

HISTORY OF MODERN INDIA

CORE COURSE

V SEMESTER

B.A HISTORY:



**UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT
SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION**

769

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT
SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Study Material

CORE COURSE

V SEMESTER B.A HISTORY:
HISTORY OF MODERN INDIA

Prepared by:

Sri. SUNILKUMAR.G
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
N.S.S. COLLEGE, MANJERI

Scrutinised by

Sri. Ashraf koyilothan Kandiyil
Chairman, BOS- History (UG)

Settings & Lay Out By:

SDE, Computer Cell

Module I
Consolidation of English Power in India

Module II:
Social and Political Consciousness in India

Module IV:
Indian National Movement

In modern times India was invaded by the Europeans. The Portuguese, the Dutch, the English and the French. The Portuguese were the first to come to India. Finally, it was the British who remained in India. There were several factors which made the Europeans advent to India. The capturing of Constantinople by the Ottoman Turks in 1453, the demand for spices of the east in Europe and the monopoly of the Arabs over trade & commerce in the east are some of reasons.

Module I

Consolidation of English Power in India

The Portuguese and the Dutch were followed by the British. The charter of Queen Elizabeth issued in 1600 authorised the London company to carry on trade & commerce with the east and other countries. Later, King James of England extended the charter for an indefinite period. The first Englishman to come to India for the purpose of trade & commerce is Captain Williams Hawkins. He visited the court of Moghul Emperor Jahangir and received permission to trade at Surat. Later Captain Best who came to India received permission to start a factory at Surat. Capt. Best defeated the Portuguese in the Battle of Swalley near Surat. In 1615, Sir Thomas Roe visited the court of Jahangir and obtained trade concessions.

The English in course of time established trading centers at different places in India. Madras became their trading centre which was fortified by constructing Fort St. George. Machalipatnam in A.P., Hariharpur & Balasora in Orissa & Kasim Bazar & Hooghly in Bengal and Patna in Bihar became the trading centres of the English.

The company obtained Bombay from the English King Charles II who received it as a part of dowry, when he married the Portuguese Princess Catherine. Ahmadabad Broach in Gujarat & Agra in Uttar Pradesh also became their trading centers. The English acquired three villages in Bengal which later developed to become Calcutta. The later Moghul Emperor Farookh Siyar granted the English the firman which permitted them to carry on duty free trade in Bengal.

Thus the English permanently settled in India till 1947. In 1707 the different trading companies came together to form the “United Company of the Merchants of England trading to East Indies”. It was this Company which carried on trade & commerce with India till 1857.

Advent of the Europeans

India's trade relations with Europe go back to the ancient days of the Greeks. During the Middle Ages trade between Europe and India and South-East Asia was carried on along several routes. One was by sea along the Persian Gulf, and from there overland through, Iraq and Turkey, and then again by sea to Venice and Genoa. A second was via the Red Sea and then overland to Alexandria in Egypt and from there by sea to Venice and Genoa. A third, less frequented overland route lay through the passes of the North-West frontier of India, across Central Asia, and Russia to the Baltic. The Asian part of the trade was carried on mostly by Arab merchants and sailors, while the Mediterranean and European part was the virtual monopoly of the Italians. Goods from Asia to Europe passed through many states and many hands. Every state levied tolls and duties while every merchant made a substantial profit, There were many other obstacles, such as pirates and natural calamities on the way. Yet the trade remained highly profitable. This was mostly due to the pressing demand of the people of Europe for Eastern spices which fetched high prices in European markets. The Europeans needed spices because they lived on salted and peppered meat during the winter months, when there was little grass to feed the cattle, and only a liberal use of spices could make this meat palatable. Consequently, European food was as highly spiced as Indian food till the 17th century,

The old trading routes between the East and the West came under Turkish control after the Ottoman conquest of Asia Minor and the capture of Constantinople in 1453. Moreover, the merchants of Venice and Genoa monopolized the trade between Europe and Asia and refused to let the new nation states of Western Europe, particularly Spain and Portugal, have any share in the trade through these old routes.

But the trade with India was too highly priced by the West Europeans to be so easily given up. The demand for spices was pressing and the profits to be made in their trade inviting. The reputedly fabulous wealth of India was an additional attraction as there was an acute shortage of gold all over Europe, and gold was essential as a medium of exchange if trade was to

grow unhampered. The West European states and merchants therefore began to search for new and safer sea routes to India and the Spice Islands of Indonesia, then known as the East Indies. They wanted to break the Arab and Venetian trade monopolies, to bypass Turkish hostility, and to open direct trade relations with the East. They were well-equipped to do so as great advances in ship-building and the science of navigation had taken place during the 15th century. Moreover, the Renaissance had generated a great spirit of adventure among the people of Western Europe.

The first steps were taken by Portugal and Spain whose seamen, sponsored and controlled by their governments began a great era of geographical discoveries. In 1494, Columbus of Spain set out to reach India and discovered America instead. In 1498, Vasco da Gama of Portugal discovered a new and all-sea route from Europe to India. He sailed round Africa via the Cape of Good Hope and reached Calicut. He returned with a cargo which sold for 60 times the cost of his voyage. These and other navigational discoveries opened a new chapter in the history of the world. Adam Smith wrote later that the discovery of America in the Cape route to India were “the two greatest and most important events recorded in the history of mankind.” The 17th and 18th centuries were to witness an enormous increase in world trade. The vast new continent of America was opened to Europe and relations between Europe and Asia were completely transformed. The new continent was rich in precious metals. Its gold and silver poured into Europe where they powerfully stimulated trade and provided some of the capital which was soon to make European nations the most advanced in trade, industry and science. Moreover, America was to provide an inexhaustible market for European manufacturers.

Another major source of early capital accumulation or enrichment for European countries was their penetration of Africa in the middle of the 15th century. In the beginning, gold and ivory of Africa had attracted the foreigner. Very soon, however, trade with Africa centered on the slave trade. In the 16th century this trade was a monopoly of Spain and Portugal. Later it was dominated by Dutch, French and British merchants Year after year, particularly after 1650; thousands of Africans were sold as slaves in the West Indies and in North and South America. The slave ships carried manufactured goods from Europe to Africa, exchanged them on the coast of Africa for Negroes, took these slaves across the Atlantic and exchanged them for the colonial produce of plantations or mines, and finally brought back and sold this produce in Europe. It was

on the immense profits of this triangular trade that the commercial supremacy of England and France was to be based.

The demand for slaves on the sugar, cotton and tobacco plantations and mines of the Western hemisphere was in exhaustive as the hard conditions of work and inhuman treatment of the slaves led to high mortality. Moreover, the limited population of Europe could not have supplied the cheap labor needed for the full exploitation of the land and mines of the New World, While no exact record of the number of Africans sold into slavery exists, historians estimate has ranged between 15 and 50 millions. While loss of people on a massive scale led to the crippling of African countries and societies, a great deal of West European and North American prosperity was based on the slave trade and the plantations worked by slave labour. Moreover, profits of slave trade and slave-worked plantations provided some of the capital which financed the Industrial Revolution in the 18th and 19th centuries. A similar role was later played by the wealth extracted from India.

Slavery was later abolished in the 19th century after it had ceased to play an important economic role, but it was openly defended and praised as long as it was profitable. Monarch, ministers, members of Parliament, dignitaries of the church, leaders of public opinion, and merchants and industrialists supported the slave trade. For example, in Britain, Queen Elizabeth, George III, Edmund Burke, Nelson, Gladstone, Disraeli and Carlyle were some of the defenders and apologists of slavery.

In the 16th century, European merchants and soldiers also began the long process of first penetrating and then subjecting Asian lands to their control. In the process, the prosperity of the Italian towns and merchants was destroyed as commerce and then political power gradually shifted westward towards the Atlantic coast. Portugal had a monopoly of the highly profitable Eastern trade for nearly a century. In India, she established her trading settlements at Cochin, Goa, Diu, and Daman. From the beginning the Portuguese combined the use of force with trade. In this they were helped by the superiority of their armed ships which enabled them to dominate the seas. A handful of Portuguese soldiers and sailors could maintain their position on the seas against the much more powerful land powers of India and Asia. Beside, they also saw that they could take advantage of the mutual rivalries of the Indian princes to strengthen their position. They intervened in the conflict between the ruler; of Calicut and Cochin to establish their trading centers and forts on the Malabar coast From here they attacked and destroyed Arab shipping,

brutally killing hundreds of Arab merchants and seamen, By threatening Mughal shipping, they also succeeded in securing many trading Concessions from the Mughal Emperors, Under the viceroyalty of Alfanso D Albuquerque, who captured Goa, the Portuguese established their domination over the entire Asian Coast from Hormuz in the Persian Gulf to Malacca in Malaya and the Spice Islands in Indonesia. They seized Indian territories on the coast and waged constant war to expand their trade and dominions and safeguard their trade monopoly from their European rivals, nor did they shy away from piracy and plunder. In the words of James Mill, the famous British historian of the 19th century: "The Portuguese followed their merchandise as their chief occupation, but like the English and the Dutch ... of the same period, had no objection to plunder, when it fell in their way." The Portuguese were intolerant and fanatical in religious matters. They indulged in forcible conversion offering people the alternative of Christianity or sword." Their approach in this respect was particularly hateful to people of India where religious tolerance was the rule. They also indulged in inhuman cruelties and lawlessness. In spite of their barbaric behavior their possessions in India survived for a century because they enjoyed control over the high seas, their soldiers and administrators maintained strict discipline, and they did not have to face the might of the Mughal Empire as South India was outside Mughal influence. They clashed with the Mughal power in Bengal in 1631 and were driven out of their settlement at Hugli. Their hold over the Arabian Sea had already been weakened by the English and their influence in Gujarat had become negligible by this time.

