Policies and British Rule-A Review

**Debasri Dasgupta Ghosh**

*Visiting Faculty, CEMS, Archaeology Department, Mumbai University, Mumbai. E-mail: [debasrig@gmail.com](mailto:debasrig@gmail.com)*

**Received :** 19 March 2025 • **Revised :** 22 April 2025 • **Accepted :** 05 May 2025 • **Published :** 30 December 2025

### **TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:**

Debasri Dasgupta Ghosh 2025. Archaeology, Policies and British Rule–A Review. *Journal of Historical, Archaeological and Anthropological Studies*, 3: 1-2, pp. 59-69.

**Abstract:** Archaeological research in India has flourished since independence with advanced technologies and interdisciplinary methodologies. The integration of scientific dating, digital documentation has revolutionized the field, enabling accurate data collection, discovery and preservation of remote and endangered heritage sites. Outreach programs, heritage tourism have grown and expanded, developing a strong sense of responsibility towards the tangible and intangible heritage. Indian archaeology is thus continually evolving while preserving its ancient heritage. Hence, the past becomes important and revisiting the beginning of archaeology and its growth trajectory in the Indian subcontinent. The expansion of knowledge regarding India's past and its impact on British administrative policies has been a subject of considerable academic interest. The influence of colonial archaeology and its effects on the evolution of archaeology into a scientific discipline are particularly significant.

This work outlines the evolution of archaeology in India, focusing on how colonial policies and influential figures such as Lord Curzon, John Marshall, and Mortimer Wheeler shaped conservation and scientific excavation practices. It discusses the transition from imperial to independent Indian control, noting how colonial frameworks were adapted and expanded upon by Indian archaeologists. The post-independence era saw increased research, decentralization, the integration of scientific disciplines and a nationalistic focus on protecting heritage, culminating in significant legislative reforms and institutional growth within the field of Indian archaeology.

**Keywords:** Colonial archaeology, Colin Mackenzie, John Marshall, Meadows Taylor, Policies

### **Introduction**

“Archaeology is generally understood to be a subject which deals with the study of antiquities. This not only includes the collection of old objects made by man, but the various methods to search for old objects, and the attempts to reconstruct the past events by the study of objects or

things so collected. Archaeology, in brief, is the pursuit of the history of man” (Sankalia, 1965). Archaeology as a discipline was not always well understood. It started as an antiquarian activity. The tale of mankind would have remained obscured if not for the natural curiosity of human beings. Most of us are familiar with the tale of Bel-Shanti-Nannar, a daughter of King Nabonidus, in the 6th century BC. who had a collection of ancient Babylonian artefacts, which is the first known museum of antiquities. Besides, there were always the ancient sites, Pompeii in Italy, Egyptian pyramids, Asokan edicts, Buddhist stupas, Mesopotamian ziggurats etc., which attracted the curious. Emergence of new aspects due to expansion of intellectual inquiry gave a much-needed boost to the discipline of archaeology.

While indigenous scholarship on Indian culture and history existed long before, the colonial Europeans played a significant role in formalizing Indological studies. The extensive linguistic and cultural research of the Jesuit missionaries in the eighteenth century was the beginning of later European approaches to Indology. Nevertheless, the most important contribution was from Sir William Jones, who established the Asiatic Society of Bengal on 15th January 1784 and formalized the study of Indology (Rajan, 2002; Paddyya, 2002-03). During the period from 1792 to 1794, William Jones translated several Sanskrit texts, including the Law Book of Manu. The linguistic similarities among Sanskrit, Latin, and Classical Greek stimulated the development of Indological studies. Universities like Cambridge, Oxford and Institutes like Société Asiatique in Paris started the study of Sanskrit and Indian literature (Rajan, 2002).

