

MAKING OF INDIAN NATION

V SEMESTER

CORE COURSE

BA HISTORY

(2011 Admission)



UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Calicut university P.O, Malappuram Kerala, India 673 635.



UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

Core Course

BA HISTORY

V Semester

MAKING OF INDIAN NATION

Prepared by: Sri. Udayakumar.K,
Associate Professor,
Department of History,
Govt. College, Malappuram.

Scrutinized by: Dr. N Padmanabhan,
Associate Professor,
PG Dept. of History,
C.A.SCollege, Madayi,
P.O. Payangadi, PIN 670 358,
Kannur (Dist).

Layout: Computer Section, SDE

©
Reserved

	<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
UNIT I	EVOLUTION OF INDIANHOOD	5
UNIT II	ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL MANIFESTATIONS OF COLONIALISM	39
UNIT III	STRUGGLES AGAINST COLONIAL STATE	90
UNIT IV	NATIONHOOD-REALITY	143

UNIT- I

EVOLUTION OF INDIANHOOD

Major Historiographical Trends

The study of history as a properly developed discipline in a scientific, ordered and systematic way began only in the 19th century. It was only then that the historians tried to absorb the lessons of early historical writings and could develop new methods and techniques. It was during this venture to know the art of historical writing of the earlier period did historiography emerged as a part of history. Historiography simply means the history of the art of historical writing. In other words, it is the history of history or the history of historical thought. As we know the colonial modernity and knowledge which brought a historical sense to Indians. Systematic historical writing began in India during the early period of British colonialism. The earliest and one of the positive results of British conquest was the recovery of ancient Indian history on modern lines of historiography. It was essential to them to know about the past, society and culture, and establish their authority over India. It was an outcome of the administrative necessity of the Britishers also. The rulers encouraged those who shown interest in the past, resulted the investigation of the past and bringing up of new interpretations and perceptions on Indian history.

Modern Indian historiography began with the writings of the scholar-administrators of the English east India Company and they found history as an instrument to legitimise the colonial rule by put making some interpretations. Thus emerged different school of thoughts or historiographical trends in Indian history. They are colonial or imperialist, nationalist, Marxist, Cambridge, and subaltern.

Colonial or imperialist historiography

It was the product of the British colonialism in India. In modern Indian history, the school or tradition of history writing which was influential in the late 19th and 20th centuries. Many intellectual influences co existed in this tradition. The indologists and orientalist were the real force behind the development of such enquiry. They laid the foundation for the development of the investigation on India's past and culture. These colonial writers upheld different ideologies in their writings that are the Utilitarians, the Evangelicals and the administrative historians.

The utilitarian school.

The utilitarian school of political philosophy was started by Jeremy Bentham in England. It was a by-product of the enlightenment of Europe. The utilitarians stood for that the power vested within the hands of the rulers must be utilised for the benefit of the society. The utilitarian was another school headed by the James Mill who believed that the backwardness of the Indian society could only be improved through the introduction of enlightened despotism. His *History of British India* was the most dominant historical work among the Britishers during the 19th century. It was published in the year 1828, became a trend setter for the subsequent historical works produced by colonial writers and the most controversial too. He never visited India and it was the first comprehensive history on India in the modern period. It covers the history of India from the beginning of the Christian era to the 19th century. He divided Indian history into three separate periods, namely, Hindu, Muhammeden and British. It was a deliberate attempt by him to designate the ancient and medieval periods of Indian history as Hindu and Muslim. He skilfully avoided designating the modern period as Christian, instead he used the term British. This periodisation was used by the subsequent colonial historians. In fact it was the recognition of the divide and rule policy of colonial authorities in India. The beginning of the both the imperialist and communalist historiography, and distorted and vested interests presentation of history for the colonial aspirations.

The evangelical historians.

The evangelical historians—Indian history written by them should be seen in relation to their attitude to Indian religions, particularly Hinduism—two such attitudes—one of hostility and one of sympathy. During the 19th century they were following or having hostility towards India but later their attitudes become sympathetic. They were the missionaries came to India in order to convert Indians and they even believed that god had allowed them to conquer the country for this purpose. The main theme of their historical writing was better criticism of all Indian things and an uncritical justification of all British rules. They believed that the people of India could only be changed progressively through Christianity and missionary education: Thus stressed on the conversion of Indians to Christianity.

Charles Grant was the prominent evangelical writer in this period, his work *Observation on State and Society* published in 1813 emphasis on the backwardness of this country was due to the Hindu religion. According to him the only solution to put an end to this backwardness was the acceptance of Christianity by the Indians. According to him by the introduction of English

language falsehood could be weakened and variety must be flourished. To them Britain had an important function to fulfil in the history of India and it was a part of some divine plan.

The industrial revolution and the spread of Protestantism were also caused for the evangelism in India. William Wilberforce was forefront in this movement. The new evangelism contributed two things that is combined religion with science and they gave kind of emphasis on science. A large number of mission societies appeared in India after this.

Christian Lassen extended the philosophy inaugurated by Grant. His work is entitled *Indian antiquities*, 4 volumes, in which tried to examine the general historical background of the Indian sub continent from the early period itself. He attempted tolerate Indian history with the dominant philosophy of the 19th century Europe, namely, the Hegelian dialectics. By this he was trying to relate Indian history with the general stream of the European philosophy and history.

The administrative historians.

The administrative historians were another category for the development of historical writing in India. They wrote on as a part other official duty. So these writers were mainly used the official records and reports for their writing. Hence these were a one sided view on history in general. The important administrative historians were V.A. Smith, who produced several works on India, Macaulay, William Wilson Hunter, B Malleson, Henry Maine, J. Tallboys wheeler, Alfred Lyall, W.H. Moreland, J.D. Cunningham, James Tod, Mark Wilks, Grant Duff, Robert Orme, T. R Holmes, M.S. Elphinstone, John Dawson, E.J Stephenson, J. Strachy, Sir Wolsely Haig, Elliot etc.

It opened up new chapter in the historical writing in India. It influenced the history of writing India as well as the European history writing on India. Their approach and attitudes which led to the emergence of nationalist, a native historical writing in India, a reaction against to colonial distortion of Indian history.

Nationalist historiography

The 19th century British historians played a crucial role in provoking a nationalist reaction. This reaction came in the form of a nationalist approach in historiography. An important element in this approach was an effort to restore national self esteem and the glorification India's past. Another element was the propagation of economic nationalism through the depiction of the ruinous

economic consequences of British rule in India. Most important of all, nationalist historiography tried to re-discover India for the modern Indian mind and promote political integration and anti imperialist sentiments to further the cause of nation building in India. The nationalist history had to contend with not only the earlier imperialist bias in historiography but also a communal interpretation of history that began to gain influence from the early decades of the century.

Nationalist historiography played an important role in providing an ideological basis of the freedom struggle and in analysing the economic consequences of imperialism. The focus of nationalist attention was on external that is imperialist exploitation of India, not so much the internal i.e., class exploitation and consequent class conflict within Indian society. Greater concentration on the latter aspect was the consequence of the influence of the Marxist approach, an influence increasingly evident from the 1940s.

The phrases nationalist school and nationalist history can only be understood in the background of the colonial domination and colonial historiography. History in its modern sense was not written in the pre-colonial India. The introduction of English education helped the Indian middle class to learn the value of historical knowledge and to get in touch with the history of India as well as the history of the world outside India. Thus newly educated Indians began to study the writings of colonial historians. The nationalist historians began to rectifying the historical writing did by the colonialists. So they had possessed some sort of bias on their writings.

The phrase nationalist historians were first used by R.C. Majumdar, to denote those historians of India whose writings had nationalist bias, especially during the period of colonial occupation. The nationalist historiography helped for unearthing of wide range of sources and re examination of all the available sources. In the course of time it received new impetus from the country wide agitation for political freedom and it slowly became a part of the movement itself.

The nationalists also gave importance to the study of the religion or society of India. In other words they try to defend religion and society in their studies. The material side of Hindu culture was also defended with equal zeal against European criticism. Rajendrala Mitra who started the nationalist writing in India with publication of some Vedic texts and the book entitled *Indo-Aryans*. He was proud of ancient Indian heritage and adopted a comparative rational view of ancient Indian society. The writings of Mitra, Bhandarkar and some of the distinguished oriental scholars of Europe were brought together in three volumes entitled *Civilization in Ancient India*, by R C Dutt in closing years of 1880s. According to Majumdar, this may be regarded as the first nationalist

history in the best sense of the term. R.K Mukharjee ,*the fundamental unity of India*, which maintained that the religious and spiritual fellowship among Hindus all over India and their ideal of an all-India empire were the basis of Indian nationalism in the past .K.P Jayaswal in his *Hindu Polity* also deals the thesis of oriental despotism.Dadabhai Naoroji and R.C..Dutt in their criticism of the British government on economic grounds. It created the economic nationalism, *the poverty and unbritish rule in India* and *the economic history of India*. They popularised the *drain theory* and exposed the exploitative character of colonialism and revolutionised the national movement .they cleverly used history as an instrument for making India as a nation on different realms, even though had some defects.

R,G.Bhandarkar ,H.C,Raychoudhary ,J.N,Sarkar ,G.S ,Sardesai ,S,Krishna Swami Ayyangar,Lalalajpath Roy,C.F.Andrews, Pattabhi Sittaramayya,, Girija Mukharjee etc were important nationalist writers. The trained or academic historians also followed this style of writing in the post independent era ,they were B.R.Nanda, Tarachand, Amales Tripathi, Bishweshar Prasad etc. Most of this historians connected history as explanationist and propagandist. They inspired the people of India and awakened the self confidence and national pride among the mass which strengthened the national movement.

The nationalist historiography has certain defects too, that is some methodological defects ,some chauvinist approaches on caste, cultural and social bias .Emotion and sentiment usurped the place of reason; and detachment, balance, perspective, and objectivity-all became a causality. They also failed and ignored certain aspects and issues like tribes, women, down trodden people, marginalised societies etc .some sensational accounts brought a sort of communal identities. It glorified Indian past and culture and the events instead of making critical analysis.

Marxist Historiography

It was a new approach in Indian historiography or historical writing in India on colonialism and nationalism. By the Marxist writing ,is not meant that the writers were all Marxists but that they more or less adopted materialistic interpretation as method of understanding and tool of analysis in the historical phenomena. Their interpretation derived from historical philosophy of Karl Marx, the dialectical materialism. The essence of this new approach lies in the study of relationship between social and economic organisation and its effects on historical events. instead of political history they gave more emphasis on the history of common people and the history of history less people.

The Marxist historiography on modern India was inaugurated by one of the founders of Marxism in India M.N.Roy with his work '*INDIA IN TRANSITION*' published in 1922. It was followed by *INDIA TODAY* of R.Palme Dutt in 1940 and '*THE SOCIAL BACKGROUND OF INDIAN NATIONALISM*' of A.R.Desai in 1959. All the three were classical Marxists and treated Indian national movement as the representation of particular stage in the development of mode of production. *India today* was considered as an authoritative Marxist work for a long time. It became an important school of historiography in India in later. Dutt and Desai studied the negative and positive roles of Gandhi in the national movement. They highlighted the positive as, he made the national movement at mass movement by awakening the backward masses with national consciousness. At the negative, he restricted the revolutionary tendencies contained the liberal bourgeois nationalism to operate, as he represented the Indian bourgeoisie.

In the post independent period the historians like D.D.Kossambi, R.S.Sharma, Romila Thapar, Bipan Chandra, Sumit Sarkar, Sushobhan Sarkar, Sunil Sen, Hiran mukharjee, K.N.Panikkar, Irfan Habib and many others have dedicated their studies for the development of historiography.

The Marxist historians tried to the transformation of India in the time of colonialism and looked it as a part of the growth of world capitalism and exploitative concerns of British imperialism. Dutt's seminal work *India today*, clearly analyses the colonial phase in India as three categories. The first phase as mercantilism or merchant capitalism under the company. from 1757-1813, followed by the stage of industrial capitalism as a result of industrial revolution, from 1813-1858 (marketisation), and the final one as finance capitalism as the capital and colonial investments. Later it became the perennial theme of the nationalist writings.

The Marxist historians turned their attention on the inner contradictions of the Indian society, the marginalised sections like peasants and workers, and highlighted their role in the movement, women's role etc. They even questioned communal periodisation of India.

The early Marxists viewed national movement as a bourgeoisie movement like Dutt and Desai. But the historians like Bipan Chandra criticise this view with his newly researches on the movement and publication of the works. The Marxist writings broadened the history from the state to society. They brought the interdisciplinary approach in the recent studies, a new style of explanation to the problems.

Neo- Imperialist Approach

It emerged in the 1960s and gathered momentum in the 1980s and 1990s and the publication of the books and articles brought a new trend in the historiography and by looking the national movement in the neo imperialist line. These scholars were belongs to the universities of England, America and Germany also known as *CAMBRIDGE HISTORIANS*. They have unearthed several source materials in the form of official records, diaries, police reports etc with the purpose of providing a new interpretation to the Indian national movement. Anil Seal and John Broomfield were the founders of this school. Anil Seal's, *Emergence Of Indian Nationalism* and Broomfield's *Elite Conflict in Plural Society ; Twentieth Century Bengal* inaugurated this approach of historiography. Following them John Galleghar, Gordon Johnson, Judith Brown, Ayesha Jalal, David Washbrook, C.J.Baker, C.A. Bayly, D.Rothermund and many other scholars also made similar interpretations.

The neo imperialist writers analysed the existence of colonialism in India as political, social, economic and cultural structure and given interpretations. They had analysed nationalism too and put forward the theories on nationalism, the causative factors and its evolution and the contradictions in the national movement. They envisages colonialism as a foreign rule and the notions like the transformation of Indian economy and the beginning of the national movement was not an outcome of the British rule. They considered it as an elitist movement. To them caste and religion were the basis of political organisation and nationalism was a mere cover. The national movement represented the struggle one group of elite against the other for the British favours.

The neo- imperialist historians argued and supported a pro attitude and severely criticises the national movement and the national leaders. They consider it as instrument of the elitist for their own selfish interests and leaders were motivated by the power and material benefits and consider it as a play for power. They consider Gandhi, Nehru and Patel as the chief political brokers and Gandhi is characterised by them as a compromiser between in Indian people and British government. They portrayed all agitations and movements as high dramas of the leaders and they also point out this by explicating the constitutional reforms and the following agitations, the doses of constitutional reforms, Montford reforms followed by N.C.M, the Simon commission by the C.D.M and the Cripps mission by the Quit India. Anil Seal out rightly questions the nationalism and tried to denigrate the national movement by picturing as a mimic warfare. Unlike the early imperialist writers, the imperialist cornered their studies to the localities but like them, it also tried to justify and legitimize the colonial rule in India.

Subaltern studies

The subaltern studies introduced a new trend in the historical research in modern Indian historiography. the development of the historical writing in the 1960s was the beginning of this new style of enquiry for the history of history less people .this new initiative was taken by the historians like Rodney Hilton,E.P. Thompson, Eric Hobsbawm, George Rude, Sobul etc had a direct influence on writing by placing common people in the centre of the studies. they characterised this trend as history from below, or peoples history ,or grassroots history etc .the appearing of this new trend was in the last two decades of the twentieth century as the subaltern studies.

Subaltern a term taken from the Antonio Gramsci's,the Italian socialist and thinker , his manuscript '*Prison Notebooks*' ,meaning *of inferior ranker*, or common people; whether of class, caste , age, gender etc. it bring to light the lower sections of the Indian people hitherto neglected by historiography.

A series of subaltern studies volumes were published on Indian national movement under the editorship of Ranajit Guha.He protests that the historiography of Indian nationalism is beset with a prejudiced elitism of two kinds, the colonial or imperialist approach and the nationalist approach. thus he insist the relevance of the subaltern approach and stated that the hitherto historiography of Indian nationalism has been dominated by elitism-colonial elitism and bourgeoisie elitism-both originated as the ideological product of British rule in India.

To the subaltern historians there are only two sections in the society-the elitists and the subaltern., so it is the time to write the history of subalterns. Thus the subaltern historians focussed on the subjugated or subordinated people such as tribals, peasants, oppressed women, workers, poor and other marginalised sects of the society who have played a key role in making the history and society. They severely criticised the existing notion of the history because of the partial history., all the history was the history of the elites. The subaltern writers have produced several articles on hitherto unexplored or the virgin areas of research on different titles, topics, issues, events, incidents, rebellions, etc related with the history and society of India.

The important subaltern writers like David Arnold, Gyan Pandey, Partha Chatterjee, Shahid Amin, Tanika Sarkar, Sumit Sarkar, Gayathri Spivak, Julie Stephens, Aravind Das, N.K Chandra, Stephen Henningham, Dipesh Chakraborty, Goutam Bhadra, etc have enriched the subaltern historiography. But later some of these writers also criticised it.

They have criticised the colonial, Cambridge, nationalist and Marxist schools of historiography. The necessity of the re writing of Indian history is asserted by them, but the term subaltern itself a curious one and it is a mixture of different groups with different aspirations.

Background of colonialism

T.R.Adams defines, colonialism in his book '*Modern colonialism: Institutions and Policies*' as the political control of an under developed people whose social and economic life is directed by the dominant power. The word colonialism, alleged policy of exploitation on backward or weak peoples by a large power. There will be the political sovereignty, it can be achieved by force, by political collaboration, by economic, social or cultural dependence.

Colonialism makes the colonial societies an integral part of world capitalism. A colony is integrated into world capitalist system, but without taking part in industrial revolution of the development of capitalist production. It was a phenomenon after the 15th century. The decline of feudalism or the transformation of the society and development of new knowledge system which paved the way for the emergence of capitalist system in the world. As a result of this transformation the social change was one of the important features. The emergence of joint stock companies and merchant classes and the revival of trade directly led to the capital system in the world, change in the feudal mode to the capital mode of productions. This powerful mercantile group or class became the most influential people in the society.

They were the leading people with a lot of wealth and adventures. they opened up new markets or business, or in a way we can say that ,it was their effort that resulted the development of the trade relation with the east. They began to invest in the resulted the trade development and the increasing demand of the eastern commodities in the west. These mercantile groups were actively supported by the monarchs of the concerned states and equipped them with all facilities for the east to catch the profitable trade. This assistance and supports poured by the rulers brought competition among the merchants and increased their commercial and economic ambitions and activities.

From the time immemorial itself India had the trade relation with the European states. Indian commodities and products were well demanded and preferable in the west., that yielded enormous profit to them and beginning official trade relations ,that is the Spice Trade. Brisk trade activities were carried out between east and west, especially with India during ancient and medieval times. But the fall of Constantinople compelled them to seek alternatives to east.

The Portugal and Spain were the pioneers in search of new sea routes. The adventures of these opened many new sea routes and discoveries of new continents. One of such attempts reached India by Vasco da Gama, the beginning colonialism in India. He arrived at Calicut which was the premier port of Kerala and a famous emporium on the east-west axis connecting the Malacca with the Mediterranean ports. It marked the turning point in the maritime trade. He is reported to set sail from the river Tagus on 8th July 1497. When the fleet reached the east African coast after crossing the good hope, knew about the pepper trade and persuaded his mariners to proceed to Calicut. He reached his target on 20th 1498, opened a new trade and on receipt, Dom Manuel of Portugal took steps to establish firm contact with Calicut and other ports on the Malabar coast. He taken back to Portugal full of pepper and other spices in his ship which was a worth of the 60 times cost of his entire journey.

This event in the history embarked an era of European colonialism in India. In due course the established their trade settlements in different parts of India and the able leaders like Cabral, Almeida and Albuquerque consolidated the power. They combined the use of force with trade in the beginning itself, converted their factories into well fortified centres and the superiority and the dominance of the weapons in the field. And they also professed their loyalty to the catholic church and the pope. Following them the Dutch, the French, and the English also arrived here for the trade.

East India companies

The establishment, success and the heap of the profit of the Portuguese traders brought a fair competition and race and rivalry among the European powers for the eastern trade. The Portuguese lost their trade monopoly in these wars and sidelined. The reports and stories regarding the heavy profits of the trade attracted many but it was not easy to conduct vast and extensive trade with east by small groups and individuals. Consequently, the combined efforts were made to organize the large companies resulted the formation of the larger merchant associations and companies. They have played an important and integral part in the development and expansion of European colonialism and foreign trade.

There were two types of merchant companies regulated and joint stock. Banking and joint stock companies made direct contributions to finance trade and commerce. As the development of the industrial operations, the formation was became inevitable. In the earlier regulated

companies were prominent but in later the coming of the joint stock companies totally changed the structure. The inadequacy and the failure of the long term transactions or to provide huge amounts led to the formation of such companies. The new type organisation called joint stock companies, which appeared in the seventeenth century ;there were about hundred companies during this period. The most notable among them were the Dutch, the English and the French east India Companies.

The Dutch East India Company

The Dutch East India was formed in 1602 to conduct trade with East. The Portuguese had been followed in the early years of the 17th century by the English and the Dutch and on a much smaller scale by the Danes. Dutch east India company was an amalgamation of several small companies of Dutch and the pattern was the large-scale and systematic participation in the intra Asian trade. The Dutch parliament gave all the assistance in the form of charters which empowered them to make war, conclude treaties for the acquisition and building territories and forts. The Dutch east India company (VOC) was an integral part of the its overall trading strategy. The Dutch procured their pepper and other spices mainly in Indonesia. India played key role in the Dutch intra Asian trade as a trade centre .The Batavia diary of 10th march 1627, mentions the advancement of the Dutch. They made a strong hold in the Indonesian archipelago by throwing out of the Portuguese and the Englishers.

Kerala was the one of the centres of their trade, made many trade centres in the different parts of the Kerala coast. They promoted some sort of industry in the area, like coir. The commercial interest of the Dutch was very explicit and followed the commercial interest in India. It was a government oriented company. Besides Kerala coast they had several other trade depots in India at Surat, Broach, Ahmadabad, Cambay, Nagapattanam, Masulipattanam, Chinsura, Patna, Agra, and Bengal. They kept aloof from the conquest and administration in India or they were not tried transform their trade superiority to administrative unit. But it can be seen one such attempt was an utter failure in the battle of kulachal. They could only capitalise the euro Asian and intra Asian trade for short span of period and the growth and powerfulness of the English east India company and defects of the Dutch company led them to a fateful end. The outbreak of the French revolution and the occupation Holland by France, Batavia council sided with France also decided its legacy.

The English East India Company

Soon after the Spanish armada in 1588, a group of London merchants presented a petition to queen Elizabeth I for permission to sail to the Indian Ocean. The permission was granted and in 1591 three ships sailed from England around the Cape of Good Hope to the Arabian Sea. One of them, the *Edward Bonaventure*, then sailed around Cape Comorin and on to the Malay peninsula and subsequently returned to England in 1594. In 1596, three more ships sailed east; however these all lost at sea. Two years later, on 24th September 1598, another group of merchants, having raised 30,133 in capital, met in London to form a corporation. Although their first attempt was not completely successful, they nonetheless sought the queen's unofficial approval, purchased ships for their venture, increased their capital to 68,373 and convened again a year later. This time they succeeded and on 31,1600, the queen granted a Royal Charter to "George, earl of Cumberland, and 215 knights, aldermen, and burgesses" under the name of, governor and company of merchants of London trading with the east Indies. For a period of fifteen years the charter awarded the newly formed a monopoly on trade with all countries east of the Cape of Good Hope and west of the Straits of Magellan. Sir James Lancaster commanded the first East India company voyage in 1601.

The East India company also known as the East India trading company, English East India company and John Company and after the Treaty of Union, the British East India company was an early English joint stock company that was formed initially for pursuing trade with the East Indies, but that ended up with mainly Indian subcontinent and China. The company was granted an English royal charter, under the name Governor and Company of Merchants of London trading into the East Indies, by Elizabeth I on 31 December 1600, making it the oldest among several similarly formed European East India companies, the largest of which was the Dutch East India company. After arrival English company challenged its monopoly in the late 17th century, the two companies were merged in 1708 to form the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies, commonly styled the Honourable East India Company, and abbreviated, HEIC; the company was colloquially referred to as John Company, and in India as Company Bahadur.

The company traded mainly in cotton, silk, indigo dye, salt petre, tea and opium. They also came to rule large areas of India, exercising military power and assuming administrative functions, to the exclusion, gradually, of its commercial pursuits; it effectively functioned as a mega corporation. Company rule

in India, which effectively began in 1757 after the battle of Plassey lasted until 1858, when following the events of the Indian rebellion of 1857, and under the Govt. of India Act 1858, the British crown assumed direct administration of India in the new British Raj. The company itself was finally dissolved on 1 January 1874, as a result of the East India Stock Dividend Redemption Act 1873. The East India Company often issued coinage bearing its stamp in the regions it had control over.

The company long held a privileged position in relation to the British Govt. as a result, it was frequently granted special rights and privileges, including trade monopolies and exemptions. These caused resentment among its competitors, who saw unfair advantage in the company's position. Despite this resentment, the company remained a powerful force for over 250 years.

French East India Company

It was formed in 1664 by Jean Baptiste Colbert, finance minister to King Louis XIV, to compete with the British and the Dutch East India Company. They also came into India for the trade. It was one of several companies created to promote Western European commercial interests in Asia, particularly in India, beginning in the 17th century. Colbert, who reorganized earlier unsuccessful trade ventures into the French East India Company. It was a government enterprise and the directors were appointed by the French government. As it was assisted by the government. The first director of the company was Francois Caron who had the experience of working for the Dutch East India Company for thirty years.

Colbert sent an expedition that reached India in 1668 and built the first French factory (production centre) in Surat on the western coast, and soon after another in Masulipatam on the eastern coast. In 1673, the company established its headquarters in Pondicherry, on the south-eastern coast below Madras (now Chennai), and founded Chandernagore on the north-eastern coast, north of Calcutta. Chandernagore became the most important European trade centre in Bengal, Pondicherry eventually became a thriving port town with a population of nearly 50,000, and became the main centre of the company, built a strong fortified factory. It was the centre of the French power in India both political and commercial activities. They were also established several other trading centres in some other parts of India, mainly at Mahe, Karaikkal, Kasim Bazaar and Balazore. France never became the dominant European authority in the region, for more than 50 years the French East India Company made great efforts to capitalize upon the expanding demand for textiles, dyes, and other goods that could be supplied by Indian merchants.

In 1742, Joseph Dupleix was appointed governor general of all French settlements in India, especially Pondicherry and dedicated himself to exerting French power. He envisioned a French empire and to this end began to interfere in local Indian politics, playing local rulers against each other for his French benefit. In French port towns, officials equipped factories for defence. The battle for supremacy led to a series of military conflicts between France and Britain, with triumph and defeat alternating between the two. In 1747, the French besieged and captured Madras. In 1751 and 1752, however, Englishman Robert Clive dislodged Dupleix's forces in Arcot and Trichinopoly, taking many French prisoners.

In 1754, the French government, anxious to make peace, recalled Dupleix to France. During the next half-century, British forces further colonized and forcefully subjugated much of India. While several Indian ports remained under French directive, Britain became the definitive Western authority of the Indian subcontinent.

The French East India Company failed to make a sway over India because of its great control by the government. The unpopularity and misleading government was the important cause for the decline of the power in India and was not well defined the interest of the company and always it was strict control even for taking a decision. It also faced the bankruptcy in sometimes.

From Company to Crown

The English east India company formed as a commercial enterprise for the trade and securing profit in India. In the earlier times its prime concern was to secure more trade transactions and trade monopoly with India because the competition and presence of the other companies. So their main focus in this time was how to eliminate and tackle this trade competition and rivalry from both the native and alien merchants.

But after the supremacy over Bengal province, the policies of the company began to change. The functioning of the company underwent some changes and the private and individual trade was also started. The excessive or huge profit from the trade transformed the company officials into the political ambitious and imperialistic aspirations. These aspirations of the officials destined the fate of India for more than two centuries of colonialism. They began to intervene in the internal affairs of the native rulers and tried capture the political control and domination. This was the clear transformation of trading or the mercantile enterprise into a gigantic territorial power in India.

The political and economic conditions of India favoured them change their policy of trade to the political domination policies. The company acquired trade concessions and built factory in different parts of India. These sites were fortified and this fortified settlements were fully under their strict control. So they also relentlessly tried to relate trade with politics. The company promoted the European traders very much for the trade transactions and keeping them as an agent of the colonialism. The profitable trade led the conflict with the natives and the free trade forced the Indians sell their products at the will of the company.

The colonial policies and interventions turned them the real power authority in India by defeating their opponents in different stages. The annexation and the gradual acquisitions of the areas resulted the building of an empire in India, the British empire. This empire was completed after waging a series of wars with their opponents and the able and superiority of the machineries.

Carnatic wars

Carnatic is the name given by the Europeans to the coromandal coast and its hinterland. The region was the scene of a long drawn contest between the French and English for almost 20 years. It was the theatre of this English east India Company and the French east India company had developed rivalry in India for colonial and commercial domination protracted struggle. The decline of the Mughal Empire wiped away any local authority to thwart the competition between these two powers .the contest led to the ultimate overthrow of the French power in India.

There were three carnatic wars between them in india.The problems aroused in Europe also led to the war between them in India too. The first carnatic war was in the year 1746,but it was started part of the Austrian succession war broke out in Europe in connection with the succession of Maria Theresa to the throne of Austria. Frederic the great of Prussia refused to accept the succession Maria Theresa. On this issue the French supported Austria and the British supported Prussia. This led to the clash between the French and the British companies at carnatic.At that time Dupleix was the chief official of the French company at Pondicherry .The French opened hostilities by sacking fort st.George and expelling all Englishmen. The Nawab of carnatic Anwarud din ,sent an army but was defeated by the French in the battle of Adayar also known as the battle of St. Thomas, near madras. Later the French force the English to surrender at fort St.David but failed. The English counter attacked to capture Pondicherry but were defeated by stiff resistance from French forces. The

carnatic war ended with the treaty of Aix la chappelle in 1748. According to this treaty the English got back Madras and the French got the Breton island and Louisbourg the boundaries of the companies unchanged.

The second Carnatic war, Dupleix, decided to loan his army and resources to local princes in their quarrels in return for monetary, commercial or territorial favours. The French along with Chand Sahib, the son in law of Dost Ali, the Nawab of Arcot, helped Musaffar Jung claim the throne by defeating Anwar Uddin. Later, the English entered into an agreement with Musaffar Jung's uncle, Nasir Jung and helped him to defeat Musaffar Jung and Chanda Sahib in 1750. Chand Sahib was killed and defeated and the entire Carnatic fell into the hands of the English. In this second battle the French and the British, the French were defeated. Dupleix was sent back to France in 1754. The new French governor Godeheu stopped the war and concluded the treaty of Pondicherry with the English. By this treaty both parties agreed not to interfere in the quarrels of native princes and respect each other's possessions. The English proved their superiority by installing Muhammed Ali as the Nawab of Carnatic.

The short peace between the English and the French ended with the outbreak of the Seven Years War in Europe in 1756. In India the war began in Bengal. The French deputed Count de Lally as the governor and commander in chief of the army to conduct the war. The English under Clive and Watson attacked the French at Chandernagore and captured it in 1757. Lally captured Fort St David in 1758 but in the meanwhile an English army under Sir Eyre Coote defeated him at Wandiwash in January 22, 1760. Lally returned to France where he was imprisoned and executed. The British captured Pondicherry in 1761.

The third battle of Carnatic proved to be a decisive one for survival between the English and French in India. It was ended with the Treaty of Paris in 1763 which restored the French factories in India, the French political influence completely disappeared after the war. Thereafter the French, like their Portuguese and Dutch counterparts in India, confined themselves to country trade.

British conquest of Bengal: Battle of Plassey (1757)

The British conquest of India began with the conquest of Bengal which was completed after fighting two battles against the Nawabs of Bengal, viz the battle of Plassey and the battle of Buxar. At that time, the kingdom of Bengal included the provinces of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. Wars and intrigues made the British masters over Bengal. The first conflict of English with Nawab of Bengal resulted in the battle of Plassey. The fought between English and French was a dress

rehearsal. The lessons learnt there were profitably applied in Bengal. It was the most fertile and the richest of India's provinces. Its industries and commerce were well developed. The company and its servants had highly profitable trading interests in this province. Under a royal Farman by the Mughal emperor in 1717, the company secured valuable privileges and got the freedom to import and export their goods in Bengal without paying taxes. The right to issue dastaks for the movement of such goods. The Mughal emperor Farrukhsiyar had permitted the English to trade in Bengal without any payment of tax.

The company officials sold the dastaks to Indian merchants. And the practice of imposing tax on Indian goods. This went against the interest of the Nawab, Siraj ud Daula. When the Nawab tried to check this malpractice attempted to punish the guilty Indian merchants, the English provided protection to them. This was the primary cause of the conflict between the Nawab and the English. The British started fortification of Fort William against French. The Nawab did not like it and ordered the English fill up the ditch. The company refused to obey. And the Nawab decided to punish the English. He attacked English factory at Kazimbasar and captured it. On June 16, 1756, he attacked Calcutta. The Nawab captured Fort William and appointed Malikchand as its administrator. When the Nawab went back the English reappeared in Calcutta. In December 1756, an English army arrived at Calcutta from Madras under the command of Clive and Admiral Watson and reconquered Calcutta. They captured Calcutta on January 2, 1757 and destroyed the city of Hugli. After a minor engagement the Treaty of Alinagar was signed. English got some concessions. The English encouraged all those who were against the Nawab and became a party to a conspiracy against the Nawab. It was decided that after the dethronement of Siraj, Mir Zafar would be placed on the throne. When everything was settled, the English placed impossible demands before the Nawab. When the Nawab refused to accept them, a battle became inevitable. The battle took place in Plassey on June 23, 1757. It was a battle only name. A major part of the Nawab's army, led by Mir Zafar and Rai Durlabh took no part in the battle because of their conspiracy with the English. The Nawab was forced to flee. But he was captured and dispatched to Murshidabad where he was killed by Miran, son of Mir Zafar. Mir Zafar reached Murshidabad on June 24 and Clive declared him the Nawab of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa.

Battle of Buxar (1764)

The new Nawab permitted free trade in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. The company was given zamindari rights and huge money as compensation. The Plassey laid the foundation stone for the later British Empire in India. Though

mir jaffar became the nawab of Bengal, the real power was within the hands of company. Mir zafar was puppet in the hands of the company. The English utilised the resources of Bengal to enhance their financial and political interest in Bengal. They were able to make a brisk trade though it meant complete draining away of the resources of Bengal.

Company appointed Robert Clive as its governor of Bengal. He demanded more and more money from Mir jaffar which could not be met by him. Consequently he was replaced by Mir kasim as the nawab of Bengal by the English. He was a jagir to the company. He was some sort able ruler and imposed certain new taxes called the abwabs. He tried to modernise his army and not ready to be puppet in the hands of English. Company couldn't tolerate it and that resulted in its conflict with the nawab. There were many other factors for the conflict between them, ultimately resulted in the battle of Buxar.

Mir kasim tried rule independently without listening the instructions of Clive. According to the existing law, tax was collected only from the Indian traders. He cancelled trade tax completely in internal trade. This new reform considering Indians and English traders equal was not accepted by the company and Clive asked the nawab to withdraw it, but the response was negative. Then started military campaigns against the nawab. The nawab's army were defeated and forced him to escape to Oudh. There made an alliance with shuja ud-daula, the ruler of Oudh to fight against British. Shah Alam II, the mughal ruler also joined with them. They formed a combined army and marched against the English. The English army under colonel Hector Munroe badly defated them at Buxar. On October 23 1764. Shah Alam surrenderd, mirkasim fled to Delhi

The English now became undisputed masters over Bengal province .The battle of plassey was won over by the English more by their diplomatic skill than by strength of their arms .but the battle of Buxar was won by them their strength and skill in their arms . Clive returned to Bengal in 1765 as the governor of east India Company. The emperor granted the diwani-the rights of collecting the revenue from Bengal province and dispensation of civil justice.

Anglo- Mysore relations

The state of Mysore emerged as a significant power under the leadership of Hyderali. He became the ruler of Mysore in 1761. It was the powerful state in the Deccan region. The wars between Karnataka and Hyderabad, the conflicts between the French and the English in the south and the defeat of the Marathas helped him in extending and consolidating the territory of Mysore.

He succeeded in making Mysore a strong state in the south and himself its master. This provoked the jealousy of the Marathas and Nizam of Hyderabad. With easy success in Bengal, the English concluded a treaty with Nizam Ali of Hyderabad and committed the company to help the Nizam with troops in his war against Hyder Ali. In 1767, the Nizam, the Marathas and the English made an alliance against Hyder. The war started when the Marathas attacked Mysore in 1766. He purchased peace with the Marathas and Nizam launched an unsuccessful attack on Mysore with the help of English. In March 1769, he attacked Madras and forced the English to sign a treaty on April 4, 1769. The terms of the treaty ended the first Anglo-Mysore war.

In 1779, the English captured the French possession at Mahe which were under the protection of Hyder Ali. This infuriated him and he decided to revenge on the English. He joined all hands with the Nizam and the Marathas and all the three agreed to fight against the English. In 1780, he entered the plains of Karnataka with more than 83,000 soldiers and 100 cannons. The English dispatched one force under Colonel Baillie and another one under Munroe. He defeated Baillie and captured Arcot. But in September 1781, Sir Eyre Coote defeated him at Solinghur and captured Nagapattanam in November. He died of cancer. Tipu continued fighting against the English even after the death of his father. In 1784, the Treaty of Mangalore was signed between Tipu and the English. Both agreed to return each other's conquered territories and also the prisoners of war.