Portugal was, however, incapable of maintaining for long its trade monopoly or its dominions in the East. Its population was less than a million, its Court was autocratic and decadent, its merchants enjoyed much less power and prestige than its landed aristocrats, it lagged behind in the development of shipping, and it followed a policy of religious intolerance. The Portuguese and the Spanish had left the English and the Dutch far behind during the 15th century and the first half of the 16th century. But, in the latter half of the 16th century, England and Holland, and later France, all growing commercial and naval powers, waged a fierce struggle against the Spanish and Portuguese monopoly of world trade. In this struggle the latter had to go under. Portugal had become a Spanish dependency in 1580. In 1588 the English defeated the Spanish fleet called the Armada and shattered Spanish naval supremacy forever. This enabled the English and the Dutch merchants to use the Cape of Good Hope route to India and so to join in

the race for empire in the East. In the end, the Dutch gained control over Indonesia and the British over India, Ceylon, and Malaya.

The Dutch had long been dealing in Eastern produce which they bought in Portugal and sold all over Northern Europe. This had led them to develop better ships, scientific sailing techniques, and efficient business methods and organization. Their revolt against the Spanish domination of their homeland, the Netherlands, and Portugal's merger with Spaniards they look for alternative sources of spices. In 1595, four Dutch ships sailed to India via the Cape of Good Hope. In 1602, the Dutch East India Company was formed and the Dutch States General—the Dutch parliament—gave it a Charter empowering it to make war, conclude treaties, acquire territories and build fortresses.

The main interest of the Dutch lay not in India but in the Indonesian Islands of Java, Sumatra, and the Spice Islands where spices were produced. They soon turned out the Portuguese from the Malay Straits and the Indonesian Islands and, in 1623, defeated English attempts to establish themselves there. It appeared at the time that the Dutch had successfully seized the most important profitable part of Asian trade. They did not, however, entirely abandon Indian trade. They also established trading depots at Surat, Broach, Cambay, and Ahmadabad in Gujarat in West India, Cochin in Kerala, Nagapatam in Madras, Masulipatam in Andhra, Chinsura in Bengal, Patna in Bihar, and Agra in Uttar Pradesh. In 1658 they also conquered Ceylon from the Portuguese. They exported indigo, raw silk, cotton textiles, saltpeter, and opium from India. Like the Portuguese they treated the people of India cruelly and exploited them ruthlessly.

The English merchants too looked greedily on the Asian trade. The success of the Portuguese, the rich cargoes of spices, calicoes, silk, gold, pearls, drugs, porcelain, and ebony they carried, and the high profits they made inflamed the imagination of the merchants of England and made them impatient to participate in such profitable commerce. For over 50 years they searched without success for an alternative passage to India. Meanwhile they gathered strength on the sea. In 1579, Drake sailed around the world. In 1588, the defeat of the Spanish Armada led to the opening of the sea-passage to the East.

An English association or company to trade with the East was formed in 1599 under the auspices of a group of merchants known as the Merchant Adventurers. The company was granted a Royal Charter and the exclusive privilege to trade in the East by Queen Elizabeth on 31

December 1600 and was popularly known as the East India Company. From the beginning, it was linked with the monarchy: Queen Elizabeth (1558-1603) was one of the shareholders of the company.

The first voyage of the English East India Company was made in 1601 when its ships sailed to the Spice Islands of Indonesia. In 1608 it decided to open a factory, the name given at the time to a trading depot, at Surat on the West coast of India and sent Captain Hawkins to Jahangir's Court to obtain Royal favors. Initially, Hawkins was received in a friendly manner. He was given a mansab of 400 and a jagir. Later, he was expelled from Agra as a result of Portuguese intrigue. This convinced the English of the need to overcome Portuguese influence at the Mughal Court if they were to obtain any concessions from the Imperial Government. They defeated a Portuguese naval squadron at Swally near Surat in 1612 and then again in 1614. These victories led the Mughals to hope that in view of their naval weakness they could use the English to counter the Portuguese on the sea. Moreover, the Indian merchants would certainly benefit by competition among their foreign buyers. Consequently, the English Company was given permission by a Royal Farman to open factories at several places.

The English were not satisfied with this concession. In 1615 their ambassador Sir Thomas Roe reached the Mughal Court. They also exerted pressure on the Mughal authorities by taking advantage of India's naval weakness and harassing Indian traders and shipping to the Red Sea and to Mecca. Thus, combining entreaties with threats, Roe succeeded in getting an Imperial Farman to trade and establish factories in all parts of the Mughal Empire. Roe's success further angered the Portuguese and a fierce naval battle between the two countries began in 1620. It ended in English victory. Hostilities between the two came to an end in 1630. In 1662 the Portuguese gave the Island of Bombay to King Charles II of England as dowry-for marrying a Portuguese Princess. Eventually, the Portuguese lost all their possessions in India except Goa, Din and Daman. The Dutch, the English, and the Marathas befitted, the Marathas capturing Salsette and Bassein in 1739.

The English Company fell out with the Dutch Company over division of the spice trade of the Indonesian Islands. Ultimately, the Dutch nearly expelled the English from the trade of the Spice Islands and the latter were compelled to concentrate on India where the situation was more favorable to them- The intermittent war in India between the two powers, which had begun in 1654, ended in 1667, when the English gave up all claims to Indonesia while the Dutch agreed to

leave alone the English settlements in India. The English, however, continued their efforts to drive out the Dutch from the Indian trade and by 1795 they had expelled the Dutch from their last possession in India.

Plassey

The beginnings of British political sway over India may be traced to the battle of Plassey in 1757, when the English East India Company's forces defeated Siraj-ud-Daulah, the Nawab of Bengal. The earlier British struggle with the French in South India had been but a dress rehearsal. The lessons learnt there were profitably applied in Bengal. Bengal was the most fertile and the richest of India's provinces. Its industries and commerce were well developed. As has been noted earlier, the East India Company and its servants had highly profitable trading interests in the province. The Company had secured valuable privileges in 1717 under a royal farman by the Mughal Emperor, which had granted the Company the freedom to export and import their goods in Bengal without paying taxes and the right to issue passes or dastaks for the movement of such goods. The Company's servants were also permitted to trade but were not covered by this farman. They were required to pay the same taxes as Indian merchants. This farman was a perpetual source of conflict between the Company and the Nawabs of Bengal. For one, it meant loss of revenue to the Bengal Government. Secondly, the power to issue dastaks for the Company's goods was misused by the Company's servants to evade taxes on their private trade. All the Nawabs of Bengal, from Murshid Quli Khan to Alivardi Khan, had objected to the English interpretation of the farman of 1717. They had compelled the Company to pay lump sums to their treasury, and firmly suppressed the misuse of dastaks. The Company had been compelled to accept the authority of the Nawabs in the matter, but its servants had taken every opportunity to evade and defy this authority.

Matters came to a head in 1756 when the young and quick tempered Siraj-ud-Daulah succeeded his grandfather, Alivardi Khan. He demanded of the English that they should trade on the same basis as in the times of Murshid Quli Khan. The English refused to comply as they felt strong after their victory over the French in South India. They had also come to recognize the political and military weakness of Indian states. Instead of agreeing to pay taxes on their goods to the Nawab; they levied heavy duties on Indian goods entering Calcutta which was under their control. All this naturally annoyed and angered the young Nawab who also suspected that the

Company was hostile to him and was favoring his rivals for the throne of Bengal. The breaking point came when, without taking the Nawab's permission, the Company began to fortify Calcutta in expectation of the coming struggle with the French, who were stationed at this time at Chandernagore. Siraj rightly interpreted this action as an attack upon his sovereignty. How could an independent ruler permit a private company of merchants to build forts or to carry on private wars on his land? Moreover he feared that if he permitted the English and the French to fight each other on the soil of Bengal, he too would meet the fate of the Carnatic Nawabs. In other words, Siraj, was willing to let the Europeans remain, as merchant but not as masters. He ordered both the English and the French to demolish their fortifications at Calcutta and Chandernagore and to desist from fighting each other. While the French Company obeyed his order, the English Company refused to do so, for its ambition had been whetted and its confidence enhanced by its victories in the Carnatic. It was now determined to remain in Bengal even against the wishes of the Nawab and to trade there on its own terms. It had acknowledged the British Government's right to control all its activities, it had quietly accepted restrictions on its trade and power imposed in Britain by the British Government; its right to trade with the East had been extinguished by the Parliament in 1693 when its Charter was withdrawn; it had paid huge bribes to the King, the Parliament, and the politicians of Britain (in one year alone, it had to pay £ 80,000 in bribes). Nevertheless the English Company demanded the absolute right to trade freely in Bengal irrespective of the Bengal Nawab's orders. This amounted to a direct "challenge to the Nawab's" sovereignty. No ruler could possibly accept this position. Siraj-ud-Daulah had the statesmanship to see the long-term implications of the English designs. He decided to make them obey the laws of the land.