James Prinsep’s 1837 decipherment of Brahmi and Kharoshthi enabled the reading of edicts, coins, and scripts. Sandrokottos of the Greek historians was identified as Chandragupta Maurya by William Jones followed by the identification of Pataliputra (Palibothra of classical writings) at the confluence of the Ganga and Son. The identification of Chandragupta Maurya was a defining moment, as it fixed the chronological horizon in Indian history (courtesy, ASI)`. Among the many researchers who were involved in the research and documentation, H.T. Colebrook and H.H. Wilson (luminaries of Asiatic Society), came to India in late eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries. They were interested in Sanskrit and translated Rig Veda and Dayabhaga of Jimutvahana among other works besides writing about Sanskrit grammar. Here, it is interesting to note on some of the observations of D. K. Chakrabarti (1982). In researching India’s past, it was not the need to observe and report precisely on Indian antiquities and monuments that was felt by William Jones and many of his contemporaries but the necessity “to integrate the emerging historical knowledge of India with contemporary notions concerning the origin of culture and civilization and simultaneously working them into the framework of the unitary origin of man as laid down in the Bible. These provided a significant framework for interpreting the Indian past.” William Jones in his discourses mentioned that the similarity of Sanskrit with Greek, Latin and other languages meant that, all these people came from one singular place. This idea found resonance in the works of several of his contemporaries, Francis Wilford, T. Maurice among others. Then, there is the evident denial of historical consciousness among the Indians. This was notably conveyed in the statement by Alexander Cunningham, “the study of Indian antiquities received its first impulse from Sir William Jones who in 1784 founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal.” Contradicting this statement is the noticeable collections of old manuscripts, paintings etc. during the Mughal period pointing to a ‘scholarship further into the past’. Besides, the factual description of old monuments

from the Mughal period are also found. Emperor Jahangir's description of the Jama Masjid in Ahmedabad (in *Jahangirnama*) falls in this category (Guha,2014). Not to mention the significant amount of Itihasa-Purana traditions, apart from the Jain and Buddhist chronicles of ancient India (Thapar,2013).

Archaeology in the Indian context was therefore deeply intertwined with the intellectual curiosity and the political motives of its European practitioners. The British motivated by a combination of scholarly interest, imperial strategy and a desire to showcase their civilizational superiority, systematically studied, catalogued and many a times appropriated India's material heritage.

The establishment of the Asiatic Society of Bengal was a watershed moment, as it marked the beginning of gradual shift in the discipline from the pursuit of individual collectors and antiquarians to an organized, state-sponsored enterprise. It provided a framework for academic inquiry and the institutionalization of archaeological research. Slowly, the archaeological undertakings became closely connected to colonial governance. The British authorities initiated a series of policies to protect and preserve India's ancient sites and antiquities. Yet, the discipline of Archaeology was rarely free of politics.

Here, we focus on Colonial Archaeology and its role in shaping the development of archeology in the Indian subcontinent. The continued legacy of the British period and further developments and changes that were visible during the early independence phase becomes an interesting study. There is no dearth of publications related to archaeology and colonialism. Trigger (1980,1984), Murray and White (1981), Prochaska (1990), Shaw (1990), Sheppard (1990), Bernal (1994), Schlanger (2003), Chakrabarti (2000), Hassan (2003) are only a few. Tracing the legacies and the policies which became the foundational fabric of archaeology is an essential adjunct to these studies. This work does just that but within the realms of Indian archaeology

### **Colonial Archaeology**

It can be said that the need to understand the past of their colonial subjects led to the rudimentary beginnings of archaeology. The topographical surveys endorsed by the government administrators (e.g., In India, the surveyors of East India Company) in the nineteenth century was a step forward from artifact description (Lyons and Papadopoulos,2002). The pioneer British archaeologists in India did a very comprehensive mapping and cataloguing of the ancient ruins, relics, sculptures, and inscriptions. Lahiri (2000) observes that the interest in mapping and surveys was directly connected to the political aspirations of the seemingly benevolent imperialist power. Increasing knowledge of new territory was essential to know the land and control its people. Exhaustive surveys of Colin Mackenzie and Francis Buchanan in Madras Presidency, Bengal Presidency and Mysuru respectively, while helping in the colonial endeavor, added an important chapter to the discipline of archaeology. New areas and different customs were recorded and exposed to the Western eye. Mackenzie was a collector of antiquities, inscriptions and manuscripts and drew everything he saw, including architectural elements, in the course of facilitating the Britishers to expand their empire (Desai-Geller,2016). The first surveyor general of India Alexander Cunningham appointed in 1861, located numerous Buddhist sites like Taxila, Sravasti, Kausambi, Barhut from the accounts of Hiuen Tsang. Renewed understanding of the emergence and the spread