The conflict between the English and Mysore again started when Cornwallis came to India. Tipu was a determined enemy of the English. He was trying to seek alliances of foreign powers against the English and for that purpose he had sent his ambassadors to France and Turkey. Cornwallis, therefore, was convinced of the necessity of subduing Tipu and described the war against him as a 'cruel necessity'. Tipu had certain grievances against the Raja of Travancore who was a dependent ally of the English. He attacked his kingdom in December 1789. Cornwallis entered negotiations both with the Marathas and the Nizam on July 1790, both agreed to help. English declared war against him and an attack of the English under General Medows failed. So Cornwallis himself took the command of the army. He proceeded towards Bangalore and captured it in March 1791. Cornwallis captured all the hill forts which obstructed his advance towards Seringapattanam and reached near its outer wall. Tipu opened negotiations with the English, and seeing no option, signed the Treaty of Srirangapatnam in March 1792. The treaty resulted in the surrender of nearly half of the Mysorean territory to the victorious allies. He had also to pay a huge war indemnity of and his two sons were taken as hostages.

He did not forget his defeat and humiliation at the hands of English in the third Mysore war. He prepared himself to restore the lost power and prestige. He further fortified his capital and tried to make alliance with Marathas and the Nizam but the English were very fast to conclude alliance with these native states. Thus Arthur Wellesley declared war against Tipu. In 1799, they attacked him from north and south-western parts of Mysore. The English besieged Srirangapatnam and captured it in May 1799. Tipu died fighting and his son surrendered. The fourth Mysore destroyed the state of Mysore and succeeded or completed the subjugation of Mysore.

British and Marathas

Peshwa Balajibaji Rao died just after the defeat of the Marathas in the third battle of Panipat in 1761. He succeeded his son, Madhav Rao but the death of Madhav Rao in 1772 could be considered as the background for the first Maratha war. He was succeeded by his son Narayan Rao; he was killed by his uncle Raghunath Rao, who declared himself as the Peshwa. Maratha nobles and chieftains under the leadership of Nana Phadnis opposed him. He sought help from English, opened negotiations with them both at Calcutta and Bombay. They agreed to help him and signed the Treaty of Surat at Bombay in 1775. As per the treaty the English would support him with 2500 soldiers at his own expense. Salsette, Bassein and adjacent islands would be ceded to the British. Colonel Keating defeated an army of the Marathas on May 1775. This started the first Maratha war against the English. The Treaty of Purandhar in 1776 was signed between them. Hostility was there and Hastings despatched a force to attack in 1778 but the English army was defeated and the commander was forced to sign the Convention of Wadgaon. It agreed that would return all that territories which they had captured since 1773.

Warren Hastings, sent a strong army under Goddard from Bengal and captured Bassein in 1780. He dispatched another force under Colonel Popham who captured the fort of Gwalior on August 3, 1780 and defeated Sindhia atSPIRI on February 16, 1780. These successes saved the English prestige. The Treaty of Salbai was on May 17, 1782.

The internal conflict among the Marathas intensified after the death of Nana Phadnavis in 1800 and mutual rivalries among the chiefs also gave an opportunity to the Britishers to interfere in the Maratha affairs. Lord Wellesley became Governor General of India in 1798 and he was determined to

make the company paramount power in India. Jaswant rao defeated peshwa Baji Rao in a battle near poona in October 25,1802. The peshwa fled towards bassein where holker was in hold. Feeling desperate, the peshwa sought the alliance of the English and signed the treaty of Bassein in December 31,1802. Baji rao accepted the subsidiary alliance imposed by lord Wellesley.

The second Anglo-Marathawar started in the year 1803 with the combined forces of the Maratha chieftains. The English forces under Arthur Wellesley defeated them, the attacked indifferent fronts. Consequently many parts of the Maratha kingdom came in the hands of the company rule and concluded treaties with holkars, sindhias and bhosales. They gave serious blow to the Maratha power.

The Marathas were completely defeated and destroyed by the british in the several wars during 1817-1818(third anglo-maratha war). It was started with the attack of Baji Rao on the british residency at Kirk, but he surrendrd in june 1818. british abolished the position of peshwa and Marathas were limited to the small kingdom of satara. All chiefs were defeated and their territories were reduced in size, subsidiary forces were kept within their territories. Thus, the Maratha power ended forever.

British paramountcy

The Britishers laid their supremacy or paramountcy in India during the period of lord Wellesley with the introduction and follow of the subsidiary alliance policy which enabled them to extend and establish a British empire in India. The English east India Company initiated several policies and programmes which made them the supreme power in India than the Indian native states. They followed the policy annexation by which they annexed many parts of India into British Empire.

The company's policy of effective control and gradual extinction of the Indian native states took a definite shape with the perfection of the subsidiary alliance system. The policy of conquest and annexation reached culmination during the period of lord Dalhousie. He introduced the policy of doctrine of laps by which the Indian states could be taking over in the absence of natural heirs. The right of adoption to the throne did not extent to rulers of Indian states. Punjab and Sikkim had been annexed by conquest Satara, Jaipur, Udaipur, Jhansi and Nagpur were annexed by the application of the doctrine of lapse.

The geographical and strategic location of Sind was one of the primary reasons for the annexation territory by them. Trade was one of the important concern, the capture of Sind would empower them the hold of the river system and the sea. It guided their policy not only towards India but also towards Afghanistan and Punjab and the fear of Russia. In 1842 sir Charles Napier was deputed to Sind and in 1843 Sind was annexed to British territories.

The annexation of Punjab was in the year march 29, 1849. It was established by maharaja Ranjith Sing went through a phase of disintegration ,after his death and the British occupied it after winning two successive wars(1845-46,1848-49).They became interested in the conquest of Punjab because that was necessary for extending their empire to its natural frontiers .they cleverly utilised the internal problems and weakness of the Sikhs and they were defeated in the first battle. The treaty of Lahore was signed. The settlement pattern and the Englisher's provided certain facilities to the Muslims adversely affected the religious sentiments which dragged them into the war. But they were badly defeated and the governor general lord Dalhousie finally annexed it to the British empire. Oudh was annexed (1856) in the name of misgovernment, was only a culmination of a long drawn out process. Thus he completed the establishment of British Empire in India.

The success of the east India Company was depended on its capacity to mobilise greater resources than its rivals. their policies of annexation and he revenue policies, the plight of the peasants which led to voice against the British or rebellion against them. The revolt of 1857 was the culmination such growing discontent among the Indians. Revenue considerations got the company involved in administration and thus there was progression from military ascendancy to dominion of territory –from indirect rule to direct annexation. But the revolt of 1857 shook the very foundation of the British empire and company rule came to an end and British parliament took over the administration of India with the government of India act of 1858.british became the head of the ruler of India. The posts of the board of control and the board of directors were abolished and created the post of viceroy instead of governor general ,who would be the representative of British crown in India. it was the commencement of British Raj in India with its sophisticated army and fully control over India.

Colonial discovery of India and its culture

The latter half of the 18th century which was an important period to the India's past and culture.The Europeans especially the Britishers, they came forward to study about India. Orientalism was the concept which developed by

them to differentiate the culture of the people of the east from the culture of the west or the 'occident'. The indologists were the forerunners in the study of India. The company servants, the more elite among them, came from the intellectual cultural milieu of the eighteenth century European enlightenment, they were in search of the rediscovery of India's past. With the establishment of company rule in India, they have to face administrative problems, many difficulties regarding the Indian conditions. They were totally unaware of it. So it was their necessity to know or tap the Indian society, culture, customary laws and traditions. So they tried to acquire the maximum scientific knowledge of the society. It was started during the period of Warren Hastings itself with the establishment of Calcutta Madrasa to a better understanding for Indian culture, customs, language and tradition. The motive behind the beginning of such institutions was merely political. They wanted to strengthen the control over India. The official language of India was Persian during this time and it was an inevitable requirement to command over Indian languages. So the company authority officially supported the study on India. It was in the name of indological studies.

There were principle that the conquered people were to be ruled by their own laws. In other words it was a strategy to accept Indians the British rule. Even though, they had possessed superior technology and military strength was essential the support of the natives. As Warren Hastings wrote every accumulation of knowledge is useful to the stateit attracts and conciliates distant affections; it lessens the weight of the chain by which the natives are held in subjection and it imprints on the hearts of our own countryman the obligation of benevolence. The legitimated authoritarian rule, as India needed to be rescued from the predicament of its own creation and elevated to a desired state of progress as achieved by Europe. Thus they inaugurated an ideological justification for colonial India.

The establishment of British rule in India was roughly coincidental with the development in Europe of a strictly scientific spirit in historical reconstruction. Indology may be defined as the scientific study data relating to Indian history and culture. The missionaries, particularly the Jesuits had begun the indological quest even before the British effort. Even before the arrival of William Jones a group of young administrators and of the company had been charmed into the indological studies. These early British orientalisks produced works great interest. They were very fond of the indigenous language, because without the command over the indigenous language no control should be completed. So they promoted the study of Sanskrit and it was the basic texts of Indian learning culture and everything, especially Hindu culture and knowledge.

In 1776, Nath Halhead produced the Gentoo laws, Charles Wilkins who was fascinated by Sanskrit and master over it produced or translated Bagavath Githa into English. Jonathan Duncan was another champion of Hindu philosophy and learning .Hastings himself was a Persian scholar. In 1784 January William Jones, who was a Supreme Court judge to Calcutta founded the *Asiatic Society of Bengal* with the support of Hastings. It was an important moment in the history of Indian literature.He Started *Asiatic Researches*, the journal of the society published original researches. Jones who translated Kalidasa's Sakunthala ,Manusmruti of Manu, Geethagovindam of Jayadeva and inaugurated the comparative study of languages. He was interested in the study of Indian literature, arts and science. Jones he announced, namely the discovery of the common origin of what came to be known as the Indo-European family of languages. And he announced that Sanskrit was cousin to old Persian, Greek, Latin and the modern languages of Europe, Aryan race theory.

Max Muller, a German Orientalist and language scholar had a mastery over Sanskrit, turned comparative language studies and religion who translated Rig-Veda into English. He had produced a extensive works on India produced the sacred books of the east on the translation of the religious texts of India. Henry T.Colebrook was another scholar who well versed in Sanskrit produced several works. On philosophy, religion, law and grammer, *Essay on the Vedas or the Sacred writings of the Hindus* is the best example.

The British officials like James Prinsep and Alexander Cunningham had given much contribution to the rediscovery of India's past with help of archaeology. They unearthed many material remains related to Indian history in the form of inscriptions and excavations. Prinsep who had deciphered the inscriptions and coins, in the period of Asoka after a periods of dedication. Cunningham who is hailed as the father of Indian archaeology ,established the *Archaeological Survey of India*. He had conducted various excavations and studies on India to enhance and reconstruct the Indian history and culture. The scholars like John B.Gilchrist, William Hunter, H.H. Wilson, gave contribution to the study of India's past.

The indologists findings should be reckoned as one of the major breakthroughs effected in the history of knowledge. It brought the world wide significance in the history of culture as the discovery of Sanskrit literature. The Europeans began to study the Sanskrit and many of ancient Indian texts were translated to English and other European languages .,many Sanskrit plays, Vedas, Upanishads, arthasastra ,bagavath githa etc. But there were the

seamy side of the orientalists was that they justified British rule in India. By making the interpretations that as the inferior and backward in the culture and civilization. They boasted that they are far superior in respect to all and characterized Indians as undemocratic, superstitious, and negativity.

Dissemination of colonial knowledge

The colonial knowledge was an outcome of the colonialism. It was intended to extend and cement the colonial rule in India. The complete acquisition of the knowledge which facilitated the conquest and created the system of knowledge securing the colonial aspirations. So they introduced and combined the different systems for easiest strengthening of the sway. They were surveys, census, taping, preservation and classification of the manuscripts, archaeology, texts, customs, oral and native usages, legal codes, gazetteers etc. Education, census and ethnographical studies were the important means in which the dissemination colonial knowledge was fulfilled.

Education.

The East India Company took very little interest in the promotion of education in India. Only a few educational institutions were set up by the company and these were designed to provide a regular supply of qualified Indians to help the administration of law in the company's court and the knowledge of classical languages and vernaculars was useful in correspondence with the Indian states. The first institution of such type was Calcutta Madrassa set up by Warren Hastings in 1781 for the study of Muslim law and related subjects. Sanskrit college was established by Jonathan Duncan in 1791 at Banaras for the study of Hindu law and philosophy. Wellesley established Fort William college in 1800 for the training of civil servants of the company in languages and customs of Indians.

The English missionaries like Charles Grant and William Wilberforce had played an important role in the introduction of English education in India. The British Parliament for the first time included a clause in the Charter Act of 1813, under which the Governor General in Council was bound to keep aside at least one lakh rupees for education. It also allowed the Christian missionaries to spread their religious ideas in India and for the time, the company acknowledged state responsibility for the promotion of education in India.

The enlightened Indians like Raja ram Mohan Roy pressurised on government to promote modern, secular, western education since they thought that the western education was the remedy for social, economic and political ills of the country. Calcutta college was set up in 1817 by educated Bengalis. They were to impart English education in western humanities and sciences. The company also set up three Sanskrit colleges at Calcutta, Delhi and Agra.

There was a great deal of confusion over English and vernacular languages as media of instruction and objects of study. A major controversy erupted on the question of the kind of education to be imparted. Views were split on this subject. In 1823, a General Committee of public institution was appointed to look after the development of education in India. The 10-member committee had, on one hand, the orientalist, who advocated the spread of oriental literature and learning, and on the other, the Anglicists or the English party, who approved promotion of western learning through medium of English. Indians well acquainted with the classical and vernacular languages were required for administrative activities, the judicial department, political correspondence with the various rulers and communicating with the uneducated.

In 1835, Lord Macaulay was made a law member of the governor general in council, he became the president of the general committee of public institution. As the president he put forward his education policy in the council on February 2, 1835, which ended the orientalist-Anglicists row. Lord Macaulay's minute settled the favour of Anglicists. Under the Macaulay system of education, which was approved by governor-general William Bentinck, Persian was abolished as the court language and was substituted by English. Printing of English books was made free and these were available at a relatively low price. 42 schools were set up by 1842 and Bengal was divided into nine educational zones by governor general Auckland. Calcutta medical college was also founded in 1835. Grant medical college in Bombay in 1854, many schools and colleges were opened.

The British planned to educate small section of upper and middle classes, thus creating a class Indian blood and colour but English in tastes, in opinion, in morals, and in intellect who would act as interpreters between the government and masses and would enrich the vernaculars by which knowledge of western sciences and literature would reach the masses. This was called the *downward filtration theory*. In 1854, Charles Wood prepared a despatch on an educational system for India. This document was the first comprehensive plan for the spread of education in India and was considered the *Magna Carta* of English education in India. It asked the government of India to

assume the responsibility for education of masses, thus repudiating the downward filtration theory at least on paper. As per Woods' recommendations, a systematised hierarchy of schools was opened and Anglo-vernacular schools also. Primary and secondary schools were started and university education also. In 1857 universities at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras were set up and later departments of education set up in all provinces. Following Woods, several education commissions were appointed to the reforms of education in India.

The English education was one of the powerful agencies in India strengthening the colonialism. Because it was motivated by the vested interests of the Britishers. They tried to fulfil the colonial commercial and capitalist concerns through the policies. They thought that the introduction of modern education would bring a sort of people into the British rule and to some extent, it was a success that could create a loyal intelligentsia to them. New educational institutions came into being like Aligarh Muslim University.

The traditional education in India gradually lost its position especially when the government announced that the English was essential for government jobs, especially during the period of Lord Hardinge. The modern education did not care to give education to the masses as well as the women in India. The neglect of Indian languages and the high cost of English education kept the common man away from the modern education. Only rich people could afford the modern education and this created a serious gap between various classes of the Indian people. No funds were created by the authority for the education of women in India and were not to be appointed in the government services. They were never paid any attention to the technical education facilities and scientific education. In 1857 there were only three medical colleges at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras and only one engineering college at Roorkee, admission was to the Europeans.

The introduction of modern education turned out to be the instrument for spreading modern rationalism among the Indians. The knowledge of English helped the educated Indians to come into contact with the scientific, rational, liberal and secular ideas of the western world and in the course of time prepared them to fight against the colonial hegemony in all fields. It was not a mere accident that the leaders of the nationalist in India belonged to the newly educated middle class. The progressive role of the modern education in the growth of Indian nationalism was remarkable.

Census and Colonial Ethnography

The colonial mind brought several methods to maintain colonial rule in India in which the census and ethnographic studies gets much importance. The pre 1857 periods the company was given importance to the revenue, laws and the economy .but the post revolt period realized them that it is essential to know about its people for an hegemony over them. So they started the collection of demographic and ethnographic details of India through the census .the colonial policies were much balanced regarding conquering of knowledge for the survival. The rebellions happened in this time in the different parts of India also compelled them to seek new measures to know about Indian castes, tribes and communities. After acquiring the data on separate groups and the tribes ,they even passed special laws and regulations for the regions and communities. They could understood that sensitiveness of Indians to the caste communities which in later prompted them to favour any of the divisions of the India. They argued that the introduction of the new policies and legalities for the betterment of Indians and to civilize them to the modernity. So the caste was main focus of their census and ethnography attack on Indian society.

Census.

The Britishers introduced the census and surveys .Prior to them, a sort of census was existed in India, but during the colonial time a partial one was conducted in the early years of the 19th century itself. However, the idea of an all India census was first seriously considered only in the mid 1850s.but an all India census was in the year 1871-72during the time of lord Mayo. But it was not covered the all regions and systematic one, only a trial one. But it was during the reign of the well known viceroy of India, Lord Ripon ,the first systematic, scientific and uniform complete census was operated in the year1881.since then it became a regular effort and duty of the authority in every ten years (decennial census).thus ,it were conducted in the years of 1891,1901,1911,1921,1931 and 1941.

Right from the beginning, the colonial census was wedded to the categories of caste and race. Caste was the primary method of classification used in the census of 1871 and 1881.in this mode of classification, the first was assigned to the Brahmins. The majority of Hindus were put together in the category of Sudra or servile classes' .The 1891 census abandoned the caste criterion for enumeration in favour of occupational criteria. However, this scheme was criticised by H.H.Risely, the census commissioner of1901. He was obsessed with race. So ,he tried to clarify the people and castes into

distinct racial groups on the basis of the physical measurement of various bodily traits. He also conceived a scheme for grouping of every racial type in India. The census of 1911, however, abandoned this racial scheme of ranking but continued to gather information on castes.

The assessment of population in colonial India had started from the early years of the 19th century. These however were indirect appraisals with no uniformity in the method followed. The first census based on a direct survey of population took place on 1 January 1853, in the North-Western Provinces (called the NWP hereafter, the province covered parts of the present day UP). In the following decade census was also held in several other provinces including Oudh and Punjab, though as yet it was neither a regular nor a pan-Indian affair. The enumeration of caste started from the census of the NWP in 1865; it continued to be a prominent part of the colonial census till 1931.

In 1865 the Government of India and Home Government had agreed upon the principal that a general population census would be taken in 1871. In the year 1866-67 census was undertaken by the actual counting of heads in most of the part of the country, which is known as the **Census of 1872**. This Census did not cover all territories possessed or controlled by the British.

The **Census of 1881** which was undertaken on 17th February, 1881 by W.C.Plowden, Census Commissioner of India was a great step towards a modern synchronous census. Since then, censuses have been undertaken uninterruptedly once every ten years. In this Census, emphasis was laid not only on complete coverage but also on classification of demographic, economic and social characteristics. The census of 1881 took in entire continent of British India (except Kashmir) which also includes feudatory states in political connection with the Government of India. However it did not includes French and Portuguese colonial possessions. However, a census of Portuguese colonial dominions in India was also undertaken at the same time as the British Indian Census. British provinces viz ,Bengal, North west Provinces, Madras, Bombay, Punjab, Assam, Baruch, Berar ,Coorg and Ajmer besides Native states of Rajputana, Central India, the Nizam's dominions, Mysore, Baroda, Travancore and Cochin were included in the census of 1881. In the Census of 1881 a schedule 'Census Schedule' with 12 questions was canvassed. Deviating from past a question on sex was introduced and practice of canvassing same questions for males and females separately dropped. New question on marital status, mother tongue, place of birth and infirmities were included. The question on education was modified to the extent that for those who are not educated it was ascertained that whether they are able to read and write. From Hindus their caste was ascertained and in other cases information on Sect was obtained.

The second census was conducted from **26th February, 1891** almost on the pattern of 1881 census. In this Census, efforts were made for hundred percent coverage and Upper part of present Burma, Kashmir and Sikkim were also included. During this census, the same schedule was canvassed which contains 14 questions. The question on religion, cast, literacy, occupation etc were further modified. In place of religion, information on main religion was obtained and information on sect was also collected. Questions on caste or race of main religion and sub division of cast or race were also canvassed. The departure from previous census was that in place of Mother Tongue, information on Parental Tongue was obtained.

The third continuous census was started on **1st March, 1901**. In this census Baluchistan, Rajputana, Andaman Nicobar, Burma, Punjab and remote areas of Kashmir was included and in respect of other areas, where detailed survey was not possible, population was estimated on the basis of houses. The census schedule of 1901 census contained 16 questions. The main change was that the provision for house number was made in the Schedule. Other changes were caste of only Hindus and Jains were recorded and in case of other religion name of tribe or race were recorded. In place of foreign language, a new question "Know or does not know English" was included. In place of mother/parental tongue, the question was modified to the extent 'Language ordinarily used'.

The **Census of 1911** was commenced on 10th March, 1911 in all fourteen British Provinces and Native states. In this census, the whole Empire of India i.e. Territories administered by the Government of India and mediatised Native states were covered with the exception of a few sparsely inhabited and unadministered tracts on the confines of Burma and Assam. The census Schedule canvassed in this census contained same number of 16 questions but their scope was extended. In place of age, the question was asked "Age Completed last Birthday". Along with the question on religion, sect of Christians was also ascertained. The particulars of district, province or country were asked in respect of Birth Place question. In 1901 a question 'know or does not know English' was asked but in 1911 in its place the question was asked "Whether Literate in English".

1921 Census, the fifth census in its continuous series was started on 18th March, 1921. In this Census the whole of territory known as the Indian Empire was covered which also includes the territories directly controlled by the Government of India generally known as British India and the Indian States consisting of areas administered by Indian chief in political relation with Central Government or with one or other Provincial Government. Although the Census

schedule of 1921 contains the same questions like 1911 but they were canvassed with slight modifications. The sect of Christians which was asked in 1911 was dropped and information on caste, tribe or race was collected from all irrespective of their religion.

The sixth general census of India commenced on **February 26, 1931**. The area covered in this census was approximately identical with that of covered by the census of 1921. The 1931 Census also coincided with a civil disobedience movement. The census Schedule of 1931 Census contains 18 questions instead of 16 questions of 1921 census. The two new questions added were- a) Earner or Dependent and b) Mother Tongue (which was asked only in 1881). For eliciting information on 2nd language the question 'other language in common use' was retained. Again the sect was added with religion and age was ascertained in respect to nearest birth day.

The Census of 1941 started under the adverse conditions of war. Till February 1940, Government was un-decided of whether to have a census or not. With concerted effort, the enumeration was carried out directly into the slips which were later sorted out to generate tables. The idea of one night enumeration was dropped in this census. The major innovation of 1941 census was to use random sample and every 50th slip was marked to list the validity of a sample in census. In place of census Schedule, an Individual Slip was canvassed which contains 22 questions. The formation of questions was modified to the great extent. Following were the new questions of 1941 census:

- i. Number of children born to a married woman and number surviving.
- ii. Her age at birth of first child.
- iii. Do you employ a) paid assistance b) member of household, if so how many?
- iv. Are you in search of employment (for unemployed) and how long have been you in search of it?
- v. How far have you read?

Besides, the question of literacy was asked in different way' "Can you both Read and write? If so, what script do you write? Can you read only?" This was the last Census of Pre Independence period. Following table depicts. The year, reference period, Schedule canvassed and number of questions asked in each census since 1872 to 1941. This was the last Census of Pre Independence period.

Colonial Ethnography.

Much time has passed since the colonial ethnographers constructed their understanding of people, customs, law, language, religious and caste beliefs for purposes of governance and control. Yet, their knowledge and constructions continue to not only influence our comprehension of modern India but also provide deeper meanings to both tangible and intangible cultural symbols, some being shrouded under the maze of distortions and unsecular characterizations. It is therefore no wonder that such ethnographic writings have continuously generated interest and new fields of enquiry. As administrators, army officers, surveyors, enumerators or recruitment officers, the British established a tradition of writing about local communities, creating 'a corpus of knowledge' enabling 'scholars and generalists to "discover", "inscribe", "imagine", and map India' (Introduction: p. xi). Most history students are familiar with the history and ethnology of William Crooke, W.W. Hunter, E.S. Thurston, Herbert Hope Risley, Todd and others. This knowledge or colonial anthropology, as is well known, was potent as a tool for exclusion, inclusion as well as institutionalization of governance by the colonial rulers over the 'natives'. This knowledge-power relationship in the Indian colonial context and its impact on the colonized mind have already been forcefully brought out by scholars such as Arjun Appadurai, Trautman, Ronald Inden and Bernard S. Cohn. The Indian Army as it grew into a strong and centralized body also became a storehouse of information available to the colonial State about the lives and social background of Indians.

The essential motivations for the mapping of India were, thus, war and commerce. The ethnographic surveys carried out by the British rulers, during this period, created an intellectual resource for the administrators, military men, traders, and merchants. Notwithstanding the false traits they had set, they explain or contextualize social and cultural life in new and compelling ways. For example, the notes relating to Hinduism by Captain W.J. Newell, create ambiguities of all sorts, but confirm that Hinduism is a construct. Writing India exemplifies colonial ethnography by drawing together a range of Notes/Memorandums that appeared in the 19th-century. Written by British army officers, these Notes focus on Brahmans, Hindu Religion, Sikhs, Punjabi Muhammadans, Hindustani Muhammadans, Dogras, and Rajputs, among several others. Each of these pieces sheds light on aspects of the colonial mentalities. Although 'blood', 'race', 'heredity', and 'selection', have factored in, they have been used, challenged, or refined by others. Despite their prejudiced outlook on India's past and present as well as several other limitations, they have great historical import.

They contain data on their geographical distribution, physical and linguistic attributes, myths and genealogies, customs and traditions, religious and social observances and livelihood patterns. These ethnographies have been brought together under one cover given the wide range of information they encompass: 'law, language, land rights, social and ritual forms of the local communities, and their art of living and dying as expressions of human or superhuman agency'

The historian Mushirul Hasan locates the communities of India in the larger context of imperial ideologies and ethnographic debates in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century India. He rightly asserts that these ethnographic descriptions constitute a corpus of knowledge that has enabled scholars and generalists, alike, to 'discover', 'inscribe', 'imagine' and map India. Moreover, he points out that the colonial discourse was not a seamless whole, and it had its own inherent tensions. For instance, whereas British scholar-administrators often portrayed Hindus and Muslims as two essentialized and warring communities. The notes collected in the volume particularly codify the martial theory for the different classes to guide military recruiting policy that continued until the beginning of the Second World War. They shed light on different classes of Indian soldiers: who among the different castes and classes were fit to join the incessant military campaigns that the British were engaged in.

Hasan is aware of the 'false trails' that some of these writings set into motion in the world of historical and social science scholarship. More often than not they are intimately tied up with the imperial projects and reveal aspects of colonial mentality. In fact, the notes are suffused with such key words as blood, race, heredity, and selection. Evidently, these compilations reveal the baggage of the nineteenth century European preconceptions. At the same time, they depict the emerging template for interactions between different forms of knowledge colonial and Indian. Arguably, war, commerce, and subsequently, the reasons of the colonial state initiated these projects of mapping and ethnographic surveys. They, in their comprehensiveness, created an intellectual resource for the administrators, military men, traders and merchants. Viewed thus, one gets insights into information gathering processes that accompanied colonialism.

Notwithstanding the limitations of the colonial 'ethnographers', it is hard not to draw on the resources provided by them or to ignore their writings on caste, jatis, and the question of Aryanism and religion. However, the issue at stake is not merely of reliability of the information offered. There are larger epistemological concerns that scholars like Susan Bayly, Bernard Cohn, Nicholas Dirks, and Ronald Inden have brought to our attention. They have collectively

probed colonial forms of knowledge and colonial investigative modalities that have had serious implications for ways of seeing and understanding Indian society. Unfortunately, Hasan's Introduction to the volume fails to bring out the complexities of knowledge production in a colonial setting. True, it does gesture towards the larger political context in which contending epistemologies emerged and took shape. Yet, the introductory text is superficial and highly incoherent. Apart from underlining the value of colonial ethnography as an inescapable minefield of information for generations of South Asian scholarship, it achieves precious little by way of providing us with an historical anthropology of the colonial knowledge formation.

UNIT-II

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL MANIFESTATIONS OF COLONIALISM

Formation of Colonial Economy

The battle of Plassey stands as an important landmark in the economic history of India. The foreign conquest of country started the process which culminated in the transformation of India's economy in to a colonial economy. In its first phase, the impact of foreign rule on India's trade and industry was both violent and destructive. The trade and industry of the country , more particularly that of Bengal, received a severe jolt as a result of the policies of the East India Company and corrupt practices of its officials . This was of course, short lived phase.

By the end of the 18th century, British rule had been established in large parts of the country and had come to stay. Britain, therefore, came to look upon India as her colony which had to be developed in the imperial interest. The overriding constraint on the process of development was to be the interest of the British manufacturers. India was to be turned in to a market for British goods and exporter of raw materials and food stuffs to feed Britain's industries and her people. This policy thwarted economic growth and resulted in economic stagnation. The cottage and small scale industries which were the pride of the country in the 17th and the first half of the country languished as a result of foreign competition and want of support from the government. New large scale industries were late to come but even when they began to be established in the second half of the 19th century, far from encouragement, the government's attitude towards them was one of open hostility. The First World War produced far-reaching changes in the world's economy and circumstances forced Britain to change her industrial and commercial policies in India. Fiscal autonomy to India was conceded by the secretary of state in 1919 and the principle of discriminating protection was accepted in 1923. This helped the industrial growth, and a number of new large scale consumer goods industries, such as sugar, matches, cement and paper came to be established in the country under the impetus of protection. But the great depression intervened mean while and prevented industrial growth from being as rapid as it otherwise might have been expected. The result of British rule in India was the aborted growth of her economy.

The British rule also produced important structural changes in the Indian economy. The new land laws gave a new concept of property and ownership in land which was alien to her. The principle of Joint stock in business units was for the first time introduced by the British. A unified currency system for the whole country, monetization of India's rural economy, substitution of commercial food crops in agriculture, a network of railways and telegraphs all over the country, an enormous increase in India's export trade and emergence of a new class structure were some of the more important contributions of the British rule in India's economy.

During the first half of the 19th century or even up to 1880 India's economy witnessed a strange phenomenon. While western countries were experiencing industrialization, India suffered a period of industrial decline. This process has been described as de industrialization.

The third phase of colonialism begun from the 1860s, when British India became part of the ever-expanding British Empire, to be placed directly under the control and sovereignty of the British crown. This period was one of 'finance-imperialism'; when some British capital was invested in the colony. This capital was organized through a closed network of British banks, export-import firms and managing agencies. Industrial development also led to capital accumulation, which was concentrated in a small number of banks and corporations. This capital was invested in the colonies to sustain the rapid inflow of raw materials to fuel further expansion of industrial production. High tariff restrictions in other developing capitalist countries led to a contraction of markets for British manufactured goods. And the need for heavy imports of agricultural products into Britain was making her position vulnerable in her trade with other countries. India proved crucial in solving the problem of Britain's deficits. Britain's control over India ensured that there would always be a captive market for Lancashire textiles. Moreover, India's export surplus in raw material with countries other than Britain, counter-balanced her deficits elsewhere. While on the one hand indigenous handicrafts faced impoverishment, on the other hand, there were few attempts at developing modern industries in the colony. Although the colonial government spoke about 'free trade', indigenous enterprise faced many obstructions perpetuated by the state's discriminatory policies. British capital was initially invested in railways, jute industry, tea plantations and mining. The Indian money market was dominated by European banking houses. While British entrepreneurs had easy access to capital made available by this banking network, Indian traders had to depend on family or caste organizations for their capital needs. British banking houses and British trading interests were well

organized through Chambers of Commerce and Managing Agencies and could also influence the colonial state, to carefully deny Indian entrepreneurs access to capital. It was during the First World War that some Marwari businessmen from Calcutta, like G.D. Birla and Swarupchand Hukumchand invested in the jute industry. Gradually their control started expanding into other areas like coal mines, sugar mills and paper industry, and they could even buy up some European companies. The greatest success of Indian capital was seen in the cotton industry in western India, which took advantage of high demands during the war years (1914-18) to consolidate its successes, and eventually was in competition with Lancashire. Certain traditional trading communities like Gujarati Baniyas, Parsis, Bohras and Bhatias became important in this sector. The colonial government also provided some protection to the sugar and cotton industries, in the face of falling prices in the agricultural sector. Low prices forced capital from land into the manufacturing sector. Indians also ventured into the field of insurance and banking. Again, during the Second World War (1939-45), as foreign economic influence declined, Indian entrepreneurs managed to make huge profits. Strengthened by its limited success, the Indian capitalist class strengthened their links with the nationalist movement. They soon started demanding the establishment of heavy industries under state ownership and started organizing themselves to resist the entry of foreign capital. But, to place these markers of success in perspective, on an overall level, these developments remained confined to the domestic market and indigenous capital still had a long battle ahead, against the structural weaknesses of a colonial economy. The potential for growth remained depressed given the massive poverty of the Indian people. Early Indian nationalists like Dadabhai Naoroji, M.G. Ranade and R.C.Dutt had expected Britain to undertake capitalist industrialization in India, but were deeply disillusioned with the results of colonial industrial policies. Consequently, they formulated a strong economic critique of colonialism in the late nineteenth century. Dadabhai Naoroji put forward the **drain of wealth theory**. Poverty in India, according to them, was the result of a steady drain of Indian wealth into Britain—a result of British colonial policy. This drain occurred through the interest that India paid for foreign debts of the East India Company, military expenditure, guaranteed returns on foreign investment in railways and other infrastructure, importing all stationery from England, 'home charges' paid for the Secretary of State in Britain and salaries, pensions and training costs of military and civilian staff employed by the British state to rule India. Even if this drain was a small fraction of the value of India's total exports, if invested within the country it could have helped generate a surplus to build a capitalist economy.

AGRARIAN SETTLEMENTS

The main burden of providing money for the trade and profits of the company, the cost of administration, and the wars of British expansion in India had to be borne by the Indian peasant or ryot. In fact the British could not have conquered such a vast country as India if they had not taxed him heavily.

The Indian state had since times immemorial taken a part of the agricultural produce as land revenue. It had done so either directly through its servants or indirectly through intermediaries, such as zamindars, revenue farmers, etc., who collected the land revenue from the cultivator and kept a part of it as their commission. These intermediaries were primarily collectors of land revenue, although they did some times own some land in the area from which they collected revenue.

After the diwani of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa was granted to the East India Company in 1765, the maximization of revenue from the colony became the primary objective of the British administration. Agricultural taxation was the main source of income for the company, which had to pay dividends to its investors in Britain. Therefore, the British administration tried out various land revenue experiments to this aim. These experiments also partly determined the relationship that the colonial state would share with the people it governed

Permanent settlement

In 1765, the east India Company acquired the Diwani, or the control over the revenues, of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. Initially, it made an attempt to continue the old system of revenue collection though it increased the amount to be collected from Rs. 14,290,000 in 1772 and Rs. 8,180,000 in 1764 to Rs.23,400,000 in 1771. In 1773 it decided to manage the land revenue directly. Warren Hastings auctioned the right to collect revenue to the highest bidders. But his experiment did not succeed. Though the amount of land revenue was pushed high by zamindars and other speculators bidding against each other, the actual collection varied from year to year and seldom came up to officials expectations. This introduced instability in the Company's revenues at a time when the company was hard pressed for money. Moreover, neither the ryot nor the zamindar would do anything to improve cultivation when they did not know what the next year's assessment would be or who would be the next year's revenue collector.

It was at this stage that the idea first emerged of fixing the land revenue at a permanent amount. Finally after prolonged discussion and debate, the permanent settlement was introduced in Bengal and Bihar in 1793 by Lord Cornwallis. The first feature of this system was the zamindars and revenue collectors were converted in to so many land lords. They were not only to act as agents of the government in collecting land revenue from the ryot but also to become the owners of the entire land in their zamindar. Their right of ownership was made hereditary and transferable. The second feature is that the zamindars were to give 10/11th of the rental they derived from the peasantry to the state, keeping only 1/11 for themselves. But the sums to be paid by them as land revenue were fixed in perpetuity. The state would not make any further demand upon him. At the same time, the zamindar had to pay his revenue rigidly on the due date even if the crop had failed for some reason; otherwise his lands were to be sold.

It was later generally admitted by officials and non officials alike that before 1793 the zamindars of Bengal and Bihar did not enjoy proprietary rights over most of the land. The land lord in Britain was the owner of land not only in relation to the tenant but also in relation to the state. But in Bengal while the zamindars was landlord over the tenant, he was further subordinated to the state.

The permanent settlement guaranteed the stability of income. The newly created property of the zamindars acted as a security of this. Moreover, the permanent settlement enabled the company to maximize its income as land revenue was now fixed higher than it had ever been in the past. Collection of revenue through a small number of zamindars seemed to be much simpler and cheaper than the process of dealing with lakhs of cultivators. The permanent settlement was expected to increase agricultural production. Since the land revenue would not be increased in future even if the zamindar's income went up, the latter would be inspired to extend and improve agricultural productivity.