Acting with great energy but with undue haste and inadequate preparation, Siraj-ud-Daulah seized the English factory at Kasimbazar, marched on to Calcutta, and occupied the Fort William on 20 June 1756. He then retired, from Calcutta to celebrate his easy victory, letting the English escape with their ships; This was a mistake for he had underestimated the strength of his enemy.

The English officials took refuge at Fulda near the sea protected by their naval superiority. Here they waited for aid from Madras and, in the meantime, organised a web of intrigue and treachery with the leading men of the Nawab's court. Chief among these were Mir Jafar, the Mir Bakshi, Mawck Chand, the Officer-in-Charge of Calcutta, Amichand, a rich

merchant, Jagat Seth, the biggest banker of Bengal, and Khadim Khan, who commanded a large number of the Nawab's troops. From Madras came a strong naval and military force under Admiral Watson and Colonel Clive. Clive reconquered Calcutta in the beginning of 1757 and compelled the Nawab to concede all the demands of the English.

The English, however, were not satisfied, they were aiming high. They had decided to install a more pliant tool in Siraj Ud Daula's place. Having joined a conspiracy organised by the enemies of the young Nawab to place Mir Jafar on the throne of Bengal, they presented the youthful Nawab with an impossible set of demands. Both sides realised that a war to the finish would have to be fought between them. They met for battle on the field of Plassey, 20 miles from Murshidabad, on 23 June 1757. The fateful battle of Plassey was a battle only in name. In all, the English lost 29 men while the Nawab lost nearly 500. The major part of the Nawab's army, led by the traitors Mir Jafar and Rai Durlabh, took no part in the fighting. Only a small group of the Nawab's soldiers led by Mir Madan and Mohan Lai fought bravely and well. The Nawab was forced to flee and was captured and put to death by Mir Jafar's son Miran. The battle of Plassey was followed, in the words of the Bengali poet Nabam Chandra Sen, by "a night of eternal gloom for India."

The English proclaimed Mir Jafar the Nawab of Bengal and set on to gather the reward. The Company was granted unimpeded right to free trade in Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa. It also received the zamindari of the 24 Parganas near Calcutta. Mir Jafar paid a sum of Rs. 17,700,000 compensation for the attack on Calcutta to the Company and the traders of the city. In addition, he paid large sums as "gifts" or bribes to the high officials of the Company. Clive, for example, received over two million rupees, Watts over one million. Clive later estimated that the Company and its servants had collected more than 30 million rupees from the puppet Nawab. Moreover, it was understood that British merchants and officials would no longer be asked to pay any taxes on their private trade. The battle of Plassey was of immense historical importance, it paved the way for the British mastery of Bengal and eventually of the 'whole of India. It boosted British prestige and at a single stroke raised them to the status of a major contender for the Indian Empire. The rich revenues of Bengal enabled them to organise a strong army. Control over Bengal played a decisive role in the Anglo-French struggle. Lastly, the victory of Plassey enabled the Company and its servants to amass untold wealth at the cost of the helpless people of Bengal. As the British historians, Edward Thompson and G.T. Garrett, have remarked:

To engineer a revolution had been revealed as the most paying game in the world. A gold lust unequalled since the hysteria that took hold of the Spaniards of Cortes' and Pizarro's age filled the English mind. Bengal in particular was not to know peace again until it had been bleed white.

Even though Mir Jafar owed his position to the Company, he soon repented the bargain he had struck. His treasury was soon emptied by the demands of the Company's officials for presents and bribes, the lead in the matter being given by Clive himself. As Colonel Malleon has put it, the single aim of the Company's

Buxar

The Battle of Buxar was fought on 22 October 1764 between the forces under the command of the British East India Company led by Hector Munro and the combined army of Mir Qasim, the Nawab of Bengal; the Nawab of Awadh; and the Mughal King Shah Alam II. The battle fought at Buxar, a "small fortified town" within the territory of Bengal, located on the bank of the Ganges river about 130 km west of Patna, was a decisive victory for the British East India Company.

The prime victim, Shah Alam II, signed the Treaty of Allahabad that secured Diwani Rights for the Company to collect and manage the revenues of almost of real estate, which form parts of the modern states of West Bengal, Odisha, Bihar, Jharkhand, and Uttar Pradesh, as es. Mir Qasim, who was not a general, was quietly replaced. He also received a small share of the total land revenue, initially fixed at 2 million rupees.

The Treaty of Allahabad heralded the establishment of the rule of the East India Company in one-eighth of India proper with a single stroke. The battles of Plassey and Buxar secured a permanent foothold for the British East India Company in the rich province of Bengal, and secured its political ascendancy in the entire region. Buxar should be seen in conjunction with the third battle of Panipat in January 1761 in terms of its impact on consolidating British presence in north-east India. By the treaty of 1752, the Marathas had essentially taken over administration of all the subahs of the Mughal Empire, and had established their right to collect Chauth across these subahs. In return, they would protect the north-west frontier of the Mughal empire from Afghan invasion. This resulted in nine years of Maratha-Afghan struggle to establish control over the empire, and the subah of Punjab, which was

claimed by both. However, due to the Marathas' defeat at the third battle of Panipat, and their subsequent ten-year hiatus from North Indian affairs, the British were able to establish a foothold in North Indian affairs. Buxar was an important step in that direction.

Nawab Shuja-ud-Daula was restored to Oudh, with a subsidiary force and guarantee of defence, the emperor Shah Alam II solaced with Allahabad and a tribute and the frontier drawn at the boundary of Bihar. For Bengal itself the Company took a decisive step.

In return for restoring Shah Alam II to Allahabad, the Company got from him the imperial grant of the diwani or revenue authority in Bengal and Bihar. This had hitherto been enjoyed by the Nawab of Bengal. Thus now there was a double government, the Nawab retaining judicial and police functions but the Company exercising the revenue power. The Company was acclimatised, as it were, into the Indian scene by becoming the Mughal revenue agent for Bengal and Bihar. There was as yet no thought of direct administration, and the revenue was collected by a Company-appointed Deputy-Nawab, Muhammad Reza Khan. But this arrangement made the British East India Company the virtual ruler of Bengal, since it already possessed decisive military power. All that was left to the Nawab was the control of the judicial administration. But he was later forced to hand this over to the Company in 1793. Thus the company's control was virtually complete.

In spite of all this the East India Company was again on the verge of bankruptcy, which stirred the British to a fresh effort at reform. On the one hand Warren Hastings was appointed with a mandate for reform; on the other an appeal was made to the British state for a loan. The result was the beginnings of state control of the Company and the thirteen-year governorship of Warren Hastings.

Hastings's first important work was that of an organiser. In the two and a half years before the Regulating Act came into force he put in order the whole Bengal administration. The Indian deputies who had collected the revenue on behalf of the Company were deposed and their places taken by a Board of Revenue in Calcutta and English collectors in the districts. This was the real beginning of British administration in India. It should also be noted that when the Marathas finally did send a large force back into North India in 1771, they were able to persuade Shah Alam II to leave British protection and enter Maratha protection. They then

established Maratha regency over Delhi, which they essentially held till their defeat in the Second Anglo-Maratha War of 1803.

Consolidation of English political power

Ever since the British came to India they have to face the contention of the European powers like the Dutch, the Portuguese & the French.

The Portuguese & the Dutch however was not serious competitor to the English. The only real rival of the English was the French. The objective of the English to establish a complete monopoly of trade & commerce in India brought them into conflict with the French. As a result was fought the Carnatic was between the English and the French in India, which was to decide as to who was supreme in India.

The causes of the Carnatic wars between the English & the French was because of the difference that existed between them outside India.

Carnatic wars

First Carnatic War (1746-1748)

The cause of the first Carnatic war is the question of succession to the Austrian throne. The differences between the English & the French regarding this event had its effect felt upon India. When the war began to Europe in 1746, the English in India expected military from the home Government to fight against the French.

Duplex, the Governor of Pondicherry called for help from the French Government of Mauritius. Accordingly La Bourdonnais the French General, came to India & even conquered Madras. Duplex did not surrender Madras as promised to the Nawab of Arcot, Anwaruddin & Duplex in which Anwaruddin was defeated in the Battle of St. Thomas. Thus the French under Duplex were victorious in the First Carnatic War.

When the Treaty of Aix La Chapelle signed between the English & the French in Europe the war came to an end, in India as well. Accordingly to the treaty the French agreed to return Madras to the English & the English on their part were to surrender the French territories which they had captured.