of Buddhism became known from the numerous inscriptions and monuments found at various sites. The glorious era of the past ruling dynasties, like the Mauryans, Guptas, Pallavas, Cheras, and Cholas, received renewed recognition. The works of Meadows Taylor, Robert Brucefoot, and A.C.L. Carllyle gave India a prehistoric past. James Fergusson worked on the architectural surveys and classification of the ancient architecture (Paddayya, 2002-03). Important publications like *Indian Antiquity* in 1872 and *Epigraphica Indica* (1882) were published and twenty volumes of *Archaeological Survey of India and the Imperial Series*. The discovery of Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro adjusted the chronology of Indian history, placing the Harappan Civilization in the same period as Mesopotamian civilization. The excavations were carried out by several archaeologists including M.S. Vats, R. D. Banerjee, E.J.H Mackay with John Marshall as the director general of Archaeological Survey of India during that period. John Marshall was also one of the earliest archaeologists who focused on recreating ancient Indian culture with the archaeological data at his disposal (Roy, 1953). Sir Mortimer Wheeler was the last director general of Archaeological Survey of British India. He excavated sites like Arikamedu, Brahmagiri etc. (Pratap, 2014).

As India's engagement with archaeology deepened under British rule, the discipline evolved from an intellectual curiosity to an institutionalized practice, shaping not only an understanding of the past but also informing policies that would leave a lasting imprint. The colonial state recognized the power of ancient monuments and antiquities in forging narratives of authority and identity. Consequently, a series of legislative and administrative measures were introduced to manage and protect these tangible symbols of antiquity, setting precedents that would echo into the post-independence era.

There were legislations passed by the British government for protection of ancient monuments. The Bengal Regulation XIX of 1810 was the first attempt to make the government intervene in case of risks to monuments, through legislation. The British government passed another act (XX) in 1863, again with a view 'to prevent injury to and preserve buildings remarkable for their antiquity for their historical or architectural value'. The Archaeological Survey was revived as a distinct department of the government and Cunningham was appointed as Director General who assumed his charge in February 1871. Cunningham was famous for surveys (Paddayya, 2016) that led to several discoveries and identification of architecture of Gupta and post-Gupta period; great stupa of Bharhut; identification of ancient cities namely: Sankisa, Sravasti and Kausambi. He also brought to prominence the Gupta temples at Tigawa, Bilsar, Bhitargaon, Kuthra, Deogarh and Gupta inscriptions at Eran, Udayagiri and other places. The department was entrusted with the task of doing - 'a complete search over the whole country, and a systematic record and description of all architectural and other remains that are either remarkable for their antiquity, or their beauty or their historical interests' (courtesy, ASI). The British, while asserting their own civilizational superiority, became interpreters of India's monumental heritage. Their fascination with the relics of the subcontinent was not simply antiquarian; it was also entwined with the politics of governance, legitimation, and cultural hegemony. Archaeological pursuits were thus supported by the apparatus of the colonial government, which actively facilitated surveys, documentation, and the establishment of regulatory frameworks. These measures, though steeped in imperial motives, laid the groundwork for a systematic approach to the study and conservation of India's rich archaeological legacy.