Failure of Warren Hastings experiment of auctioning the right to collect revenue to the highest bidder; introduction of Permanent settlement by Cornwallis in 1793 in Bengal and Bihar with the help of Sir John Shore. Cornwallis name ranks pre-eminent because of the galvanizing reforms introduced by him in land revenue which came to be known as the permanent settlement. The erstwhile arrangement was that the zamindar was given a right to collect revenue on a temporary or periodic basis .Since they had no permanent right over the land; they would collect as much as they could. This entailed oppression and coercion upon the cultivators who naturally became indifferent to

cultivation and as a result the output was small. Cornwallis came from the landed aristocracy in and so he could well diagnose the malady. The cure prescribed by him was the Permanent settlement in 1793 with zamindars. The zamindars were required to pay eighty nine percent of the revenue and retain eleven percent of the revenue. The system was not arisen without thorns. It had both advantage and disadvantage.

Merits of the Permanent Settlement

Since the zamindars were entrusted with the collection of revenue, the officers of the company were now relieved of the burden of revenue settlement and they could be engaged in the more important administrative and judicial functions of the company. It improved the status of the zamindars that enjoyed a secure position in the sense that they could not be deprived of their position so long as they paid revenue to the company. As a result they could give more interest and attention to their land, since they got the position of the owner of the land. The system removed the erstwhile practice of hiding the revenues and resultant evasion of the revenue. The result was that the revenue of the company increased. It certainly contributed to develop the agricultural wealth of Bengal to an extent not found in any other Indian province. It saved Bengal from the increasing exactions of periodical settlements that have been one of the causes of the poverty of the other provinces as compared to Bengal. Owing to this permanent settlement in Bengal we never had the painful necessity of special measures like, for instance, the Bombay Agricultural Relief Act. The net result was that Bengal gained material prosperity out of the permanent settlement.

Demerits of the Permanent settlement

The serious flaw with the permanent settlement was that it did not yield the extra revenue from the land, though the value of the land had increased or more areas were brought under cultivation. Thus the system remained static from its inception in 1793 to the day of its abolition in 1954. The zamindars did not take as much interest in the land as they were expected to do so. So the province of Bengal as a whole suffered for the negligence of the zamindars that did not live in the land but in the town and lived in luxury and debauchery. The permanent settlement was beneficial for the zamindars and the company but not for the peasants. The zamindars grew in power, position and wealth at the cost of the cultivators and to a greater extent of the state. A serious flaw of the permanent settlement was confining industries in the hands of the rich and the trade in the hands of the lower castes in the Hindu society. The permanent zamindari settlement was later extended to Orissa, the Northern Districts of Madras, and the District of Varanasi. In parts of Central India and Awadh the British introduced a temporary zamindari settlement under which the zamindars were made owners of land but the revenue they had to pay was revised periodically.

Ryotwari settlement

The establishment of British rule in South Western India brought new problems of land settlement. The officials believed that in these regions there were no zamindars with large estates with whom settlement of land revenue could be made and that the introduction of zamindari system would upset the existing state of affairs. Many Madras officials led by Reed and Munro recommended that settlement should therefore be made directly with the actual cultivators. They also point out that under the permanent settlement the company was a financial loser as it had to share the revenues with the zamindars and could not claim a share of the growing income from land. Moreover, the cultivator was left at the mercy of the zamindar that could oppress him at will. Under the system they proposed which is known as Ryotwari settlement, the cultivator was to be recognized as the owner of his plot of land subject to the payment of land revenue. The supporters of the Ryotwari system claimed that it was a continuation of the state of affairs that had existed in the past. The ryotwari settlement was introduced in parts of the Madras and Bombay Presidencies in the beginning of the 19th century. The settlement under the ryotwari system was not made permanent. It was revised periodically after 20 to 30 years when the revenue demand was usually raised.

The ryotwari system protected neither the rights of the cultivators nor put them to any financial gain. The system did not introduce peasant ownership. The state remained the owner of the land. The cultivator had to pay regular revenue otherwise they could be dispossessed of their lands any time. The demand of revenue by the government remained very high. The cultivators were, thus, not sure of greater advantage for their better producing. For them the state stood as a zamindar which was more powerful than the zamindars under the permanent settlement or the Mahalwari settlement.

Under the Ryotwari system, the government fixed the revenue directly with the cultivators. The revenue was collected with the help of local hereditary village officers who were recognized by the government. The state demand was mostly kept at fifty percent of the produce.

To keep out intermediaries from revenue collection, so that the state could acquire a larger share of the income from land, the Ryotwari System was started by Alexander Read in 1792, for the Madras Presidency. Later it was introduced in the Bombay Presidency as well. Under this system, revenue was initially collected from each village separately, but later each cultivator or 'ryot' was assessed individually. Thus, peasants not zamindars were established as property owners. Although this system increased the revenue collected by the state, the assessments were faulty and the peasants over burdened by the taxes. The landed intermediaries continued to flourish.

Merits of the Ryotwari Settlement

1. Absence of zamindars with large estates with whom settlement of land revenue could be made in some regions like Madras and Bombay and hence the need to make settlement directly with the actual cultivators
- 2 .Desire of the company to claim a share of the growing income from land which the company could not do under the permanent settlement and which the company could do because of the periodic revision of the revenue demand under the new system.
3. Need to protect the cultivators from the oppression of the zamindars, which was rampant under permanent settlement .This could be done by recognizing the cultivators as the owner of his plot of land.
4. The supporters of the Ryotwari system claimed that it was a continuation of the state of affairs that had existed in the past. Due to the efforts of Sir Thomas Munro it was introduced first in Madras Presidency followed by Bombay.

Demerits.

1. In most areas the land revenue fixed was exorbitant
2. The government retained the right to enhance land revenue at will.
3. The ryot had to pay revenue even when his produce was partially or totally destroyed. Replacement of large number of zamindars by one giant zamindar-the state.

The Mahalwari System

The company could not draw any advantage from increased production in agriculture in the system introduced in Bengal .i.e., the permanent settlement. The system was opposed by members of the village communities. The loyalty of the zamindars to the company could also be taken for granted. The company lost its monopoly of trade with India in 1813 and therefore, India was opened to all British traders. The company so far had been interested in exporting Indian goods broad. But now the British manufacturers, because of the industrial Revolution in England desired to create a big market in India for their finished goods and also to convert India in to a field for raw material.

A modified version of the zamindari settlement, introduced in the Gangetic valley, the North West Provinces, parts of Central India, and the Punjab, was known as the Mahalwari system. The revenue settlement was to be made village by village or state (mahal) by estate with landlords or heads of families who collectively claimed to be the landlords of the village or the estate. In the Punjab, a modified Mahalwari system known as the village system was introduced. In Mahalwari areas also, the land revenue was periodically revised.

Under this system, the revenue was settled only for a fixed period with either the local zamindars of a village and its hereditary collectors of the revenue or with the zamindars or hereditary collectors of a Mahal (estate which included many villages). The zamindars were not accepted as hereditary owners of the land. It was held that they had only the right to collect revenues which the government may continue or withdraw.

The Mahalwari system brought no benefit to the cultivators. It was a modified version of the zamindari system and benefited the upper class in villages. The government demand was also very high. Initially the state share was fixed at two-thirds of the gross produce. Bentinck, therefore, reduced it to sixty six percent and, afterwards, in some areas, it was reduced to fifty percent. The burden of all this heavy taxation finally fell on the cultivators.

Both the zamindari and the ryotwari systems departed fundamentally from the traditional land systems of the country. The British created a new form of private property in land in such a way that the benefit of the innovation did not go to the cultivators. All over the country land was now made salable, mortgagable, and alienable. This was done primarily to protect the Governments revenue. Another reason for introducing private ownership in land was provided by the belief that only right of ownership would make the land lord or the ryot exert himself in making improvements.

The British by making land a commodity which could be freely brought and sold introduced a fundamental change in the existing land systems of the country. The stability and continuity of the Indian villages were shaken. In fact, the entire structure of rural society began to break up.

Changes in the Political structure

The first association of British with the work of administration under what is called as the system of Dual Government (1765-1772) is a discreditable and shame full page of British history, which had been summed up in a contemporary Muslim history, the *siyar- ul- Mutakherin*, thus 'the new rulers paid no attention to the concerns of the people and suffered them to be mercilessly oppressed and tormented by officers of their own.

The dual government of Bengal Following the Treaty of Allahabad (1765), Robert Clive set up the infamous dual system of administration in Bengal wherein the Company acquired the real power, while the. Responsibility of administration rested on the Nawab of Bengal. Under the 'dual' or double government system, the Company got both the diwani (revenue) and nizamat (civil administration) functions of Bengal from two different sources-diwani from the Mughal emperor and nizamat from the nawab of Bengal.

As the diwan, the Company was authorized to collect revenues of the province, while through the right to nominate the deputy subahdar it was in a position to control the nizamat or the police and judicial powers. The deputy subahdar could not be removed without the consent of the Company. However, at this point of time, the Company was neither willing nor able to collect the revenue directly.

Hence, it appointed two deputy diwans for exercising diwani functions-Mohammad Reza Khan for Bengal and Raja Sitah Roy for Bihar. Mohammad Reza Khan also functioned as deputy nizam. In this way, the whole administration of Bengal was exercised through Indian agency, although the actual authority rested with the Company.

The dual government system held a great advantage for the British-they had power without responsibility. The Nawab and his officials were responsible for administration, but they had no power to discharge it. The system had many weaknesses that ultimately led to administrative breakdown. The peasantry of Bengal suffered greatly due to the decline of agriculture and arbitrary revenue demands. Trade and commerce were disrupted, and the industry and skills ruined.

Regulating Act, (1773), legislation passed by the British Parliament for the regulation of the British East India Company's Indian territories, mainly in Bengal. It was the first intervention by the British government in the company's territorial affairs and marked the beginning of a takeover process that was completed in 1858.

The occasion for the Regulating Act was the company's misgovernment of its Bengal lands, brought to a crisis by the threat of bankruptcy and a demand for a government loan. The main provisions of the act were the appointment of a governor-general of Fort William in Bengal with supervisory powers over the presidencies of Madras (now Chennai) and Bombay (now Mumbai). The governor-general had a council of four and was given a casting vote but no veto. A supreme court of four English judges was set up in Calcutta (now Kolkata). In Great

Britain annual elections of 24 directors were replaced by the election of six judges a year, each for a four-year term, and the qualification for a vote was raised from £500 to £1,000. This change made it more difficult for private groups to control policy and places by manipulating votes. The act had many defects—e.g., the governor-general's lack of a veto led to quarrels with his councillors, and the supreme court's lack of defined powers led to legal disputes and anomalies. The act was amended and the government of India was recast by Prime Minister William Pitt's India Act of 1784.

The Regulating Act of 1773

The Regulating Act of 1773 opened a new chapter in the constitutional history of the Company. Previously, the Home government in England consisted of the Court of Directors and the Court of Proprietors. The Court of Directors were elected annually and practically managed the affairs of the Company. In India, each of the three presidencies was independent and responsible only to the Home Government. The government of the presidency was conducted by a Governor and a Council.

The following conditions invited the Parliamentary intervention in the Company's affairs. The English East India Company became a territorial power when it acquired a wide dominion in India and also the Diwani rights. Its early administration was not only corrupt but notorious. When the Company was in financial trouble, its servants were affluent. The disastrous famine which broke out in Bengal in 1770 affected the agriculturists. As a result, the revenue collection was poor. In short, the Company was on the brink of bankruptcy. In 1773, the Company approached the British government for an immediate loan. It was under these circumstances that the Parliament of England resolved to regulate the affairs of the Company. Lord North, the Prime Minister of England, appointed a select committee to inquire into the affairs of the Company. The report submitted by the Committee paved the way for the enactment of the Regulating Act.

Provisions of the Regulating Act of 1773

The act remodelled the constitution of the company both in England and in India. In England, the right of vote in the court of proprietors was raised from 500 to 1000. It was provided that the court of directors was, hitherto elected every year, and was hence forth to be elected for four years. The number of directors was fixed at 24, one forth retiring every year.

In Bengal a collegiate government was created consisting of a Governor – general (president) and four members of the council. The vote of the majority was to bind the council, the Governor General having a casting vote when there was an equal division of opinion. Three members of the council formed a quorum. The first Governor –General and Councillors were named in the Act. They were to hold office for five years, and could be removed earlier only by the king on the recommendation of the court of Directors. Future appointments were to be made by the company. The Governor Generals in council were vested with the civil and military government of the presidency of Fort William in Bengal. They were to superintend and control in certain matters the subordinate presidencies of Madras and Bombay.

The Act empowered the crown to establish by charter a supreme court of Judicature, consisting of a chief justice and three puisne judges. The Supreme Court was to be a court of Equity and of common Law, a court of Admiralty, and Ecclesiastical court. All the public servants of the company were made amenable to its jurisdiction. All British subjects in Bengal, European and Indian, could seek redress in the Supreme Court against oppression, the Supreme Court could also entertain suits, actions and complaints against persons in the company's service or any of his Majesty's subjects. The court could determine all types of cases and grant redress through all the methods then in vogue in English judicial procedure. The court was given both original and appellate jurisdiction. Following the British custom, the court heard these cases with the help of a jury of British subjects.

The regulating act laid down the fundamental principle of honest administration by providing that 'no person holding or exercising any civil or military office under the crown shall accept , receive or take directly or indirectly any present, gift, donation, gratuity or reward, pecuniary or otherwise'.

This act was the first serious attempt made by a European power to organize government in a far off country inhabited by a civilized people. It tried, however, to organize an honest and efficient supreme authority in Bengal, at Madras and at Bombay. The act in short was a well meant attempt to introduce a better system of government but being designed in ignorance of the real nature of the problem it was a total failure and only added to Hastings difficulties instead of strengthening his hands.

The regulating act was in operation for eleven years till it was superseded by the Pitt's Act of 1784. Warren Hastings was the only Governor- General who had to administer India under it.

Merits and Demerits of the Act

The significance of the Regulating Act is that it brought the affairs of the Company under the control of the Parliament. Besides, it proved that the Parliament of England was concerned about the welfare of Indians. The greatest merit of this Act is that it put an end to the arbitrary rule of the Company and provided a framework for all future enactments relating to the governing of India. The main defect of the Act was that the Governor-General was made powerless because the council which was given supreme power often created deadlocks by over-ruling his decision. However, many of these defects were rectified by the Pitt's India Act of 1784.

Pitt's India Act, 1784

The Regulating Act proved to be an unsatisfactory document as it failed in its objective. In January 1784, Pitt the Younger (who became Prime Minister of England after the General Elections) introduced the India Bill in the British Parliament. Despite bitter debate in both the Houses, the bill was passed after seven months and it received royal assent in August 1784. This was the famous Pitt's India Act of 1784.

The act of 1784 introduced changes mainly in the company's home government in London. It greatly extended the control of the state over the company's affairs. While the patronage of the company was left untouched, all civil, military and revenue affairs were to be controlled by a Board popularly of the principal secretaries of state and four members of the Privy Council appointed by the king. A secret committee of three directors was to be the channel through which important orders of the board were to be transmitted to India. The court of proprietors lost the right to rescind, suspend or revoke any resolution of the directors which was approved by the board of control.

In India, the chief government was placed in the hands of a governor general was still left liable to be over ridden by the council but as the number of councillors was reduced to three, he, by the use of his casting vote, could always make his will predominate if he had one supporter. Beyond this act of 1784 did not go. The defects was met in the Act of 1793, where by the governor general was empowered to disregard the majority in council provided he did so in a formal way accepting the responsibility of his own action. Under the act of 1784 the presidencies of Madras and Bombay were subordinated to the governor general and council of Bengal in all matters of diplomacy revenue and war.

Pitt's India Act of 1784 brought about two important changes in the constitution of the company. It constituted a department of state in England known as the Board of control whose special function was to control the policy of the court of Directors, thus introduced the dual system of government by the company and by a parliamentary Board which lasted till 1858. The board of control had no independent executive power. It had no patronage. Its power was veiled, it had access to all the company's papers and its approval was necessary for all despatches that were not purely commercial, and in case of emergency the board could send its own draft to the secret committee of the Directors to be signed and sent out in its name. The Act thus placed the civil and military government of the company in due subordination to the government in England. The court of Directors retained their patronage and their right of dismissing their servants. The head of the board was at first one of the secretaries of state without special salary, but after 1793 a special president of the Board was appointed and this officer was ultimately responsible for the government of British India until he was succeeded in 1858 by the Secretary of state for India. Pitt's India act thus settled the main lines of the company's home and Indian government down to 1858.

The act reduced the number of members of the executive council to three, of whom the commander in chief was to be one. It also modified the councils of Madras and Bombay on the pattern of that of Bengal.

Pitt's India Act constitutes a significant landmark with regard to the foreign policy of the Company. A critical review of the Act reveals that it had introduced a kind of contradiction in the functions of the Company. The Court of Directors controlled its commercial functions, whereas the Board of Control maintained its political affairs. In fact, the Board represented the King, and the Directors symbolized the Company.

Charter Act of 1813

Charter Act of 1813 reduced the monopoly of the East India Company's in all major sections. The Charter Acts of the British East India Company were decided to be renewed by 1813. There were several discussions about the justification of the commercial privileges enjoined with the company. Company's territories expanded so much that it was impossible to continue as a political and commercial functionary. Moreover with the introduction of the new concepts of laissez faire, Europeans demanded a share in the trades with India. The continental system introduced by Napoleon had closed the European ports to the British trade. Hence, the English demanded to strengthen the trades in India. Due to these problems in the inland trades, the Englishmen demanded the

termination of the commercial monopoly of the British East India Company. Hence the contemporary circumstances made it necessary for the renewals of the Charters Act of 1793.

While offering the company's right to the territorial possession and revenues of India, the Act proclaimed the sovereignty of the crown over them. The Indian administration was asked to maintain separate accounts for its commercial and political activities.

The Charter Act of 1813 was as follows:

1. The monopoly of trade of the Company was abolished except in Tea and its trade with China.
2. Church was placed under a Bishop which was maintained from Indian revenue. Englishmen were granted permission to settle and hold land in India; to the missionaries for introducing useful knowledge and propagating religious and moral improvement and to traders for their lawful purposes, under a system of licenses.
3. The crown had complete power over territorial and revenue.
4. For the improvement of education one lakh grant was allotted.

Charter Act of 1833

The period following the enactment of the Charter Act of 1833 witnessed great change in England. The industrial revolution had a great impact in England. The Industrial revolution ushered a period of Machine Age which induced a revolutionary change in the method of production. Cheap products of the new machine and their massive exports to the foreign countries widened the prospects and also changed the perspective of the traders. The flowing of moneys dues to the open trade induced a spirit of Independence. Moreover the Marxist Concepts class-consciousness gave a new colour to the British idea of politics. A new enlightened class came into existence. In this new age intelligent writers emerged and echoed the significance of the New Age

In the year 1830, when the Whigs came into power in the political scenario of England, it opened a way of the triumph of the liberal principles. The Rights of Men was emphasized. Consequently the great Reform Act was passed in the year 1832. The concepts of laissez faire were duly emphasized.

The liberal Whigs controlled the Parliament and it upheld the triumph of the liberal ideas. Though there were many supporters of the Company who did not advocate the transference of powers to the Crown, majority considered that the company should cease to be functioning as the political body. Macaulay the secretary of the Boards of Control and James Mill occupied a high position in the India House. Henceforth their influence was clearly evident in the Charters Acts of 1833.

The Charter Act of 1833 therefore came into existence after massive socio-political changes in England. The Act gave another lease of life to the Company for twenty years to administer the Indians territories. However their power was subjected to the trust of His Majesty, his heirs and successors. The company lost its monopoly of China Trade. The company was also asked to stop the commercial transactions as early as possible. However the interests of the shareholders were safeguarded by granting them a dividend of 10.5 % per annum till the company's stock was purchased. Henceforth all the restrictions on European immigration into India and acquisitions of land and property by them was removed. This clause removed the legal obstruction on the European colonization of India.

The Charter Acts of 1833 centralized the administration in India. The Governor General of Bengal, according to the act was declared as the Governor General of India. The jurisdiction of the Governor General in council was extended considerably. The Charter Act of 1833 vested the Governor General in Council with the powers of control and superintendence of the civil and the military affairs of the Company. Bombay, Madras and Bengal and other territories came under the direct control of the Governor General in Council. All revenues were to be raised under the authority of the governor general in Council who had also to control the entire system of expenditure.

The Charter Acts of 1833 emphasized the legislative centralization. The Government of Madras and Bombay were deprived of their powers of legislation. The state governments were only left with the powers of proposing the project of laws to the governor General in council.

The charter Act of 1833 enlarged the Executive council by the addition of fourth member (Law Member) for legislative purposes. The fourth member was entrusted with the charge to give professional advice regarding the procedure of law making. Theoretically he was entitled to sit and vote at meetings of the Council only for the purpose of making law. The Boards of directors nominated Macaulay as the first Law Member of the Council. Also a Law Commission was constituted, following the recommendations of the Charter Act. The Law Commission looked after consolidating, codifying and improving Indian Laws.

Apart from the judicial and the administrative procedures, the Charter Act provided some other general provisions. Among the general provisions envisaged by the Charter Act of 1833, the most important was the Section 87. Sections 87 provided that there would be no indiscrimination made between the Indian and the British residents in Indian provinces on the basis of caste, creed and religion. The Directors defined in clear terms that the motto of this provision was to remove disqualification. However the provisions declared in the Charters Acts of 1833 were ended up with the short-sighted and the ill-conceived policy introduced by Cornwallis. Cornwallis shut the doors of high military and the civil services to the Indians. Under Cornwallis the Indians could hold only the minor posts.

Charter Act of 1853

After 20 years of the Acts of 1833, the time approached for the renewal of the Company's Charter. With the passage of time there was a growing demand that the double Governments of the company in England should be ended. It has also been declared that the Court of Directors and the Board of control only resulted in the unnecessary delay in the business transactions and led to undue expenditure. An application was sent to the presidencies of India to appoint a secretary of state with a Council. The Secretary of state would be entrusted to handle all business relating to India.

It had been ideated that the existing legislative system under the Charter Act of 1833 was completely inadequate. Moreover after the Acts of 1833 there were territorial and the political changes in India. Sind and Punjab had been annexed to the company's territory. A number of Indian States except Pegu in Burma became victim of Dalhousie's policy of annexation. Gradually there were the demands of the decentralization of power and for giving the Indian people the shares in the administration. It was under these circumstances that the British parliament decided to renew the charter of the company in the year 1853. The company in the preceding year appointed two Committees to look into the affairs of the company. On the basis of their reports the charters Act of 1853 was framed and passed.

The charter Acts of 1853 renewed the powers of the company and allowed it to retain possessions of Indian territories. However this Charter Act did not grant commercial privileges for the specific period of time. Rather it did not mention any time period. The charter Act of 1853 provided that the salaries of the members of the Boards of controls, its Secretary and other officers would be fixed by the British government but would be paid by the company. The number of the members of the court of directors was reduced from 24 to 18 out of which

6 were to be nominated by the Crown. By the Act of 1853, the Court of directors was disposed of their power of patronage and the high posts were made subjects to the competitive examination, where no discriminations would be made on the basis of caste, creed and religion. A committee with Macaulay as its president was appointed in the year 1854 to enforce his scheme. The Court of directors was empowered to constitute a new Presidency. The court of Directors, by the Act also could alter the boundaries of the existing states and incorporate the newly acquired state. This provision was made use to create a separate Lieutenant Governorship for Punjab in the year 1859. The Act also empowered the crown to appoint a Law commission in England to examine the reports and the drafts of the Indian law commission.

In India the separation of the executive and the legislative functions was carried a step further by the provision of the additional members for the purpose of legislation. The Law Member was made the full member of the governor General's Executive council. This council while sitting in its legislative capacity was enlarged by the addition of the six members, namely the chief Justice and others judge of Calcutta supreme Court and four representative one each from Bengal, Madras, Bombay and the north western provinces. The provincial representatives were to be the civil servants of the company. The governor General was empowered to appoint two more civil servants to the Council. It had been declared by the Act that discussion in the Council became oral instead of writing. Bills were referred to the Select Committees instead to a single member and legislative business was conducted in public instead of the secret.

The charter Act of 1853 was a compromise between the two conflicting views. Those who favoured the retention of the Company's territorial authority were satisfied by the provisions of the charter Act of 1853. The newly formed Legislative council threatened to alter the whole structures of the Indian government. Thus the Legislative Council denied the provisions made by the Charter Acts of 1853. The glaring defect of the Charter Act of 1853 was the continued exclusion of the people of the land with the work of legislation. However the charter act of 1853, strengthened the oppressive policy of the British Government in India.

Judicial Administration

The British laid down the foundation of a new judicial system by establishing a hierarchy of civil and criminal courts. The beginning was made by Warren Hastings while Cornwallis stabilized it. The regulating act made the provision of establishing a supreme court in Bengal. The powers and jurisdiction of which were specifically defined by the Act of 1781. It also continued along with

courts established by Hastings and Cornwallis though, afterwards, it decided the cases concerning European only. The one important measure of Cornwallis was that criminal jurisdiction was taken from the hands of the Nawab and handed over to the company. Another useful measure of Cornwallis was the codification of laws. The Cornwallis code systematized the laws and their procedures of implementation. Another remarkable measure of Cornwallis was the separation of the executive and the judiciary and the making of civil servants legally responsible for the acts done in their official capacity. Commenting on it M.P. Jain writes, "The principle of Rule of Law, and administration according to law 'or in other words the sovereignty of law 'was definitely transplanted in this country". Wellesley appointed three regular judges to preside over the Sadar Nizamat Adalat. Later on, this number was increased further. A few measures concerning the judicial organization were taken by William Bentinck. The most remarkable work done during the period of Bentinck was the codification of laws which was first taken up by Lord Cornwallis. In 1833, the Commission headed by Lord Macaulay started its work and its labour resulted in the Indian penal Code, Codes of Civil and Criminal Procedures and other codes of laws.

The British thus introduced a new system of justice and law in India. Separate courts for civil and Criminal cases were established, a new system of law was evolved , the laws were codified , attempts were made to separate the judiciary and the executive though given up during the period of William Bentinck because of financial consideration and efforts were made to establish the Rule of Law and Equality before law in India. All these efforts were probably, well meaning and saved the people from the arbitrary powers of local zamindars, and native rulers and customary laws based on Hindu Shastras and Muslim Shari at as interpreted by the Pandits and the Moulavis respectively .Justice during the British period became costly. The poor people could not afford it. Besides courts were often situated in distant towns and law suits dragged on for years. Thus the common people remained sufferer as before and in practice the system failed to achieve its objectives of establishing the Rule of Law and Equality before Law.

Administrative system

The territories under direct British rule were divided in to three presidencies-Bengal, Madras, and Bombay. The new territories annexed by the British were added to these presidencies. In 1835, British territory to the west of Bihar was separated from Bengal Presidency and made a separate administrative unit called the North -West provinces. Later, Punjab was made a new unit.

To begin with, the administration of the British territories in India was entirely in the hands of the company. In course of time, however, the British government established its effective control

Misrule by Company's Officials

The commercial officials of the Company were the earliest British administrative officials also and in the beginning their job was to collect revenue and do a few other civic duties. The officials made a mess of this job. They were ignorant of the problems and methods of Indian administration. But more disastrous was their immense greed for money. For making the Company richer as well as for building up their personal fortunes, the officials practically plundered Bengal and brought it on the verge of ruin. From peasants and zamindars they demanded much more revenue than they could afford to pay. They also forced the local petty traders and artisans to sell their commodities at cheap prices. Due to these reasons, the people looked upon the new revenue collector with terror coming from outside.

Organization of the Civil services

The “steel frame” of the British administration was its civil service. The miserable failure of the Company’s commercial officials to do administrative jobs because of their corrupt practices, forced Clive and Warren Hastings to adopt some corrective measures. But it was Cornwallis who was the real founder of the British civil service in India. He separated the commercial and revenue branches of administration, banned acceptance of presents by the administrative staff and arranged for paying them handsome salaries. In course of time, the members of this civil service became the highest paid civilians in the world.

Because of the influential position and high salary that the civil service guaranteed, it was very much coveted by the young men of the British aristocratic families. For a long time, one could enter the civil service only through nomination by the Directors of the Company. This enabled a few influential British families to dominate the Company’s civil service. The nomination system continued up to 1853 when a system of open competition through examination was introduced.

Indians were not allowed to enter the civil service. In fact, in 1793 a rule was made that no Indian would be eligible for posts carrying 500 or above as salary. Similar restrictions were imposed on Indians in judiciary, engineering and other services. Not only the East India Company but all influential sections of British society wanted to benefit from their country’s domination over India. They did not like to have Indians as their competitors.

As the responsibilities of the administration grew, the need was felt to train the service personnel in the system of government, social conditions, languages and the traditions prevalent in India. To train the young recruits to the civil service in these matters, the College of Fort William was started in Calcutta in 1801. Later on, for the same purpose, the East India College was set up at Haileybury in England.

British India was divided in two districts corresponding more or less to the Sarkars of the earlier period. In each district there was a Collector to collect revenue, a Magistrate to maintain law and order and a judge to administer justice. In general, the Collector was the head of the district. All the posts were held by members of the civil service. The members of the civil service exercised vast power and gradually built up a tradition of hard work. But they never came close to the Indian people in general. The only Indians they knew were their subordinate staff. The main aim of the members of the civil service was to safeguard the British interests. This made it difficult for them to come close to the Indian people.

Civil Service Administration

The servants of the company who were employed to carry on its trade assumed administrative functions as well when it became a territorial power in India. They proved thoroughly corrupt. They exploited the Indian artisans, merchants, zamindars etc. took bribes and presents from the Indian rajas (kings) and Nawabs and made huge profits by engaging themselves in private trade. Both Clive and Hastings attempted to root out the corruption rampant among them but failed.

Cornwallis was the first Governor-General who tried to organize different branches of public service and, thus, brought the civil service into existence. He also tried to put an end to the corrupt practices existing in the services. He strictly enforced the rules against private trade, increased the salaries of the civil servants, stopped them from taking bribes and presents and laid down that promotion in the services would be on the basis of seniority. Lord Wellesley, when he came to India, realized that while the civil servants enjoyed wide powers and governed extensive areas, most of them came to India at an immature age of eighteen or so and without any training. Therefore, he established the college of Fort William at Calcutta for their education and training. The Directors disapproved of his action and, in 1806, established the East India College at Haileybury in England for imparting two years of training to the young officers nominated for the service in the East. The college at Fort William, however, survived as a language school for the Bengal Civil Servants till 1854. The

appointments to civil services were made by the Directors of the Company till 1853. By and large they filled up these posts with their favourites by nomination. But the Charter Act of 1853 withdrew this privilege from them. It was decided that all recruits to the civil services were to be selected through a competitive examination. In 1858, after the transfer of government of India from the company to the crown, it was decided that the appointments to the civil services would be made by the Secretary of State in council with the advice and help of Her Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners of course, on the basis of a competitive examination.

Administration of Justice

All governments and administrations are based on certain rules and laws which the rulers and the ruled must observe. The governments try to see that these rules and laws are not violated. They establish laws courts where violations of laws are examined and the guilty are punished. The British continued for some time with the laws which were then current in India. According to the Indian tradition personal laws, i.e., laws regarding marriage, inheritance, etc., were governed according to customs and scriptures. The revenue and criminal cases were decided by rulers or judges appointed by them. The British thought it wise not to interfere with this system. For a while the English judges of the Supreme Court which was established in 1774 tried to apply English law. But neither the company's government nor the Indian people liked it. An act of 1781 restricted the application of English law to Englishmen only. But as conditions changed, the need for definite codes to be applicable to the Indians subjects was felt.

This need was met by the Bengal Regulation of 1795. This regulation sound the courts to be doctrines on the rights of persons and property. The Indians according to the provisions contained less. To great extent the Regulation accommodated the personal laws of Hindus and Muslims and stated them in clear terms. It was expected that each individual should know his rights and for that the Regulation was printed and published in English and Indian languages. Thus the administration of justice based on written laws and regulations in place of vague customs and the will of the ruler was founded. Similar regulation were adopted in other parts of British India. In 1833, the Indian Law commission was appointed to codify the Indian system of law and court procedure. Courts to administer justice were set up in every district. The establishment of 'rule of law' by framing laws and setting up courts was a new experience for India. The new sovereign whom the Indians called "Company Bahadur" was not a ruler in flesh and blood.

But rule of law implies that everybody is equal in the eye of law. In British India this was never true. The British and the Indians in British India were neither ruled by the same laws nor tried in the same courts. There were separate courts of the British living in India and only British laws were applied to them.

Military Administration

The beginning of the British Indian Army was made in 1748 when major stringer Lawrence called the father of the British Indian army organised a small band of Indian soldiers at Madras. The wars of conquests and the gradual extension of the empire led to the enlargement of the European recruits and the Royal regiments. In the beginning, the presidencies of Bombay, Madras and Calcutta had their separate armies under separate Commander- in chiefs but, afterwards, the Bengal Army became the Army of the Central Government and its Commander became the Commander in Chief of the Indian forces. Local regiments were also raised afterwards as was the case in Punjab and Oudh. The number of the Indian soldiers went on increasing in the Army and it grew so disproportionate that Lord Dalhousie took recourse to check their numbers. Besides, he increased the number of the English officers and soldiers.

No Indian was assigned an officer's post in the Army. All offices of the Army were British. The highest rank which an Indian could receive was that of a subedar and, in 1856, there were only three Indians getting rupees three hundred per month as salary in the Indian Army.

Yet the Indian soldiers served their masters well. India was mostly conquered for the English by the Indians. Primarily, two factors were responsible for it. One, the Indians lacked the spirit of nationalism. The Indians, at that time, had no concept of belonging to one country. Second, the Indian soldiers had a long tradition of loyal service to those who regularly paid their salaries. The Indians, therefore, proved very good and loyal mercenary soldiers for their British masters.

Police System

Warren Hastings attempted to establish a new police system consisting of the Faujdars and Thanedars. But he did not succeed and gave it up in 178. Therefore, the police duties, remained in the hands of local zamindars. Cornwallis, the next Governor –General, however, succeeded in his attempts. He devided the zamindars of their rights and duties of police functions and established a separate police force. He established thanas (police posts), each of which was kept under a Daroga or superintendent assisted by fifteen to twenty

constables. The Darogas were appointed and controlled by District Magistrates. But the measures of Cornwallis failed to maintain peace and order because the police force was not adequate and the Darogas remained mostly corrupt. In 1807, an effort was made to restore the duties of the police to the zamindars but it did not succeed. However, in 1814 the police force was abolished in Bombay and Madras and the hereditary village officers were given the police duties. The first successful attempt regarding the police was made by Sir Charles Napier in Sindh in 1843. The functions of the Magistrates and superintendents of police were separated, police force was increased and a reasonable degree of discipline was enforced. The system was, later on, adopted in other provinces as well.

Administrative Changes after 1858

Administration

An Act of Parliament in 1858 transferred the power to govern from the East India Company to the British Crown. While authority over India had previously been wielded by the directors of the Company and the Board of Control, now this power was to be exercised by a Secretary of State for India aided by a Council. The Secretary of State was a member of the British Cabinet and as such was responsible to Parliament. Thus the ultimate power over India remained with Parliament.

Under the Act, government was to be carried on as before by the Governor-General who was also given the title of Viceroy or Crown's personal representative. With the passage of time the Viceroy was increasingly reduced to a subordinate status in relation to the British Government in matters of policy. The Secretary of state controlled the minutest details of administration. Thus the authority that exercised final and detailed control and direction over Indian affairs came to reside in London, thousands of miles distant from India. Under such conditions, Indian opinion had even less impact on government policy than before.

In India the Act of 1858 provided that the Governor-General would have an Executive Council whose members were to act as heads of different departments and as his official advisers. The Council discussed all important matters and decided them by a majority vote; but the Governor-General had the power to override any important decision of the Council.

The Indian Councils Act of 1861 enlarged the Governor-General's Council for the purpose of making laws, in which capacity it was known as the Imperial Legislative Council. The Governor-General was authorized to add to his

Executive Council between six and twelve members of whom at least half had to be non-officials who could be Indian or English. The Imperial Legislative Council possessed no real powers and should not be seen as a sort of elementary or weak parliament. It was merely an advisory body. It could not discuss any important measures and no financial measures at all, without the previous approval of the Government. It has no control over the budget. It could not discuss the actions of the administration; the members could not even ask questions about them. In other words, the Legislative Council had no control over the executive. Moreover, no bill passed by it could become an Act till it was approved by the Governor-General. On top of all this, the Secretary of State could disallow any of its Acts. Thus, the only important function of the Legislative Council was to give official measures and give them the appearance of having been passed by a legislative body. In theory, the non-official Indian members were added to the Council to represent Indian views. But the Indian members of the Legislative Council were few in number and were not elected by the Indian people but were nominated by the Governor-General whose choice invariably fell on princes and their ministers, big zamindars, big merchants, or retired senior government officials. They were thoroughly unrepresentative of the Indian people or of the growing nationalist opinion.

Provincial Administration: The British had divided India for administrative convenience into provinces, three of which—Bengal, Madras and Bombay—were known as Presidencies. The Presidencies were administered by a Governor and his Executive Council of three, who were appointed by the Crown. The Presidency governments possessed more rights and powers than governments of other provinces which were administered by Lieutenant Governors and Chief Commissioners appointed by the Governor-General.