Second Carnatic War (1748-1756)

The main cause of the second Carnatic war is the question of succession to the throne of Hyderabad. On the death of the Nizam of Hyderabad, his son Nasir Jang and his grandson Muzafar Jang contended for the throne of Hyderabad. Musaffar Jang sought that help of Chanda Sahib, who wanted to become the king of Arcot. Chanda Saheb sought the help of the French. On the other hand Nazir Jang sought the help of the British.

The war broke out in 1748 with the help of the French Governord Duplex. Chanda Saheb defeated & killed Anwaruddin and became the Nawab of Arcot. Musaffor Jang became the Nizam of Hyderabad. Thus Duplex successfully asserted the French supremacy against the English. On the death of Musaffor Jang, Salabath Jang was placed on the throne of Hyderabad by the French General Bussy for which the French were rewarded with Northern Sarkars. However the French success was short lived.

Robert Clive an Englishman changed the course of the war. He defeated Chanda Saheb & captured Arcot & Trichunapalli & placed on the throne of Arcot Anwaruddin's son Mohammed Ali. As the French forced defeat the home Government recalled Duplex & appointed Godehue as the Governor. As the French could no longer continue with the fight, they were ready for peace. The war came to an end when the Treaty of Trichunapalli was signed. Accordingly the English & the French agreed to not to interfere in the affairs of Carnatic and secondly they agreed to exchange prisoners of war. Robert Clive took the Northern Sarkars.

Third Carnatic War:

The cause of the third Carnatic war is the seven years war that broke out in Europe between the English & the French.

During the third Carnatic war the French General was Count De Lally. The French lost the support of Arcot as the Nizam Salbath Jang had joined the English. The war began when Count De Lally attacked Madras. But he was defeated by the English General Sir Eyre Coote in the Battle of Wandiwash. The English captured Pondicherry & Count De Lally was forced to surrender Karaikal & Jinji were also captured by the English. Thus the French lost the Carnatic war.

The war came to end with the signing of treaty of Paris in Europe between the English & the French. Accordingly the French settlements were to be returned but the French were not to build fortification. Secondly the English & the French were to exchange prisoners of war.

The Carnatic wars thus prepared the Ground for the English to establish their supremacy in India in the long run.

Maratha wars

From the late eighteenth century the Company also sought to curb and eventually destroy Maratha power. With their defeat in the Third Battle of Panipat in 1761, the Marathas dream of ruling from Delhi was shattered. They were divided into many states under different chiefs (sardars) belonging to dynasties such as Sindhia, Holkar, Gaikwad and Bhonsle. These chiefs were held together in a confederacy under a Peshwa (Principal Minister) who became its effective military and administrative head based in Pune. Mahadji Sindhia and Nana Phadnis were two famous Maratha soldiers and statesmen of the late eighteenth century. The Marathas were subdued in a series of wars. In the first war that ended in 1782 with the Treaty of Salbai, there was no clear victor. The Second AngloMaratha War (1803-05) was fought on different fronts, resulting in the British gaining Orissa and the territories north of the Yamuna river including Agra and Delhi. Finally, the Third Anglo-Maratha War of 1817-19 crushed Maratha power. The Peshwa was removed and sent away to Bithur near Kanpur with a pension. The Company now had complete control over the territories south of the Vindhyas.

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 puraudhar 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 at Spiri on February 16, 1780. This success 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-Maratha War 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 surrendered 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.

Native States & Subsidiary alliance

To achieve his political aims Wellesley relied on three methods: the system of Subsidiary Alliances, outright wars, and assumption of the territories of previously subordinated rulers. While the practice of helping an Indian ruler with a paid British force was quite old, it was given a definite shape by Wellesley who used it to subordinate the Indian States to the paramount authority of the Company. Under his Subsidiary Alliance system, the ruler of the allying Indian State was compelled to accept the permanent stationing of a British force within his territory and

to pay a subsidy for its maintenance. All this was done allegedly for his protection but was, in fact, a form through which the Indian ruler paid tribute to the Company. Sometimes the ruler ceded part of his territory instead of paying annual subsidy. The Subsidiary Treaty also usually provided that the Indian ruler would agree to the posting at his court of a British Resident, that he would not employ any European in his service without the approval of the British, and that he would not negotiate with any other Indian ruler without consulting the Governor-General. In return the British undertook to defend the ruler from his enemies. They also promised non-interference in the internal affairs of the allied state, but this was a promise they seldom kept. In reality, by signing a Subsidiary Alliance, an Indian state virtually signed away its independence. It lost the right of self-defense, of maintaining diplomatic relations, of employing foreign experts, and of settling its disputes with its neighbors. In fact, the Indian ruler lost all vestiges of sovereignty in external matters and became increasingly subservient to the British Resident who interfered in the day to day administration of the state. In addition, the system tended to bring about the internal decay of the protected state. The cost of the subsidiary force provided by the British was very high and, in fact, much beyond the paying capacity of the state. The payment of the arbitrarily fixed and artificially bloated subsidy invariably disrupted the economy of the state and impoverished its people. The system of Subsidiary Alliances also led to the disbandment of the armies of the protected states. Lakhs of soldiers and officers were deprived of their hereditary livelihood, spreading misery and degradation in the country. Many of them joined the roaming bands of Pindarees which were to ravage the whole of India during the first two decades of the 19th century. Moreover, the rulers of the protected states tended to neglect the interests of their people and to oppress them as they no longer feared them. They had no incentive to be good rulers as they were fully protected by the British from domestic and foreign enemies.

The Subsidiary Alliance system was, on the other hand, extremely advantageous to the British. They could now maintain a large army at the cost of the Indian states. They were enabled to fight Wars far away from their own territories, since any war would occur in the territories either of the British ally or of the British enemy. They controlled the defence and foreign relations of the protected ally, and had a powerful force stationed at the very heart of his lands, and could, therefore, at a time of their choosing, overthrow him and annex his territories by declaring him to be „inefficient“. As far as the British were concerned, the system of Subsidiary

Alliances was* in the words of a British writer, “a system of fattening allies as we fatten oxen, till they were worthy of being devoured.”

Lord Wellesley signed his first Subsidiary Treaty with the Nizam of Hyderabad in 1798. The Nizam was to dismiss his French-trained troops and to maintain a subsidiary force of six battalions. In return, the British guaranteed his state against Maratha encroachments. By another treaty in 1800, the subsidiary force was increased and, in lieu of cash payment, the Nizam ceded part of his territories to the Company,

The Nawab of Avadh was forced to sign a Subsidiary Treaty in 1801. In return for a larger subsidiary force, the Nawab was made to surrender to the British nearly half of his kingdom consisting of Rohilkhand and the territory lying between the Ganga and the Jamuna. Moreover, the Nawab was no longer to be independent, even within the part of Avadh left with him. He must accept any „advice“ or order from the British authorities regarding the internal administration of his state. His police was to be reorganised under the control and direction of British officers. His own army was virtually disbanded and the British had the right to station their troops in any part of his state

Native States & Doctrine of Lapse

Lord Dalhousie came out to India as the Governor-General in 1848, He was from the beginning determined to extend direct British rule over as large an area as possible. He had declared that “the extinction of all the native states of India is just a question of time”. The ostensible reason for this policy was his belief that British administration was far superior to the corrupt and oppressive administration of the native rulers. However, the underlying motive of this policy was the expansion of British exports to India. Dalhousie, in common with other aggressive imperialists, believed that British exports to the native states of India were suffering because of the maladministration of these states by their Indian rulers, Moreover, they thought that their “Indian allies” had already served the purpose of facilitating British conquest of India and could now be got rid of profitably.

The chief instrument through which Lord Dalhousie implemented his policy of annexation was the Doctrine of Lapse. Under this Doctrine, when the ruler of a protected state died without a natural heir, his state was not to pass to an adopted heir as sanctioned by the age-

old tradition of the country. Instead, it was to be annexed to the British dominions unless the adoption had been clearly approved earlier by the British authorities. Many states, including Sataia in 1848 and Nagpur and Jhansi in 1854, were annexed by applying this doctrine.

Dalhousie also refused to recognise the titles of many ex-rulers or to pay their pensions. Thus, the titles of the Nawabs of Carnatic and of Surat and the Raja of Tanjore were extinguished. Similarly, after the death of the ex-Peshwa Baji Rao II, who had been made the Raja of Bithnr, Dalhousie refused to extend his pay or pension to his adopted son, Nana Saheb.

Lord Dalhousie was keen on annexing the kingdom of Avadh. But the task presented certain difficulties. For one, the Nawabs of Avadh had been British allies since the Battle of Buxar, Moreover, they had been most obedient to the British over the years. The Nawab of Avadh had many heirs and could not therefore be covered by the Doctrine of Lapse. Some other pretext had to be found for depriving him of his dominions. Finally, Lord Dalhousie hit upon the idea of alleviating the plight of the people of Avadh. Nawab Wajid Ali Shah was accused of having misgoverned his state and of refusing to introduce reforms. His state was therefore annexed in 1856.