One of the underwritten policies behind the keen interest by the colonial powers, in the history and archaeology of the colonies, was to position themselves as a superior civilization. This led to framing of India's past accomplishments within the developmental framework of European art, law and literature. Indian art in comparison to the art of Classical Greece was found wanting. Naturally, the idea of colonization as a beneficial experience for the natives was reinforced (Lyons and Papadopoulos, 2002). In this background, a notion of the continuous cycle of subjugation had led to the development of the Aryan invasion theory which repeated the subjugation of the natives by the Aryans coming from abroad and who destroyed the older Harappan civilization and established a culture of their own (Chakrabarti, 1982). In facing this problem, India shared the problem of "intellectual expropriation with repercussions in the present day" with Egypt and the Middle East. It is important to note here, that, to prove the white man's superiority, monuments discovered in places as different as Egypt, India, sub-Saharan Africa (Hall, 1995) to Australia (Russell and McNiven 1998), were automatically linked to superior, white populations which had apparently occupied the land before the arrival of their current inhabitants (Gonzales-Ruibal, 2010). The supremacy of the colonial rulers was emphasized using ruins of bygone days. Historical, archaeological studies of the native land and culture were utilized to strengthen the colonial rule (Trigger, 1980, Edward Said, 1978). Said observed, "...Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring and having authority over the Orient" These disconcerting notions of superiority and entitlement informed the colonial discourse on archaeology wherein the perception, that British archaeologists could enrich the British museums with precious Indian antiquities. Cunningham's interest in carrying back the artefacts is palpable from the contract which allowed him a share in these antiquities (Lahiri, 2000). Wheeler's letter to Stuart urging him to join the Mohenjo-Daro excavations, "...and get 50% of the loot "is quite illuminating (Guha, 2015). It was a common practice among the British officers and civilians to remove precious Indian sculptures and sell them abroad (Guha-Thakurta, 2004). The encroachment upon the religious ethos of the native people was another abhorrent practice wherein the Survey officers took away images under active worship. First century AD shrines of Mathura (Vogel, 1908), Buddhist statues from Bishenpur in Bihar (Bloch, 1904) are few such images (Lahiri, 2000).

## Discussion

The entire gamut of policies and laws enacted during the colonial period was a continuous process of firming up the British control of India as it was regarded as the most important of British colonies. Cunningham gave importance to archaeological work to imply the non-importance and short-term durability of the religion of the native people, in order to give a foothold to Christianity in his initial days, is a case in point. Nonetheless, the fact remains that his work unveiled hitherto unknown sites and put them on the geographical map of India, giving a concrete structure to Indian archaeology. Authority in the way he handled coins, sculptures, inscriptions singlehandedly is manifest in the sagacity of his literary works (Chakrabarti, 1999, Guha-Thakurta, 2004). Herein, lies the rudimentary foundation of the Archaeological Survey of India. The determined searches of other British administrators dedicated to the archaeological pursuits added to the growing knowledge and acceptance of the antiquity of the Indian civilization. Meadows Taylor's work on Iron Age burial monuments called megaliths (1<sup>st</sup> millennium BCE) was monumental. He not only

located these sites but also excavated some using the principles of stratigraphy. He also published research papers based on the discoveries from these sites (Paddayya,2013). Robert Bruce Foote found stone tools as early as 1863 and carried on exploration and recording of stone tool sites for next thirty-five years. As early as 1878, the Treasure Trove Act was ratified for the confiscation and safety of the antiquities found during chance digging (courtesy, ASI).

The establishment of the Archaeological Survey of India, albeit in a colonial background, saw the slow evolution of policies which were underpinning for the future growth and expansion of the Survey. The differences in the political mindset led to policy vicissitudes over a period, especially from the mid nineteenth century to the twentieth century.