The provincial governments enjoyed a great deal of autonomy before 1833 when their power to pass laws was taken away and their expenditure subjected to strict central control. But experience soon showed that a vast country like India could not be efficiently administered on the principle of strict centralization.

The evil of extreme centralization was most obvious in the field of finance. The revenues from all over the country and from different sources were gathered at the centre and then distributed by it to the provincial governments. The Central Government exercised strict control over the smallest details of provincial expenditure. But this system proved quite wasteful in practice. It was not possible for the Central Government to supervise the efficient collection of revenues by a provincial government or to keep adequate check over its expenditure. The authorities there for decided to decentralize public finance.

The first step in the direction of separating central and provincial finances was taken in 1870 by Lord Mayo. The provincial governments were granted fixed sums out of central revenues for the administration of certain services like Police, Jails, Education, Medical Services, and Road and were asked to administer them as they wished. Lord Mayo's scheme was enlarged in 1877 by Lord Lytton who transferred to the provinces certain other heads of expenditure like Land Revenues, Excise, General Administration, and Law and Justice. To meet the additional expenditure a provincial government was to get a fixed share of the income realized from that province from certain sources like Stamps, Excise Taxes, and Income Tax. Further changes in these arrangements were made in 1882. The system of giving fixed grants to the provinces was ended and, instead, a province was to get the entire income from certain sources or revenues within it and a fixed share of the income from other sources. Thus, all sources of revenue were now divided into three- general, provincial, and those to be divided between the centre and the provinces.

The different measures of financial decentralization discussed above did not really mean the beginning of genuine provincial autonomy or of Indian participation in provincial administration. They were much more in the nature of administrative reorganization whose chief aims were to keep down expenditure and increase income. In theory as well as in practice, the Central Government remained supreme and continued to exercise effective and detailed control over the provincial governments. This was inevitable, for both the Central Government and the provincial governments were completely subordinated to the Secretary of State and the British Government.

Local Bodies: Financial difficulties led the Government to further decentralize administration by promoting local Government through municipalities and district boards. The Industrial Revolution. Gradually transformed European economy and society in the 19th century. India's increasing contact with Europe and new modes of imperialism and economic exploitation made it necessary that some of the European advances in economy, sanitation, and education should be transplanted in India. Moreover, the rising Indian nationalist movement demanded the introduction of modern improvements in civic life. Thus the need for the education of the masses, sanitation, water supply, better roads, and other civic amenities was increasingly felt. The Government could no longer afford to ignore it. But its finances were already in disorder due to heavy expenditure on the army and the railways. It could not increase its income through new taxes as the burden of the existing taxation was already very heavy on the poor and further addition to it was likely to create discontent against the Government. On the other hand, the Government did not want to tax the upper classes, especially

the British civil servants, planters and trades. But the authorities felt that the people would not mind paying new taxes if they knew that their proceeds would be spent on their own welfare. It was therefore decided to transfer local services like education, health, sanitation and water supply to local bodies who would finance them through local taxes. Many Englishmen and pressed for the formation of local bodies on another ground also. They believed that associating Indians with the administration in some capacity or the other would prevent their becoming politically disaffected. This association could take place at the level of local bodies without in any way endangering British monopoly of power in India.

Local bodies were first formed between 1864 and 1868, but almost in every case they consisted of nominated members and were presided over by District Magistrates. They did not, therefore, represent local self- Government at all. Nor did the intelligent Indians accept them as such. They looked upon them as instruments for the extraction of additional taxes from the people.

A step forward, though a very hesitant and inadequate one, was taken in 1882 by Lord Ripon's Government. A government resolution laid down the policy of administering local affairs largely through rural and urban local bodies, a majority of whose members would be non- officials. These non- official members would be elected by the people wherever and whenever officials felt that it was possible to introduce elections. The resolution also permitted the election of a non- official as Chairman of a local body. But the elected members were in minority in all the district boards and in many of the municipalities. They were, moreover, elected by a small number of voters since the right to vote was severely restricted. District officials continued to act as presidents of district board through non- officials gradually became chairmen of municipal committees. The Government also retained the right to exercise strict control over the activities of the local bodies and to suspend and supersede them at its own discretion. The result was that except in the Presidency cities of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, the local bodies functioned just like department of the Government and were in no way good examples of local self- government. All the same, the politically conscious Indians welcomed Ripon's resolution and worked actively in these local bodies in the hope that in time they could be transformed into effective organs of local self- government.

Changes in the Army

The Indian army was carefully reorganized after 1858, most of all to prevent the recurrence of another revolt. The rulers had seen that their bayonets were the only secure foundation of their rule. Several steps were taken to minimize, if not completely eliminate, if not completely eliminate, the capacity of

Indian soldiers to revolt. Firstly, the domination of the army by its European branch was carefully guaranteed. The proportion of Europeans to Indians in the army was raised and fixed at one to two in the Bengal Army and two to five in the Madras and Bombay armies. Moreover, the European troops were kept in key geographical and military positions. The crucial branches of the army like artillery and, later in the 20th century, tanks and armoured corps were put exclusively in European hands. The older policy of excluding Indians from the officer corps was strictly maintained. Till 1914 no Indian could rise higher than the rank of a subedar. Secondly, the organization of the Indian section of the army was based on the policy of balance and counterpoise' or 'divide and rule' so as to prevent its chance of uniting again in an anti- British uprising. Discrimination on the basis of caste, region and religion was practiced in recruitment to the army. A fiction was created that Indians consisted of 'martial' and 'non-martial' classes. Soldiers from Oudh, Bihar, central India, and south India, who had first helped the British conquer India but had later taken part in the Revolt of 1857, were declared to be non- martial. They were no longer taken in the army on a large scale. On the other hand, Punjabis, Gurkhas, and Pathans who had assisted in the suppression of the revolt, were declared to be martial and were recruited in large numbers. By 1875, half of the British Indian regiments were made a mixture of various castes and groups which were so placed as to balance each other. Communal, caste, tribal and regional loyalties were encouraged among the soldiers so that the sentiment of nationalism would not grow among them. For example, caste and communal companies were introduced in most regiments.

Thus the Indian Army remained a purely mercenary force. Moreover, every effort was made to keep it separated from the life and thoughts of the rest of the population. It was isolated from nationalist ideas by every possible means. Newspapers, journals and nationalist publications were prevented from reaching the soldiers. But, as we shall see later, all such efforts failed in the long run and section of the Indian army played an important role in India's struggle for freedom.

The Indian army became in time a very costly military machine. In 1904 it absorbed nearly 52 per cent of the Indian revenues. This was because it served more than one purpose. India, being the most prized colonial possession of the time, had to be constantly defended from the competing imperialisms of Russia, France and Germany. This led to a big increase in the size of the Indian army. Secondly, the Indian troops were not maintained for India's defence alone. The Indian army was the chief instruments for the expansion and consolidation of British power and possessions in Asia and Africa. Lastly, the British section of

the army served as an army of occupation. It was the ultimate guarantee of the British hold over the country. Its cost had, however, to be met by the Indian revenues; it was in fact a very heavy burden on them.

Administrative Policies

The British attitude towards India and, consequently, their policies in India changed for the worse after the Revolt of 1857. While before 1857 they had tried, however half-heartedly and hesitatingly, to modernize India, they now consciously began to follow reactionary policies. As the historian Percival Spear has put it, "the Indian Government's honey-moon with progress was over".

We have seen above how the organs of administrative control in India and in England, the Indian army and the Civil Service were reorganized to exclude Indians from an effective share in administration. Previously at least lip-service had been paid to the idea that the British were 'training' and 'preparing' the Indians for self-government and would eventually transfer political power to their hands. The view was now openly put forward that because of their inherent social and cultural defects the Indians were unfit to rule themselves and that they must be ruled by Britain for an indefinite period. This reactionary policy was reflected in many fields.

Divide and Rule: The British had conquered India by taking advantage of the disunity among the Indian powers and by playing them against one another. After 1858 they continued to follow this policy of divide and rule by turning the princes against the people, province against province, caste against caste, group against group and, above all, Hindus against Muslims.

The unity displayed by Hindus and Muslims during the Revolt of 1857 had disturbed the foreign rulers. They were determined to break this unity so as to weaken the rising nationalist movement. In fact, they missed no opportunity to do so. Immediately after the Revolt they repressed Muslims, confiscated their lands and property on a large scale, and declared Hindus to be their favourites. After 1870 this policy was reversed and an attempt was made to turn upper class and middle class Muslims against the nationalist movement.

The Government cleverly used the attractions of government service to create a split along religious lines among the educated Indians. Because of industrial and commercial backwardness and the near-absence of social service, the educated Indians depended almost entirely on Government service for employment. There was few other opening for them. This led to keen competition among them for the available Government posts. The Government utilized this

competition to fan provincial and communal rivalry and hatred. It promised official favours on a communal basis in return for loyalty and so played the educated the educated Hindus.

Hostility to Educated Indians: The Government of India had actively encouraged modern education after 1833. The Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras were started in 1857 and higher education spread rapidly thereafter. Many British officials commended the refusal by educated Indians to participate in the Revolt of 1857. But this favourable official attitude towards the educated Indians soon changed because some of them had begun to use their recently acquired modern knowledge to analyze the imperialistic character of British rule and to put forward demands for Indian participation in administration. The officials became actively hostile to higher education and to the educated Indians when the latter began to organize a nationalist movement among the people and founded the Indian National Congress in 1885. The officials now took active steps to curtail higher education.

Thus the British turned against that group of Indians who had imbibed modern western knowledge and who stood for progress along modern lines. Such progress was, however, opposed to the basic interests and policies of British imperialism in India. The official opposition to the educated Indians and higher education shows that British rule in India had already exhausted whatever potentialities for progress it originally possessed.

Attitude towards the Zamindars: while being hostile to the forward- looking educated Indians, the British now turned for friendship to the most reactionary group of Indians, the princes, the zamindars, and the landlords. We have already examined above the changed policy towards the princes and the official attempt to use them as a dam against the rise of popular and nationalist movements. The Zamindars and landlords too were placated in the same manner. For example, the lands of most of the talukdars of Oudh were restored to them. The Zamindars and landlords were now hailed as the traditional and 'natural' leaders of the Indian people. Their interests and privileges were protected. They were secured in the possession of their land at the cost of the peasants and were utilized as counterweights against the nationalist minded intelligentsia. The Viceroy Lord Lytton openly declared in 1876 that "the Crown of England should hence forth be identified with the hopes, the aspirations, the sympathies and interests of a powerful native aristocracy". The Zamindars and landlords in return recognized that their position was closely bound up with the maintenance of the British rule and became its firm supporters.

Attitude towards Social Reforms: As a part of the policy of alliance with the conservative classes, the British abandoned their previous policy of helping the social reformers. They believed that their measures of social reform, such as the abolition of the custom of sati and permission to widows to remarry, had been a major cause of the Revolt of 1857. They, therefore, gradually began to side with orthodox opinion and stopped their support to the reformers.

Thus, as Jawaharlal Nehru has put it in the 'Discovery of India', "Because of this natural alliance of the British power with the reactionaries in India, it became the guardian and upholder of many an evil custom and practice, which it otherwise condemned". In fact, the British were in this respect on the horns of a dilemma. If they favoured social reform and passed laws to this effect, the orthodox Indians opposed them and declared that a Government of foreigners had no right to interfere in the internal social affairs of the Indians. On the other hand, if they did not pass such laws, they helped perpetuate social evils and were condemned by socially progressive Indians. It may, however, be noted that the British did not always remain neutral on social questions. By supporting the status quo they indirectly gave protection to existing social evils. Moreover, by encouraging casteism and communalism for political purposes, they actively encouraged social reaction.

Extreme Backwardness of Social Services: While social services like education, sanitation and public health, water supply, and rural roads made rapid progress in Europe during the 19th century, in India they remained at an extremely backward level. The Government of India spent most of its large income on the army and wars and the administrative services, and starved the social services. For example, in 1886, of its total net revenue of nearly Rs.47 crore the Government of India spent nearly Rs.19.41 crore on the army and Rs.17 crore on civil administration but less than Rs.2 crore on education, medicine, and public health, and only Rs.65 lakh on irrigation. The few halting steps that were taken in the direction of providing services like sanitation, water supply and public health were usually confined to urban areas, and that too to the so-called civil lines or British or modern parts of the cities. They mainly served the Europeans and a handful of upper class Indians who lived in the European part of the cities.

Labour Legislation: The condition of workers in modern factories and plantations in the 19th century was miserable. They had to work between 12 and 16 hours a day and there was no weekly day of rest. Women and children worked the same long hours as men. The wages were extremely low, ranging from Rs.4 to 20 per month. The factories were overcrowded, badly lighted and aired, and completely unhygienic. Work on machines was hazardous, and accidents very common.

The Government of India, which was generally pro-capitalist, took some half hearted and totally inadequate steps to mitigate the sorry state of affairs in the modern factories, many of which were owned by Indians. In this it was only in part moved by humanitarian considerations. The manufacturers of Britain put constant pressure on it to pass factory laws. They were afraid that cheap labour would enable Indian manufacturers to outsell them in the Indian market. The first Indian Factory Act was passed in 1881. The Act dealt primarily with the problem of child labour. It laid down that children between 7 and 12 would work for more than 9 hours a day. Children would also get four holidays in a month. The Act also provided for the proper fencing off of dangerous machinery. The second Indian Factories Act was passed in 1891. It provided for a weekly holiday for all workers. Working hours for women were fixed at 11 per day, whereas daily hours of work for children were reduced to 7. Hours of work for men were still left unregulated.

Neither of the two Acts applied to British – owned tea and coffee plantations. On the contrary, the Government gave every help to the foreign planters to exploit their workers in a most ruthless manner. Most of the tea plantations were situated in Assam which was very thinly populated and had an unhealthy climate. Labour to work in the plantations had therefore to be brought from outside. The planters would not attract workers from outside by paying high wages. Instead they used coercion and fraud to recruit them and then keep them as virtual slaves on the plantations. The Government of India gave planters full help and passed penal laws in 1863, 1865, 1870, 1873 and 1882 to enable them to do so. Once a labourer had signed a contract to go and work in a plantation, he could not refuse to do so. Any breach of contract by a labourer was a criminal offence, the planter also having the power to arrest him.

Restriction on the press: The British had introduced the printing press in India and thus initiated the development of the modern press. The educated Indians had immediately recognized that the Press could play a great role in educating public opinion and in influencing government policies through criticism and censure. Rammonhun Roy, Vidyasagar, Dadbahai Naoraji, Justice Ranade, Surendranath Banerjea, Lokamany Tialak, G. Subramaniya Iyer, C. Karunakara Menon, Madan Mohan Malaviya, Lala Lajpat Rai, Bipin Chandra Pal, and other Indian leaders played an important part in starting news papers and making them a powerful political force. The Press gradually became a major weapon of the nationalist movement.

The Indian Press was feed of restriction by Charles Metcalf in 1835. This step was welcomed enthusiastically by the educated Indians. It was one of the reasons why they had for sometime supported British rule in India. But the nationalists gradually began to use the Press to arouse national consciousness among the people and to sharply criticize the reactionary policies of the Government. This turned the officials against the Indian Press and they decided to curb its freedom. This was attempted by passing the Vernacular Press Act in 1878. This Act put serious restrictions on the freedom of the Indian public opinion was now fully aroused and it protested loudly against the passage of this Act. This protest had immediate effect and the Act. This protest had immediate effect and the Act was repealed in 1882. For nearly 25 years thereafter the Indian Press enjoyed considerable freedom. But the rise of the militant Swedish and Boycott Movement after 1905 once again led to the enactment of repressive Press laws in 1908 and 1910.

Impact of Colonial knowledge

Making of Indian Middle class

The major social section of the population that came to form the back bone of the nationalist movement was that of the middle classes. New opportunities had opened to these groups in the first half of the 19th century when the British recruited an entire army of petty government servants and by opening new schools and law courts created new jobs and professions. By the end of the 19th century , even the limited number of educated Indians –fewer in the whole of India than at present in a small territory such as Delhi were faced with growing unemployment. Moreover even those who found jobs discovered that most of the better paid jobs were reserved for the English middle and upper classes. In particular employment prospects became increasingly bleak for those who were forced to drop out from the universities without getting a B.A.degree. The middle and lower middle class Indians soon realized that only a country that was economically developing and socially and culturally modern could provide them economic and cultural opportunities to lead a worthwhile and meaningful life and above all save them from rapid impoverishment, unemployment, and loss of socio economic status.

Nationalist Critique of Colonial Economy

In colonial India, the Indian national movement was the most deeply and firmly rooted in an understanding of the nature and character of colonial economic domination and exploitation. Its early leaders, known as Moderates, were the first in the 19th century to develop and economic critique of colonialism.

This critique was, also, perhaps their most important contribution to the development of the national movement in India- and the themes built around it were later popularized on a massive scale and formed the very pith and marrow of the nationalist agitation through popular lectures, pamphlets, newspapers, dramas, songs, and prabhat pheires.

Indian intellectuals of the first half of the 19th century had adopted a positive attitude towards British rule in the hope that Britain, the most advanced nation of the time, would help modernize India. In the economic realm, Britain, the emerging industrial giant of the world, was expected to develop India's productive forces through the introduction of modern sciences and technology and capitalist economic organization. It is not that the early Indian nationalist were unaware of the many political, psychological and economic disabilities of foreign domination, but they still supported colonial rule as they expected it to rebuild India as a spit image of the western metropolis.

The process of disillusionment set in gradually after 1860 as the reality of social development in India failed to conform to their hopes. They began to notice that while progress in new directions was slow and halting, overall country was regressing and under developing, Gradually, their image of British rule began to take on darker hues; and they began to probe deeper into the reality of British rule and its impact on India.

Three names sand out among the large number of Indians who initiated and carried out the economic analysis of British rule during the years 1870-1905. The tallest of the three was Dadabhai Naoroji, known in the pre-Gandhian era as the Grand Old Man of India. Born in 1825, he became a successful businessman but devoted his entire life and wealth to the creation of a national movement in India. His near contemporary, Justive Mahadeve Govind Ranade, taught an entire generation of Indians the value of modern industrial development. Romesh Chandra Dutt, a retired ICS officer, published the Economic History of India at the beginning of the 10th century in which he examined in minute details the entire economic record of colonial rule since 1757.

These three leaders along with G.V. Joshi, G. Subramaniya Iyer, G.K. Gokhale, Prithwis Chandra Ray and hundreds of other political workers and journalists analyzed every aspect of the economy and subjected the entire range of economic issues and colonial economic policies to minute scrutiny. They raised basic questions regarding the nature and purpose of British rule. Eventually, they were able to trace the process of the colonialization of the Indian economy and conclude that colonialism was the main obstacle to India's economic development.

They clearly understood the fact that the essence of British imperialism lay in the subordination of the Indian economy to the British economy. They delineated the colonial structure in all its three aspects of domination through trade, industry and finance. They were able to see that colonialism no longer functioned through the crude tools of plunder and tribute and mercantilism but operated through the more disguised and complex mechanism of free trade and foreign capital investment. The essence of 19th century colonialism, they said, lay in the transformation of India into a supplier of food stuffs and raw materials to the metropolis, a market for the metropolitan manufacturers, and a field for the investment of British capital.

The early Indian national leaders were simultaneously learners and teachers. They organized powerful intellectual agitations against nearly all the important official economic policies. They used these agitations to both understand and to explain to others the basis of these policies in the colonial structure. They advocated the severance of India's economic subservience to Britain in every sphere of life and agitated for an alternative path of development which would lead to an independent economy. An important feature of this agitation was the use of bold, hard hitting and colourful language.

The nationalist economic agitation started with the assertion that Indian was poor and was growing poorer every day. Dadabhai Narorji made and British public to the 'continuous impoverishment and exhaustion of the country' and 'the wretched, heart-rending, blood-boiling condition of India' Day after day he declaimed from public platforms and in the Press that the Indian 'is starving, he is dying off at the slightest touch, living on insufficient food'.

The early nationalists did not see this all-encompassing poverty as inherent and unavoidable, a visitation from God or nature. It was seen as man-made and, therefore, capable of being explained and removed. As R.C. Dutt put it: 'If India is poor today, it is through the operation of economic causes. In the course of their search for the causes of India's poverty, the nationalist underlined factors and forces which had been brought into play by the colonial rulers and the colonial structure.

The problem of poverty was, moreover, seen as the problem of increasing of the 'productive capacity and energy, of the people, in other words as the problem of national development. This approach made poverty a broad national issued and helped to unite, instead of divide, different regions and section of Indian society.

They early nationalists accepted with remarkable unanimity that the complete economic transformation of the country on the basis of modern technology and capitalist enterprise was the primary goal of all their economic policies. Industrialism, it was further believed, represented, to quote G.V.Joshi, 'a superior type and a higher stage of civilization; or, on the words of Ranade, factories could 'far more effectively than Schools and Colleges give a new birth to the activities of the Nation'. Modern industry was also seen as a major force which could help unite the diverse peoples of India into a single national entity having common interests. Consequently, because of their whole-hearted devotion to the cause of industrialization, the early nationalists looked upon all other issues such as foreign trade, railways, tariffs, currency and exchange, finance, and labour legislation in relation to this paramount aspect.

Ever since the 1840s, British economists, statesman and officials have seen the investment of foreign capital, along with law and order, as the major instrument for the development of India. John Stuart Mill and Alfred Marshal had put forward this view in their economic treatises. In 1899, Lord Curzon, the Viceroy, said that foreign capital was 'a sine qua non to the national advancement' of India.

The early nationalists disagreed vehemently with this view. They saw foreign capital as an unmitigated evil which did not develop a country but exploited and impoverished it. Or, as Dadabahi Naoroji popularly put it, foreign capital represented the 'despoliation' and 'exploitation' of Indian resources. Similarly, the editor of the Hindustan Review and Kayastha Samachar described the use of foreign capital as 'a system of international deprecation'.

In essence, the early nationalist asserted that genuine economic development was possible only if Indian itself initiated and developed the process of industrialization. Foreign capital would neither undertake nor could it fulfil this task.

According to the early nationalist, the political consequences of foreign capital investment were no less harmful, for the penetration of a country by foreign capital inevitably led to its political subjugation. Foreign capital investment created vested interests which demanded security for investors and, therefore, perpetuated foreign rule. A major problem the early nationalists highlighted was that of the progressive decline and ruin of India's traditional handicrafts. Nor was this industrial prostration accidental, they said. It was the result of the deliberate policy of stamping out Indian industries in the interests of British manufactures.

The British administrators, on the other hand, pointed with pride to the rapid growth of India's foreign trade and the rapid construction of railways as instruments of India's development as well as proof of its growing prosperity. However, the nationalists said that because of their negative impact on indigenous industries, foreign trade and railways represented not economic development but colonization and underdevelopment of the economy. What mattered in the case of foreign trade they maintained, was not its volume but its pattern or the nature of goods internationally exchanged and their impact on national industry and agriculture. And this pattern had undergone drastic changes during the 19th century, the bias being overwhelmingly towards the export of raw materials and the import of manufactured goods.

Similarly, the early nationalists pointed out that the railways had not been coordinated with India's industrial needs. They had, therefore, ushered in a commercial and not an industrial revolution which enabled imported foreign goods to undersell domestic industrial products. Moreover, they said that the benefits of railway construction in terms of encouragement to the steel and machine industry and to capital investment -what today we would call backward and forward linkages- had been reaped by Britain and not India.

According to the early nationalists, a major obstacle to rapid industrial development was the policy of free trade which was, on the one hand, ruining India's handicraft industries and, on the other, forcing the infant and underdeveloped modern industries into a premature and unequal and, hence, unfair and disastrous competition with the highly organized and developed industries of the West. The tariff policy of the Government convinced the nationalist that British economic policies in India were basically guided by the interests of the British capitalist class.

The early nationalists strongly criticized the colonial pattern of finance. Taxes were so raised, they averred, as to overburden the poor while letting the rich, especially the foreign capitalists and bureaucrats, go scot-free. To vitiate this, they demanded the reduction of land revenue and abolition of the salt tax and supported the imposition of income tax and import duties on products which the rich and the middle classes consumed. On the expenditure side, they pointed out the emphasis was on serving Britain's imperial needs while the development and welfare departments were starved. In particular, they condemned the high expenditure on the army which was used by the British to conquer and maintain imperialist control over large parts of Asia and Africa.

The important point of the nationalist critique of colonialism was the drain theory. The nationalist leaders pointed out that a large part of India's capital and wealth was being transferred or 'drained' to Britain in the form of salaries and pensions of British civil and military officials working in India, interest on loans taken by the Indian Government, profits of British capitalists in India, and the Home Charges or expenses of the Indian Government in Britain.

The drain took the form of an excess of exports over imports for which India got no economic or material return. According to the nationalist calculations, this drain amounted to one-half of Government revenues, more than the entire land revenue collection, and over one-third of India's total savings.

The acknowledged high-priest of the drain theory was Dadabahi Naoroji. It was in May 1867 that Dadabahi Naoroji put forward the idea that Britain was draining and 'bleeding' India. From then on for nearly half a century he launched a raging campaign against the drain, hammering at the theme through every possible form of public communication. The drain, he declared, was the basis cause of India's poverty and the fundamental evil of British rule in India. Thus, he argued in 1880: 'It is not the pitiless operations of economic laws, but it is the thoughtless and pitiless action of the British policy; it is the pitiless eating of India's substance in India, and the further pitiless drain to England; in short, it is the pitiless perversion of economic laws by the sad bleeding to which India is subjected, that is destroying India.'

Other nationalist leaders, journalists and propagandists followed in the foot-steps of Dadabahi Naoroji, R.C. Dutt, for example, made the drain the major theme of this Economic History of India. He protested that 'taxation raised by a king, says the Indian poet, is like the moisture sucked up by the sun, to be retired to the earth as fertilizing rain; but the moisture raised from the Indian soil now descends as fertilizing rain largely on other lands, not on India. So great and Economic Drain out of the resources of a land would impoverish the most prosperous countries on earth, it has reduced India to a land of famines more frequent, more widespread, and more fatal, than any known before in the history of India, or of the world'.

The drain theory incorporated all the threads of the nationalist critique of colonialism, for the drain denuded India of the productive capital its agriculture and industries so desperately needed. Indeed, the drain theory was the high watermark of the nationalist leaders' comprehensive; inter related and integrated economic analysis of the colonial situation. Through the drain theory, the exploitative character of British rule could be made visible. By attacking the drain, the nationalists were able to call into question, in an uncompromising manner, the economic essence of imperialism.

Moreover, the drain theory possessed the great political merit of being easily grasped by a nation of peasants. Money being transferred from one country to another was the most easily understood of the theories of economic exploitation, for the peasant daily underwent this experience vis-à-vis the state, landlords, money lenders, lawyers and priests. No other idea could arouse people more than the thought that they were being taxed so that others in far off lands might live in comfort. No drain was the type of slogan that all successful movements' need it did not have to be proved by sophisticated and complex arguments. It has a sort of immanent quality about it; it was practically self-evident. Nor could the foreign rulers do anything to appease the people on this question. Modern colonialism was inseparable from the drain. The contradiction between the Indian people and British imperialism was seen. British imperialism was seen by people to be insoluble except by the overthrow of British rule. It was therefore, inevitable that the drain theory became the main staple of nationalist political agitation during the Gandhi era.

This agitation on economic issues contributed to the undermining of the ideological hegemony of the alien rulers over Indian minds, that is, of the foundations of colonial rule in the minds of the people. Any regime is politically secure only so long as the people have a basic faith in its moral purpose, in its benevolent character- that is, they believe that the rulers are basically motivated by the desire to work for their welfare. It is this belief which leads them to support the regime or to at least acquiesce in its continuation. It provides legitimacy to a regime- in this belief lie its moral foundations.

The economic development of India was offered as the chief justification for British rule by the imperialist rulers and spokesmen. The Indian nationalist controverted it forcefully and asserted that India was economically backward precisely because the British were ruling it in the interests of British trade, industry and capital, and that poverty and backwardness were the inevitable consequences of colonial rule.

It was above all Dadabhai Naoroji who in his almost daily articles and speeches hammered home this point. 'The face of the country was carried on by the British though 'unaccompanied with any open compulsion or violence to person or property which the world can see and be horrified with'. And, again: 'Under the present evil and unrighteous administration of Indian expenditure, the romance is the beneficence of the British Rule, the reality is the "bleeding" of the British Rule'.

In the course of their economic agitation, the nationalist leaders liked nearly every important economic question with the politically subordinated status of the country. Step by step, issue by issue, they began to draw the conclusion that since the British Indian administration was 'only the handmaid to the task of exploitation', pro- Indian and developmental policies would be followed. Only by a regime in which Indians had control over political power.

The result was that even though most of the early nationalist leaders were moderate in politics and political methods, and many of them still professed loyalty to British rule, they cut at the political roots of the empire and sowed in the land the seeds of disaffection and disloyalty and even sedition. This was one of the major reasons why the period 1875 to 1905 became a period of intellectual unrest and of spreading national consciousness- the seed- time of the modern Indian national movement.

While until the end of the 19th century, Indian nationalists confined their political demands to a share in political power and control over the purse, by 1905 most of the prominent nationalist were putting forward the demand for some form of self- government.

The nationalists of the 20th century were to rely heavily on the main themes of their economic critique of colonialism. These themes were then to reverberate in Indian cities, towns and villages, carried there by the youthful agitators of the Gandhi an era. Based on this foundation, the later nationalists went on to stage powerful mass agitations and mass movements. At the same time, because of this firm foundation, they would not, unlike in China, Egypt and many other colonial and semi-colonial countries, waver in their anti- imperialism.

Challenges in the field of Culture

Question of Social reform Movement

Britain's relationship with her Indian colony was one of political subordination, but economic exploitation formed the core of this relationship. This process of colonization was geared clearly to benefit the mother country, even at the cost of the colony.

As a result of British rule, India was transformed by the end of the 19th century in to a classic colony. It was a major market for British manufacturers, a big source of raw materials and food stuffs, and an important field for the investment of British capital. Its agriculture was highly taxed for the benefit of imperial interests. The bulk of the transport system, modern mines and

industries, foreign trade, coastal and international shipping, and banks, and insurance companies were all under foreign control. The Indian army acted as the chief instrument for maintaining the far flung British Empire and protecting and promoting British imperial interests in East, South-east, Central and West Asia and North, East and South Africa.

Indian economy and social development were completely subordinated to British economy and social development. Indian economy was integrated in to the world capitalist economy in a subordinate position and with a peculiar international division of labour.

Phases of British colonialism

Colonial exploitation was carried on broadly through three phases. The first phase (1757-1813) of 'mercantilism' was one of direct plunder in which surplus Indian revenues were used to buy Indian finished goods to be exported to England. Absence of large scale import of British goods, no basic changes in the colony's administration, judiciary, culture, economy, etc. In the second phase (1813-1858) of free trade or Laissez-faire India was converted into a source of raw material and a market for British manufactured goods. Determination of the administrative policies and economic structure of the colony by the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie of the metropolis. Making the colony a subordinate trading partner which would export raw materials and import manufactured goods. Transformation of the colony's economy, polity, administration, society, culture and ideology under the guise of development and modernization in order to exploit it in the new and more sophisticated way. The third phase (1858 onwards) was one of finance imperialism in which British capital controlled banks, foreign trading firms and managing agencies in India. Intensive struggle for new, secure and exclusive markets and for sources of raw materials among the industrialized countries. And consequent export of capital by these countries to the colonies. Replacement of liberal policies by reactionary ones in the administration of colonies. This 'First Phase' is generally dated from 1757, when the British East India Company acquired the rights to collect revenue from its territories in the eastern and southern parts of the districts. From 1757 the British had used their control over India to promote their own interests. But it would be wrong to think that the basic character of their rule remained the same throughout. It passes several stages in its long history of nearly 200 years. The nature of British rule and imperialism, as also its policies and impact, changed with changing pattern of Britain's own social, economic and political development.

To begin with, that is, even before 1757, the English East India Company was interested only in making money. It wanted a monopoly of the trade with India and the East, so that there would be no other English or European merchants or trading companies to compete with it. The company also did not want the Indian merchants to compete with it for the purchase in India or sale abroad of Indian products. In other words, the company wanted to sell its products at as high a price as possible and buy Indian products as cheaply as possible so that it could make the maximum profits. This would not be possible if there was ordinary trade in which various companies and persons competed. It was easy enough to keep out its English competitors by using bribery and various other economic and political means to persuade the British government to grant the East India Company a monopoly of the right to trade with India and the East.

About this time British capitalism was also beginning to enter its most vigorous phase of development. To develop more and more, it needed immense capital for investment in industries, trade and agriculture. As the resources for such investments were limited in Britain at that time the capitalists began to look to the plundering of foreign countries for finding the necessary capital for the development of British capitalism.

Both the objectives – the monopoly of trade and control over financial resources – were rapidly fulfilled and beyond the imagination of the East India Company when Bengal and south India rapidly came under the Company's political control during the 1750's and 1760's.

At the same time the Company used its political power to acquire monopolistic control over Indian trade and production. The Indian merchants were gradually squeezed out, while the weavers and other craftsmen were compelled either to sell their products at uneconomic rate or to hire themselves out to the company at low wages.

In the intellectual field no attempt was made to spread modern ideas which were changing the entire way of life in the west. Only two educational institutions were started during the second half of the 18th century, one at Calcutta and other at Benares. Both were centres for traditional Persian and Sanskrit learning. Even Christian missionaries were kept out of the Company's dominions. It should also be remembered that India was conquered by the East India Company at a time when the era of the great mercantilist trading corporations was already over in Britain. Within British society, the company represented the dying and not the rising, social forces.

The British had come to India in the seventeenth century, purely as a trading company, backed by an exclusive royal charter to trade with India, from their Queen, Elizabeth I. They set up their first 'factory' on the banks of the Hugli River in Bengal. The Company had managed to acquire permits or a 'dastak' from the Mughal emperor that exempted it from having to pay duties on its trade. This led to a great deal of corruption among the employees of the Company, as the 'Farman' was widely misused by them for their private trade. It also meant heavy losses in revenue for the Bengal governors (later nawabs) in way of customs duties. This became a contentious issue and one of the chief factors, which led to the Battle of Plassey, fought in 1757. The primary function of the British East India Company in this period was to buy spices, cotton and silk from India and sell them at huge profits to the large market these goods enjoyed in Britain. This meant that large quantities of bullion would flow out of Britain into India to pay for these commodities. Despite efforts, it seemed difficult to find British goods that could be sold in India in exchange, to stem this outflow of bullion. Besides the expenditure on buying commodities, the Company also spent very large amounts on the wars that it had to fight with other European powers, all in search of the same goods to trade in. These included the Portuguese, the Dutch and the French. Thus the acquisition of 'diwani' (right to collect revenue) in Bengal, after the Battle of Buxar, which followed the Battle of Plassey, opened the way for the Company to raise money for its expenditure in India .

The 'Second Phase' is generally seen to have begun with the charter Act of 1813, when the Company lost its monopoly trading rights in India, and ended in 1858, when the British crown took over the direct control and administration of all British territory in India.

Immediately after the East India Company became a territorial power in India, an intense struggle broke out in Britain as to whose interests the newly acquired empire would serve. Year after year the company was made to yield ground to the other commercial and industrial interests in Britain. Britain had in the mean time undergone the industrial revolution. This made her the leading manufacturing and exporting country in the world. The industrial revolution was also responsible for a major change inside Britain itself. The industrial capitalists became in course of time the dominant elements in the British economy with powerful political influence. The British industrialists did not gain much from the monopolization of the export of Indian handicrafts or the direct appropriation of Indian revenues. Britain now wanted India as a subordinate trading partner, as a market to be exploited and as a dependent colony to produce and supply the raw materials and food stuffs Britain needed.

As the Company's profits grew, the support they enjoyed from the British government became precarious. Earlier many members of the parliament had 'East Indian' interests, who used the Company's resources to maintain their patronage within the government. But as unprecedented levels of industrialization were achieved in Britain, there was a gradual change in the constitution of the parliament. Adam Smith's book, 'An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations', heralded a new school of economic thought, which critiqued the idea of companies enjoying exclusive monopolies and lobbied for a government policy of 'free trade' or 'laissez faire'. In a bid to acquire greater control over the Company's earnings, the parliament started attacking individual Company officials with charges of 'misconduct'. The 'Free Traders', dominant in the parliament with the turn into the 19th century, demanded free access to India, which led to the passing of the Charter Act of 1813, thus ending the monopoly enjoyed by the Company in India, while subordinating its territorial possessions to the overall sovereignty of the British crown. 'Free Trade' changed the nature of the Indian colony completely, through a dual strategy. Firstly it threw open Indian markets for the entry of cheap, mass-produced, machine-made British goods, which enjoyed little or almost no tariff restrictions. The passage of expensive, hand-crafted Indian textiles to Britain, which had been very popular there, was however obstructed by prohibitive tariff rates. And secondly British- Indian territory was developed as a source of food stuff and raw material for Britain, which fuelled rapid growth in its manufacturing sector, crucial to the emergence of a powerful capitalist economy. During the first of the 19th century, however, efforts were made to eradicate some social evils. Some of the British administrators who came to India during this period were influenced by humanist and radical ideas. It was because of them that some humanitarian measures were introduced in India.

At that time, female infanticide – the practice of killing infant girls- was prevalent in some sections of society in some parts of the country. According to the social customs of the time, the marriage of girls had to be arranged within one's own small section of the community. Heavy expenditure had to be incurred by the parents for their daughter's marriage. If daughters remained unmarried, it was considered a matter of disgrace to the family. To avoid this, many infant girls were killed at birth. Sometimes both infant boys and girls were thrown in to sacred rivers to honour religious vows. Government passed regulations to stop this in human practice. It, however, took a long time to eradicate it.