Undoubtedly, the degeneration of the administration of Avadh was a painful reality for its people. The Nawabs of Avadh, like other princes of the day, were selfish ruler's absorbed ia self-indulgence who cared little for good administration or for the welfare of the people. But the responsibility for this state of affairs was in part that of the British who had at least since 1801 controlled and indirectly governed Avadh. In reality, it was the immense potential of Avadh as a market for Manchester goods which excited Dalhousie's greed and aroused his „philanthropic“ feelings. And for similar reasons, to satisfy Britain's growing demand for raw cotton, Dalhousie took away the cotton-producing province of Berav from the Nizam in 1853. It needs to be clearly understood that the question of the maintenance or annexation of the natives states was of no great lelevance at this time. In fact, there were no Indian States in existence at that time, The protected native states were as much a part of the British Empiie as the territories ruled directly by the Company. If the form of British control over some of these states was changed, it was to suit British convenience. The interests of their people had htle to do with the change.

Economic policies of the British

The British like other European colonial powers followed the policy of Mercantilism. A policy aimed to support the interests of the colonial masters by regulating the trade as well as the revenue policies of colonies. The exclusive privileges of the Company were also attacked by the rising school of economists representing free-trade manufacturing capitalism. In his celebrated work, *The Wealth of Nations*, Adam Smith, the founder of Classical economics, condemned the exclusive companies.

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 Dewani, or 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 1722 and Rs. 8,110,000 in 1764 to Rs. 23,400,000 in 1771. In 1773, it decided to manage the land revenues 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 official 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. It had two special features. Firstly, the zamindars and revenue collectors were converted into so many landlords. 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 zamindari. Their right of ownership was made hereditary and transferable. On the other hand the cultivators were reduced to the low status of mere tenants and were deprived of long-standing rights to the soil and other customary rights. The use of the pasture and forest lands, irrigation canals, fisheries, and homestead plots and protection against enhancement of rent were some of their rights which were sacrificed. In fact the tenantry of Bengal was left entirely at the mercy of the zamindars. This was done so that the zamindars might be able to pay in time the exorbitant land revenue demand of the Company. Secondly, the zamindars were to give 10/11th of the rental they derived from the peasantry to the state, keeping only 1/11th for themselves. But the sums to be paid by them as land revenue were fixed in perpetuity. If the rental of a zamindar's estate increased due to extension of cultivation and improvement in agriculture, or his capacity to extract more from his tenants, or any other reason, he would keep the entire amount of the increase. 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.

The initial fixation of revenue was made arbitrarily and without any consultation with the zamindars. The attempt of the officials was to secure the maximum amount. As a result, the rates of revenue were fixed very high. John Shore, the man who planned the Permanent Settlement and later succeeded Cornwallis as Governor-General, calculated that if the gross produce of Bengal be taken as 100, the Government claimed 45, zamindars and other intermediaries below them received 15, and only 40 remained with the actual cultivator.

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 question then arises; why did the British recognise them as such? One explanation is that this was in part the result of a misunderstanding. In England, the central figure in agriculture at the time was the landlord and the British officials made the mistake of thinking that the zamindar was his Indian counterpart. It is, however, to be noted that in one crucial respect the British officials clearly differentiated between the positions of the two. The landlord 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 zamindar was landlord over the tenant, he was further subordinated to the state. In fact he was reduced virtually to the status of a tenant of the East India Company, In contrast to the British landlord, who paid a small share of his income as land tax, he had to pay as tax 10/11th of his income from the land of which he was supposed to be the owner; and he could be turned out of the land unceremoniously and his estate sold if he failed to pay the revenue in time.

Other historians think that the decision to recognise the zamindars as the proprietors of land was basically determined by political, financial, and administrative expediency. Here the guiding factors were three. The first arose out of clever statecraft: the need to create political allies. The British officials realised that as they were foreigners in India, their rule would be unstable unless they acquired local supporters who would act as a buffer between them and the people of India. This argument had immediate importance as there were a large number of popular revolts in Bengal during the last quarter of the 18th century. So they brought into existence a wealthy and privileged class of zamindars which owed its existence to British rule and which would, therefore, be compelled by its own basic interests to support it. This expectation was, in fact, fully justified later when the zamindars as a class supported the foreign government in opposition to the rising movement for freedom, second, and perhaps the predominant motive, was that of financial security. Before 1793 the Company was troubled by fluctuations in its chief source of income, the land revenue. 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 maximise 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. Thirdly, 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 cultivation and improve agricultural productivity. 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 Avadh 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. Another group of landlords was created all over India when the Government started the practice of giving land to persons who had rendered faithful service to the foreign rulers.

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 bidder. 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. 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 into 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 zamindari. 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 hore.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. 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.

Railways

Development of Means of Transport and Communication:- Up to the middle of the 19th century, the means of transport in India were backward. They were confined to bullock-cart, camel, and packhorse. The British rulers soon realised that a cheap and easy system of transport was a necessity if British manufactures were to flow into India on a large scale and her raw materials secured for British industries. They introduced steamships on the rivers and set about improving the roads, Work on the Grand Trunk Road from Calcutta; to Delhi was begun in 1839 and completed in the 1850's. The first, railway engine designed by George Stephenson in England in 1814. Railways developed rapidly During the 1830's and 1840's. Pressure soon

mounted for their speedy construction in India. The British manufacturers hoped thereby to open the vast and hitherto untapped market in the interior of the country and to facilitate the export of Indian raw materials and food-stuffs to feed their hungry machines and operatives. The British bankers and investors looked upon railway development in India as a channel for safe investment of their surplus capital. The British steel manufacturers regarded it as an outlet for their products like rails, engines, wagons, and other machinery and plant. The Government of India soon fell in step with these views and found additional merit in the railways; they would enable it to administer the country more effectively and efficiently and to protect their regime from internal rebellion or external aggression by enabling more rapid mobilization and movement of troops.

The earliest suggestion to build a railway in India was made in Madras in 1831. The wagons of railway were to be drawn by horses. Construction of steam-driven railways in India was first proposed in 1834 in England. It was given strong political support by England's railway promoters, financiers, and mercantile houses trading with India, and textile manufacturers. It was decided that the Indian railways were to be constructed and operated by private companies who were guaranteed a minimum of five per cent return on their capital by the Government of India. The first railway line running from Bombay to Thana was opened to traffic in 1853.

Lord Dalhousie, who became Governor-General of India in 1849, was an ardent advocate of rapid railway construction. In a famous note, written in 1853, he laid down an extensive programme of railway development. He proposed a network of four main trunk lines which would link the interior of the country with the big ports and inter-connect the different parts of the country.

By the end of 1869 more than 4,000 miles of railways had been built by the guaranteed companies; but this system proved very costly and slow, and so in 1869 the Government of India decided to build new railways as state enterprises. But the speed of railway extension still did not satisfy officials in India and businessmen in Britain. After 1880, railways were built through private enterprise as well as state agency. By 1905, nearly 28,000 miles of railways had been built. Three important aspects of the development of Indian railways should be kept in view. Firstly, nearly the entire amount of over 350 crores of rupees invested in them was provided by British

investors, Indian capital contributing only a negligible share of it. Secondly, they were for the first 50 years financially losing concerns which were not able to pay interest on the capital invested in them. Thirdly, in their planning, construction and management, the economic and political development of India and her people was not kept in the forefront. On the contrary, the primary consideration was to serve the economic, political, and military interests of British imperialism in India. The railway lines were laid primarily with a view to link India's raw material producing areas in the interior with the ports of export. The needs of Indian industries regarding their markets and their sources of raw materials were neglected. Moreover, the railway rates were fixed in a manner so as to favour imports and exports and to discriminate against internal movement of goods. Several railway lines in Burma and North-Western India were built at high cost to serve British imperial interests.

Forest policy

Forest became a state affair only after the advent of the British. Before that forest were part of the native kings and it was for hunting and pleasure trips for the royal families. "The necessity of a vigorous forest policy was strongly indicated from the earliest days of British occupation of India, but it was not understood; and questions which were considered of more immediate importance pressed its claim into the background". B. Ribbentrop, *Forestry in British India* (Calcutta, 1900; reprint, New Delhi, 1989), p.65. Without their knowledge, advocates of joint forest management (JFM) are, in effect, reviving and reaffirming Dietrich Brandis's vision for Indian forestry. Striking parallels can be seen between the ideas of Brandis and the ideas underlying the successful application of JFM in West Bengal. Ramachandra Guha, "Dietrich Brandis and Indian Forestry: A Vision Revisited and Reaffirmed" in Marc Poffenberger and Betsy McGean (eds), *Village Voices, Forest Choices: Joint Forest Management in India* (New Delhi, 1996), pp.96-97. Forest policies in India have recently been a subject matter of prolonged discussion among social scientists including historians, economists, sociologists and anthropologists. While much of this discussion centres on the post-colonial era, a considerable part of it is also devoted to the colonial period. However, since most of the studies view the formation and evolution of forest policies in colonial India in isolation, they fail to relate it both with the broader historical issues of the day and their legacy in the post-colonial era. Part of the

failure is rooted in the absence of a detailed study of the evolution of forest policies in the regional context from the multiple ideas and legal discourses involved in the process.