Lord Curzon (Viceroy) and John Marshall (Director General ASI) were the two people directly in charge during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. They were responsible for the revival of archaeological work. Marshall's principles on archaeological conservation are still valid and followed even by modern conservation experts. He not only reorganized and centrally consolidated the Survey but conducted many excavations and explorations. Arduous archaeological investigations yielded the required outcome. The discovery of the Harappan civilization and excavations at Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa, the explorations of Aurel Stein in Baluchistan, the explorations of N. G. Majumdar in Sind, and the excavations at Taxila and at some of the most important early historical sites of the Gangetic valley happened during this period (Chakrabarti, 1982). Wheeler introduced the stratification technique, the study of stratified ceramic and undertook major exploration and excavation works. It was under him that conservation was centralized. Conservation work undertaken by the Imperial Britishers was monumental. The Pearl Mosque at Lahore, Mandalay palace in Burma, Taj Mahal in Agra were among the monuments conserved. Skill, sensitivity and technical details were factored into the conservation efforts (Lahiri, 2012). Lord Curzon, the main figure behind the beginning of conservation efforts, was an imperial, 'an imperialist heart and soul. Imperialist expansion seems to me to be an inevitable necessity and carries a noble and majestic obligation' to provide good administration and priority to Indian development. He believed that one of the ways of making the imperial government seem more human would be by restoring its architectural heritage and structures. This policy of Lord Curzon led to the efforts behind the conservation of structures that were deemed important architectural heritage. Ancient monuments preservation act of 1904 was enacted. This act enabled local museums to keep portable antiquities. Still the flow of antiquities to European museums especially British museums continued. It was understood that the monuments that fell beyond the British political control and under the native states were not to be conserved. A prime example of this were the Khajuraho temples. The places where the tourist footfalls were less were also not to be conserved (Lahiri, 2012). Steeped in colonial ethos, the conservation and preservation of Ajanta caves vis a vis the non-conservation of the ancient caves and temple complex at the site of Badami was not atypical of British Archaeological Survey of India. (Desai-Geller,2016).

The one important addition to the conservation effort was the appearance of site museums. Kanika Singh (2014), mentions under "Lord Curzon as viceroy and John Marshall as Director General of the ASI that museums became part of the archaeological agenda in their own right." The plans for a museum were formulated as early as 1814 by the Asiatic Society in Kolkata. Next was the Chennai Museum in 1851 and the museum in Mumbai in 1855. Concerned with ethnology,

zoology and eventually industrial arts, these museums scarcely served the purpose of preservation of archaeological relics. Although, there were archaeological antiquities like sculptures, coins, inscriptions, and monuments present in their collection, unlike the site museums these were more of natural history museums (Guha-Thakurta, 2004). Museums were established at the site for the first time. An endeavor that seeks to enhance local interest and preserve antiquities was Marshall's viewpoint. Further, notes Singh (2014) that the National Museum is still a legacy of colonial rule. Emphasizing the colonial legacy is the division of medieval artifacts into manuscripts, textiles, coins, arms and armors classified without any chronological framework but as 'industrial arts' which was of significance during the colonial times, and this stands in contrast to the chronological division of the sculptures of the ancient period.

As the colonial era drew to a close, the transition to independence marked a profound transformation in the discipline of archaeology in India. The inherited frameworks from British rule—museum practices, conservation methods, and excavation protocols—were not simply abandoned; rather, they formed the bedrock upon which new Indian approaches were built. The early post-independence phase was characterized by both continuity and innovation. Indian archaeologists, many of whom had been trained under the tutelage of British experts, began to reorient the field, shifting its focus from outward narratives shaped by imperial interests to research that reflected indigenous perspectives and national priorities.

## Conclusion

Archaeology in India, as in other places under colonial rule, happened under the imperialistic thought process of the ruler's view to consolidate their rule with all the accompanying biases, but there's no denying the fact that it also developed into an academic discipline with strong scientific root. Capable handling of the Indian Archaeological Survey has indeed led to the utilization of some of the colonial era policies and legacies into a well-developed Organization after independence. During the early decades of independence, there was a deliberate effort to balance the inherited colonial legacy—such as systematic surveys and conservation techniques—with new policies that reflected the aspirations and priorities of a self-governing nation. The Archaeological Survey of India (ASI), though rooted in colonial origins, began to evolve, expanding its research agenda and deepening its scientific rigor.

The scientific basis given to archaeology by the works of Lord Curzon, John Marshall and the last British director general Mortimer Wheeler gave a firm foundation to many a future work. The incorporation of Archaeological Chemist happened as early as 1917. Under Indian leadership, the ASI adopted more nuanced and multidisciplinary approaches, incorporating methods from anthropology, geology, and palaeobotany, among others. Physical anthropologists, geoarchaeologists and other scientists are indispensable in the field of archaeology today. Exemplifying is the usage of archeozoological, archaeobotanical analysis for various studies like domestication of animals and plants, ancient dietary practices, and ultimately palaeoclimate reconstructions.