One of the worst features of Indian society was the position of women. For many of them it was a long tale of suffering and humiliation from birth to death. They were married of a at a very young age. In some sections, the widows could

not remarry and were doomed to lead a miserable life. The most barbarous practice which was prevalent among some so called upper caste Hindus were the burning of the widow. In Bengal presidency now 813 cases of sati were recorded from 1813 to 1823. The most significant social legislation of the British government in India was the banning of this barbarous William Bentinck was the Governor General. The powerful campaign launched by Raja Ram Mohan Roy helped in banning this practice. Through the efforts of another Indian reformer, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar, the government passed the Widow Remarriage Act in 1856. This act made it lawful for a Hindu widow to marry again.

There had been a regular trade of slaves in India, though not on a large scale. Because of their poverty, people were forced to sell their children. Slaves were used mostly for domestic work. Sometimes they were exported to other British colonies. A law was passed in 1843 which made slavery illegal in India.

These measures of social reform, though important affected a very small section of the Indian population. The government primarily concerned with protecting and promoting British interest had little enthusiasm for far reaching social reforms. This effort in this direction was made by Indians themselves who started movements for social and religious reforms and, later, for the freedom of the country.

Education

There was a network of elementary schools Pathshalas and Maktabas as well as Tols and Madrassas for higher education throughout the country when the company's rule began. At the elementary level the pupils were taught certain passages from religious books written in the local language, letter writing and arithmetical tables. Higher education was mostly availed of by Brahmins among the Hindus and upper class Muslims. At this level, there was specialized training in grammar, classical languages (Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian) and literature, law, logic and among the science subjects, medicine and astronomy. The courses were based on old texts and their commentaries and there was little in them that were new. There was no awareness of the vast advances in knowledge that were taking place in some parts of the world and of new ideas. The system, however, did impart literacy to a large part of the population.

This system of education continued in most parts of Company's territory for some time. The company's government was indifferent to education. Even the old system of education suffered under the company's rule. The lands granted by the Indian rulers for purposes of education were taken over by the government. As a result, the old system of education declined.

A few types of schools giving instruction in English language and other branches of western learning had started functioning first in the Madras region and then in Bengal and Bombay. These were mostly run by Christian missionaries. The first educational institutions supported by the government were the Calcutta Madrassa and Benares Sanskrit College established in 1781 and 1791 respectively. The purpose of opening them was to train Indians so that they could help the Company's British officials in administration. The courses in these institutions were more or less on the old Indian lines. The Fort William College was started in Calcutta in 1801 and a handful of Indian scholars under a British principal were engaged there to acquaint the British civilians with the languages, history, law, and customs of India. The first primer in Bengali, and Urdu dictionary and a grammar of Hindi were produced by these scholars.

The first step in India towards the educational development of India by the British rulers was taken after the Charter Act of 1813. This act sanctioned one lakh of rupees for purposes of education in India. It however took the company another twenty years to have an educational policy for India. Some Indians such as Ram Mohan Roy advocated western learning. They thought that only through western learning India could make progress. In 1835, the government decided in favour of the promotion of European literature and sciences among the natives of India. Following this decision, English was made the medium of instruction in the few schools and colleges that were opened by the government. Some year's later three universities were set up at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. The system of education introduced by the British came to be known as English education.

The demand for English education was growing fast throughout the first half of the nineteenth century. The government's declaration in 1844 that English knowing Indians would be given preference in government jobs made English education more popular.

Public Services

We have seen above that Indians had little control over the Government of India. They were not permitted to play any part in the making of laws or in determining administrative policies. In addition, they were excluded from the bureaucracy who put these policies into practice. All positions of power and responsibility in the administration were occupied by the members of the Indian Civil Service who were recruited through an annual open competitive examination held in London. Indians also could sit in this examination. Satyendranath Tagore was the first Indian to do so successfully in 1863. Almost every year thereafter one or two Indians joined the coveted ranks of the Civil Service, but their number was negligible compared with that of the English

entrants. In practice, the doors of the Civil Service remained barred to Indian for they suffered from numerous handicaps. The competitive examination was held in the far away London. It was conducted through the medium of the alien English language. It was based on Classical Greek and Latin learning which could be acquired only after a prolonged and costly course of studies in England. In addition, the maximum age for entry into the Civil Service was gradually reduced from twenty-three in 1859 to nineteen in 1878. If the young Indian of twenty- three found it difficult to succeed in the Civil Service competition, the Indian of nineteen found it almost impossible to do so.

In other departments of administration Police, Public Works, Medicine, Posts and Telegraphs, Forests, Engineering, Customer and, later, Railways- the superior and highly paid posts were likewise reserved for British citizens.

This preponderance of Europeans in all strategic posts was not accidental. The rulers of India believed it to be an essential condition for the maintenance of British supremacy in India. Thus Lord Kimberley, Secretary of State, laid down in 1893 that “it is indispensable that an adequate number of the members of the Civil Service shall always be Europeans”, and the Viceroy, Lord Lansdowne, stressed “the absolute necessity of keeping the Government of this widespread Empire in European hands, if that Empire is to be maintained”.

Under Indian pressure the different administrative service were gradually Indianised after 1918; but the positions of control and authority were still kept in British hands. Moreover, the people soon discovered that Indianisation of these services had not put any part of political power in their hands. The Indians in these services functioned as agents of British rule and loyally served Britain’s imperial purposes.

Public works.

The advent of the British transformed the infrastructural facilities of India. The colonial administration brought revolutionary changes in the transport and communication. The improvement of the means of transport and communication was an essential requirement for the spread of colonial rule. So they improved the existing roads and opened new roads, bridges and canals in different parts. And they used this for the exploitation and strengthening the colonialism by the transaction of goods and deploying the army and police forces. The best example is the introduction of railway. Therefore, the colonial authorities started a separate department for undertaking the public works and the technological change ushered in by the industrial revolution, had an important impact and Dalhousie had embraced this technological change.

Before the period of Dalhousie, the job of the Public Works Department was done by the Military Board. Dalhousie created a separate Public Works Department and allotted more funds for cutting canals and roads. The Upper Ganges Canal was completed in 1854. Many bridges were constructed. By modernizing the Public Works Department he laid the foundations of the engineering service in India. a Public Works Department became one of the institutions of Government, with a separate Secretary, not only to the Government of India, but to that of each Presidency. The responsibility of management was vested in a Chief Engineer, assisted by executive officers and subordinates appointed from England.

To secure the uninterrupted progress of these works, which had previously been prosecuted by spasmodic efforts, it was ordered that a schedule of all the undertakings which it was proposed to commence, or to carry on during the year, at each Presidency, and under each commissionership. Lord Dalhousie fed this department, which had been famished for many years, may be gathered from the fact, that while the entire sum expended during the seventeen preceding years, including the repairs of civil and military buildings, had not on an average exceeded seventeen lakhs of rupees a-year,. Dalhousie attached to the construction of roads and canals extensively and he perceived the necessity of connecting the provinces with Bengal by a military road,. A road was constructed from Dacca to Aracan and introduced the grant trunk roads .They transformed some roads to into the grant trunk roads by extending ,for the Calcutta to Peshawar road. They were also taken the initiatives for connecting major cities, ports and other commercial centres of the country.

The canal, in its class and character, stands among the noblest efforts of civilized nations. The colonial masters constructed large scale canals in India for transportation and irrigation facilities. The period from 1836 to 1866 marked the investigation, development and completion of these four major works. In 1867, the Government adopted the practice of taking up works, which promised a minimum net return. Thereafter, a number of projects were taken up. Some other major canal projects were also completed on the Indus system during this period. The important among these canals were the Jamuna and Ganges Canals in north India and the Bari Doab Canal, the Krishna and Godavari Canals in south India. They were also constructed the Agra Canal, the Mutha Canals, and the Periyar Dam and canals, and Sir Hind Canal in later.

The gross area irrigated in British India by public works at the close of the nineteenth century was about 7.5 m.ha. Of this, 4.5 m.ha. came from minor works, like tanks, inundation canals etc. for which no separate capital accounts were maintained

Public health

The evolution of public health in British India and the history of disease prevention in that part of world in the 19th and early 20th century provide a valuable insight into the period that witnessed the development of new trends in medical systems and a transition from surveys to microscopic studies in medicine. The advent of infectious diseases and tropical medicine was a direct consequence of colonialism. The history of diseases and their prevention in the colonial context traces back the epidemiology of infectious diseases and the development of surveillance systems and the response to epidemics by the imperial government. It depicts how the establishment of health systems under the colonial power shaped disease control in British India to improve the health of its citizens

In 1757, the East India Company established its rule in India, which led to the development of civil and military services. A medical department was established in Bengal as far back as 1764, for rendering medical services to the troops and servants of the Company. In 1775, Hospital Boards were formed to administer European hospitals comprising of the Surgeon General and Physician General, who were in the staff of the Commander-in-Chief of the Royal Indian Army. In 1785, medical departments were set up in Bengal, Madras, and Bombay presidencies with 234 surgeons. The medical departments involved both military and civil medical services. In 1796, hospital boards were renamed as medical boards to look after the affairs of the civil part of the medical departments. In 1857, the Indian Rebellion led to the transfer of administration of India to the Crown and different departments of civil services were developed. It wasn't until 1868 that a separate civil medical department was formed in Bengal. In 1869, a Public Health Commissioner and a Statistical Officer were appointed to the Government of India. In 1896, with the abolition of the presidential system, all three presidential medical departments were amalgamated to form the Indian Medical Services (IMS). After the development of IMS, medical duties for the Royal Indian Army were performed by the Army Medical Department, later called the Royal Army Medical Corps (RAMC).

Medical departments were under the control of the central government until 1919. The Montgomery-Chelmsford Constitutional Reforms of 1919 led to the transfer of public health, sanitation, and vital statistics to the provinces. This was first step in the decentralization of health administration in India. In 1920-21, Municipality and Local Board Acts were passed containing legal provisions for the advancement of public health in provinces. The Government of India Act 1935 gave further autonomy to provincial governments. In 1937, the Central

Advisory Board of Health was set up with the Public Health Commissioner as secretary to coordinate the public health activities in the country. In 1939, the Madras Public Health Act was passed, which was the first of its kind in India. In 1946, the Health Survey and Development Committee (Bhore Committee) was appointed by the Government of India to survey the existing health structure in the country and make recommendations for future developments. The Committee submitted its report in 1946 and the health of the nation was reviewed for Public Health, Medical Relief, Professional Education, Medical Research, and International Health.

The Sanitary Commissioner to the government of India supervised sanitation, vaccination, and vital statistics. The Public Health Commissioner and the Statistical Officer were responsible for public health matters.) In 1835, with the opening of Calcutta Medical College, IMS was opened to the natives of India trained in Calcutta who were selected to serve in Subordinate Military Medical Services or as Assistant Civil Surgeons to serve in sub-divisional civil hospitals. The best of them held minor civil surgeoncies. From 1890 to 1900, ten Indians entered the Indian Medical Services.

The officers of the Indian Medical Services were mostly military surgeons of European origin who were selected in England. In 1788, Lord Cornwallis, Governor General of India, issued orders that medical officers were not permitted to join civil services until serving 2 years in the army and the situation changed little during the rest of British rule. The first hospital in India was the Madras General Hospital in 1679. The Presidency General Hospital, Calcutta was formed in 1796. About four hospitals were formed in Madras between 1800 to 1820. To fulfil the growing need for health professionals, Calcutta Medical College was established by an order in February 1835, which was the first institute of western medicine in Asia. Medical College Hospital, Calcutta was formed in 185. In 1860, Lahore Medical School (later named King Edward Medical College) started in Lahore, Punjab. Afterwards, a network of hospitals was set up throughout India. In 1854, the government of India agreed to supply medicines and instruments to the growing network of minor hospitals and dispensaries. Government Store Depots were established in Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. The total number of public hospitals and dispensaries under the control of the Imperial government of India was about 1200 in 1880 and in 1902, the figure raised to approximately 2500. There was one hospital for every 330 square miles in 1902.

They faced the challenge of a new set of diseases that were endemic in that region. India was a vast country with environments ranging from the world's highest mountains to plain green fields, and from tropical forests to barren deserts. Such a diverse region had its own peculiar diseases, which were difficult to prevent with the limited resources of the IMS. Epidemic diseases that had devastating effects during that period were plague, leprosy, cholera, and malaria. The British government took great efforts to prevent diseases and prevented and public health services were strengthened. The Plague Commission was constituted in 1896 under the chairmanship of Prof. T.R. Frasar, and emphasised sanitation works. The Epidemic Diseases Act was passed in 1897 and the Governor General of India conferred special powers upon local authorities to implement the necessary measures for control of epidemics. Leprosy was a big problem in British India. IMS medical officers did enormous amounts of research on the scientific treatment for leprosy. Officers of the British East India Company were not familiar with cholera. In the 1860s and 1870s, Dr. James L. Bryden, India's first epidemiologist and government's chief advisor on epidemic cholera, studied cholera extensively. Malaria fever was one of the leading causes of deaths in India. The situation worsened in the early 19th century. One of the contributing factors was the establishment of the railways and irrigation network by the British government of India without keeping in view the efficient drainage systems for floods and rain waters. Major Sir Ronald Ross started to study malaria in 1882. Despite initial failures and hardships, his devotion to research for nearly 2 1/2 years earned him great honour. In August 1897, he demonstrated the life cycle of the malaria parasite stating that anopheles mosquitoes carried the protozoan parasites called "plasmodia".

Even though they had introduced several health policies and implementations was only a limited coverage of their own special needs like the barracks, plantations, factories, mines, and administrative head quarters etc. The rural mass and majority were out of the scope of the public health services.

UNIT-III

STRUGGLES AGAINST COLONIAL STATE

Pre-Gandhian Agitations and Movements

Resistance and struggles against colonial occupation began from its very inception. The advent of the European colonial powers to India also resulted the beginning of such movements. Majority of the resistance movements occurred before the revolt of 1857. It can be considered as the culmination of these resistances. There were more than hundreds of major and minor resistances against the alien rule between 1757 and 1857. The resistance movements were organised by the princes, chieftains, landlords, peasants, soldiers and tribals. In the pre-capitalist Indian society, the natives were contended with their feudal and pre-feudal ways of life. The early resistance movements were traditional and local in character. Being the representative of a better mode of production, the colonial intruders had at their disposal better tools, techniques and weapons. In fact, the resistance movements were struggles between two modes of production, namely, feudalism and capitalism. This itself predominated the destiny of the movements. They were unequal contests between bows and bullets, cavalry and canons, handloom and power loom and the old and the new. But the rebels expressed extra ordinary endurance, energy and courage. These confrontations was in different forms and means, and can be classified as civil rebellions, peasant uprisings, tribal uprisings and Sepoy mutinies.

Civil Rebellions

The colonial attempt to conquer the principalities of India was resisted by the local rulers like rajas, princes, chieftains, nobles, land lords and deposed zamindars. The colonial expansion in India from Plassey up to the revolt 1857 resulted the capturing of their power. So these rulers revolted. Treachery, fabrication of false documents and other deceitful means were resorted to by the British.

The Revolt of the Raja of Vizianagaram(1794)

The East India Company acted in a very high handed manner after acquisition of the Northern Sarkars in 1765. It demanded a present of three lakhs from the Raja apart from ordering him to disband his troops. On the Raja's refusal, his estate was annexed. This was a signal for a revolt in which the Raja

received full support of his people and his troops. The Raja lost his life in a battle in 1794. Wisdom dawned on the Company's authorities who offered the estate to the deceased Raja's son and also reduced the demand for presents.

Similarly the Poligars of Dindigul and Malabar took up arms against the evils of the English land revenue system. During 1801-5 the Poligars of the ceded Districts and North Arcot revolted against the company. The resistance movements was led by Veera Pandya Kttabomman and Marutha Pandian ,but they were captured and killed by the britishers in 1799 and 1801. Sporadic risings of the Poligars in the Madras Presidency continued up to 1856.

Revolt of Velu Tampi (1809)

In 1805 Wellesley imposed a subsidiary alliance treaty on the ruler of Travancore. Resentful of the harsh terms imposed on the State, the ruler did not pay the subsidy and fell in arrears. The overbearing attitude of the British Resident caused deep resentment and Velu Tampi Dalawa raised the banner of revolt with the support of the Nair battalion. A large British force had to be deployed to meet the situation and restore ease.

Ramosi Uprisings.

The Ramosis who served in the lower ranks of the Maratha army and police, revolted in Satara in 1822 under the leadership of Chittur Sing in protest against heavy assessment of land revenue and very harsh method of its collection. Gadkari uprising and Sawantwadi revolt were the two other such movements in this region.

Kittur Chennamma(1824-29)

There was a serious uprising at kittur ,when the British after the death of local chief in 1824, refused to recognise the adopted heir to the Gaddi of kittur and took over the administration. Thereupon, Chennamma, the widow of the chief assisted by Royappa rose in rebellion.

Rebellion in Ganjam, in 1835

Dhanajaya Bhanja, the zamindar of Gumsur raised the rebellion. In Mysore Dhondi Wagh organised a rebellion in 1840-41 and in the same year the Dhar Rao rebellion happened in Satara. The Bundela land lords in Sagar broke into rebellion in 1842.

Pazhassi revolts

Keralavarma Pazhassi Raja of the kottayam royal family in the north Malabar led an historic struggle against the Britishers. British occupied Malabar with the treaty of srirangapattanam and the right of revenue collection was not given to raja but to his uncle. This act of betrayal infuriated him and asked people not to pay revenue and prevented the collection of revenue. He revolted against the British with the support of the local population especially Kurichia tribesmen and others. Raja and his army fought against them and when they strengthened the military power, retreated to the Wynadan jungles where he operated the guerrilla warfare. But he suffered repeated reverses and died in the course of battle in 1805.

Waghera Rising

The Wagheras of Okha Mandal resented the imposition of foreign rule from the very beginning. The exactions of the Gaekwar of Baroda supported by the British Government compelled the Waghera chief to take up arms. The Wagheras carried on in roads in to British territory during 1818-19. A peace treaty was concluded in November 1820.

Surat Salt Agitation

Surat had a long history of opposition to unpopular measures. The raising of salt duty from 50 paise to one rupee in 1844 caused great discontent among the people. Soon the anti Government spirit turned in to a strong anti British spirit. Some Europeans were attacked. Faced with a popular movement the Government withdrew the additional salt levy. Similarly in 1848 the Government's decision to introduce Bengal Standard weights and measures had to be withdrawn against the people's determined bid to resort to boycott and passive resistance.

The Cutch Rebellion

Anti British sentiments prevailed in the Cutch and Kathiawar areas. The struggle between the Cutch ruler, Rao Bharmal and the pro -Jhreja chiefs was at the root of the trouble. In 1819 a British force defeated and deposed Rao Bharmal in favour of his infant son. The actual administration of Cutch was committed to the care of a Council of Regency under the superintendence of the British Resident. The administrative innovations made by the Regency Council coupled with excessive land assessment caused deep resentment. The news of the English reverses in the Burma war emboldened the chiefs to rise in revolt and demand the restoration of Bharmal. Extensive military operations had to be undertaken. The trouble erupted again in 1831. The company's authorities were compelled to follow a conciliatory policy.

Kolhapur and Savantvadi Revolts

The hardships caused by administrative reorganization in the Kolhapur state after 1844 caused deep resentment. The Gadkais (the hereditary military class which garrisoned Maratha forts) were disbanded. Faced with the spectre of unemployment the Gadkaris rose in revolt and occupied the forts of Samangarh and Bhundargarh. Similarly; the simmering discontent caused a revolt in Savantvadi.

Peasant Revolts

An important impact of British rule on rural India was the far-reaching changes in Indian agrarian structure. The old agrarian system gradually collapsed under new administrative innovations. The new land tenures created new types of land ownerships. New social classes emerged in rural India. Land became a marketable commodity. The excessive state land revenue demand and exactions of the zamindars drove the peasant in to the clutches of the money lender and the trader. Absentee landlordism, parasitical intermediaries, the avaricious money lender all combined to push the peasant deeper in to the depth of poverty. So the peasants had played an important role in the early anti-British movements. Imposition of illegal taxes and oppression of government officials for the extraction of revenue, the role of money lenders which all turned them poverty, misery and indebtedness. A massive process of pauperization and proletarianization began and created a new category of agricultural proletariat. The peasant had to face oppression at the hands of not only foreign but indigenous exploiters and capitalists also.

In the 19th century peasant mobilizations were in the nature of protests, revolts and rebellions primarily aimed at loosening the bonds of feudal exploitation; they protested against enhancement of rent, evictions, usurious practices of money lenders; their demands included occupancy rights, commutation of produce rent in to money rent etc. In the absence of class consciousness or proper organizations the peasant revolts did not develop a political matrix. In the 20th century, however, we witness the emergence of class consciousness and formation of peasant organizations like the kisan sabhas. In the decade preceding the advent of independence the kisan sabhas increasingly came under the spell of left political parties like the congress socialist party and the communist party of India.

Faqir uprising; They were a group of wandering Muslim religious mendicants of Bengal. Majum shah, in 1776-77, began to levy contributions on the Zamindars and peasants defying the British authority. After

Shah, Chirag Ali became the leader and extended the movement supported by the pathans and Rajaputs etc. It got considerable strength. **Sanyasi uprisings** were another such movement in the 18th and 19th century. They rose in rebellion after the great famine of Bengal 1770. Both these attacked the English factories and seized their goods and confronted with troops.

The Chour rebellion in Bengal and Bihar broke out in 1796 and lasted up to 1816 was another important wide spread peasant rebellion. The **Kurichyas** and Kurumbas of Wynad resisted the British policies and confronted with the English army. The new system of taxation and the change in the pattern compelled them to take on the aliens and subjected to double exploitation. The revolt was in 1812 and the British could put out it completely.

In the 1836-1921 period witnessed a series of **Mappila uprisings** in Malabar. As the jenmi land lords backed by the police, law courts and revenue officials tightened their grip over the Mappila peasants the latter rebelled against the landlords and the British. It was essentially a rich poor conflict between jenmi landlords and moplal peasants. The change in the land revenue system and the eviction and oppressions led to the heavy confrontations and attack, burnings of the houses of the landlords. The rebellion was suppressed by the authority with the help of Malabar special police, a newly constituted wing in the later.

Peasant Participation in the Revolt of 1857

No uniform pattern of peasant participation in the disturbed areas can be discerned. However, in most of Oudh and Western U.P., the peasant forgot the oppressive hands of the local zamindars and joined the local feudal leadership in bid to uproot foreign imperialism. Canning's announcement of confiscation of proprietary rights in the soil was meant to punish those who had taken active party against the Government. However, after the revolt, for tactical consideration the British Indian Government decided to maintain the landed classes as the social buttress of the British raj. The post -1857 settlement was made with the taluqdars of Oudh, restoring most of the land to them. Rather the position of the taluqdars was strengthened by conferring on them some magisterial and revenue powers. The interests of the occupancy peasants were ignored and the chief Commissioner even refused to extend the Bengal Rent Act of 1839 to Oudh. Rather, the peasants of some areas like the Meerut division were made to pay some areas like the Meerut division was made to pay some additional cesses as a punitive impost for participation in the revolt. 4.5 Bengal Indigo Cultivators' strike, 1860.

Bengal Indigo Cultivators Strike, 1860

The revolt was directed against British planters who behaved like feudal lords in their estates; the revolt enjoyed the support of all categories of the rural population including the zamindars, money lenders, rich peasants and even karamcharis of indigo concerns.

Right from the beginning of the 19th century many retired officers of the East India Company and some upstarts who had earlier been slave drivers in America acquired land from Indian zamindars in Bihar and Bengal and began large scale cultivation of indigo. These planters committed great abuses and oppressions on the cultivators in the process of forcing them to grow indigo crop under terms which were the least profitable to them. In April 1860 all the cultivators of the Barasat sub division and in the districts of Pabna and Madia resorted to, what may be called, the first general strike in the history of Indian peasantry. They refused to sow any indigo. The strike spread to Jessore, Khulna, Rajshahi, and Dacca, Malda, Dinajpur and other places in Bengal. Faced with such solid unity and determination and apprehending a great agrarian uprising, the Government ordered a notification to be issued enjoining on the police to protect the riot in the possession of his lands. On which he was at liberty to sow any crop he liked, without interference on the part of the planter or anyone else. The planter could, if he liked, move the civil court for breach of contract. An Indigo Commission was also appointed in 1860. Its recommendations were embodied in Act VI of 1862. The Bengal indigo planters developed cold feet and gradually moved out to Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.

The Maratha Peasant Uprising, 1875

The Deccan peasants' uprising was directed mainly against the excesses of the Marwari and Gujarat money lenders. A combination of adverse circumstances excessive government land revenue demand, slump in the world cotton prices at the end of the American Civil war pushed the Deccan peasants deeper in the morass of indebtedness. The ever greedy Marwari and Gujarati money lenders, adept in the art of manipulation of their accounts and the peasants' illiteracy and habit of signing any bond without having a proper knowledge of its contents were at the root of the trouble. The civil courts invariably gave verdicts in favour of the usurious money lenders who obtained decrees of evictions against the peasants.

The trouble started in village Kaedeh in Sirur taluka in December 1874 when a Marwari money lender Kalooram obtained a decree of eviction against Baba Saheb Deshmukh, a cultivator in debt to him for Rs.150. The callous attitude of the money lender in pulling down the house aroused the wrath of the villagers.

The entire Poona district was ablaze by June 1875. The peasants attacked the money lenders' houses, shops and burnt them down. Their chief targets were the bond documents, deeds and decrees that the money lenders held against them. The rising spread to most of the taluks of Ahmadnagar district. The police assisted by the military was swung in to action. By June 1875 nearly a thousand peasants were arrested and the uprising completely suppressed. The struggle had a popular base for the Government could not get trustworthy evidence against the rebels. The Government appointed the Deccan Riots Commission to investigate in to the causes of the uprising. The ameliorative measure passed was the Agriculturists Relief Act of 1879 which put restrictions on the alienation of the peasants' lands and imposed some restrictions on the operations of the Civil Procedure Code in that the peasant could not be arrested and sent to civil debtors' jail for failure to pay debts.

TRIBAL UPRISINGS

Tribals, adivasis or aboriginals were usually the original inhabitants of vast tracts indifferent parts of India. They were groups of people bound together by blood relationships and socially organised differently from caste society. The influx of the outsiders and exposed them to a rapid change. Their way of life and socio-cultural structure was underwent changes, even the position and status also. Tribal movement in colonial India were distinguished from the movements of other communities in that they were the most militant, most isolated and most frequent. There were many frequent tribal uprisings occurred in the colonial India. They were the most exploited community in this period by different groups and the most devastated group for various reasons and means.

The Sanyasi Revolt

The establishment of British rule in Bengal after 1757 and the new economic order it brought spelt ruin on zamindars, peasants, and artisans alike. The famine of 1770 and the callousness on the part of the company's stooges were seen as a direct impact of alien rule. The restrictions imposed on visits to holy places estranged the sanyasis. The sanyasis, with a tradition of fighting against oppression, espoused the popular cause and organized raids on the Company's factories, state treasuries and valiantly fought against the company's armed forces. Only after prolonged military action could Warren Hastings contain sanyasi raids.

Chaur and Ho Risings

Famine, enhanced land revenue demands and economic distress goaded the Chaur aboriginal tribesman of Midnapur district to take up arms. The Rajas of Dhalbhum, Kailapal, Dholka and Barabhum organized a revolt of 1768 and followed a scorched earth policy. The disturbed conditions continued till the end of the century.

The Ho and Munda tribesmen of Chotanagpur and Singhbhum had their own scores to settle. They challenged the company's forces in 1820-22, again, in 1831 and the area disturbed till 1837.

Kol Rising

The Kols of Chhotanagpur resented the transfer of land from Kol headmen (Mundas) to outsiders like Sikh and Muslim farmers. In 1831 the Kol rebels killed or burnt about a thousand outsiders. The rebellion spread to Ranchi, Singhbhum, Hazaribagh, Palamau and western parts of Manbhum. Order could be restored only after large-scale military operation.

The Ahoms' Revolt

The Ahom nobility in Assam accused the Company's authorities of non-fulfilment of pledges of withdrawal from their territory after the conclusion of the Burma war. The attempt of the English to incorporate the Ahoms' territory in the Company's dominion sparked off a rebellion. In 1828 the Ahoms proclaimed Gomdhar Konwar as their king and planned a march to Rangpur. The superior military power of the Company aborted the move. Second revolt was planned in 1830. The Company followed a pacific policy and in 1833 handed over upper Assam to Maharaja Purander Singh Narendra and a part of the kingdom was restored to the Assamese Raja.

Khasi Rising

The East India Company occupied the hilly region between Jaintia in the east and Garo hills in the west. The English also planned a military road to link up the Brahmaputra valley with Sylhet and brought a large number of Englishmen, Bengalis and other labour to complete the project. Tirat Singh, the ruler of Nunklow, resented the intrusion into his territories, won over the support of the Garos, the khampits and Singhpos in a bid to drive away the lowland straglers. The insurrection developed into popular revolt against British rule in the area. The superior English military force suppressed the revolt in 1833.

Koli Risings

The Kolis, living in the neighbourhood of the Bhils, also resented the imposition of British rule and dismantlement of their forts. The new order of administration set up by the Company caused wide spread unemployment. The Kolis rose in rebellion in 1829, in 1839 and once again during 1844-48.

Khonnd uprisings.

They uprising from 1837-1856 were directed against the British in which the tribals of Ghumsar, China-ki -Medi, Kalahandi and Patna actively participated. The leader was Chakra Bisoi, the causes for the uprising were the moriah, new taxes, influx of new zamindars and sahlukars in their areas.

Koya rebellion in 1879-80 in the eastern Godavari tracts rose against their overlord under Tomma Sora. Kol and Ho, Munda uprisings were the other tribal movements.

Bhil Risings

The Bhils, an aboriginal tribe, lived in the Western Ghats with their strong holds in Khandesh. During 1817-19 the Bhils revolted against their new masters, the English East India Company. The Company authorities alleged that the revolts had been encouraged by Peshwa Baji Rao II and his lieutenant Trimbakji Dangle. Agrarian hardships and fear of the worst under the new regime were their apprehensions. Several British detachments ruthlessly crushed the revolt. However the Bhils were far from being pacified. Encouraged by the British reverses in the Burma war, the Bhils under their leader Sewram again revolted in 1825. The trouble erupted in 1831 and again in 1846 signifying the popular character of the discontent.

The Santal Rebellion, 1855-56

The santhals, a peaceful and unassuming agricultural people, originally belonged to Manbhum, Barabhum, Hazaribagh, Midnapur, Bankura, and Birbhum areas. The permanent settlement of Bengal (1793) handed over the land which they had cultivated for centuries to the zamindars. The excessive rent demands of the zamindars compelled these peace loving people to leave their ancestral homes and settle in the plains skirting the Rajmahal hills. With great industry they cleared the forests. Once the land was made suitable for cultivation the greedy zamindars of the adjoining areas laid claim to the proprietorship of the soil. The money lenders, mostly from Bengal and upper India, started their usurious

practices.”The santhal, reported a writer in the ‘Calcutta Review,” saw his crops,his cattle,even himself and family appropriated for a debt which ten times paid remained an incubus upon him still.”Worst still, the santhal found the police, the revenue and court amlas all ranged behind the money lender and all combining to practice extortions, oppressive exactions and forcible dispossession of his property and land.

The santhal’s main grouse was against the ‘civilized people’ from Bengal and upper India, but they turned against the Government when they found that instead of remedying their grievances, the Government officials not only protected the oppressors but participated in their economic oppression. In June 1855, under the leadership of two brothers, Sidhu and Kanhu, the santhals announced “their intention to take possession of the country and set up a Government of their own”. They cut off postal and rail communications between Bhagalpur and Rajmahal.The santhals proclaimed the end of the company’s rule; the regime of their subah had commenced. The troops were alerted and military operations began. Unable to face the company’s musketry, the rebels took shelter in the thick jungles and carried on their struggle. A British force under Major Burrough suffered a humiliating defeat. However, in February 1856 the rebel leaders were arrested and the rebellion suppressed with great brutality. The government tried pacification by creation of a separate (district of santh) parganas.

Sepoy mutinies

Like the civilian uprisings, the army of the company also raised the roaring voice against the masters. The company’s soldiers were known as sepoys, and there were deprived classes and the most grievance and humiliated people in this period. Before the revolt of 1857 there were a number of sepoy mutinies stemming from common discontent and grievances. The earliest one was in 1766, a regiment of Bengal army rebelled but it was ruthlessly suppressed. In 1806, Indian soldiers at Vellore, protesting against interference in their social and religious practices, mutinied and unfurled the flag of the rulers of Mysore. In 1824, the 47th Native Infantry mutinied, when they were ordered to proceed to Burma without adequate overseas allowance. There were similar mutinies against individual grievances in 1825 in Assam,1838 at Sholapur,1844 in Sind, and 1849-50 in Punjab .in February 1844 ,the 34th regiment was disbanded after it refused to march into Sind and defied the officers. Almost the same time, the 66th Regiment posted at Govindgarh mutinied and was suppressed ruthlessly by Charles Napier. Most of these movements were spontaneous and sporadic against the company rule.

The Revolt of 1857

The Revolt of 1857, commonly called as the Sepoy Revolt, was the first organised revolt against British rule in India. It was the culmination of the manifold grievances that Indians had against the East India Company's rule. It was to a great extent a popular revolt led by exiled princes and displaced landlords. The revolt was largely confined to North and Central India. The revolt failed due to various reasons, including lack of organised planning on the part of the rebels and superior strength of the British. The transfer of the Indian administration from the English East India Company to British Crown was the important result of the Revolt.

Causes of the Revolt

It was earlier widely believed that it was merely discontent of the Sepoys that led to the Revolt. It is no more accepted. The general causes are considered to be equally important. These include economic, political, administrative, military and socio-religious causes.

Economic Causes

The economic policy of the British was the primary reason for the Revolt. The British economic policy destroyed the traditional economic fabric of country. It impoverished the vast mass of peasants, artisans and handicraftsmen. The land revenue policies like the Permanent Settlement exorbitantly raised the land revenue demand. It led to the replacement of traditional zamindars by a new class of zamindars.

Political Causes

Dalhousie had a major share in the outbreak of the Revolt. His Doctrine of Lapse created new tensions. This doctrine refused to recognise the right of the adopted sons to succeed as heirs to a protected state, unless the adoption was approved earlier by the British. It was based on this doctrine he annexed Satara, Nagpur and Jhansi. He also refused to recognise the titles of ex-rulers like the Nawabs of Surat and Carnatic and Raja of Tanjore. He refused pension to ex-rulers of India. The most important of such ex-rulers was Nana Saheb, the adopted son of the ex-Peshwa Baji Rao-II. He also decided that the Mughal successor to Bahadur Shah Zafar would have to shift from Red Fort to more humble quarters in Delhi's outskirts. This was greatly resented for in the people's mind Mughals were still considered as the rulers of India. The culmination of Dalhousie's imperialistic policies was the annexation of Awadh on

the pretext of maladministration by the reigning Nawab Wajid Ali Shah. This caused a great uproar in Awadh and caused the displacement of thousands of the ex-Nawab's nobles and of native Indian rulers who were their chief patrons. This made them the sworn enemies of the English. Certain social reforms instituted on demand by Indian social reformers were not liked by the conservative sections of the society. They viewed them as government deliberately tampering with their age-old customs. Abolition of Sati, the legalisation of widow remarriage, and the opening of Western education to women were regarded as instances of deliberate infringement of the government on the people's customs.

Administrative Causes

Under the new administrative dispensation all higher posts were reserved for Englishmen. During Lord Cornwallis' tenure he tried to ensure that all positions of authority were out of bounds for the Indians. The Indian middle and upper class, who served the native rulers, were the worst affected. They lost their only source of livelihood. Furthermore the administration at lower levels was corrupt. Judicial and police administration seemed to favour the landlords than the poor farmer. Another aspect of British administration was its foreignness. Unlike earlier invaders, the British never tried to become a part of the Indian society. They remained aloof and were more interested in exploitation rather than development of India.

Military Causes

A major part in the outbreak of the Revolt was undoubtedly played by sepoy discontent. Discrimination was a way of life in the English East India Company's army. The principle of equal pay for equal work or rank had no place. The Indian sepoys were paid less, lodged and fed far inferior to his British counterpart. He was always nearly insultingly addressed as 'nigger' or 'suar' or 'pig'. He had no avenues for promotion. An Indian could utmost become a subedar. Unlike earlier times the soldiers no longer won any jagirs for their work. As more and more parts of India were conquered, the sepoy lost their batta (Foreign Service allowance). This was a huge cut in their salary. The new rulers also hurt their religious sentiments. Thus the General Services Enlistment Act of 1856 necessitated them to serve beyond the seas. This was against the prevalent Hindu belief that overseas travel would deprive a person of the caste status. They were also forbidden to wear their caste marks. Further the sepoys were also not immune to the economic changes brought about by British conquest. As has been said a sepoy was only a "peasant in uniform". He too felt the destruction of traditional socio-economic structure by the British.