It is assumed here that colonial watershed is an important marker in the evolution of forest policies in India, when compared with the pre-colonial era. Perceptions of the state towards the forests began to change radically from the arrival of British colonial interests in India in the late eighteenth century, when forests were increasingly viewed as an asset of the state with great commercial potential. However, establishing control of the state over the forests was not easy: there were administrative difficulties and various types of usage rights of the communities over the forests. The search for a balance between the rights of the state and communities over forests has been stated to be the right focus of forest policies and legislation in India. One argument as propounded by Ramachandra Guha even finds its replica in the views of Dietrich Brandis, the first Inspector General of Forests in India, on “a collaborative relationship between the state and local communities” in forest management. The colonial forest policies in India were, therefore, chequered as they developed over a century and half. Before the general issues and problems tackled by them are considered, it would be worthwhile to look at the chronology of their evolution. The growth of the forest policies in India was extraordinarily slow. According to Stebbing, the writer of the three volumes of *The Forests of India* (London, 1922- 27), the slow progress was due to the confinement of “scientific knowledge amongst European officials... almost entirely to the members of the medical profession”.

The British administration had a basic mistrust for anything that was Indian, the Indian traditions or their administrative patterns. They lacked confidence in the capacity of Indians to look after themselves. This was juxtaposed with the essential assumption that the essence of all human endeavours was realised in the West; in their rational and progressive institutions, in the scientific thought. The essence of Indian civilisation was the very opposite of the West and was expressed in the irrational practices of Hinduism and the Eastern system. Therefore the legitimisation of British rule was derived from the self-validating argument that India was essentially incapable of self governance.

Much of their opinion about Indian forest administration, rather the lack of it, was reflected from time to time in their official accounts. The Forest Department was founded on the assumption that the Indians lacked sense of conservation. This was the opinion held by a majority of the British administrators, though there were a few exceptions. The culmination of this feeling gave birth to the Indian Forest Act of 1865. To further consolidate and legitimise their control over forests, the British successively passed the Forest Act, VII of 1878 amended by Act V of 1890, Act XII of 1891, Act V of 1901 and Act XV of 1911. The 1865 Act empowered several local governments to declare certain areas as State Forests without in any way interfering with the rights of the people. As per the Act, government forests meant land covered with trees and brushwood or jungle. A revenue official and not a forest official determined the merits of a particular block of forest chosen for reservation.

Early resistance against the British

In the history of colonial India, insurgency of the peasantry is as old as colonialism itself. In South Canara there arose peasant movements during 1810- 11 and 1830-31. It should be analysed in the light of peasant discontent and frustration on account of economic grievances. There was no highly developed political and national consciousness behind it. Along with the colonisation the company introduced strict control over the economic surplus. So the revenue regulations and commercial agreements enforced on the agrarian class resulted as the major cause of the two uprisings. They resisted the company's rule, demanding the redressal of specific grievances caused by the colonial exploitation. The peasant uprisings of these period could be considered as tax rebellion.

In the nineteenth century we come across a number of peasant and tribal uprisings. The early uprisings were not consciously nationalist uprisings, but, in due course this contributed to the emergence of nationalist consciousness. To begin with, these peasant and tribal revolts were organised against the British oppressive policies. According to Sumit Sarkar, for at least a century after Plassey there were revolts led by traditional elements (dispossessed local chiefs, zamindars or religious figures). These revolts were predominantly of a lower class social character. Kathleen Gough has compiled a list of 77 peasant uprisings involving violence. The tribal movements were militant. K. Suresh Singh in his study of the tribals, says that, they

revolted more often and far more violently than any other community including peasants in India. Some important peasant and tribal revolts are mentioned below.

There is a very long list of peasant and tribal revolts spread throughout India. Here we will mention a few of them which are important. Later you will read in detail in a separate unit about peasant movements. In the first half of the nineteenth century Travancore revolt (1800-09), Bhil revolt (1818-31), Ho revolt (1820-21) and Khasi revolt (1829-31) were among important peoples movements. And so were Wahabi movement (1830-69), Kol revolt (1831), Faraizi movement (1834-47) and Santhal revolt (1855-56). In most of these revolts the leadership and support was provided by the feudal chiefs. These revolts cannot be called the conscious nationalist movements in the modern sense. The most important factor behind all these movements was a combined protest against British policies. At times these were also sparked off by some oppressive policies of a zamindar, money lender or an administrative officer. During the same period we come across a number of protests by town people against the British. Strike in Banaras (1810-11) and the revolt of Bareilly (1816) are important examples. In the case of Banaras, the city people on strike against the levying of House Tax while, in Bareilly, the protest was directed against the Police Tax, which was levied to provide police protection to the citizens. In the case of Banaras the British had to withdraw the tax while in Bareilly people had to pay the tax.

Sanyasi rebellion

The Sannyasi Revolt was the activities of sannyasis and fakirs (Hindu and Muslim ascetics, respectively) in Bengal, India in the tardy 18th century. It is additionally kened as the Fakir-Sannyasi Revolt which took place around Murshidabad and Baikunthupur forests of Jalpaiguri. Historians have not only debated what events constitute the revolt, but have additionally varied on the paramountcy of the revolt in Indian history. While some refer to it as an early war for India's independence from peregrine rule, since the right to amass tax had been given to the British East India Company after the Battle of boxer in 1764, others categorize it as acts of truculent banditry following the depopulation of the province, post the Bengal famine of 1770. At least three separate events are called the Sannyasi Revolt. One refers to an astronomically immense body of Hindu sannyasis that travelled from North India to different components of Bengal to visit shrines. En route to the shrines, it was customary for many of these holy men to exact a religious tax from the headmen and zamindars or regional landlords. In

times of prosperity, the headmen and zamindars generally obliged. However, since the East India Company had received the diwani or right to accumulate tax, many of the tax demands incremented and the local landlords and headmen were unable to pay both the ascetics and the English. Crop failures, and famine, which killed ten million people or an estimated one-third of the population of Bengal, compounded the quandaries since much of the arable land lay fallow. In 1771, 150 saints were put to death, ostensibly for no reason. This was one of the reasons that caused distress leading to violence, especially in Natore in Rangpur, now in modern Bangladesh. However, some modern historians argue that the kineticism never gained popular support. The other two forms of kineticism involved a sect of Hindu ascetics, the Dasnami naga sannyasis who likewise visited Bengal on pilgrimage commixed with mazuma lending opportunities. To the British, these ascetics were looters and must be ceased from accumulating mazuma that belonged to the Company and possibly from even entering the province. It was felt that an immensely colossal body of people on the move was a possible threat. When the Company's forces endeavored to obviate the sannyasis and fakirs from entering the province or from accumulating their mazuma in the last three decades of the 18th century, fierce clashes often ensued, with the Company's forces not always victorious. Most of the clashes were recorded in the years following the famine but they perpetuated, albeit with a lesser frequency, up until 1802. The reason that even with superior training and forces, the Company was not able to suppress sporadic clashes with migrating ascetics was that the control of the Company's forces in the far-abstracted hilly and jungle covered districts like Birbhum and Midnapore on local events was impotent. The Sannyasi revolt was the first of a series of revolts and revolts in the Western districts of the province including (but not restricted to) the Chuar Revolt of 1799 and the Santal Revolt of 1855–56. What effect the Sannyasi Revolt had on revolts that followed is debatable. Perhaps, the best reminder of the Revolt is in literature, in the Bengali novel *Anandamath*, indicted by India's first modern novelist Bankim Chandra Chatterjee. The musical composition, *Vande Mataram*, which was indicted in 1876, was utilized in the book *Anandamath* in 1882 (pronounced Anondomo h in Bengali) and the 1952 movie predicated on the book.

Kol uprising

The Kols of chhota Nagpur 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, Hazari bagh, Palamau and western parts of Manbhum. Order could be restored only after largescale military operations.