Some of the leading lights of Indian archaeology, B.B. Lal, B.K. Thapar, A. Ghosh, G. R. Sharma were trained in the excavations of Taxila, Mohenjo-Daro, Harappa, Arikamedu, Brahmagiri by Mortimer Wheeler. Archaeological research as part of the university curriculum was initiated

and this period witnessed the decentralization of research, with universities and newly founded institutes playing an increasingly significant role in archaeological discovery and training.

H. D. Sankalia, a doyen of Indian archaeology, established one of the early departments of Archaeology in Deccan College before independence. This also included the establishment of various archaeological Sciences departments. Eventually, the other Universities also inculcated Archaeology in their curriculum, viz., Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, Banaras Hindu University, Allahabad University. Institutes like Birbal Sahni Institute of Paleobotany, Lucknow played an important role in formulating the role of Sciences in Archaeology.

Any newly independent nation goes through this phase where it needs to prove its antiquity and belong to the oldest of civilizations. The prehistoric and protohistoric study of the country received a major boost, because of the discovery of huge number of sites belonging to these phases. Archaeological data was being contributed by various research institutes. H. D. Sankalia's discovery of Mesolithic at Langhnaj in Gujarat (Sankalia *et.al.* 1964) bridged the gap between Palaeolithic and Neolithic (also mentioned by Robert Brucefoot). His Paleolithic Survey proved the presence of prehistoric man in the Deccan. The Chalcolithic communities were identified for the first time at the site of Jorwe, Maharashtra (Sankalia, 1955). A comprehensive documentation by Allahabad University under GR Sharma was done of the archaeological investigations in the Paleolithic, Mesolithic, Neolithic (Sharma, 1980) and the Megalithic of the Middle Ganga valley and lower Vindhyas (Sharma, 1985). Archaeological research was not lopsided but was being conducted in various parts of the country. B. B. Lal, B. K. Thapar, J. P. Joshi, S. R. Rao were among the foremost archaeologists of the Archaeological Survey of India, after independence. Their excavations at Lothal in Gujarat (Rao, 1985) Kalibangan in Rajasthan (Lal *et.al.*, 2003), Surkotada in Gujarat (Joshi, 1972), Bhagwanpura in Haryana, Dadheri and Nagar in Punjab (Joshi, 1993), Hastinapur in Haryana (Lal, 1955), were of immense importance. Beginning with the identification of Painted Grey Ware sites (identified at certain sites like Bhagwanpura with overlap of the Late Harappan phase), these excavations documented the continuity of culture from the Early Harappan to the beginnings of Early Historic period. Being free of colonial rule, the investigations into the past became more intensive and widespread. The policy followed here was to understand and produce a broad chronology of the ancient past irrespective of any prejudices.

Along with the new discoveries, several new responsibilities were helmed by the Archaeological departments and specially the Archaeological Survey of India. Policies framed during this phase was in response to the requirements of protecting and preserving its antiquities and monuments from pillaging and damage. Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains act 1958, Art Treasures Act 1972 were enacted. Further the Central Government through AMASR Act 1959 empowered the Archaeological Survey of India to regulate the archaeological excavations in the country (courtesy, ASI). Innate belief in protecting and recovering the past heritage with the country's interest in mind distinguishes this phase and gives importance to a nationalistic approach.

Furthermore, the post-independence era was characterized by a heightened sense of stewardship over the nation's archaeological wealth. Efforts intensified to prevent the illicit export of antiquities, to document and protect vulnerable sites, and to foster public awareness of India's archaeological heritage. Legislation was both strengthened and modernized to reflect the evolving values and

needs of the nation. The interplay between tradition and innovation, between inherited structures and emergent paradigms, defined the character of Indian archaeology as it moved confidently beyond its colonial past.