Social and Religious Causes

The social and religious causes played no minor role in the outbreak of the Revolt. The people feared that English rule was a danger to their religion. They thought that they were always trying to convert them to Christianity. This feeling was encouraged by the activities of the Christian missionaries who were seen almost everywhere in markets, schools, hospitals and prisons. Their vulgar attacks on Hinduism and Islam and centuries old tradition and customs under police protection angered the people. Certain Government measures like the Religious Disabilities Act 1856 (which protected civil rights of the Hindu converts), the law which enabled a convert to inherit his ancestral property added fuel. The Government also taxed the lands belonging to temples and mosques or priests or charitable institutions. This was resented by the priests and maulavis for these lands were hitherto not taxed. These people were also affected by the disappearance his superior officers at Barrackpore. He was captured and hanged to death.

Immediate Causes

The immediate cause was the introduction of the new Enfield rifle and the greased cartridges episode. The cartridges of the Enfield rifle had a greased paper cover. The end of this paper had to be bitten off before the cartridge was loaded into the rifle. The grease, it was suggested, was made of beef and pig fat. This enraged both Hindus and Muslims for whom it was against their religion to touch beef and pig fat. They felt that it was another instance of the Government deliberately trying to destroy their religion and convert them to Christianity.

Causes for the failure

In spite of being a popular revolt, the revolt failed to achieve its objective. The main reasons were :(i) Lack of unity: The revolt was supported and led by a few discontented rulers of India. The majority of the Indian rulers remained aloof. These included the Sindhia of Gwalior, the Holkar of Indore, the Nizam of Hyderabad, the Raja of Jodhpur, the Nawab of Bhopal, the Sikh chieftains of Punjab, the Maharaja of Kashmir, the Ranas of Nepal and so on. They in fact gave active help to the British to suppress the revolt. Canning referred to these chieftains as having “acted as breakwaters to the storm, which would have otherwise swept us in one great wave”.(ii) Lack of support: The Revolt was not supported by all classes of the society. The upper and middle classes were critical of the rebels. The money-lenders, who were chiefly attacked and the merchants slowly turned hostile. The Revolt was not supported by the modern educated Indians. They falsely believed that the English rule was essential for modernising

India. They were also alarmed by the rebel's appeals to superstitions and their staunch opposition to progressive social measures.(iii) Lack of modern equipments: The rebels were constrained by the shortage of modern weapons and other materials of war. While the English fought with modern weapons, the rebels fought with such ancient weapons as pikes and swords. Further the rebels were poorly organised, ill-disciplined and lacked common military plans.(iv) Lack of centralised leadership: The rebels did not have a unified command structure. It was their common hatred of the British that brought the rebel leaders' together movement. It also increased racial bitterness between the English and Indians. Economic: The Revolt also brought massive economic destruction. Delhi, Lucknow, Kanpur were completely destroyed. The public debt of the country rose by about 98million sterling .Other impact: A positive aspect of the Revolt was that it laid the foundation for the later nationalist movement .The Revolt was a beacon for the later nationalist leaders. The exploits of the Revolt leaders inspired them to take on the mighty British Empire.

Character of the Revolt

The character of revolt of 1857 has been a subject of much debate. It has been declared as the first war of Indian independence by V.D. Savarkar in his book *The Indian War of Independence, 1857*. He has been supported by Dr. S.N.Sen (*Eighteen Fifty-Seven*), Tarachand and Ashok Mehta. The British authors like Sir J.M. Kaye (*A History of the Sepoy War in India*), G.B. Malleson (*Indian Mutiny of 1857*) and C.T. Metcalfe have called the Revolt as mere Sepoy Mutiny zamindars, mostly merchants, were merely interested in raising more money than improving agriculture. Artisans and handicraftsmen were affected by import of cheap machine made clothes from England.The mercantalist policies followed also destroyed India's external trade.

Centres of the Revolt

Meerut: The revolt of 1857 began at Meerut on May 10, 1857. Here the sepoys revolted against their English officers, killed them and marched to Delhi. However it is often considered that Mangal Pande fired the first shot of the revolt. On March 29, 1857, he attacked once the British were ousted, they did not have a political structure to replace it. They were also suspicious and jealous of one another and often indulged in suicidal quarrels. Butan attempt to build an organisation was made. At Delhi, for example, a Court of administrators', consisting of ten members, six army men and four civilians was established. All its decisions were taken by a majority vote. But with the capture of Delhi on September 20, 1857 this edifice disappeared. (v) Localised nature: The Revolt was confined to parts of North and Central India. Madras, Bombay, Bengal and the

Western Punjab were relatively undisturbed.(vi) Lack of an alternative plan: The rebels had no alternative to British administration. This point has been highlighted by Bipin Chandra. According to him “It lacked a forward-looking programme, coherent ideology, a political perspective or a vision of the future society and economy”.

Results

The Revolt of 1857 had far-reaching political, military, social and economic results. Political: The administration of India now passed from the English East India Company to the British crown by the Government of India Act, 1858. A Secretary of State of India was appointed in England. He was to be assisted by a 15-member advisory council. The Queen’s Proclamation also promised to discontinue the practice of annexation, and recognise adoption. Religious freedom was also assured. The proclamation also assured political reforms which were fulfilled to some extent by the 1861 Councils Act. Military: The military administration was strengthened. The number of European troops was increased and all artillery units were placed in European hands. The different classes of sepoys were mixed. All important posts in the army were reserved for the English. Social: The English felt that their social reforms were a cause for the Revolt. So they began to tread cautiously in this regard. They also started encouraging such social conservatives against nationalists during the freedom R.C. Majumdar also does not consider the Revolt to be of a nationalistic in nature. The Revolt has also been described as a “religious war against the Christians”, “racial struggle for supremacy between the Black and White”, “a struggle between Oriental and Occidental civilisation and culture” and a “Hindu-Muslim conspiracy to overthrow the British rule”. The Revolt of 1857, to conclude was caused due to many reasons. It also had manifold results. The Revolt failed in its objective of driving out the British. Yet it had a long term impact of being a source of inspiration for the nationalists during the later freedom struggle.

Act of 1858 and Queen’s Proclamation and Administrative changes

In August 1858, the British Parliament passed an Act which put an end to the rule of the company. The control of the British government in India was transferred to the British crown .At this time; Victoria was the Queen of Britain. The supreme body in Britain was the British parliament to which the British government was responsible .All activities of the British government were, however, carried out in the name of the monarch..... Minister of the British government called the secretary of state, was made responsible for the government of India. The real power of the company in the government of India had been declining and that of the British government increasing .This process

was completed by the Act of 1858 .As the British government was responsible to Parliament, the supreme body for India also was the British Parliament. The British governor general of India was now also given the title of Viceroy which means the representative of the monarch.

Queen Victoria issued a Proclamation which was read out by Governor - General Canning at Durbar held at Allahabad on 1 November 1858. The proclamation promised to respect the rights of the Indian Princes and disclaimed any intention of extending British conquests in India. It also promised to pay due regard to the ancient rights, usages and customs followed by the people and follow a policy of justice, equity and toleration. However it soon became evident that the promise of equality of opportunity to the new social groups was not meant to be implemented. In fact, many British administrators, including some viceroys, thought that it was a mistake to make this promise .The promise with regard to the respect for ancient customs of India took form of a policy to preserve social evils. The British came to believe that their rule could be preserved only by maintain the old social order .It was fortunate that measures like the abolition of Sati and making widow remarriage legal had been adopted before 1857. The foreign rulers thereafter showed little interest in social reform and opposed it even when Indian leaders made demands for it. After 1858, the interests of India were further subordinated to those of Britain. After the Industrial Revolution, the British Industrialists had become the most dominant group in the political life of Britain. British Empire had also started expanding in other parts of the world, particularly in Africa. It was involved in conflicts with other imperialist powers. In this situation, India was made to serve the British economic interests of the British Empire in other parts of the world and in costly wars against other countries.

The revolt of 1857 gave a severe jolt to the British administration in India and made its reorganization inevitable. The Government of India's structure and policies underwent significant changes in the decades following the Revolt. But more important for changes in Indian economy and Government was the inauguration of a new stage of colonialism in India.

The second half of the 19th century witnessed the spread and intensification of the Industrial Revolution; they tried to dominate with it. But facing a challenge to its dominant position in the world capitalism from newcomers, Britain began a vigorous effort to consolidate its control over its existing empire and to extend it further.

Moreover, after 1850, a very large amount of British capital was invested in railways, loans to the Government of India, and to a smaller extent in tea plantations, coal mining, jute mills, shipping, trade and banking. There was a renewed upsurge of imperial control and imperialist ideology which was reflected in the reactionary policies of the viceroynalties of Lytton, Dufferin, Lansdowne, Elgin and, above all, Curzon.

An Act of Parliament in 1858 transferred the power to govern from the East India Company to the British Crown. While authority over India had previously been wielded by the directors of the Company and the Board of Control, now this power was to be exercised by a Secretary of State for India aided by a Council. The Secretary of State was a member of the British Cabinet and as such was responsible to Parliament. Thus the ultimate power over India remained with Parliament.

Under the Act, government was to be carried on as before by the Governor-General who was also given the title of Viceroy or Crown's personal representative. With the passage of time the Viceroy was increasingly reduced to a subordinate status in relation to the British Government in matters of policy as well as execution of policy. The Secretary of state controlled the minutest details of administration. Thus the authority that exercised final and detailed control and direction over Indian affairs came to reside in London. The capitalist influence became vigorous. This made the Indian administration even more reactionary than it was before 1858, for now even the pretence of liberalism was gradually given up.

In India the Act of 1858 provided that the Governor-General would have an Executive Council whose members were to act as heads of different departments and as his official advisers. The Council discussed all important matters and decided them by a majority vote; but the Governor-General had the power to override any important decision of the Council.

The Indian Councils Act of 1861 enlarged the Governor-General's Council for the purpose of making laws, in which capacity it was known as the Imperial Legislative Council. The Governor-General was authorized to add to his Executive Council between six and twelve members of whom at least half had to be non-officials who could be Indian or English. It was merely an advisory body. It could not discuss any important measures and no financial measures at all.

The British had divided India for administrative convenience into provinces, three of which- Bengal, Madras and Bombay- were known as Presidencies. The Presidencies were administered by a Governor and his

Executive Council of three, who were appointed by the Crown. The Presidency governments possessed more rights and powers than governments of other provinces which were administered by Lieutenant Governors and Chief Commissioners appointed by the Governor- General.

The provincial governments enjoyed a great deal of autonomy before 1833 but changed later. The Central Government exercised strict control over the smallest details of provincial expenditure.

The provincial governments were granted fixed sums out of central revenues for the administration of certain services like Police, Jails, Education, Medical Services, and Road. Lord Mayo's scheme was enlarged in 1877 by Lord Lytton in the later for the departments like Land Revenues, Excise, General Administration, and Law and Justice. Further changes were made in 1882. The system of giving fixed grants to the provinces was ended and, instead, a province was to get the entire income from certain sources or revenues within it and a fixed share of the income from other sources.

Decentralized administration was inaugurated by promoting local Government through municipalities and district boards. The rising Indian nationalist movement demanded the introduction of modern improvements in civic life. Thus the need for the education of the masses, sanitation, water supply, better roads, and other civic amenities was increasingly felt but due to the financial constraints increased taxes. It was therefore decided to transfer local services like education, health, sanitation and water supply to local bodies that would finance them through local taxes. Local bodies were first formed between 1864 and 1868. But the real step was taken in 1882 by Lord Ripon's Government.

The Indian army was carefully reorganized after 1858, most of all to prevent the recurrence of another revolt. The rulers had seen that their bayonets were the only secure foundation of their rule. Several steps were taken to minimize, if not completely eliminate, the capacity of Indian soldiers to revolt. Firstly, the domination of the army by its European branch was carefully guaranteed. The proportion of Europeans to Indians in the army was raised and fixed at one to two in the Bengal Army and two to five in the Madras and Bombay armies. Moreover, the European troops were kept in key geographical and military positions. The crucial branches of the army and armoured corps were put exclusively in European hands. The older policy of excluding Indians from the officer corps was strictly maintained. The organization of the Indian section of the army was based on the policy of balance and counterpoise' or 'divide and

rule' so as to prevent its chance of uniting again in an anti- British uprising. Discrimination on the basis of caste, region and religion was practised in recruitment to the army. A fiction was created that Indians consisted of 'martial' and 'non-martial' classes, caste and communal companies were introduced in most regiments.

They introduced Indian civil service and all positions of power and responsibility in the administration were occupied by the members of the Indian Civil Service who were recruited through an annual open competitive examination held in London. Indians also could sit in this examination. Satyendranath Tagore was the first Indian to do so successfully in 1863. Almost every year thereafter one or two Indians joined the coveted ranks of the Civil Service, but their number was negligible compared with that of the English entrants. In practice, the doors of the Civil Service remained barred to Indian for they suffered from numerous handicaps. In addition, the maximum age for entry into the Civil Service was gradually reduced from twenty-three in 1859 to nineteen in 1878. If the young Indian of twenty- three found it difficult to succeed in the Civil Service competition, the Indian of nineteen found it almost impossible to do so. Major and key posts were reserved for British citizens.

The experience of the Revolt and convinced the British authorities that the princely states could serve as useful allies and supporters in case of popular opposition or revolt. It was, therefore, decided to use the princely states as firm props of British rule in India. In 1876, Queen Victoria assumed the title of the Empress of India to emphasis British sovereignty over the entire Indian subcontinent. Lord Curzon later made it clear that the princes ruled their states merely as agents of the British Crown. As the paramount power, the British claimed the right to supervise the internal government of the princely states. After 1858 they continued to follow this policy of divide and rule by turning the princes against the people, province against province, caste against caste, group against group and, above all, Hindus against Muslims.

Causes for the growth of the Indian National Movement

During the Mutiny the earliest rays of the national movement are traceable. But nationalism was quite weak in 1857. The national movement really began in 1885 with the birth of the Indian National Congress .Below are given some of the immediate ,as well as ,the remote causes, which were responsible for the growth of the Indian national movement.

1. Socio- religious movements of the 18th and 19th centuries:

The soil for the growth of Indian nationalism was prepared by the socio – religious movements of the 18th and 19th centuries. Among these, the names of the Brahmo Samaj, the Arya Samaj, The Ramakrishna Mission and the Theosophical society may be prominently mentioned. Raja Rammohan Roy, who founded the Brahmo Samaj in 1828, is often called ‘the Prophet of Indian nationalism’. He is also remembered as the Father of the Indian Renaissance or the Modern age in India. He was mostly responsible for the rejuvenation of the Indian society. Swami Dayananda, the founder of the Arya Samaj, was another saviour of the Hindu society. He saved Hinduism from the onslaught of Islam and Christianity by pointing out the superiority of the Hindu religion and the sterling worth of the Hindu scriptures like the Vedas. The germs of the cult of swadeshi can also be traced to his teachings. Swami Vivekananda also contributed a good deal to the revival of Hinduism. Mrs. Annie Besant the president of the Theosophical society adopted Hinduism and regarded it as better than all other religions. India began to realize the evils of their subjection. Freedom began to be considered necessary even for the achievement of social and religious reforms. These movements preached love for India, Indians and Indian things.

2. Effects of British Administration: British rule unified the country by introducing a uniform system of law and government. The introduction of the modern methods of the communication and transport produced the same unifying effect. The economic life and the lot of the Indian people were getting inter linked and India’s economic life was becoming a single whole. The two new classes born in this country the capitalist class and the working class.

The highly centralized character of the British rule in India particularly after 1833 promoted the growth of Indian nationalist. Centralization meant not only the subordination of the government of various provinces and the Indian states to meet the Central Government, it also involved uniform and sometimes even common laws, institutions and taxes for the whole country.

The Government of India was ‘one and indivisible’ and its actions often had the effect of encouraging the people to feel that they too were or should be one and indivisible. Sometimes, the action of the Central Government in India united all the people of India belonging to various classes, creeds and provinces in a common opposition to the Government. That happened when income tax was first imposed all over British India immediately after the revolt of 1857.

3. Effects of English Education: The English language played an important part in the growth of nationalism in the country. It acted as the *Lingua Franca* of the 'intelligentsia of India. Without the common medium of the English language, it would have been well nigh impossible for the different linguistic groups to sit at one table and discuss the common problems facing the country. The English language also made the Indian inheritors of a great literature which was full of great ideas and ideals. The view of K.M.Panikkar is that the introduction of English helped the cause of unity in the country and without it India would have been split in to as many different units as there are languages in India and would have been repeated the pattern of Europe with its conglomeration of mutually hostile units through professing the same Christian religion

Dr.A.R.Desai points out that the study of the English Language unfolded the treasures of democratic and nationalist thought crystallized in precious scientific works. Their study clarified, made more vivid and even fanned into fire the nascent nationalism of the educated Indians. Knowledge of the English language also brought within the reach of an educated Indian most vital portion of the scientific, philosophical, sociological and literary achievements of the non English speaking peoples. Through English translations ,he could study Plato, Aristotle, Spinoza, Kant, Auguste Comte, Nietzsche, Hegel, Benedetto, Croce, Spengler, Marx, Machiavelli, Saint Simon, Bakunin, Proudhon, and others ,and was bound to be influenced by them.

Western thought during this period was saturated with the ideas of the French Revolution. In Britain, liberalism was gaining ascendancy. The Indians learnt the ideas of liberty and equality through English education and heard and saw them being translated in to practice all over the Europe including England. These naturally produced among them aspirations for self government.Knowledge of English also demolished the language barrier and enabled the rising English educated intelligentsia to communicate with each other and organize the national movement. It gave rise to prose literature in the vernaculars and led to the development of the vernacular press. Much of this literature such as Bankim Chandra Chatterjee's *Anand Math* and other historical novels and Din Bandhu Mitra's play '*Nil Darpan*', roused patriotism and anti British feelings.

4.The Indian Press: The Indian Press, both English and vernacular, also aroused national consciousness. Great was the influence of the news papers like the *Indian Mirror*, *The Bombay Samachar*,*The Hindu Patriot*,*The Amrita Bazar Patrika*,*The Hindu*,*The Kesari*, *The Bengalee*,*The Hurkura*,*The Bengal Public Opinion*,*The Reis and Rayet*,*The Som Prakash*,*The Sulabh Samachar*,*The Sanjibham*,*The Sadharm*, *The Hitavadi*, *The Rast Guftar* ,*The Indu Prakash*,*The*

Standard, The Swadeshmitram, The Herald of Bihar. The Advocate of Lucknow, The Andhra Praksika, The Kerala Patrika, The Hindustani, The Azad, The Tribune The Akhbar-i-Am, The Koh-i-Noor etc. on the political life of the country.

The growth of the Indian press was phenomenal and by 1875, there were no less than 478 news papers in the country. It is rightly point out that the Indian press helped in mobilizing public opinion, convincing provincial and national conferences, organizing political movements, building up public institutions and fighting out public controversies.

No grievance affecting India's honour or economic welfare and aiming at securing participation in Government was left undiscussed. It conveyed to the Government what the people thought of their executive and legislative acts. The press became an important political institution and its influence extended over people living even in remote villages.

5. Discontentment in the country: A lot of discontentment erupted in the country on account of many reasons. There was the economic exploitation of the people. The revenue charged by the Government was more than what the people could afford to pay. The demands of the Government continued to increase unmindful of the condition of the people and their net earnings.

The Forest Laws made by the Government were very cruel and unjust. Vast areas were declared as forest lands and the people were not allowed to enter them. They were not allowed to cut wood or grass from them although their very existence depended upon them. Salt Tax was collected from the people in a variety of ways. Another unfortunate thing in connection with salt was that an attempt was made to import salt in to India from England although salt was produced in plenty in this country.

There was lot of wasteful expenditure which adversely affected the Indian economy. Thousands of Indian troops were sent out side India and they were all paid out of Indian revenues. The people also resented the heavy cost of civil services in the country.

6. Economic Exploitation: The destruction of rural and local self sufficient economy and the introduction of modern trade and industries on all India scale had modern trade and industries on all India scale had increasingly made India's economic life a single whole and inter linked the economic fate of people living in different parts of the country.

The economic system of India was adjusted to the needs of the people of England. All tariff duties were abolished in 1879 with a view to benefit Lancashire. While Indian handicrafts and industries were allowed to starve. Indian agriculture was encouraged with a purpose. Most of the raw materials were produced in the country so that those could be used to feed industries in England. That policy made India dependent on England. The free trade policy helped the British manufacturers and sacrificed the interests of India.

The extravagant civil and military administration, the denial of high posts to Indians, the ever mounting 'Home Charges', the continuous drain of wealth from India resulted in stagnation of Indian economy.

The acknowledged high priest of the 'drain theory' was Dadabhai Naoroji. Indian nationalists like Ranade, G.K.Gokhale, R.C.Dutt etc. developed the 'Theory of increasing poverty in India' and attributed it to British anti India economic policies.

7. Ilbert Bill Controversy: Sir C.P. Ilbert was the Law Member of the Executive Council of Lord Ripon. Sir Ilbert introduced a Bill, the object of which was to remove some of the disqualifications from which the Indian magistrates suffered, while trying Europeans. This was also against principles of the Rule of Law. The Bill advocated a right cause and was sponsored by a European Law Member. The European community in India rose to a man, to oppose the enactment of this Bill. It was seriously argued that the Indian Judges were not fit to administer justice to a White man, even when he was a criminal. The European Defence Association was formed by the opponents of the Bill, with branches in all important centres of India to carry on agitation against the Bill.

The agitation was an eye opener for Indians, who became convinced that they would continue to be humiliated and insulted so long as they were not free. It was a poor little bill, just and equitable; yet the Government of India had to bow before the storm of agitation and they withdrew the proposed legislation.

Early political associations

Formation of associations in India could be traced to the second quarter of the 19th century. These were purely political associations secular in nature and different from socio-religious reform associations. Several associations were formed. Indians to look after certain specific group interests and a few to discuss and promote general welfare of the people led to the establishment of the Congress. A few among them were Zamindari Association formed in 1837, it was renamed Landholders society shortly after

wards, Raja Radhakant Dev, Dwarkanath Tagore, Prasanna Kumar Tagore, Rajkamal Sen and B.C. Mitra were behind the foundation. The Bengal British Indian Society founded in 1843, dominated by the young Bengal groups, the British Indian Association of Indians founded in 1851, Radhakant Dev, Debendranath Tagore were important leaders, in Bengal to represent Indian grievances to the British government, the East India Association established Dadabhai Naoroji in London in 1856, the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha by Justice Ranade in 1870, the Madras Mahajana Sabha founded in 1881, P. Anadacharlu and S. Ramaswami Mudaliar, M. Viraragavachari as leaders, the Madras Native Association, and the Bombay Presidency Association in 1885 by Pheroze Sha Mehta, M.T. Telang, and Badruddin Tyabji etc

But the most important of the pre-congress nationalist organizations was the Indian National Association of Calcutta led by Surendra Nath Banerjee and Anandamohan Bose. It was established in July 1876 with a view to creating a strong public opinion in the country on political questions and the unification of Indian people on a common political programme. In the early associations were dominated by wealthy and aristocratic elements, but gradually in the second half of the 19th century the political associations came to be increasingly dominated by the educated middle class.

Constitutional Agitations: Moderates

During its early years, the Congress was entirely under the influence of leaders, described as the Moderates, who were guided by the following principles:

Belief in Gradual Reforms: The Moderates believed in agitating for piecemeal reforms. They were content with urging only reforms in the administration, e.g., in councils, in services, in Local Bodies, in Defence forces, etc. It was only in the year 1906 that Dadabhai Naoroji declared in his presidential address that "self-government or swaraj like that of the United Kingdom or the Colonies was the objective before the Congress". Even in 1906, when swaraj was laid down as the objective of the Congress, it was emphasized that self-government was claimed only under the aegis of the British Empire. It was also admitted, that a considerable training period was necessary for achieving this ideal, although some of Congress leaders believed that the probationary period was already over. "If we look at the early proceedings of the Congress, we are struck by the extreme moderation of its demands. The organizers and promoters of the Congress were no idealists, who had built their habitation away on the horizon; they were practical reformers imbued with the spirit, principles and methods of mid-Victorian Liberalism and went on winning freedom by gradual stages, broadening from step to step. They, therefore, took scrupulous care not to pitch

their demands too high. Some of them may have cherished in their heart of hearts, fully fledged parliamentary self government as a far off ideal; but all of them wanted to work on lines of the least resistance, and therefore framed their proposals of reforms on such moderate and cautious lines as not to arouse any serious opposition”.

Faith in constitutional method: The Moderates were confirmed believers in the efficacy of the constitutional method. They avoided conflict with the government at all cost. They eschewed violence. They followed the method of prayers, petitions, representations and deputations in order to convince the Government about the justice of demand. This method is often nicknamed as the method of ‘political concessions. Revolutionary method was regarded simply, out of question, because it was impossible to succeed in practice, and also because, the Moderates were simply not prepare to have a clash with the Government.

Faith in British sense of justice and fair play: Most of the early congress leaders believed that the British people were essentially just and fair. According to them, Englishmen were lovers of liberty and would not grudge it to Indians, when they were convinced that Indians were fit for self government. It was for this reason that from the earliest time, the congress was constantly doing its best to win the sympathy and support of the British public opinion. For that very purpose, a strong deputation of the Congress visited England in 1889. A journal called ‘India’ was also founded in London in 1890 to place before the British public the view point of Indians regarding the British administration in India.

Regarded connection with the British for the Good of India: Most of the early congressmen were the product of Western civilization and were imbued with western thought. They honestly believed that the British had given Indians a progressive civilization. The English literature, the system of education, the system of transportation and communication, the system of justice and local bodies were regarded as some of the invaluable blessings of the British Raj. They believed that even when India became free, she was bounded to keep some permanent ties with the British for India’s own advantage.

Work and Weaknesses of Early Moderates

The congress of early times is often criticized for its lack of vigour and effectiveness. No doubt; it was not in touch with the masses. Its leaders were mostly men of ideas and not of action. They believed in the method of prayers and petitions and not in self reliant and vigorous action. Perhaps, they were not prepared to make extreme type of sacrifices. They took every possible care to avoid conflict with the government. They worked only for peace meal reforms and followed strictly constitutional methods.

But keeping in view the period under study and the conditions of those times, theirs was probably the only practical, sagacious and far sighted method. They planted the sapling of freedom, watered it cautiously, but constantly and steadily, which in the fullness of time was bound to grow as it had actually grown. They made a humble, but correct beginning. We should not minimize, therefore, the stupendous work done by early congressmen for the national cause. We should in the words of Dr. Rash Behari Ghosh, have “some kindly thoughts for those who too, in their days, strove to do their duty, however imperfectly, through good report and through evil report, with it may be a somewhat chastened fervour, but a fervour as genuine as that which stirs and aspires younger hearts”.

Beyond Constitutional Agitations: Extremists

In the early years the congress was completely under the influence of the Moderates, who believed in purely constitutional methods and agitated for piecemeal reforms in the Indian administrative system. But during these very years of the congress, certain events happened in India and abroad and certain forces were at work, which produced, among the younger of the nation, a group of people, who began to question the wisdom of the method of prayers and petitions followed by the Moderates in order to achieve their political objectives. They were called the Extremists or Militant Nationalists.

Causes for the Growth of the Extremists Movement

The following are some of the important causes responsible for the growth of the Extremist school of politics in India.

Apathy of the Government to Demands of the congress: The Act of 1892 was regarded by the congress as inadequate for the purpose of giving Indians an effective voice in the administration of their own country. Hence the congress continued to adopt, almost every year, resolutions urging the Government to enlarge the membership and functions of those councils. But the government was adamant in ignoring the demands of the congress. This indifference of the Government to the demands of the congress led, many a Youngman to question seriously the efficacy of the purely constitutional method had, apparently, failed and it was, therefore, necessary to give up the technique so far used by the moderates.

Hindu Revivalism: Almost all leaders of the early congress were under the influence of the western civilization. Some of them regarded western religion, literature, political institutions, language, civilization and culture, as distinctly

superior to that of Indians In 1893, at Chicago was held the Parliament of Religions, wherein, India was represented by Swami Vivekananda, who revealed before the American public the catholicity of the Indian culture and the Hindu religion Mrs. Annie Besant also helped in this revivalism. Tilak decried everything western and preached intense love for India and things Indian. Lala Lajpat Rai pooh –poohed Anglicized Indians, who were aping western customs and habits and were forgetting their own hoary culture. B.C. Pal appealed, in the name of *Kali* and *Durga*, for acquiring strength and cultivating the capacity to strike. Most of the early leaders of the Extremists were thus under the influence of Hindu revivalism and some of them were deeply religious men.

The Discontent created by the famine of 1897:

A famine broke out in India in 1897 and affected about 20 million people and 70,000 square miles of Indian Territory. People died in large numbers. It was felt by Indians that any national government, under similar circumstances, would have staked its all to save the people from the clutches of draught any hunger. The government became a target of attack everywhere and a great deal of resentment grew against the government.

The outbreak of Plague:

Hot on the heels of the aforesaid famine, there burst out a virulent bubonic plague in the western part of the Bombay presidency .The government was no doubt earnest in checking the epidemic, but the chief mistake of the government was that it employed an altogether official machinery for the purpose. The soldiers were requisitioned for this service. They were given the right of inspection of houses and were required to remove the infected persons to isolation hospitals. The officers controlling the disinfection and evacuation processes began to be hated by the orthodox public .A sensitive young man, in a fit of anger, shot dead Mrs. Rand, the Plague Commissioner of Poona and one of his associate. The young man, who committed this act, was sentenced to death and hanged.

Lokmania Tilak made a political use of this resentment of the public against the Government. In his paper 'Kesari' he had directed a bitter attack against the government for the steps taken by it to check the epidemic. Tilak was found guilty by a jury on which Europeans were in a majority and was sentenced to 18 months' rigorous imprisonment. Tilak asked for permission to appeal to the Privy Council against his conviction, which was refused. By then, Tilak had already captured the imagination of the masses. His trial imprisonment and the refusal of permission to appeal to the Privy Council sent a wave of indignation throughout the length and breadth of the country against the Government and won many new adherents to the cult of Extremism.

The Repressive Policy of Lord Curzon:

Lord Curzon remained the Governor –General of India from 1898 to 1905. He openly said that Indians were unfit for higher services which must continue to be manned by the European alone. This he considered necessary, because of his faith about the higher qualities of head and heart possessed by the Europeans and because of their position as the rulers of India.

During the viceroyalty of Lord Curzon many unpopular measures were also enacted, the chief of which were the Calcutta Corporation Act of 1899, Indian Universities Act, 1904, and the official secrets Act. The object of the Corporation and Universities Acts was to officialise these bodies and thus to bring them under the influence of the Government. His Frontier Policy and the Mission to Lhasa were also resented. A deputation was sent to wait upon him in order to point out the opinion of Indians about this measure. Lord Curzon refused to meet the deputation. The congress sent Mr. Gokhale and Lala Lajpat Rai to England to point out, to the British Government and public, the high handedness of the steps taken by the Indian Government. Lala Lajpat Rai returned disappointed. On his return to India, the message which he brought to his people was that, if they really cared for their country, they would have to strike the blow for freedom themselves, and that they would have to furnish unmistakable proofs of their earnestness.

Ill-treatment of Indians Abroad:

Indians were not allowed to build houses in certain localities which were reserved for Europeans and were not allowed to buy property there. They were not admitted to certain types of schools, hospitals and hotels. They were not allowed to travel in upper railway classes with Europeans. The cup of their humiliation was full, when in 1907, the Transvaal Government passed the notorious Asiatic Registration Act, which required that all Indians living in South Africa must get themselves registered and leave their finger prints. Mahatma Gandhi was a practicing Barrister in South Africa at that time. His mind revolted against this injustice and he decided to defy the Government even single handed at a place so far away from the country of his birth. He refused to get himself registered according to this “satanic Law”, as he called it, and started along with some other Indians, the satyagra. i.e, passive civil resistance campaign. Indians began to feel that they were humiliated abroad, because they were slaves in their own country and because their Government was not prepared to defend them and to retaliate on behalf of them.

Partition of Bengal:

The last official act of Lord Curzon was the partition of Bengal. The province of Bengal was sought to be divided into two parts, i.e., the western and the eastern Bengal. In western Bengal, Hindus were in a majority and in the eastern zone Muslims were in preponderance. It was said that partition was necessary for administrative convenience and efficiency because the province had become unwieldy. Lord Curzon visited east Bengal and in his attempt to win over Muslims in favour of the partition, said that the partition would create in east Bengal a province, where the Muslims could flourish without the dominance of any other community. The partition was taken to be a diplomatic move to play the game of divide and rule. Some of the Muslims were apparently caught in the snare.

The vigorous agitation started against the contemplated partition. Swadeshi movement had already been gaining ground in Bengal and other Provinces of India for some time. The people of Bengal retaliated by giving a vigorous start to the movement for the boycott of foreign and especially the British goods. The swadeshi and the boycott movements spread throughout the length and breadth of India and especially in Bengal. Many authorities on the national movement are agreed that the partition became the direct and immediate cause of the growth of the Extremism and terrorism in the country. The partition day began to be observed in India everywhere to register protests. Many young men formed secret associations, whose object was to avenge the wrong by fair or foul means. People lost faith in the integrity and sense of justice of the English rulers. Mr. Gokhale was sent to England to appeal to the British Government to undo the wrong.

Myth of European supremacy exploded:

Near about the end of the 19th century, certain events happen in Europe, which had far reaching repercussions on the national movement. In 1895, Italy was defeated by Abyssinia and in 1904-5, Russia by Japan. Thus two European powers had been humbled by Asian powers. Up to that time, the superiority of European powers over Asians in the matter of warfare was taken for granted and the European armed might was considered invincible. The results of these two wars exploded this myth.

Swadeshi and Boycott Movements

The swadeshi and boycott movements which started with a view to ending the partition of Bengal soon became powerful weapons of the struggle for freedom. Swadeshi means 'of one's own country'. During the struggle for freedom,

it meant that people should use goods produced within the country. This would help promote Indian industries and strengthen the nation. It was also an effective method of developing patriotism.

The promotion of swadeshi was accompanied by the advocacy of Boycott. People were asked to boycott foreign goods. This helped arouse the nationalistic sentiments of the people. It was stressed that the boycott of foreign goods, which were mostly British, would hurt Britain's economic and the British government would be forced to accept Indian demands.

The swadeshi and Boycott movements were supported by the Congress at its session held at Benares in 1905 and at the Calcutta session held in 1906. This marked a very big change in the methods adopted by the congress. These methods were no longer confined to persuading the rulers by petitions and appeals to their sense of justice.

The swadeshi and boycott movements were not confined to Bengal but had spread to many parts of the country. It led to the heightening of political activity all over India. British cloth, sugar and other goods were boycotted. People went in groups to shopkeepers to persuade them to stop selling British goods. They stood outside the shops to dissuade people from buying British cloth. People stopped talking to those who sold or used British goods. At places, barbers and washer men refused to serve such persons.

A very important role was played in this movement by school and college students. They started using only Indian goods and took a leading part in dissuading from buying British goods. The government resorted to all kinds of repressive measures. Many students were expelled from schools and colleges. Many were beaten up and sent to jail.

Swadeshi and Boycott were not confined to goods only. Swadeshi gradually came to include everything Indian. Similarly, Boycott, in course of time, came to include everything connected with the British rule. Initially aimed at forcing the government to end the partition of Bengal, they ultimately became the means to attain freedom from foreign rule.

Making of Grass root level Movements

A section of the Kisan leadership saw the inner contradictions in congress agrarian policy. The peasant movements launched by the congress were primarily aimed at seeking relief against excessive government land revenue demand and were thus solicitous for the interests of the zamindars and landed magnates. The propaganda of the communists and other left parties created class consciousness among the peasants and provided the nucleus for the formation of Kisan Sabhas

In the 1920s kisan sabhas were organised in Bengal, the Punjab and the U.P. In 1928 the Andhra provincial Ryots Association was formed. However the first All India Kisan Sabha was formed at Lucknow on 11 April 1936. The kisan sabha explained its objective of “securing complete freedom from economic exploitation and achievement of full economic and political power for peasants and workers and all other exploited classes”. The kisan sabhas launched anti settlement agitation against zamindari ‘zulum’ in Andhra Pradesh. In U.P. and Bihar heroic struggles were launched against Bakasht (self cultivated land) movement in Bihar Bakasht was zamindar’s khas land which was cultivated by tenants on condition that they would pay a certain portion of the produce as rent to the land owner.

Towards the end of 1921, peasant discontent surfaced again in the districts of Hardoi, Bahraich and Sitapur (UP), with grievances relating to: i) High rents- 50 per cent higher than the recorded rates; (ii) Oppression of thikadars in charge of revenue collection; and (iii) Practice of share-rents. The meetings of the Eka or the Unity Movement involved a symbolic religious ritual in which the assembled peasants vowed that they would • Pay only the recorded rent but would pay it on time; • Not leave when evicted; • Refuse to do forced labour; • Give no help to criminals; • Abide by panchayat decisions. The grass root leadership of the Eka Movement came from Madari Pasi and other low-caste leaders, and many small zamindars.

Congress and Khilafat leaders provided the initial thrust to the peasant grievances and the movement grew under the name Eka or unity movement. With grass-root leadership not in favour of non- violence taking over the movement, the authorities succeeded in bringing it to an end. The Kisan movements were also overshadowed by the Non-Cooperation Movement in UP. By March 1922, severe repression by authorities brought the movement to an end.