1857

Causes and results

The revolt began at Meerut 58 km from Delhi on 10th May 1857 and then it spread various parts of north India. It covered vast area, that is north Punjab to Narmada in the south and Bihar in the east to Rajasthan in the west (The mutiny spread rapidly in eastern and northern India. Dehri,Arrah, Azamgarh, Allahabad, Gorakhpur, Faizabad, Fatehpur, Jhansi, Lucknow,Kanpur, Etawah, Fategarh, Gwalior, Shahjahanpur, Agra, Bharatpur, Rohilkhand, Mathura, Agra, Hatras,

Delhi, Meerut, Bareilly and Roorki). It came to an end by the hanging of Tantio Tope 19thcentury witnessed some anti-imperialist uprisings against imperialism, most notably in Latin America against Spanish colonialism under the leadership of Simon Bolivar and the revolutionary priest Hidalgo. But both in terms of social base and geographical distribution, the1857 Revolt in India was much more powerful. The Revolt started with the mutiny of the Indian sepoy over the use of greased cartridges, but the sepoy were soon joined by broader sections of the civil society whose moral economy had been disrupted by the political system that had been imposed by the East India Company. The conjunction between the sepoy mutiny with the civil uprisings imparted the rebellion of 1857 the character of a national popular armed Revolt. Writing shortly after the outbreak in the New York Tribune of 28 July 1857, Karl Marx had correctly described it as “not a military mutiny, but a national Revolt”. On 14 September 1857 inNew York Tribune Marx compared the 1857 Revolt with the 1789 French revolution

Causes for the Revolt:-

How did the Revolt break out? What were its causes? The main reason for this was the ruthless exploitation of the Indian people by the British. The British rule which was formally established after the Battle of Plassey in 1757 in Bengal, strove to fill the coffers of the East India Company at the expense of the Indians. The East India Company was governed by greedy merchants and traders who could go to any extent to enrich themselves. The Company was formed in 1600, and was given a Royal Charter by Queen Elizabeth which conferred on it the exclusive privilege to trade with the East. Its main aim was to assume the trade monopoly in India. It was not an ordinary merchant company formed for trade but had its train of soldiers who

fought battles with the Portugues and the French trading companies in the 17th and 18th centuries in order to establish its trade monopoly. After these rival powers had been defeated it also tried to humble the Indian traders who offered competition. When the Battle of Plassey was won in 1757, the British successfully imposed their trade monopoly over the area under their control, eliminated

The great Revolt of 1857 was a watershed in the history of modern India. It marked first national challenge to the English in India; it emboldened the growth of Indian nationalist politics; it presaged significant constitutional changes in British India. Today one hundred fifty years later as we commemorate the event, the rebellion provides us with a new source of inspiration to complete the nation-building project. 19thcentury witnessed some anti-imperialist uprisings against imperialism, most notably in Latin America against Spanish colonialism under the leadership of Simon Bolivar and the revolutionary priest Hidalgo. But both in terms of social base and geographical distribution, the 1857 Revolt in India was much more powerful. The Revolt started with the mutiny of the Indian sepoys over the use of greased cartridges, but the sepoys were soon joined by broader sections of the civil society whose moral economy had been disrupted by the political system that had been imposed by the East India Company. The conjunction between the sepoy mutiny with the civil uprisings imparted the rebellion of 1857 the character of a national popular armed Revolt. Writing shortly after the outbreak in the New York Tribune of 28 July 1857, Karl Marx had correctly described it as “not a military mutiny, but a national Revolt”. On 14 September 1857 in New York Tribune Marx compared the 1857 Revolt with the 1789 French revolution and noted: The first blow dealt to the French monarchy proceeded from the nobility, not from the peasants. The Indian Revolt does not similarly commence with the riots, tortured, dishonoured, stripped naked by the British, but with the sepoys, clad, fled, patted, fatted and pampered by them. It is unfortunate that professional historians of our country could not appreciate either the national or the popular character of the 1857 Revolt and preferred to call it a Sepoy Mutiny. But we understand that recent researchers have exposed the fallacy of such a contention, and the historians in India and abroad are increasingly acknowledging the national character of the 1857 Revolt.

The 1857 Revolt began on 29th March 1857 when Mangal Pandey of the 34th infantry in Barrackpore became the first martyr. The mutiny spread rapidly in eastern and northern India. Dehri, Patna, Arrah, Azamgarh, Allahabad, Gorakhpur, Faizabad, Fatehpur, Jhansi, Lucknow, Kanpur, Etawah, Fategarh, Gwalior, Shahjahanpur, Agra, Bharatpur, Rohilkhand, Mathura, Agra, Hatras, Delhi, Meerut, Bareilly and Roorki – these emerged as storm-centres of the Revolt. On 11th May 1857 the sepoys of the Meerut regiment captured Delhi and proclaimed the last Mughal emperor Bahadur Shah Zafar as their undisputed leader. In this entire region the dispossessed talukdars and impoverished peasants and artisans joined the sepoys to contest the English authority. The English land-revenue experiments not only deprived the talukdars and landlords of their estates and social status, but also subjected the peasants to excessive revenue demands. At the same time the acute crisis faced by urban handicraft industry due to the intrusion of cheaper English products and the disappearance of the patronage of the traditional local courts and ruling classes dislocated the livelihood of the artisans. Despite their class contradictions the zamindars, the peasants and artisans joined hands with the sepoys to fight their common enemy – the English. According to one estimate one-fifth of the Indian population in 1857 directly or indirectly participated in the Revolt. The English authority virtually collapsed over the entire plains of Uttar Pradesh. In Rohilkhand the British rule was 'non-existent' for almost a year. Contemporary British officials remarked that in Oudh and its surrounding areas it was difficult to distinguish who among the rebels were the sepoys and the peasants. In some areas like Bijnour the civil population even rose up in revolt before any help could be received from the sepoys. In other cases as in Bulandshahr the popular uprising coincided with the arrival of the rebel army from Aligarh. Recent researches have thus tended to stress that in the affected area the mutiny of the sepoys were either preceded by or accompanied by or followed by a civil rebellion. The popular violence was characterized by killing of Europeans, pillaging of English establishments and record rooms, indigo factories and burning of land records and official documents. In some areas such assaults on symbols of English authority were contemporaneous with attacks on indigenous baniyas and moneylenders. In parts of North-Western province the peasant participation in the Revolt was motivated by the aim to win back the land that they had lost because of English revenue settlement. Contemporary English observers like Kaye admitted that there was hardly any Indian belonging to any religious faith between the Ganges and Jamuna who was not against the British. Although traditionally believed that Bengal remained aloof from

the tumult, I understand that recent historians in Bengal are demonstrating that the English in Bengal were also panic-stricken and the area, too, was seething with unrest. The other unique feature of the 1857 Revolt was the solidarity amongst the rebels cutting across religious and provincial lines. Leaders of the Revolt issued proclamations to stress the importance of communal amity amongst the rebels, emphasizing the need of Hindus and Muslims to join their hands to drive out the English and protect their own religious customs and rituals. Mention may be made in this connection of the pamphlet *Fath-I-Islam* (Victory to Islam) issued from Lucknow. Again, the Azamgarh proclamation called upon the Indians of all classes and religions to rise up against the faithless English. The rebel leader Feroze Shah's proclamation of August 1857 reiterated the same national spirit: It is well known to all that in this age, the people of Hindustan, both Hindus and Mohammedans, are being ruined under the tyranny and oppression of the infidel and treacherous English. Historians have also drawn our attention to such examples as the Muslim rebel leaders banning sacrifices of cows during the festival to avoid any Hindu-Muslim discord. It is unfortunate that sometimes the Revolt of 1857 is denied the national character since the ideal of a unified all-India nation state was premature for most people of 19th century India. But how can we deny a national character to a popular outburst against an alien regime, particularly when it enjoyed the support of a large mass of population and affected a large part of the country? We need not forget that based on this particular criterion many European episodes have been considered as national events, as for example, the Russian peasants fighting Napoleon or the French fighting the English under Joan of Arc or the Carbonaris fighting for Italian unification even when the concerned Russians, French or the Italians were yet to develop the notion of a united Russia, France or Italy. Double standards in historical judgements are required to be avoided. The Revolt failed, thanks to the brutalities committed by the English on the rebels. But the Revolt generated new national ideas. Historians like Irfan Habib have demonstrated that apart from laying stress on communal harmony the rebel leaders visualized a new national order. They sought to establish 'a kind of elective military rule', assured economic relief to the zamindars, peasants and artisans alike and promised better service conditions for the sepoys. The rebel leaders certainly deserve credit for nursing this national vision at a time when nationalism in the modern bourgeois sense was yet to develop. What then is the lesson to be drawn from the 1857 Revolt? The uprising underlines the importance of fighting imperialism at all costs. The 1857 rebels fought and died for a cause – the cause of

national liberation from an alien rule. They raised the standard of rebellion when the English power in India was at its ascendant height, and fought relentlessly shoulder to shoulder for a national cause till the last hour, ignoring religious, ethnic and local divides. Today when we are fighting to uphold the secular and democratic values of our federal polity, to strengthen the national unity of our country and to frustrate the evil designs of the forces of neoimperialism we can draw strength from the martyrs of the 1857 Revolt. This should be the context of the commemoration of the 150 years of the 1857 Revolt. I am happy that the government of India has constituted a committee to observe the anniversary. But this should not be only confined to high level conferences for established academics or officials. We should use the occasion to correct any distorted understanding of the great event, publish credible accounts of the Revolt in vernacular and in a language that can be understood by the rank and file in our society, and disseminate the political lesson of the uprising at the grass-root level. Only then the commemoration of the glorious chapter in our struggle for freedom can have a multiplier effect, and only then can we pay our real tribute to the martyrs who died for the noble cause to make our country a better place to live in.