## Bibliography

- Bernal, M. 1994. The Image of Ancient Greece as a Tool for Colonialism and European Hegemony, in *Social Construction of the Past: Representation as a Power* (G. C. Bond and A. Gilliam Eds.), pp. 119–128. London & New York: Routledge.
- Bloch, T. 1904. Letter of 7<sup>th</sup> March 1904 from T. Bloch to J. Marshall. *File No.46. Serial nos. 1-6*. New Delhi. Archaeological Survey of India.
- Chakrabarti, D.K.1982. The Development of Archaeology in the Indian Subcontinent. *World Archaeology*, 13(3):326-344
- 1999. *India, An Archaeological History: Paleolithic Beginnings to Early Historic Foundations*. New Delhi. Oxford India.
- 2000. Colonial Indology and Identity. *Antiquity* 74 (285): 667–671.
- Desai-Geller Ilan.2016. Orientalism and the Archaeological Survey(s) of India. *Independent Study Project (ISP). Collection. 2510*. Unpublished.
- Hall, M. 1995. Great Zimbabwe and the lost city: The cultural colonization of the South African past, in *Theory in Archaeology: A World Perspective*, (P. J. Ucko Ed.), pp. 28–45. London: Routledge.
- Hassan. A.Fekri. 2003. Imperialist Appropriations of Egyptian Obelisks, in *Views of Ancient Egypt Since Napoleon Bonaparte: Imperialism, Colonialism and Modern Appropriations. Encounters with Ancient Egypt*, (D. Jeffreys Ed.), pp. 19-68. London: University College London
- Gonzales-Ruibal, Alfredo.2010. Colonialism and European Archaeology, in *Handbook of Post-Colonial Archaeology* (Jane Lyndon and Uzma Rizvi Eds), Walnut Creek. Left Coast Press, pp.39-50
- Guha, S.2014. South Asian Heritage and Archaeological Practices, in *Cultural Heritage Ethics: Between Theory and Practice* (Constantine Sandis Ed), pp.103-116. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- \_2015. *Artefacts of History: Archaeology, Historiography and Indian Pasts*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Guha-Thakurta, T. 2004. *Monuments, Objects, Histories: Institutions of Art in Colonial and Postcolonial India*. Columbia University Press.
- Joshi, J. P. 1972. Exploration in Kutch and Excavation at Surkotada and New Light on Harappan Migration. *Journal of Oriental Institute* 22 (1-2): 98-144.
- Joshi, J. 1993. *Excavation at BhagwanPura 1975-76 and other explorations & Excavations 1975-81 In Haryana, Jammu & Kashmir and Punjab*. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India.
- Lahiri, N.2012. Destruction or conservation? Some Aspects of Monument Policy in British India. (1899-1905) (2001), in, *Archaeological Sites: Conservation and Management*, (Sharon Sullivan and Richard Mackay Ed.), pp.50-62. Los Angeles. The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Lahiri, N.2000. Archaeology and identity in colonial India. *Antiquity* Vol.74 Issue 285 September 2000: 687-692.
- Lal, B.B.1954-55. Excavation at Hastinapur and other explorations in the Upper Ganga and Sutlej basins 1950-52: New Light in the dark age between the end of the Harappa Culture and the early historical period. *Ancient India*.No.10 &11: 4-151.