The Bardoli Satyagraha (1928) in the state of Gujarat, India was a major episode of civil disobedience and revolt in the Indian Independence Movement. Its success gave rise to Vallabhbhai Patel as one of the greatest leaders of the independence struggle. The Bardoli taluqa in Surat district had witnessed intense politicisation after the coming of Gandhi on the national political scene. In 1925, Bardoli in Gujarat suffered from floods and famine, causing crop production to suffer and leaving farmers facing great financial troubles. The movement sparked off in January 1926 when the authorities decided to increase the land revenue by 30 per cent. The Congress leaders were quick to protest and a Bardoli Inquiry Committee was set up to go into the issue. The committee found the revenue hike to be unjustified. In February 1926, Vallabhai Patel was called to lead the

movement. The women of Bardoli gave him the title of “Sardar”. Under Patel, the Bardoli peasants resolved to refuse payments of the revised assessment until the Government appointed an independent tribunal or accepted the current amount as full payment. Bardoli Satyagraha Patrika was brought out to mobilise public opinion. An intelligence wing was set up to make sure all the tenants followed the movement’s resolutions. Those who opposed the movement faced a social boycott. Special emphasis was placed on the mobilisation of women.

K.M. Munshi and Lalji Naranji resigned from the Bombay Legislative Council in support of the movement. By August 1928, massive tension had built up in the area. There were prospects of a railway strike in Bombay. Gandhi reached Bardoli to stand by in case of any emergency. The Government was looking for a graceful withdrawal now. It set the condition that first the enhanced rent be paid by all the occupants (not actually done). Then, a committee went into the whole affair and found the revenue hike to be unjustified and recommended a rise of 6.03% only. During the 1930s, the peasant awakening was influenced by the Great Depression in the industrialised countries and the Civil Disobedience Movement which took the form of no-rent, no-revenue movement in many areas. Also, after the decline of the active phase movement (1932) many new entrants to active politics started looking for suitable outlets for release of their energies and took to organisation of peasants.

The Malabar Rebellion of 1921 is often considered as the most significant and the culmination of a series of Mappila riots. The Malabar Rebellion (also known as the "Moplah Rebellion") was an armed uprising in 1921 against British authority and Hindus in the Malabar region of Southern India by Mappila Muslims and the culmination of a series of Mappila revolts that recurred throughout the 19th century and early 20th century. The 1921 rebellion began as a reaction against a heavy handed crackdown on the Khilafat Movement by the British authorities in the Eranad and Valluvanad taluks of Malabar. In the initial stages, a number of minor clashes took place between Khilafat volunteers and the police, but the violence soon spread across the region. The Mappilas attacked and took control of police stations, British government offices, courts and government treasuries. The largely kudiyaan (tenant) Mappilas also attacked and killed jenmi (landlords) of the Hindu Nair and Brahmin Nambudiri castes. In the later stages of the uprising, Mappilas committed several atrocities against the Hindu community, who they accused of helping the police to suppress their rebellion.

The British Government put down the rebellion with an iron fist, British and Gurkha regiments were sent to the area and Martial Law imposed. But once the British declared martial law and repression began in earnest, the character of the rebellion underwent a definite change. Many Hindus were seen by the Mappilas to be helping the authorities. What began as an anti-government and anti-landlord affair acquired communal overtones. The communalisation of the rebellion completed the isolation of the Mappilas from the Khilafat-Non-Cooperation Movement. By December 1921, all resistance had come to a stop.

Working class movement

The history of working class in India can be divided into the four phases, the first phase spans from 1850 to 1890; the second phase from 1890 to 1918; the third phase from 1918 to 1947 and finally the post-independence period. The emergence of industrial working class in India since it is this class, which, to a large extent, is organized whereas workers engaged in the unorganized sector largely remain out of the fold of organized working class activity.

The modern Indian working class arose in consequence to the development and growth of factory industries in India from the second half of the nineteenth century. It is however about the turn of the twentieth century, it took the shape of working class. An exact estimate of the total population of the working class is difficult to arrive at but N. M. Joshi, on the basis of the 1931 census, calculated 'the laboring class at 50 million out of which roughly 10 percent were working in the organized industry'. So far as the major industries were concerned, the cotton textile industry in 1914 employed 2.6 lakh workers, the jute industry employed 2 lakh workers in 1912 the railways employed around 6 lakh workers. The number swelled further and on the eve of World War II, in which, about 2 million were employed in manufacturing industry, 1.5 million in railways and 1.2 million in the British owned plantations.

The actions of the working class in the earliest stage were sporadic and unorganized in nature and hence were mostly ineffective. It is only from the late 19th century in Madras and from the second decade of the twentieth century in Bombay that serious attempts were made for the formation of associations that could lead organized form of protests. Prior to that some philanthropists in the 1880s sought to improve working conditions by urging the British authorities in India to introduce legislations for improving its condition. S. S. Bengalee in Bombay, Sasipada Banerjee in Bengal and Narayan Lokhandya in Maharashtra were prominent among them.

Nationalist historians often argue that the organized working class movement in the country was associated with the Indian national movement but this is only partially correct. Several movements took place even before the Congress took a serious note of the interests of the working class questions. Though the Congress was formed in 1885, it seriously thought of organizing the working class only in the early 1920s. The Working class in the country was organizing struggles against capital much before the 1920s. In the last decades of the 19th century, Lieten informs us, there occurred strikes at Bombay, Kurla, Surat, Wardha, Ahmedabad and in other places. According to official sources there were two strikes per year in every factory. The strikes however were only sporadic, spontaneous, localized and short-lived and were caused by factors such as reduction in wages, imposition of fines, dismissal or reprimand of the worker. These actions and militancy, which they showed, helped in the development of class solidarity and consciousness, which was missing earlier. The resistance was mediated by outsiders or outside leaders. Agitations grew and they were not on individual issues but on broader economic questions, thus leading to a gradual improvement

It was after World War I that the working class struggle in the country entered into a different phase. The unorganized movement of the workers took an organized form; trade unions were formed on modern lines. In several ways the decade of the 1920s is crucial in this regard. Firstly in the 1920s serious attempts were made by the Congress and the Communists to mobilize the working class and hence from then onwards the national movement established a connection with the working class. Secondly, it was in 1920 that the first attempt to form an all India organization was made. Lokmanya Tilak, a Congressman from Bombay was instrumental in the formation of the All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC) with Chaman Lal and others as office bearers of the organization. Thirdly, in this decade, India witnessed a large number of strikes; the strikes were prolonged and well participated by the workers. The number of strikes and the number of workers involved in these strikes went on increasing in the subsequent decades. We shall return to this later after a brief discussion of the Congress and the Communist party's approach to labour.

The Indian National Congress started thinking of mobilizing the working class from the 1920s. There were at least two reasons behind that: firstly, it felt that if it failed to bring the working class into their fold and control, India might face a people's revolution and secondly, because it realized that to launch an effective struggle against imperialism all the sections of the Indian society were to be mobilized. Though some Congressmen formed the AITUC in 1920 and resolutions were passed in 1920,1922,1924 and in 1930 in the all India

conferences, the clearest policy of the Congress came only in 1936 when it appointed a committee to look after labour matters. Thus it was from the late 1930s that the Congress established deep links with the working class in the country. The Congress, however, believed in the Gandhian strategy of class harmony and as a result it did not lead any radical working class agitations. But after 1920, the working class movement underwent many changes and division under different leaders based on ideology and practices.

Armed struggles

Indian National Congress was founded in 1885 A.D. At that time moderates were in power. After 1905 their place was taken by the extremists. These people did a lot for awakening the people but still many Indian youth felt that the Britishers would not leave India by simply taking out processions and shouting slogans. They felt that they would think of leaving India only when there was violence. This idea gave birth to revolutionary movement in India.

Method of working of the Revolutionaries

The revolutionaries believed in violence. They would simply throw bombs and kill notorious British officers who were known for their anti-Indian activities. In addition, they also killed those Indians who used to cooperate with such officers. They believed in looting treasuries so that they could purchase equipment etc. They wanted to create an atmosphere of terror throughout India.

Work of the Revolutionaries

The revolutionaries had such active leaders as Veer Savarkar, Bhagat Singh, Khudi Ram Bose, Profulla Chander and several others. First to take the lead were Chapeka Brothers. In 1904 veer Savarkar founded Abhinava Bharat, a secret society to spread violence. News papers like Sandhya and Yugantar were founded which preached violence. Not only in India but these people carried on their activities abroad as well. They founded the Ghadar Party in London. Those who actively worked in London and the U.S.A. included Shyamji Krishna Verma, Ajit Singh, Veer Savarkar and Lala Hardayal.

Reaction of the Government

As the time passed their activities increased. They threw a bomb on the viceroy Lord Hardinge. The government used all repressive measures to check their activities. Many of these youth were shot dead and many others imprisoned for life. Hanging them was quite common.

Failure of the Movement

The movement, however, failed. It was because many people in India were not as this revolutionaries. In addition, during those days Gandhiji dominated the Indian National Congress. He and all his followers believed in non-violence. Thus the movement did not get popular support.

Advent of Gandhi

Question of Mobilisation of Masses

Mahatma Gandhi completely dominated the Indian political scene from 1919 to 1948 so much that this period also called the Gandhian era in Indian history. Born on October 2, 1869, Gandhi had spent twenty one years (1893-1914) of his life in South Africa fighting for the rights and dignity of Indians in Africa. Influenced by the writings of Tolstoy, Ruskin and Thoreau, Gandhi organised satyagraha against the racial laws in South Africa. This was the assertion of moral superiority of Indians against the material superiority of the British. The moderate success he achieved in South Africa led him to place implicit faith in non-violent passive resistance. Returning to India in January 1915, Gandhi at the advice of his political Guru Gokhale, kept himself aloof from Indian politics for one year. He founded the Sabarmati Ashram at Ahmadabad in May 1915, where he could obtain the spiritual deliverance he sought in his home land.

Non violence and Satyagraha

M.K. Gandhi was born on 2 October 1869 at Porbander in Gujarat. After getting his legal education in Britain, he went to South Africa to practice law. Imbued with a high sense of justice, he was revolted by the racial injustice, discrimination and degradation to which Indians had to submit in the South African colonies. Indian labourers who had gone to South Africa and the merchants who followed were denied the right to vote. They had to register and pay a poll-tax. They could not reside except in prescribed locations which were insanitary and congested. In some of the South African colonies, the Asians, as also the Africans, could not stay out of doors after 9 p.m.; nor could they use public foot paths. Gandhi soon became the leader of the struggle against these conditions and during 1893-1914 was engaged in a heroic though unequal struggle against the racist authorities of south Africa. It was during this long struggle lasting nearly two decades that he evolved the technique of satyagraha

based on truth and non violence The ideal satyagrahi was to be truthful and perfectly peaceful, but at the same time he would refuse to submit to what he considered wrong. He would accept suffering willingly in the course of struggle against the wrong –doer. This struggle was to be part of his love of truth. But even while resisting evil, he would love the evil doer. Hatred would be alien to the nature of a true satyagrahi. He would, more over be utterly fearless. He would never bow down before evil whatever the consequences .In Gandhi's eyes, none was not a weapon of the weak and the cowardly .Only the strong and the brave could practise it. Even violence was preferable to cowardise. In a famous article in his weekly journal, *Young India*, he wrote in 1920 that "non violence is the law of our species, as violence is the law of the brute", but that "where there is only a choice between cowardice and non violence. I would advise violence .I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honour, than that she would, in a cowardly manner, become or remain a helpless witness to her own dishonour". He once summed up his entire philosophy of life as follows: The only virtues I want to claim is truth and non-violence. I lay no claim to super human powers. I want none'.

Another important aspect of Gandhi's outlook was that he would not separate thought and practice, belief and action. His truth and none violence were meant for daily living and not merely for high sounding speeches and writings.

Gandhiji, moreover, had an immense faith in the capacity of the common people to fight. For example, in 1915, referring to the common people, who fought along with him in South Africa, in the course of his reply to an address of welcome at Madras, he said: you have said that I inspired these great men and women, but I cannot accept that proposition. It was they, the simple-minded folk, who worked away in faith, never expecting the slightest reward, who inspired me, who kept me to the proper level, and who compelled me by their sacrifice, by their great faith, by their great trust in the great God to do the work that I was able to do. Similarly, in 1942, when asked how he expected "to resist the might of the Empire", he replied:"with the might of the dumb millions".

Gandhiji returned to India in 1915 at the age 46. He spent an entire year in travelling all over India, understanding Indian conditions and the Indian people and then, in 1916, founded the Sabarmati Ashram at Ahmedabad where his friends and followers were to learn and practise the ideas of truth and non-violence. He also set out to experiment with his new method of struggle.

Hind swaraj.

The term appeared in Gandhiji's writings for the first time in November 3, 1906. The idea underlying his writing was that there should be complete swaraj for India and that the British should quit the country handing over reigns of powers to Indians. He held that unless this is done, the people of India will never be happy. Everything else will follow swaraj. He wrote the columns of the *Indian opinion* a series of articles on swaraj that subsequently appeared in a book form with the title *Hind Swaraj*. In this work comprehensive views about the nature and picture of swaraj were expressed and hence it constitutes first Gandhian blue print of swaraj. The spirit of swaraj expounded in this booklet.

The ultimate objective swaraj as per Gandhi's own admission was swaraj within the empire. After the meeting with viceroy, he said that our immediate objective and not our distant goal, is complete independence. If swaraj was a doubtful word it became unequivocal by making it *Purna swarajya*. Thus it became Gandhi's immediate goal.

In *Hind Swaraj* he pointed out that the real enemy was not the British political domination but the modern western civilization which was luring India into its stranglehold. He believed that Indians educated in western style, particularly lawyers, doctors, teachers and industrialists, were undermining Indian's ancient heritage by insidiously spreading modern ways. He criticised railways always as they had spread plague and produced famines by encouraging the export of food grains. He insisted that Indians should follow their traditional civilization uncorrupted by modern civilization.

Gandhi tried to give concrete shape to his social and economic ideas by taking up the programme of khadi, village reconstruction, and Harijan welfare. It is true that these efforts of Gandhi could not completely solve the problem of the rural people, but it cannot that these ideas and programmes of Gandhi succeeded in improving their conditions to a certain extent and making the whole country conscious of the new need for its new social and economic reconstruction. Gandhi conveyed his perspectives on social and economic strength to India through his book *Hind Swaraj*.

Rural reconstruction

Gandhi initiated several programmes for the development of the rural people or for the rural reconstruction in which Sevagram at Wardha occupies a significant place. He started it in 1938 and he stressed his ideas as the

constructive programmes. The Gandhian idea of village swaraj shows that the dream of Gandhi was to make village communities self contained by developing them into ideal villages. By evolving a suitable pattern of local self government in the vast multitudes of the tiny villages. The concept of village swaraj was the guiding force behind the Gandhian scheme of rural development. He also emphasised the organizational scheme of the development by highlighting the system of Panchayathi Raj and decentralization by taking various names like grama sabha, nyaya panchayath etc.

The basic aim of the Gandhian philosophy is the realization of *sarvodaya* i.e. the good of all –the good to percolate even unto this last meaning that it should reach even the lowest stratum of the society. He emphasise the peaceful coexistence in all the ways. The concept of *sarvodaya* is “the greatest good of all” and it aims at the promotion of the greatest good of all which can only be achieved through self sacrifice on the part of all. The constructive programmes which popularised the use of khadi, promotion of village industries, adult education, basic education, rural sanitation, removal of untouchability, upliftment of backward classes welfare of women, education of public health and hygiene, prohibition, propagation of mother tongue and economic equality. Thus it was basically a programme of the human catered beneficial over all development programme with the existing strength.

By the popularisation of the khadi which ensured a sort employment opportunity and native industrial growth. He stressed the development of the villages and its economic self sufficiency. The Wardha scheme education was the best example for his vision on the rural development by encouraging and popularising the *learning through activity* education system or vocational education. In the Wardha scheme of basic education, Zakir Husain Committee formulated a detailed national plan for the basic education. The main principle behind this scheme was learning through activity. It was based on Gandhian ideas published in the weekly *Harijan*. The Wardha scheme had a few remarkable provisions like inclusion of a basic handicraft in the syllabus. Gandhi's concept of Ramarajya, self autonomous villages and swadeshi was the base of rural reconstruction.

Champan Satyagraha

Gandhi's first great experiment in satyagraha came in 1917 in Champaran, a district in Bihar. The peasantry on the indigo plantations in the district was excessively oppressed by the European planters. They were compelled to grow indigo on at least 3/20 of their land and to sell it at prices fixed by the planters. Similar conditions had prevailed earlier in Bengal, but as a result of a major uprising 1859-61 the peasants there had won their freedom from the indigo planters.

Having heard of Gandhi's campaigns in south Africa, several peasants of Champaran invited him to come and help them. Accompanied by Babu Rajendra Prasad, Mazhar-ul-Huq, J.B. Kripalani, Narhari Parekh and Mahadev Desai, Gandhiji reached Champaran in 1917 and began to conduct a detailed inquiry into the condition of the peasantry. The infuriated district officials ordered him to leave Champaran, but he defied the order and was willing to face trial and imprisonment. This forced the government to cancel its earlier order and to appoint a committee of inquiry on which Gandhiji served as a member. Ultimately the disabilities from which the peasantry was suffering were reduced and Gandhiji had won his first battle of civil disobedience in India. He had also had a glimpse into the naked poverty in which the peasants of India lived.

Ahmadabad Mill Strike

In 1918, he intervened in a dispute between the workers and mill owners of Ahmedabad. He advised the workers to go on strike and to demand a 35 percent increase in wages. But he insisted that the workers should not use violence against the employers during the strike. He undertook a fast unto death to strengthen the workers' resolve to continue the strike. But his fast also put pressure on the mill owners who relented on the fourth day and agreed to give the workers a 35% increase in wages.

In 1918, crops failed in the Kheda District in Gujarat but the government refused to remit land revenue and insisted on its full collection. Gandhiji supported the peasants and advised them to withhold payment of revenue till their demand for its remission was met. The struggle was withdrawn when it was learnt that the government had issued instructions that revenue should be recovered only from those peasants who could afford to pay. Sardar Vallabhai Patel was one of the many young persons who became Gandhiji's followers during the Kheda peasant struggle.

These experiences brought Gandhiji in close contact with the masses whose interests he actively espoused all his life. In fact; he was the first Indian nationalist leader who identified his life and his manner of living with the life of the common people. In time he became the symbol of poor India, nationalist India and rebellious India. Three other causes were very dear to Gandhi's heart. The first was Hindu-Muslim unity, the second, the fight against untouchability, and the third, the raising of the social status of women in the country.

Satyagraha against the Rowlett Act

Along with other nationalists, Gandhiji was also aroused by the Rowlett Act. In February 1919, he founded the satyagraha sabha whose members took a pledge to disobey the Act and thus to court arrest and imprisonment. Here was a new method of struggle. The nationalist movement, whether under moderate or extremist leadership, had hitherto confine its struggle to agitation. Big meetings and demonstrations, refusal to cooperate with the government, boycott of foreign cloth and schools, or individual acts of political work known to the nationalists. Satyagraha immediately raised the movement to a new, higher level. Nationalists could now act, instead of merely agitating and giving only verbal expression to their dissatisfaction and anger.

It was moreover, to rely increasingly on the political support of the peasants, artisans and the urban poor. Gandhiji asked the nationalist workers to go to the villages. That is where India lives, he lived. He increasingly turned the face of nationalism. Towards the common man and the symbol of this transformation was to be khadi or hand spun and hand woven cloth, which soon became the uniform of the nationalists. He spun daily to emphasise the dignity of labour and the value of self reliance. India's salvation would come, he said, when the masses were wakened from their sleep and became active in politics. And the people responded magnificently to Gandhi's call.

March and April 1919 witnessed a remarkable political awakening in India. Almost the entire country came to life. There were hartals, strikes, processions and demonstrations. The slogans of Hindu-Muslim unity filled the air. The entire country was electrified. The Indian people were no longer willing to submit to the degradation of foreign rule.

The growing indignation against the British rule led to the launching of the Khilafat and Non cooperation movement. Turkey had fought against Britain in the First World War. At the end of the war, Turkey which was one of the defeated countries, suffered injustices at the hands of Britain. In 1919, a movement was organised under the leadership of Mohamed Ali and Shaukat Ali, popularly known as Ali brothers, Abdul Kalam Azad, Hasrat Mohani and others to force the British government to undo these injustices. All these leaders had been imprisoned by the government during the war and were released after it. The khilafat committee which was set up to conduct this movement was joined by Gandhiji. The sultan of Turkey was also considered the caliph or Khalifa, the religious head of the Muslims. Therefore, the movement over the question of the injustice done to Turkey was called the khilafat movement. It gave a call for non movement. The movement on the khilafat question soon merged with the movement against the repression in Punjab and for Swaraj.

In 1920, the congress, first at a special session held at Calcutta and later at the regular session held at Nagpur under Gandhiji's leadership, adopted a new programme of struggle against the government. At the Nagpur session which was attended by about 15,000 delegates, the congress Constitution was amended and "the attainment of swarajya by the people of India by all legitimate and peaceful means" became the First Article of the Constitution of the congress. The movement was aimed at undoing the injustice done to Punjab, Turkey, and the attainment of swaraj. It is called the Non-cooperation Movement because of the methods adopted in this movement. It was launched in stages. It began with the renunciation of honorary titles like 'Sir' that Indians had received from the British government. Subramanya Iyer and Rabindranath Tagore had already done so. Gandhi returned his Kaiser-i-Hind medal in August 1920. Many others followed. Indians no longer thought it honourable to receive titles from the British Government and thus it is associated with it. Thousands of students and teachers left schools and colleges. New educational institutions like the Jinnah Memorial (later shifted to Delhi) and Kashi Vidyapeeth in Benares were started by nationalists. Government servants resigned their jobs. Lawyers boycotted law courts. Foreign cloth was burnt in bonfires. There were strikes and hartals all over the country.

The movement was a great success and the firings and arrests could not stop it. Before the year 1922 was out, 30,000 people were in jail. They included most of the prominent leaders. Gandhiji, however, was still free. A rebellion had broken out in some parts of Kerala. The rebels were mostly Moplah peasants; hence it is called the Moplah rebellion. It was suppressed by terrible brutalities. More than 2000 Moplahs were killed and about 45,000 arrested. An example of the brutalities was suffocation to death of 67 Moplah prisoners in a railway wagon when they were being shifted from one place to another.

The 1922 session of the congress was held at Ahmadabad. It was presided over by Hakim Jinnah. The session decided to continue the movement and to launch the final stage of the Non-cooperation Movement. This was to be done by giving a call to the people to refuse to pay taxes. It was started by Gandhiji in Bardoli in Gujarat. It was a very important stage because when people openly declare that they would not pay taxes to the government, they mean that they no longer recognise that the government is legitimate. This is a very powerful method of fighting an oppressive government. Gandhiji had always emphasised that the entire movement should be peaceful. However, people were not always able to contain themselves. In Chauri Chaura in Uttar Pradesh, on 5 February 1922, the police, without any provocation, fired on the people who were taking part in a demonstration. The people, in their anger, attacked the police station and set it

on fire. Twenty two police men who were inside the police station were killed. Gandhiji had made it ... condition that the movement should remain completely peaceful. Gandhiji, hearing the news of the incident, called off the movement .On 5th March 1922; he was arrested and sentenced to six years imprisonment.

With the calling off of the movement, one more phase of the nationalist movement was over. In this movement large masses of people participated over the country .It spread to the village also.People were out in open defiance of the government to demand swaraj.The movement also strengthened the unity between the Hindus and the Muslims .One of the most popular slogans during the movement was 'Hindu Muslman Ki Ji'.

Civil Disobedience movement of 1930

The observance of the Independence Day in 1930 was followed by the launching of the Civil Disobedience Movement under the leadership of Gandhiji.It began with the famous Dandi March of Gandhiji.On 12 March 1930, Gandhiji left the Sabarmati Ashram at Ahmadabad on foot with 78 other members of the Ashram at for Dandi,a village on the western sea coast of India, at a distance of about 385 km from Ahmedabad.They reached Dandi on 6 April 1930. There, Gandhiji broke the Salt Law. It was illegal for anyone to make salt as it was a government monopoly.Gandhiji defied the government by picking up a handful of salt which had beenFormed by the evaporation of sea water.

The defiance of the Salt Law was followed by the spread of Civil Disobedience Movement all over the country.Making of salt spread throughout the country in the first phase of Civil Disobedience Movement. It became a symbol of the people's defiance of the government.In Tamil Nadu, C.Rajagopalachari led a march similar to the Dandi March-from Trichinopoly to Vedaranyam.In Dharsana, in Gujarat, Sarojini Naidu,the famous poetess who was a prominent leader of the congress and had been president of the congress, led non -violent satyagrahis in a march to the salt depots owned by the government. Over 800 satyagrahis were severely injured and two killed in the brutal lathi charge by the police. There were demonstrations hartals,boycott of foreign goods, and later refusal to pay taxes.Lakhs of people participated in the movement , including a large number of women.

All the important leaders were arrested and the Congress was banned.There were firings and lathi charges and hundreds of people were killed.About 90,000 persons were imprisoned within a year of the movement. The movement had spread to eveOry corner of the country.In the North-West Frontier Province,the movement was led by khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan who came to be

popularly known as the Frontier Gandhi (Sarhadi Gandhi). A significant event took place there during this movement. Two platoons of Garhwali soldiers were ordered to fire at demonstrators in the city of Peshwar, but they refused to obey the orders. For a few days, the British control over the city of Peshwar ended. In Sholapur, there was an uprising in protest against Gandhiji's arrest and the people set up their own rule in the city. The activities of the revolutionaries in Chittagong led by Surya Sen and in other places have already been mentioned.

In November 1930, the British government convened the First Round Table Conference in London to consider the reforms proposed by the Simon Commission. The Congress, which was fighting for the independence of the country, boycotted it. But it was attended by the representatives of Indian Princes, Muslim League, Hindu Mahasabha and some others. But nothing came out of it. The British government knew that without the participation of the Congress, no decision on constitutional changes in India would be acceptable to the Indian people. Early in 1931, efforts were made by Viceroy Irwin to persuade the Congress to join the Second Round Table Conference. An agreement was reached between Gandhiji and Irwin, according to which the government agreed to release all political prisoners against whom there were no charges of violence. The Congress was to suspend the Civil Disobedience Movement. Many nationalist leaders were unhappy with this agreement. However at its Karachi session which was held in March 1931 and was presided over by Vallabhai Patel, the Congress decided to approve the agreement and participate in the Second Round Table Conference. Gandhiji was chosen to represent the Congress at the Conference which met in September 1931.

At the Karachi session of the Congress, an important resolution on fundamental Rights and Economic Policy was passed. It laid down the policy of the nationalist movement on social and economic problems facing the country. It mentioned the fundamental rights which would be guaranteed to the people irrespective of caste and religion, and it favoured nationalisation of certain industries, promotion of Indian industries, and schemes for the welfare of workers and peasants. This resolution showed the growing influence of the ideas of socialism on the nationalist movement.

Besides Gandhiji, who was the sole representative of the Congress, there were other Indians who participated in this conference. They included Indian Princes and Hindu, Muslim and Sikh communal leaders. These leaders played in to the hands of the British. The Princes were mainly interested in preserving their position as rulers. The communal leaders had been selected by the British government to attend the Conference. They claimed to be representatives of their respective communities and not the country, though their influence within their

communities was also limited. Gandhiji had alone as the representative of the Congress represented the whole country. Neither the princes nor the communal leaders were interested in India's independence. Therefore, no agreement could be reached and the Second Round Table Conference ended in a failure. Gandhiji returned to India and the Civil Disobedience movement was revived. The government repression had been continuing even while the conference was going on and now it was intensified. Gandhiji and other leaders were arrested. The government's efforts to suppress the movement may be seen from the fact that in about a year 1, 20,000 persons were sent to jail. The movement was withdrawn in 1934. The congress passed an important resolution in 1934. It demanded that a constituent assembly elected by the people on the basis of adult franchise be convened. It declares that only such an assembly could frame a constitution for India. It thus asserted that only the people had the right to decide the form of government under which they would live.

Though the Congress had failed to achieve its objective, it had succeeded in mobilizing vast sections of the people in second great mass struggle in the country. It has also adopted radical objectives for the transformation of Indian society.

Gandhi –Irwin Pact

The Viceroy, Lord Irwin, was at this time directing the sternest repression which Indian nationalism had known, but he did not really relish the role. The British civil service and the commercial community were in favour of even harsher measures. But Premier Ramsay MacDonald and Secretary of State Benn were eager for peace, if they could secure it without weakening the position of the Labour Government; they wanted to make a success of the Round Table Conference and they knew that this body without the presence of Gandhi and the Congress could not carry much weight. In January 1931, at the closing session of the Round Table Conference, Ramsay MacDonald went so far as to express the hope that the Congress would be represented at the next session. The Viceroy took the hint and promptly ordered the unconditional release of Gandhi and all members of the Congress Working Committee. To this gesture Gandhi responded by agreeing to meet the Viceroy.

"The Two Mahatmas" –as Sarojini Naidu described Gandhi and Irwin—had eight meetings which lasted for a total of 24 hours. Gandhi was impressed by Irwin's sincerity. The terms of the "Gandhi-Irwin Pact" fell manifestly short of those which Gandhi had prescribed as the minimum for a truce. Some of his colleagues considered the Gandhi-Irwin Pact a clever manoeuvre, and suspected that Irwin had led the Mahatma upon the garden path of the Viceroy's House

Critique on Gandhian Ideology and Practice

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, popularly known as Mahatma Gandhi, was a complex personality. He was a unique mixture of traditionalism and modernity. Therefore, it is not surprising that historians and scholars have passed judgment on him which is objectively not true. They judge him in a subjective and somewhat prejudiced way.

R.P. Dutt a famous communist has assessed Gandhi as anti revolutionary, commander of calamities and well wisher of bourgeoisie. This assessment was thoroughly sectarian and even Dutt has to concede that it was Gandhi only who could enter the hearts and huts of the poor.

Professor Irfan Habib opines that R.P. Dutt and early communist leaders went wrong in their judgment of Gandhi because they have a wrong notion of their role and position in India's struggle for freedom. They looked upon the left movement as a parallel movement and not as an integral part of national movement which, in their eyes was a bourgeois movement. Hence the left was contesting bourgeoisie for the leadership of freedom movement.

The new school of history, known as 'subaltern school' rejects class approach to understanding history. In their view society consists only of the 'Elites' and the 'Non elites'. Hence a movement is either elitist or non elitist. They looked upon national movement as an elitist movement in which non elitist have no role to play. Mahatma Gandhi being the leader of an elitist movement was the representative of and served the interests of the elites and not of the common people. Thus, he was an elitist and not the representative of the masses. Prof. Irfan Habib writes that it is claimed on behalf of the subaltern historians that they give new in sight for understanding Gandhi and his role. But the truth is that their studies make Gandhi totally irrelevant and present a much distorted picture of freedom movement.

The historians like Anil Seal and Judith Brown also down play Gandhi's role in transforming India's struggle for freedom in to a mass movement. If Anil Seal declares that freedom movement received no mass support before the passage of Act of 1935; Judith Brown looked upon the civil Disobedience Movement as a business movement.

The British historians and those belonging to Cambridge school of history argue that Gandhiji was a Mahatma only in appearance. In their eyes he was a shrewd politician, an expert in making moves. These historians go on to declare that Gandhi myth was created by the British themselves. It was they who by their

political and constitutional acts brought and created a halo around him. The view point of these historians, in Pro.Irfan's opinion is so erroneous that it needs no comment. Some scholars have psycho analyzed Gandhiji. On the other hand ,historians of Nationalist school have eulogized Gandhiji.It is true that they have made mild criticism of some moves made by Gandhi, but on the whole, they appreciate him and are convinced that India owe its freedom to him.

Then there are historians like R.C.Majumdar who give no credit to Gandhi for India's freedom. The presence of so many divergent views makes it difficult to make a correct assessment of Gandhi's role in freedom struggle.

The arguments of those who think that Gandhiji is given more credit than he deserve run as follow:

The main weapons in Gandhi's armoury during freedom struggle were swadeshi, Boycott and passive resistance. These are the methods introduced and followed by Tilak and others even before Gandhi.Even the goal of swaraj was put forward by Tilak who declared it his birth right.

Gandhiji's contribution in freedom struggle consists of three land mark struggles. They are the Non cooperation Movement of early twenties, the Civil Disobedience Movement of early thirties and the Quit India Movement of 1942.The first two movements roused the masses and was full of possibilities .But, whatever may be reason behind it, both these movements were brought to an abrupt end by Gandhiji's himself. These movements were far removed from 1947 and cannot be credited with achievement of freedom in that year. So far as the Quit India Movement is concerned; Gandhi himself declared that it was not his movement. Thus by his own admission, he just gave a call for 'Quit India' and could do no more .Hence he cannot be credited either with success or failure of that movement. Even Pro. Irfan who has assessed Gandhiji's role with an open mind, is of firm view that to give a call of Quit movement, was totally wrong.

The role and contribution of revolutionary movements to India's struggle for freedom should not be underrated or over looked. It is not simply a coincidence that every high tide of revolutionary activities is followed by concessions in the form of constitutional reforms by the British government. The revolutionaries, with their heroic deeds and supreme sacrifice, roused the patriotic spirit of the people and the Gandhian current of national movement was a beneficiary of that. Similarly, the communist and the Left movement also contributed to India's struggle, but they never saw eye to eye with Mahatma Gandhi.

The observance of the Independence Day in 1930 was followed by the launching of the Civil Disobedience Movement under the leadership of Gandhiji. It began with the famous Dandi March of Gandhiji. On 12 March 1930, Gandhiji left the Sabarmati Ashram at Ahmedabad on foot with 78 other members of the Ashram for Dandi, a village on the western sea coast of India, at a distance of about 385 km from Ahmedabad. They reached Dandi on 6 April 1930. There, Gandhiji broke the Salt Law. It was illegal for anyone to make salt as it was a government monopoly. Gandhiji defied the government by picking up a handful of salt which had been formed by the evaporation of sea water.

The defiance of the Salt Law was followed by the spread of Civil Disobedience Movement all over the country. Making of salt spread throughout the country in the first phase of Civil Disobedience Movement. It became a symbol of the people's defiance of the government. In Tamil Nadu, C. Rajagopalachari led a march similar to the Dandi March—from Trichinopoly to Vedaranyam. In Dharsana, in Gujarat, Sarojini Naidu, the famous poetess who was a prominent leader of the Congress and had been president of the Congress, led non-violent satyagrahis in a march to the salt depots owned by the government. Over 800 satyagrahis were severely injured and two killed in the brutal lathi charge by the police. There were demonstrations, hartals, boycott of foreign goods, and later refusal to pay taxes. Lakhs of people participated in the movement, including a large number of women.

All the important leaders were arrested and the Congress was banned. There were firings and lathi charges and hundreds of people were killed. About 90,000 persons were imprisoned within a year of the movement. The movement had spread to every corner of the country. In the North-West Frontier Province, the movement was led by Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan who came to be popularly known as the Frontier Gandhi (Sarhadi Gandhi). A significant event took place there during this movement. Two platoons of Garhwali soldiers were ordered to fire at demonstrators in the city of Peshwar, but they refused to obey the orders. For a few days, the British control over the city of Peshwar ended. In Sholapur, there was an uprising in protest against Gandhiji's arrest and the people set up their own rule in the city. The activities of the revolutionaries in Chittagong led by Surya Sen and in other places have already been mentioned.

In November 1930, the British government convened the First Round Table Conference in London to consider the reforms proposed by the Simon Commission. The Congress, which was fighting for the independence of the country, boycotted it. But it was attended by the representatives of Indian Princes, Muslim League, Hindu Mahasabha and some others. But nothing came out of it. The British government knew that without the participation of the

congress; no decision on constitutional changes in India would be acceptable to the Indian people. Early in 1931, efforts were made by Viceroy Irwin to persuade the congress to join the Second Round Table Conference. An agreement was reached between Gandhiji and Irwin, according to which the government agreed to release all political prisoners against whom there were no charges of violence. The congress was to suspend the Civil Disobedience Movement. Many nationalist leaders were unhappy with this agreement. However at its Karachi session which was held in March 1931 and was presided over by Vallabhai Patel, the congress decided to approve the agreement and participate in the Second Round Table Conference. Gandhiji was chosen to represent the Congress at the Conference which met in September 1931.

At the Karachi session of the Congress, an important resolution on fundamental Rights and Economic Policy was passed. It laid down the policy of the nationalist movement on social and economic problems facing the country. It mentioned the fundamental rights which would be guaranteed to the people irrespective of caste and religion, and it favoured nationalisation of certain industries, promotion of Indian industries, and schemes for the welfare of workers and peasants. This resolution showed the growing influence of the ideas of socialism on the nationalist movement.

Besides Gandhiji, who was the sole representative of the Congress, there were other Indians who participated in this conference. They included Indian Princes and Hindu, Muslim and Sikh communal leaders. These leaders played in to the hands of the British. The Princes were mainly interested in preserving their position as rulers. The communal leaders had been selected by the British government to attend the Conference. They claimed to be representatives of their respective communities and not the country, though their influence within their communities was also limited. Gandhiji had alone as the representative of the Congress represented the whole country. Neither the princes nor the communal leaders were interested in India's independence. Therefore, no agreement could be reached and the Second Round Table Conference ended in a failure. Gandhiji returned to India and the Civil Disobedience movement was revived. The government repression had been continuing even while the conference was going on and now it was intensified. Gandhiji and other leaders were arrested. The government's efforts to suppress the movement may be seen from the fact that in about a year 1, 20,000 persons were sent to jail. The movement was withdrawn in 1934. The congress passed an important resolution in 1934. It demanded that a constituent assembly elected by the people on the basis of adult franchise be convened. It declares that only such an assembly could frame a constitution for India. It thus asserted that only the people had the right to decide the form of government under which they would live.

Though the Congress had failed to achieve its objective, it had succeeded in mobilizing vast sections of the people in second great mass struggle in the country. It has also adopted radical objectives for the transformation of Indian society.

GANDHI AND AMBEDKAR

Diverging perceptions in the struggle against oppression among those who contributed to the social advancement of the Harijans, Gandhi and Ambedkar are the most important. Gandhi approached the problem from the standpoint of an upper caste Hindu who wanted to rot out Untouchability from the fabric of society; the latter identified himself with the struggle against the exploitation which the untouchables had suffered under the upper caste Hindus across the centuries.

Gandhi, as a believing Hindu, felt that Hinduism needed to be reformed of the excrescence of untouchability. Ambedkar, on the contrary, was convinced that the problem was a part of Hinduism and was enshrined in its sacred scriptures. They continue to be debated within Indian Society even today. In what follows we shall look at some significant situations where the differing positions of the two leaders emerge.

At Gandhi's invitation Ambedkar went to meet him Malabar Hill, in Bombay, on August 14th, 1931. The meeting did not go off well. Gandhi stated that he had been thinking of the problem of Untouchables ever since his school days, well before Ambedkar was born. He had incorporated the fight against untouchability in the programme of the Congress. He was surprised that Ambedkar opposed him and the Congress. Ambedkar replied sarcastically that it was true that Gandhi started to think about the problem of Untouchables before he was born. Old people always liked to emphasise the point of age. However, the Congress had done nothing beyond giving formal recognition to the problem. Had the Congress party been sincere it would have made "the removal of Untouchability a condition, like the wearing of Khaddar, for becoming a member of the Congress". Ambedkar states that Hindus were not showing any change of heart concerning the problem of untouchables. He continued: We believe in self-help and self-respect. We are not prepared to have faith in great leaders and Mahatmas

Ambedkar asked Gandhi what his position was on the question of special political safeguards and adequate political representation for the Depressed Classes. Gandhi replied: "I am against the political separation of the Untouchables from the Hindus. That would be absolutely suicidal." When Ambedkar heard this his worst fears about Gandhi were probably confirmed for he brusquely thanked the latter and left the hall.

At the second round Table Conference had in London, in 1931, Gandhi and Ambedkar continued to have serious differences. While the latter wanted reserved seats and separate electorates for the Untouchables, the former wouldn't hear of it. Stating that Dr. Ambedkar did not speak for the whaled of the Untouchables in India, Gandhi went on to say: "I want to say with all the emphasis I can command that if I was the only person to resist this thing I will resist it with my life." Gandhi was true to his word. Under the Communal Award of 1932 the Untouchable castes were to choose a few representatives of their own by separate electorates and also vote in the general electorate. Gandhi imposed this move by going on the famous 'Fast'. Ambedkar, with great reluctance, went to Poona to negotiate with Gandhi, whose condition was worsening. Eventually a compromise was arrived at where Ambedkar dropped his demand for separate electorates and Gandhi conceded the provision of reserved seats. He pointed out that the practice of untouchability did not have the approval of the Hindu religion either. In order to remove untouchability, he called himself an untouchable. He called upon all inhabitants of ashram to cleanse the ashram themselves. He organised the Harijan Sevak Sangh with the objective of eradicating the evil of untouchability.

Gandhi's reason for opposing separate electorates was his fear that it would disrupt the Hindu community. He said separate electorates will create division among Hindus so much that it will lead to bloodshed. Untouchable hooligans will make common cause with Muslim hooligans and kill caste-Hindus. At another level Gandhi felt that the time was ripe for caste Hindus to make reparation to the untouchables. Conceding separate electorates would take away this possibility of change of heart. The Harijan Sevak Sangh

On September 30, 1932, Gandhi organised a group called the All India Anti untouchability League, which later came to be known as The Harijan Sevak Sangh. Several untouchables were on the central board, including Ambedkar. The goals of the organisation were to open out public wells, roads, schools, temples and cremation grounds to the Untouchables. Intra-caste practices like rules relating to commonality did not enter the reforms envisaged by the organisation.

Between November 1933 and July 1934 Gandhi travelled 12,500 miles in India to talk about the evils of untouchability and collect funds for the organisation. Ambedkar wanted the Anti untouchable league to take seriously the question of equal opportunity in economic and social matters. His views do not appear to have been shared by the other founders. He resigned after a few months and the other Untouchable members also appear to have left. In course

of time The Harijan Sevak Sangh did not admit Untouchable members. Gandhi explained that the organisation was there for repentance on the part caste Hindus. Therefore, Untouchables could advice but not play a leading role. From this it is clear that Gandhi was extremely concerned about a change of attitude among the higher castes and less preoccupied with the new ideas emerging from among the Untouchables themselves.

Ambedkar accepted to give up his demand for a separate electorate, Gandhi responded by conceding the claim for reserved seats. Gandhi disliked conflictual struggle. The style of resolving differences where the two contending parties had to fight each other so that one of them might win was abhorrent to him. It has been argued by Lloyd and Susan Rudolph that Gandhi's preference for consensus and distaste for conflict has roots in village society. There was a constant search for consensus in village affairs and opposition to partisanship. De-emphasising open clashes, victories and defeats, appeared to be a widely prevalent way of resolving disputes. We are of the opinion, however, that the dominant castes potential for coercion contributed to the success of the consensus approach. One of the references in Gandhi's autobiography deals with his firmness on the question of admitting and untouchable family to his ashram near Ahmebadad in 1915. In 1920, Gandhi said: "Swaraj is unattainable without the removal of the sin of untouchability as it is without Hindu-Muslim unity. In 1921 he said, "I do not want to be reborn. But if I have to be reborn, I should be born an Untouchable".

In 1937 Gandhi said, "One born a scavenger must earn his livelihood by being a scavenger, and then do whatever else he likes. For a scavenger is as worthy of his hire as a lawyer or your President. That according to me is Hinduism."What is being implied is that all varnas have equal worth. Seen from another point of view, this would suggest a denial of equal opportunity: for few people will admit that a scavenger is the equal of a lawyer or a President in worldly status, Gandhi believed in Varnashramadharma, the religious division of society into four groups: Brahman, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra. This four-fold ordering of society and the associated traditional duties were important for the preservation of harmony and the growth of the soul. "The law of Varna prescribes that a person should, for his living, follow the lawful occupation of his forefathers," Stated Gandhi.

Ambedkar hardened his position towards Hinduism and caste-Hindu society. To begin with, there was a great difference in the respective family situations of Ambedkar and Gandhi. He was not the social equal of caste Hindus. Ambedkars earlier attitude to Hinduism was ambivalent. On the one hand, he

was slowly coming to realise that within Hinduism there could be no liberation from untouchability; on the other, his own upbringing had been within an atmosphere where the Hindu epics were recited with great devotion. In the early 1920's he had some faith in the Untouchables changing their status through emulating higher caste practices. He gradually came to the conclusion that this process, which sometimes included wearing the sacred thread and celebrating marriages with Vedic rites, had little effect in changing the attitudes of caste Hindus.

In 1935, he announced his decision to leave Hinduism. Where Gandhi's path was one of rediscovering Hinduism, Ambedkar's was one of bitterness and eventual rejection of the religion of his forefathers. On October 14th, 1956, Ambedkar renounced Hinduism and embraced Buddhism along with several hundred thousand of his followers. His choice of this particular religion and not any other was based on need to be bicultural rooted in India. Furthermore, he felt that Buddhism espoused egalitarian values without resorting to the violent methods of communism.

Ambedkar and Gandhi played complementary roles in the fight against Untouchability. To begin with, Gandhi may be seen as coming from the dominant sections of Hindu society, while Ambedkar mainly represented the Mahars (although he attempted, with limited success, to mobilise Untouchables all over India) The former believed that a change of heart on the part of the caste Hindus could revitalise Hinduism and permit the development of a Varna system where all sections would be equal. For him, however, Untouchability and Hinduism were inextricably interwoven.

Through calling Untouchables Harijan (children of God) Gandhi attempted to give them a new self-respect. His efforts to change the hearts of the caste Hindus did result in creating acclimatization of concern among at least some of them, particularly the educated sections.

For Ambedkar, equality did not stop with all varnas being equal. In fact he harshly criticised the caste-system and wanted Untouchables to have no part in it. When he advocated equality, he referred to equality in the economic, political and social spheres. His contribution was realistic and lasting. He was largely responsible for creating reserved positions for untouchables in the civil service, legislatures and higher education.

The differences between Gandhi and Ambedkar still continue to haunt the various Dalit movements and reformist Hindu organisations.

UNIT-IV

NATIONHOOD-REALITY

On September 3, 1939, the second world war was broken out and the same day viceroy Linlithgow, without consulting the Indian people declared India to be a belligerent and at war with Germany. The Congress was not averse to the idea of offering support to the British war efforts, but in return demanded that India must be declared an independent nation and that during the war a genuine representative government must be set up at the centre.

The viceroy Lord Linlithgow offered a set of proposals to the Congress for securing its cooperation during war, which are popularly known as the August offer. It proposed a representative constitution-making body set up after war, for the present there would be an immediate increase in the number of Indians in the viceroy's executive council and a war advisory council would be set up. The Congress rejected the August offer. In March 1942 the British government sent Sir Stafford Cripps, a member of the British cabinet to India to find out a solution in consultation with the Indian leaders. He spent three weeks in India and announced his proposals in the form of a draft declaration, which may be summarised as, the creation of a new Indian union, which would have dominion status, a constitution-making body, consisting of the elected representatives of British provinces and the princely states. The constitution framed by this body would be accepted and implemented subject to two conditions. (a) any province of British India not prepared to accept this constitution would retain its present constitutional position. With such non-acceding provinces, the British might agree upon a constitution, giving them the same status as the Indian union. (b) every princely state would be free to adhere to the constitution or decline to do so. During the war an executive council would be set up, composed of leaders of the principal sections of the Indian people. But both the Congress and Muslim League found the Cripps proposals unacceptable and Gandhi described it as a post-dated cheque.

The failure of Cripps' mission and the growing threat of Japanese aggression brought about a radical change in Gandhi's attitude towards the British government. The Congress Working Committee which met at Wardha on July 14, 1942, passed a long resolution, generally called the Quit India resolution. The All India Congress Committee which met in Bombay on August 7, 1942, ratified the Wardha resolution with overwhelming majority. It

sanctioned the non violent mass struggle under the leadership of Gandhiji ,.he said every one of you should from this moment onwards consider yourself a free man or woman and act as if you are freei am not going to be satisfied with anything short of freedom. We shall do or die. We shall either free India or die in the attempt.

The AICC meeting ended at around midnight on August 8, 1942. During that very night the police arrested Gandhi, Azad and all eminent Congress leaders. After the mass arrests, the movement passed through three phases. During the first phase from August 9-13, there were wide scale disturbances, afterwards the situation began to deteriorate. Hartals, mob violence and sabotages were happened against the government apparatus. The events of these four days in August are known as the great August uprising. The course and progress of the movement passed different stages with various leaders, middle-level Congress men and Congress socialists, students were active force in the movement.

The British put down the movement with ruthless brutality. The Congress organizations were banned; lathi charges, bombing imprisonment, torture, and machine gun firing etc. Gandhiji was released after the imprisonment in 1944 and the movement was withdrawn.

Meanwhile, another fight for independence was being waged by Subash Chandra Bose and INA. After founding Forward Bloc, in 1941, he made anti British moves along with the Japanese and German assistance. He raised free India units with Indian prisoners of war in Germany. The efforts of *Indian Independence League* and the formation of INA or Azad Hind Fauj in 1942 gave momentum to the freedom movement. The nucleus of the INA was composed of the Indian soldiers who had surrendered to Japanese troops after the fall of Singapore. The INA was initially organised by Captain Mohan Singh, an Indian officer of British army in Malaya who had surrendered to the Japanese.

The Bangkok conference of the Indian Independence League decided that INA would fight for India's independence and invited Bose to take over the chairmanship of the league and named as the supreme commander of the INA. On October 21, 1943 Bose set up a provisional government of free India in Singapore and in 1944 the INA commenced its military offensive and advanced towards Assam. Bose the famous *Chalo Delhi*, slogan to the soldiers. And acclaimed him as Netaji. The women battalion of INA was under Captain Lakshmi Saigal. The allies fought with tenacity and determination but with the final defeat of Japan INA the movement collapsed. On one disastrous day of August 1945, Subash Chandra Bose is reported to have lost his life in an air crash. It occupies a honourable place in the annals of Indian freedom

struggle. A universal sympathy displayed by the Indian people for the INA, officers, when they were tried in 1945-46 in the Red fort at Delhi, a panel of lawyers who included Tej bahdur sapru, bulabhai desai and Jawaharlal Nehru appeared for them.

COMMUNAL AND SECTARIAN POLARISATION

The Muslim league was in the year 1906 which coloured the subsequent history of the national movement and had a far reaching effect in Hindu Muslim relations. It was the first organised expression of the communal separatism in the country. The encouragement from the British government fostered the separatism, the British civilians like Colvin and Hunter exhorted for a fair deal to the Muslims and to check the growth of national feeling. The British policy of the divide and rule encouraged the communal and separatist tendencies in Indian politics. As per this intention, they came out as a champion of the Muslims and to win over the side of Muslim zamindars, landlords and the newly educated.

The role of sir sayyid Ahamedkhan was notable in the rise Muslim separatist tendency, the ideologies and writings of the khan towards the end popularised the tendencies and the preachings of the political interests too---complete obedience to British rule. When Indian national congress was founded, he opposed it and also began to preach that since the Hindus formed the larger part of the Indian population, they would dominate the Muslims in the case withdrawal of the British rule. Relative backwardness of the Indian Muslims in education, industry also contributed to the separatist tendency. When the educated Muslims found the very rare opportunities for them, they developed a kind of resentment against the Hindus.

The extremist policies, programmes and the speeches and writings of some the militant nationalist had a strong religious and Hindu tinge. They emphasised and identified Indian culture and Indian nation with the Hindu religion, and ignored the elements of composite culture. The absence of a central political organisation to safeguard the Muslim interest against the preponderance of the congress was keenly felt by the Muslim leaders. The viceroy at simla, in august 1906 demanded that the legislative representation of the Muslim should be by the separate electorate and representation should be higher than their percentage in population.

The formation of league produced far reaching consequences in the political history of India. it created the cleavage between the Hindus and Muslims. in 1908 the annual session of the Muslim league opposed the

congress resolution against the partition of Bengal and pressed for a representation on a communal basis. The minto-morley reforms of 1909 accepted the demand for separate electorate for the Muslims, but there was a change in the programme and demands on the Muslim league after 1911. the revocation of the partition of Bengal gave a rude shock to league. The discontent of the Muslim sprang from the foreign source., Gandhi, the khilafat and non cooperation tried to a Hindu Muslim unity in the 20s and 30s.

During the 40s communalism and sectarianism became more severe in India. The partition of India was a logical conclusion of the British policy of divide and rule to look of the communal problem in India merely as a Hindu- Muslim question as of religious antagonism between Hindus and Muslims is misleading. The communal problem at its base was mere economically and politically motivated than religious oriented. apart from the Hindus and Muslims , there was a third party in the communal triangle --- the British rules. They created communal triangle of which they remained the base. The British were neither true friends of the Muslims nor the foes of the Hindus.

The genesis of Pakistan was implicit in the feeling of separatism .the Pakistan demand which accelerated the process of separatism and as a result of the poor performance of the league in the provincial elections of 1937 even in the Muslim majority provinces of Punjab and Bengal .the league leader Jinnah touched the chord of the religious feelings of the Muslim which acted as a rallying force in Muslim politics. The communalism under Hindu mahasaba, RSS and the leaders like M S Golwalkar and V D Savarkar. Their writings and speeches aggravated the Hindu communalism and sectarianism .the demand for Pakistan and two nation theory of league, the direct action day which ultimately led to the partition of India and communal holocaust after the partition too.

In 1943 ,c Rajagopalachari ,who had resigned from the congress in 1942, devised a formula to hold talks with Jinnah on his demand for Pakistan. The main features of this formula were, Muslim league endorses the Indian demand for independence and cooperation with the congress in the formation of the provisional interim government for the transitional period. after the termination of the second world war ,a commission shall be for demarcating contiguous districts in the north west and east of India where the Muslim population is in absolute majority .In the areas thus demarcated ,a plebiscite and shall ultimately decide the issue of separation from Indian union. If the majority decide in favour of forming a separate and sovereign state, such a decision shall be given effect to without prejudice to the right of the border areas to choose between either State.

Jinnah turned down Rajagopalachari's proposal as offering a mutilated and moth eaten Pakistan, but he agreed to discuss the issue with Gandhi, leading to Gandhi-Jinnah talks. Gandhi's negotiate with Jinnah on the basis of Rajaji formula of partitioning India created a sensation and particularly provoked the indignation of the Hindu and Sikh minorities in the Punjab and the Hindus of Bengal. As could be expected, the most bitter criticism was made by the Hindu mahasabha. Savarkar asserted that the Indian provinces were not the private properties of Gandhiji and Rajaji so that they could make gift of them to anyone they liked. The talks were in September 9-27, 1944 and failed to reach an agreement. Gandhi held that the separate Muslim state should be formed after India was free; but Jinnah urged for an immediate and complete settlement. The Gandhi-Jinnah talks did not bring the two communities nearer each other, but two results followed. In the first place, Jinnah was on a high pedestal and there was an inordinate accession of strength to the Muslim league.

After the failure of Gandhi-Jinnah talks, another attempt was made by the Congress and the Muslim League to find a way out from the political impasse. The Congress representative of the Central Assembly, Bhula Bhaijevan Desai and his Muslim League counterpart Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan came up with the following proposals, both the Congress and League would join in forming an interim government at the centre which would function as per the Act of 1935, independent of the Governor General. The interim government would have equal seats for representatives of both parties with adequate representation of the minorities. This pact came to be known as Desai-Liaquat pact. But it never got approval from either the Congress or League, and Jinnah denounced the pact.

About this time, on February 18, 1946, a section of Indians serving in the Royal Indian Navy, known as ratings (non-commissioned officers and sailors) mutinied in Bombay. They went on a hunger strike in protest against untold hardships regarding pay and food and the outrageous racial discrimination, in particular derogatory references to their national character. The ratings took possession of some ships, mounted the guns and prepared to open fire on the military guards. It was largely due to the efforts of Vallabhai Patel that on February 23, 1946, the ratings surrendered; but not before hartals and strikes and even violent outbreaks that had broken out in Bombay and elsewhere claimed a death toll of more than 200 persons.

Besides the R.I.N Mutiny, the Royal Indian Air Forces also started strikes in this period. The labour problem was another feature. The postal and telegraph, railway workers were also went on strikes. The peasants also rose against the high rents and for lands, tebhaga; the village of Bengal was the most important and notable in this character.

On June 14, Wavell broadcast a plan, popularly known as the Wavell Plan. the essence of the plan was the formation of a new executive council at the centre, in which all but the viceroy and the commander in chief would be Indians. All portfolios except defence would also be held by the Indian members. The executive council was an interim arrangement, which was to govern the until such time that a new permanent constitution could be agreed upon and come to force. To consider these proposals and to progress towards the formation of the executive council, a conference of 21 Indian political leaders were invited to the summer capital of simla in june,25 1945.the leaders included Moulana Abdul kalam azad, the then president of the congress, M.A.jinnah the leader of Muslim league, the leaders of the nationalist party, scheduled castes,Sikhs etc.

Jinnah, however, sabotaged the simla conference. He objected to the inclusion of any non league Muslim in the executive council, with the claim that the Muslim league was the sole representative of Indian muslims;the congress therefore had no right to nominate Muslim member to the council .he also demanded, in addition to the retention of the viceroy s veto ,some other safeguards for the Muslim members, such as a provision requiring a clear two-thirds majority in case of proposals objected to by muslim members. The congress objected to these demands as unreasonable.

Abdul kalam Azad who represented the congress at the simla conference, is of the view that the failure of simla conference marked a watershed in India's political history. It immensely strengthened the clout of the Muslim league.

The new Attlee govt of Britain was to hold general elections in India. In the election results announced in December 1945,the congress made its presence felt in the central legislative assembly as also the provincial legislatures .in the central legislative assembly ,the congress secured 91.3 percent of votes in the general constituencies ;the Muslim league won every Muslim seat.

The cabinet mission (march-may,1946) ,composed of three British cabinet ministers –sirpethic Lawrence ,sir Stafford Cripps and A.V Alexander were the members. its objective was to set up quickly a machinery for drawing up the constitution for independent India and make necessary arrangements for an

interim government. After the meeting and discussion with the Indian leaders and announced its recommendations on May 16, 1946. The demand for Pakistan was rejected on the ground that it would not solve the communal minority problem. In addition, partition would create many serious problems in defence, communications and other areas. There was to be a union of India, consisting of the British provinces and the princely states. The union government and its legislature were to have limited powers, dealing with only defence, foreign affairs, and communications. The union would have the powers necessary to raise the finances to manage these subjects. The provinces would enjoy autonomy. The provinces were grouped into three categories – A, B and C. Group A was to consist of Madras, United Provinces, Bihar, Central Provinces, Bombay, and Orissa. Group B was to comprise (the Muslim majority areas) of the Punjab, Sind, NWFP and Baluchistan; Group C was to include Bengal and Assam.

The Congress agreed to the proposals relating to the constituent assembly, but rejected the proposal regarding the formation of an interim government, because the Muslim League had been given disproportionate representation. The League at first accepted it but later rejected and turned to “resort to direct action to achieve Pakistan”. There were communal riots in some parts.

The Viceroy Lord Wavell invited Nehru, the leader of the largest party in India to form an Interim Government, which was sworn in on September 2, 1946. It was composed of 12 members nominated by the Congress with Nehru as its vice president. It was the first time since the coming of the British that the government of India was in Indian hands. The League at first refused to join the interim government, but later joined it on 13 October. It became clear, however, that the League joined the interim government not to work sincerely and cooperate with the Congress, but to paralyse the functioning of the new government and it also boycotted the constituent assembly.

While the country was passing through these uncertainties, Prime Minister Attlee announced on February 20, 1947, in the House of Commons, that the British would quit India after transferring “into responsible hands not later than June 1948.” He also appointed Lord Mountbatten as Viceroy, successor of Lord Wavell, who was the 34th and the last Governor General and immediately began to take measures for transfer. But the Attlee’s proclamation aggravated the communal violence and holocausts in different parts of India. It became a common sight and the partition became inevitable. In the renewed communal violence all the communities – the Hindus, the Muslims and the Sikhs – vied with each other in the worst orgies of violence. The conflagration soon spread from the Punjab to NWFP and other parts of North India.

Mount batten hold prolonged discussions with the leaders and convinced them the reality ,but the stalwarts like Gandhi and Azad vehemently opposed the partition .he prepared a partition plan which came to be known as June 3rd plan or mount batten plan as it was presented in June 3.as per this two new dominions came into being in the world-India and Pakistan. The plan laid the following procedure ,the provincial legislative assemblies of Bengal and Punjab would meet in two parts separately, one representing the Muslim majority districts and the other representing the remaining districts, to decide by vote for partition of the provinces. Sind and Baluchistan decision was to be taken their respective legislatures. NWFP was to be made by people through referendum and a similar referendum was to be held in the sylhet district of Assam .princely states can either accede to or remain independent.

Both congress and league accepted and agreed the plan and the Indian independence act was passed in July 1947. The act provided setting up two independent dominions to be known as India and Pakistan from august 15,1947.

Partition -its impact

As per mount batten plan The partition took place at the midnight of 14th and 15th august 1947 in which the entire paraphernalia was also divided; the geography, administrative units, population, defence etc. the impact of partition was so profound and prolonged. Lord Mountbatten went to Karachi on 13th august and on the following day addressed the Pakistan constituent assembly and attended the inauguration ceremony at Karachi. The partition raised some major issues in which most important was the question of refugees. Bengal, Punjab and Delhi affected the serious refugee problems and communal riots. The rehabilitation of the refugees was the important challenge to face the newly formed government. Displacement of millions of the people and the separation of the minds of Hindus, Muslims and the Sikhs, the question and confusions of the accession of the princely states, either India, Pakistan or to be independent.

Though congress was committed to secularism and though Gandhi staked his life for Hindu Muslim unity ,the congress was not able to a long term strategy to fight communalism in its different forms at the level of both politics and ideology. the congress leaders naively believed that reassurances, generous concessions and willingness to reach a compromise would solve the problem .

National integration

According to the Indian independence act of 1947, along with the British Indian provinces, the princely states of India also become independent. Princely states were free to join in the Indian union or to declare independence. This provision of the act created a very dangerous situation because 40% of territory was under the princes and which may again bring the disunity. In 1947, the future of the princely states became a matter of concern. Many of the larger princes began to dream of independence. They claimed that paramount cannot be transferred to the new states of India and Pakistan. Rulers of several states claimed that they became independent, when British rule ended.

The national could hardly accept such a situation of disunity and rejected the claims of any state of independence. They declared that independence for princely states was not an option; the only option to accede to India or Pakistan on the basis of contiguity of its territory and wishes of its people. The prime task of the new formed independent government was the integration of the Indian states. As a result of several factors and the tact, wisdom, skill with which Sardar Patel handled the problem and he was relentlessly assisted by V.P Menon the secretary of state's department. Patel assumed the charge of the states department on 27th June 1947 and Menon too. Patel appealed to all the princes to accede to the Indian union. Due to the rising tide of the popular movements in the states and the firm attitude of Patel most of the princes responded to the appeal and acceded to Indian union by August 15th 1947. Some of the states joined in the constituent assembly in April 1947 and some of the princess stayed away and few states like Travancore, Bhopal and Hyderabad publically declared their desire to claim an independence status. But at the last three of the states, Junagadh, Jammu and Kashmir and Hyderabad did not join the union and they were acceded to the union by forcefully or with the will of the people.

The ruler of Junagadh, Nawab announced accession of his state to Pakistan but the people state desired join India. The popular movements, the intervention of the Indian troops with the invitation of Shahnawaz Bhutto and the plebiscite favoured to India and accession. In the state of Kashmir ruler was a Hindu and population was Muslim. Hari Singh did not accede either India or Pakistan and continue to be an independent ruler. The popular political force led by the national conference and Sheikh Abdullah wanted to join India and the invasion of the Pathan tribes (Pak Army) compelled the ruler to accede India and also agreed to install Sheikh Abdullah as the head of the state administration. India announced that it would hold referendum on the accession decision in the valley and part of India.

Hyderabad was the largest state in India, ruled by the Nizam who wished to become an independent status with encouragement of Pakistan. Patel negotiated with Hyderabad but the ruler was strengthening his force. In the meanwhile the political developments in the state; the rapid growth of militant Muslim communal organisation, *Ittehad-ul-Muslimin* and its Para military wing Razakars and the satyagraha movement of the state congress for the democratisation made the turbulent situation. The disturbed activities of the Razakars brought the situation very tense and Nizam continued to impart more and more army. At that time Indian army moved to Hyderabad on 13th September 1948, Nizam surrendered and acceded to the Indian union in November 1948. Thus integration process was completed.

Representation in cinema and literature

The partition of India was a tragic event in the history of India. The experience of partition can be seen in cinema, literature, art, paintings and feature films etc. Through this the people of the new generation also could know about the partition and its experience. The partition of India has been documented as the most lethal incidence.

Kushwant Singh's *Train to Pakistan* was the first Indian novelist in English to write and depict the horror and holocaust with the great artistic concern. The novel was written on the background of Mano Majra, an imaginative peaceful village of communal harmony. The bitterness and sympathy in the novelists' attitude and the strange impression.

The most prominent work on partition is '*Freedom at Midnight*' by Dominique Lippere and Larry Collins. It describes the events in Indian independence movement, beginning with the appointment of Lord Mountbatten and ending with the martyrdom of Mahatma Gandhi. The work gives a detailed account of the partition and bloodshed that followed. The fury of both Hindus and Muslims and biggest mass slaughter in the history of India have explained. One incident quoted is particularly terrifying, it describes a canal in Lahore that ran with blood and floating bodies.

In the field of fiction *Hoshiyarpur to Lahore* is a true story based on a train journey from Indian city of Hoshiyarpur to Lahore in Pakistan written by a police officer in Urdu, who travelled in this train.

Tamas is a wonderful novel about the partition and its consequences written by Bisham Sahni. *My Heart* was another novel written by Deepak Aluvalia. *My Blood* is a Bengali novel written by Leena Itejubuhurai, the

basic theme of this novel was problem of minorities. *The shadow lines* by Amithav Ghosh picturises the brutality of partition riots. Chaman Nahal's *Azadi* was on the fact that those who opposed the idea of partition were isolated. It presents the remarks of the common people on the nature of the political situation and the role of politics in their life. *Shadow death* was another novel by Punjabi writer Beejo Singh Surendhran.

Cracking India is a novel written by Bapsi Sidhwa is fascinating account of the violent racial religious clashes created by the partition through the eyes of Lenny provides an intense image of the period. Lenny is a Parsi girl growing up in pre-partition Lahore. The story is unique because it comes from the point of view of a child from an impartial community.

Pinjar is a Punjabi novel by Amrita Pritam is the story of an abducted woman in the period before partition and how she brings about a change in the man who rapes her. It is one of the heart full story and realistic picturization of the partition.

The dawn of freedom written by Fais Ahmed Faiz is one of the wonderful poems about partition. Devakumar Vipin Dev written a novel *partition*.

Khak aur kheen is a historical novel by Nazim Hijasi that describes on Muslims. *The broken mirror* is a Hindi novel by Krishna Baldev Vaid, portrays the psychological and sociological transformations in a West Punjabi villages in the leading up to partition.

The weary generations is a Urdu novel by Abdullah Husain tracks the pre history of the partition through the experiences of the main character, Naem a veteran of the first world war, who faces up to the futility and meaninglessness of the partition.

Midnight's children of Salman Rushdie's famous surrealistic fiction, full of satirical references to the event of partition and independence. The midnight alluded to in the title is the moment at which partition and independence became official.

The Rape Raj Gill directly holds the political leadership responsible for the partition of India and chaos and turmoil it unleashed on the people. The novel reflects that the displacement and sufferings due to partition had demoralised the refugees so much that Leila, the Muslim beloved of Dalipjit and she was raped by Dalipjit's own father, which exposes the unethical consequences of the partition.

Manohar Malgaonkar in *A Bend in the Ganges*, presents a different version of the anatomy of partition which he traces back to the religious hostilities engendered by the British.

Ashes and Petals by H S Gill presents some aspects of life following the partition., the rapes in Punjab and Meerut, the trauma of train massacre in coming and going to Pakistan and the plight of the passengers .

The Sunlight on a Broken Column is a very interesting and significant novel by Attia Hussain on the theme of partition. The novel covers a period of twenty years starting from the 30s when both Hindus and Muslims took active part in the freedom struggle as great patriots.

The dark dancer of balachandra rajan, adha gaon of rahi masoom razha, Toba Teksari of sadat hasan manto, gives us the pictures of the partition and experience. *Purab paschim* of *sunil gangopadhyay*, is a Bengali novel deals with a family that had to migrate from east Pakistan to west Bengal.

Bapsi sidhwa written the *Ice Candy Man* which shows that how friends and neighbours turn out to be enemies overnight. *Pirpindo* a Muslim village is attacked by Sikhs and Muslim men and women are killed. In Lahore the Sikh families are attacked and the chain reaction continued.

Waiting for the mahatma by R.K.Nrayan dealt with a unique aspect of the trauma of partition wherein it is shown that making of a country is not as important as that of the making of humanity.

In cinema

Popular cinema in India is deeply influenced by partition and writers , poets and film makers in India have expressed the ruthlessness of killings and the sufferings of displacement and violence .films being a strong medium to convey and depict the trauma of partition had much discussed. The recounting the trauma of partition, the cinema have used the phrase that the survivors themselves, the division of hearts, the gallantry, and consequences of partition as the central theme. Between 1947-1980 the Indian cinema have a common trend to deals with social problems.

Chalia directed by Manmohan Desai portrays the violent aspects of partition such as abduction, rape, killing, suicide of women etc in this film. M.S Saty's *Garam Hawa* tells the situation of Muslims who remained in India. Govind Nihalani's, *Tamas* a cinematographic work dealt with the events of partition. *dhamaputra* of yash chopra tells and depicts the pre and post independence where a muslim mother left her son to a Hindu family and later he becomes a Hindu fundamentalist.

Pinjar of Chandra Prakash Dwivedi is about the Hindu-Muslim problems during the time around the partition. It is based on a Punjabi novel written by Amrita Pritam. It tells the story of Puro, a young woman of Hindu background. Ritwik Ghatak a Bengali film maker had produced a series of films on partition based themes like *Meghe Dhak A Tara*,

Gaddar ek Prem Katha of Anil Sharma tells about a love story and the following communal riots. *Train to Pakistan* of Pamela Rooks is adapted from Khuswant Singh's novel by the same name tells about the partition and subsequent migration, and violence based on a silent village on the border. *Veer Zara* of Yash Chopra and *Earth* of Deepa Mehta were the other films in which earth features the religious and political uproar during the partition.

Nemai Ghosh's *Chinnamul* a Bengali film tells about the migration of a group of farmers to Calcutta. *Hey Ram* of Kamal Hasan and *Border* of J.P. Dutta also deals some aspects of partition and *Paradesi* of Kunhumammed. Richard Attenborough's *Gandhi* also portrays some aspects and the documentary entitled *The Day India Burned - Partition 1947* is also gives the picture of violence and displacement.

Syllabus

HY5B09 MAKING OF INDIAN NATION

No. of Credits: 4

No. of Contact Hours per week: 5

Aim of the Course: To enable the students to understand the major aspects of colonialism, nationalism and the important stages of the struggle for freedom and to critically analyse colonialism and nationalism. This may help them to have their own ideas on the concepts and realities of the nation that emerged through centuries of western domination and struggles against the same.

UNIT I - Evolution of Indianhood

- Major historiographical trends
- Background of colonialism - East India Companies.
- From Company to Crown
- Colonial Discovery of India and its culture
- Dissemination of colonial knowledge - education.
- Census and colonial ethnography.

UNIT II - Economic and Political Manifestations of Colonialism

- Formation of Colonial Economy
- Agrarian Settlements
- Changes in the political structure – legal juridical apparatus – Indian penal Code – Adalath – Supreme Court – Police System – Administrative system.
- Impact of colonial knowledge - making of Indian middle class.
- Nationalist Critique of Colonial economy - challenges in the field of culture.
- Question of Social reform. – Education – Public Service – Health – Public work.

UNIT III - Struggles Against Colonial State.

- Pre-Gandhian agitations and movements - constitutional agitations - beyond constitutional agitations – moderates and extremist groups - making of grass root level movements – armed struggles
- Question of Mobilization of masses – Divisive policy of Britain - Hind Swaraj - rural reconstruction - non-violence and satyagraha - non-cooperation movement of 1921 and civil disobedience movement of 1930.
- Critique on Gandhian ideology and practice.
- Gandhi Ambedkar debates - Subaltern approach and approach of Cambridge Historians.

UNIT IV - Nationhood - Reality

- Power - communal and sectarian polarisation - national integration - subaltern reflections.
- Representation in Cinema and Literature.

Readings:

Bandopadhyaya Sekhar, *Plassey to Partition*

Bipan Chandra (*et. al*), *India's Struggle for Independence*

Bipan Chandra (*et. al*), *Nationalism and Colonialism in Modern India*

Desai.A.R, *Social Background of Indian Nationalism* Popular Prakasan, Bombay, 1976.

Dharam Kumar & Tapan Ray Chauduri, *The Cambridge Economic History of Indian 1707-1970*

Kulke Herman, *State in India 1000-1800*

Mahajan Sucheta, *Independence and Partition: The Erosion of Colonial Power in India*

Majumdar. R.C., *The Struggle for Freedom*

Metcalf Barbara.D and Thomas.R. Metcalf, *A Concise History of Modern India 4th Edition*, OUP, 2008

Panikkar. K.N., *Culture Ideology Hegemony: Intellectual and Social Consciousness in Colonial India*, Tulika, New Delhi, 1995

Sarkar Sumit, *Modern India 1885-1947*

Further Readings:

- Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/Post Colonialism*
- Bhattacharya Sabya Sachi & Romila Thapar (ed), *Situating Indian History*, OUP, 1986.
- Chandra Sekhar. S, *Colonialism Conflict and Nationalism*, Viswa Prakasam, New Delhi, 1995
- Chatterjee Partha, *A Possible India*
- Chatterjee Partha, *National Thought and the Colonial World*
- Chatterjee Partha, *Wages of Freedom*
- Cohn Bernard. S, *Colonialism and its Forms of Knowledge*
- Gandhi M.K., *My Experiments with Truth.*
- Gosh. S.C., *The History of Education in Modern India* Orient Longman, Hyderabad, 1995
- Hanlon O'Rasalind, *Caste Conflict and Ideology: Mahatma Jyothi Rao Phule Law Caste Protest Movement in Nineteenth Century Western India*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 1985.
- Hasan Mushirul (ed), *India's Partition: Process, Strategy and Mobilisation*, Oxford and Delhi, O.U.P, 1995.
- Irfan Habib, *Essays in Indian History*
- Navaroji Dadabhai, *Poverty and un-British rule in India*
- Pandey Gyanendra, *Remembering Partition*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Pandey Gyanendra, *The Construction of Communalism in Colonial North India*, O.U.P. 1990.
- Sarkar Sumit, *Writing Social History Oxford and Delhi*, 1998.
- Seal Anil, *Emergence of Indian Nationalisation*, Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Tara Chand, *History of Freedom Movement in India* (Four volumes)

^^