- Lal, B. B., J.P. Joshi, B.K. Thapar and Madhu Bala. 2003. *Excavations at Kalibangan: The Early Harappans (1961-1969)*. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India
- Lyons, L. Claire and John. K. Papadopoulos. 2002. Archaeology and colonialism, in *The Archaeology of Colonialism*. (Claire L Lyons, and John. K. Papadopoulos Eds.) pp. 1-23. Los Angeles. The Getty Research Institute.
- Moro-Abadía, Oscar. 2006. The History of Archaeology as a 'Colonial Discourse' in *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology*:4-17 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/bha.1620>
- Murray, T. and White, J. P. 1981. Cambridge in the Bush? Archaeology in Australia and New Guinea. *World Archaeology* 13 (2): 255–263.
- Paddayya, K. 2002-2003. The Expanding Horizons of Indian Archaeology. *Bulletin of the Deccan College* 62-63: 291-309
- \_2014. On Some Historiographical Aspects of Oriental Studies. *Journal of the Oriental Institute* Vol. 63 Nos. 1-4, September-December 2013 and March-June 2014: 139-158
- \_2016. Theoretical Archaeology in India: An Anthropological Perspective, in *A Companion to South Asia in the Past*. (Schug, G.R. and Walimbe, S.R. Eds) pp. 623-640. John Wiley and Sons Incorporated
- Pratap, A. 2014. Indian Archaeology and Postmodernism: Fashion or Necessity? *Ancient Asia*. 5, p.Art. 2. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/aa.12318>
- Prochaska, D. 1990. *Making Algeria French. Colonialism in Bone, 1870–1920*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rajan, K. 2002. *Archaeology: Principles and Methods*. Thanjavur. Manoo Pathippakam
- Rao, S. R. 1985. Lothal: A Harappan Port Town, 1955-62. *Memoirs of Archaeological Survey of India, No. 78. Vol. 2*. New Delhi.
- Roy, S. 1953. Indian Archaeology from Jones to Marshall (1784-1902). *Ancient India* 9:4-28
- Russell, L. and McNiven, I. J. 1998. Monumental colonialism. *Journal of Material Culture* 3 (3):283–299.
- Said, E.W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage
- Sharma, G.R. 1980. *Beginnings of Agriculture: from Hunting and Food Gathering to Domestication of Plants and Animals : Epi-Palaeolithic to Neolithic : Excavations at Chopani-Mando, Mahadaha, and Mahagara*: Abinash Prakashan.
- Sharma, G.R. 1985. Megalithic Cultures of the Northern Vindhyas, in *Recent Advances in Indo-Pacific Prehistory* (VN. Misra and P. Bellwood Eds.), pp. 477-80. New Delhi: Oxford IBH
- Sankalia, H.D and S.B. Deo. 1955. Excavations at Nasik and Jorwe, 1950-51, Poona. Deccan College.
- Sankalia, H.D. 1964. Excavations at Langhanaj, 1944-47. Poona.
- Sankalia, H. D. 1965. *An Introduction to Archaeology*. Poona. Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.
- Shaw, T. 1990. West African Archaeology. Colonialism and Nationalism. in *A History of African Archaeology* (P. Robertshaw Ed.), pp. 205–220. London: James Currey.
- Schlanger, N. 2003. The Burkitt Affair Revisited. Colonial Implications and Identity Politics, *Early South African Prehistoric Research. Archaeological Dialogues* 10 (1): 5–26.
- Sheppard, P. J. 1990. Soldiers and Bureaucrats: The Early History of Prehistoric Archaeology in the Magreb, in *A History of African Archaeology* (P. Robertshaw Ed.), pp. 173–188. London: James Currey.

Singh, Kanika. 2014. Professor S.R. Das Memorial Prized Paper: The Archaeological Survey and Museums in Colonial India, *Proceedings of Indian History Congress*, Vol.76(2015): 778-785.

Thapar, R. 2013. *The Past Before Us, Historical Traditions of Early Northern India*. Harvard University Press.

Trigger, B. G. 1980. Archaeology and the image of American Indian, *American Antiquity* 45 (4): 662-676

\_\_1984. Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist. *Man*, New Series 19 (3): 355–370.

Vogel, J. P. 1902. Memorandum on the preservation of archaeological material in the Peshawar district. File No. 86 May 102. New Delhi. Archaeological Survey of India.

[http://asi.nic.in/asi\\_aboutus\\_history.asp](http://asi.nic.in/asi_aboutus_history.asp)

National policy on Archaeological Exploration and Excavation. Archaeological Survey of India. [http://asi.nic.in/pdf\\_data/Final\\_Draft\\_Policy\\_Expl\\_Excav-09\\_14.pdf](http://asi.nic.in/pdf_data/Final_Draft_Policy_Expl_Excav-09_14.pdf)