POLITICAL CAUSES

- a) Lord Dalhousie's policy of annexation caused uproar among the people of India. The last Peshwa, Baji Rao's adopted son Nana Sahib was deprived of the pension his father was receiving. Rani Laxmi Bai's adopted son was not given the throne after the death of his father. To make matters worse Lord Dalhousie announced in 1849 that Bahadur Shah Zafar will not be allowed to stay in the Red Fort anymore and they were compelled to move to a place near Qutab Minar. To further worsen the situation Lord Canning announced in 1856 that with the demise of Bahadur Shah Zafar, his successor will not be allowed to use the title "king".
- b) The political scheme's of the British were in question when they resorted to harsh means when dealing with the native princes. The written and oral pledges made with the princes were often disregarded by the British. The annexation of Oudh without a reason led to a huge uprising. The proposal of taking away the title from the Mughal emperor shocked the Muslims. The annexation of Jhansi, Satara and Nagpur shocked the Hindus as they

were predominantly Hindu states. The remaining Hindus and Muslims who were unaffected became insecure, lest they meet the same fate.

- c) The myth about the superiority of the British was shattered when they were badly beaten in the first Afghan War. They were again humbled in 1855-56, when they had to face the rebellion of the Santhal tribe of Bengal and Bihar. This proved that the Indian army was quite powerful.
- d) There was a rumour floated around that with the end of the Revolt of 1857 the British Raj would come to an end. This rumour emanated from the fact that the battle of Plassey in 1757 brought about British power and with 1857 a century would be completed which will mark the end of British rule.

ECONOMIC CAUSES

a) During the first two hundred years (16th and 17th centuries) the East India Company confined its activities to trade and commerce and had no political intention. The company purchased textiles, indigo, saltpetre, spices and foodgrains from Indian market in exchange for gold and other precious metals. It thus played a useful role by exporting Indian goods and by increasing the production the Indian goods became so popular that the British government had to pass a law in 1720 forbidding the use of Indian textiles. However during the 18th century, the pattern of trade went through a drastic change. With the advent of the Industrial Revolution, England developed its own textile industry and with that the dependence on Indian textiles came to an end. The result was that instead of buying finished textile goods from India, the British company purchased raw cotton and exported the same to England. India soon became a raw material producing country, supplying cotton and jute to the factories in Britain. Cotton was processed into finished cloth and exported back to India. British traders made massive profit through this two way trade. Demand for Indian textiles having reduced, the local handloom industry incurred heavy losses and suffered badly. The poor Indian weavers could not compete with the machine made goods imported from England. Moreover, the Company used its political resources to buy the best quality cotton from the Indian markets leaving no scope for the Indian weavers to produce good quality products. Gradually, the Indian handicraft and Cottage industries died out. There was major unemployment problem and that resulted in resentment among workers against the British rule. The little patronage that they received from the native princes also was gone

because of the annexations of those dominions. The miserable condition of the working class led to this rebellion against the British Rule. The trade and commerce of the country was monopolized by the by the East Indian Company. No efforts were made to improvise on the living conditions of the people. Cruel exploitation of the economic resources made people miserable leading to periodic famines.

b) The British confiscated the lands and properties of many landlords and Talukdars, especially those of Oudh. These very disgruntled landlords became leaders of the Revolt.

c) Thousands of soldiers under the employment of the native states became jobless when the states were annexed to the British dominion. As many as 60,000 families lost their livelihood, when Oudh's army was disbanded. Naturally the disbanded soldiers were seething with anger and were seeking an opportunity to strike at the new regime which had deprived them of their livelihood.

d) Gradual disappearance of many states also deprived those Indians who held civil and judicial posts in the states, of their jobs. Even religious preachers were divested of their livelihood with the extinction of native kingdoms. The people who were affected rose against the British.

SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS CAUSES

Indians had a lurking suspicion that they would be converted to Christianity under the new regime. The fear was largely due to the activities of some of the activities of some Christian missionaries who openly ridiculed the customs and the traditions of both Hindus and Muslims. The English also established Chapels and Churches for propagating Christianity at the expense of the government. Even civil and military officers were asked to propagate the gospel. The religious sentiments of the people were further hurt when a tax was imposed on property held by temples and mosques. Indian soldiers in the service of the company were equally prejudiced against the English in the religious matters. An ACT was passed in 1856 known as the "General Services Enlistment Act", which imposed on the Indian sepoys the obligation to serve wherever required. This dreaded sea voyage and considered this measure against their religious customs. The passing of the laws allowing converts from Hinduism to Christianity to inherit their ancestral property was a clear proof of the encouragement to the Christian missionaries for the

spread of Christianity in India. The introduction of western innovations had unsettled the minds of the ignorant people. The spread of English education, the construction of railways and telegraph lines, legislation for the suppression of sati and the remarriage of the widows engendered a belief that the British were determined to convert the people to Christianity. The introduction of railways was resented on the ground that people of all castes would have to travel in the same compartments. The common people did not appreciate these changes. They looked upon them as foreign innovations designed to break down the social order to which they were accustomed and which they considered sacred. The educated Indians were also denied high posts. The highest office open to an Indian in Civil Services was that of a sadar or an Amin with an annual salary of Rs. 500/- only. In the military service the highest office that an Indian could secure is that of a Subedar. Humiliation and torture were inflicted upon Indians in their own country. This racial discrimination hurt Indian sentiments tremendously.

MILITARY CAUSES

The East India Company was formed with the help of Indian soldiers. Instead of giving them due credit, the Indian soldiers were made victims of ridicule. Disregarding the fact that the Indian soldiers were efficient, the British officials paid them poorly and they lived in total squalor. Indian soldiers who had formerly held high offices in the times of the native princes found themselves in low ranks. All the higher ranks were reserved for white men irrespective of their capacity to perform. The future of the soldier was doomed and bleak. There was no hope of receiving any allowance also. The Bengal army lacked discipline. The sepoys were unhappy as they were for the most of the times sent overseas to fight, which was not desirable at all. There was no retirement age. The Bengal army had Hindustani sepoys of the higher caste who disliked menial jobs and dreaded overseas fighting as it meant loss of caste. The bitter feeling and anger reached its highest point with the emergence of the Enfield Rifles. The cartridges of these rifles were greased with cow and pig fats. The sepoys had to remove the cartridge with their teeth before loading them into the rifles. Both the Hindus and Muslims were discontented as it was sacrilegious for both of them. Hindus consider cow sacred and Muslims consider pigs. Thus, both refused to use this cartridge and there was disharmony everywhere.

Causes for the failure of the revolt

1. Lack of planning, Organization and Leadership

Movement without planning, organization and leadership is bound to be a failure. The revolt of 1857 was no exception. The revolt was supposed to have started on May 31, 1857 as decided by Nana Sahib and his colleagues. But an incident at Meerut whereby the soldiers had to bite cartridges made of pig fat and cow fat added fuel to the fire leading to the revolt breaking out early. The leaders had no made plans. The movement had no leader on top to guide people and command obedience. Every movement requires some sort of discipline and a leader to guide and help. But since the Revolt unexpectedly broke out on May 10, 1857, there is nothing much the leaders could do.

2. Indian help to the British

Unfortunately, some of the Indian prince's helped the British government at that point of time. The Sikh princes of Nabhya, Patiala and Kapurthala and the rulers of Hyderabad and Gwalior very openly helped the British suppress the war with men and money. Holka and Scindia remained loyal to the British. Their help at this point of time riveted the shackles of British yoke over India for almost another century.

Results of the Revolt

1. End of company's rule

The British Parliament passed an "Act for the Better Government of India" in 1858, whereby the administration responsibility was passed into the hands of the British Queen and her Parliament. With this, the rule of the Company came to an end. The Board of Control was abolished and the Board of Directors had no power left. A secretary of State for India was to take the place of the President of the Board of Control. He was advised by a board of fifteen members. The designation of the Governor-General was changed. While he remained Governor-General for the provinces under his rule, he came to be known as Viceroy while dealing with Nawabs, Rajas and native princes.

2. Policy of Divide and Rule

During the Revolt of 1857 the Hindus and Muslims had unity and fought together for the welfare of the country. The British government realized that the unity of the Hindus and Muslims was

posing a serious threat and therefore the best thing would be to create a wall between the two communities. Thus, they adopted the "Divide and Rule" that completely destroyed the relationship. So much so that the unrest between the two communities has still not been resolved. As the Muslims had taken a prominent role in the Revolt, they were deprived of patronage in education, business and services and Hindus were given preferential treatment. At a later stage the Policy was reversed. The British used this disharmony to their advantage and widened the gulf between the two major communities. It was on this ground that India had to be partitioned on the event of her independence in 1947.

3. Economic Exploitation of India

Economic exploitation of the country was an inevitable situation after the Revolt. In words of Majumdar, "the extinction of the East India Company's Rule brought in grave economic perils to India. India now became a dumping ground of British manufacturers and an almost inexhaustible field for investment of capital for it offered unlimited scope for commercial and industrial enterprises like railways, steamers, tea, and coffee plantations etc". The British henceforth started abusing political power for the enhancement of their commercial and economic interest.

4. End of Peshwaship and the Mughal Rule

Nana Sahib escaped after the Revolt as he had actively taken part in it. He could not be traced after that. With his escape the Peshwaship came to an end. The title of Mughal emperor was also abolished as the last Mughal emperor, Bahadur Shah Zafar died in 1862 and he also took part in the Revolt. Thus came the end of the glorious Mughal dynasty founded by Babur in 1526 in the first battle of Panipat.

5. Reorganization of Army

The British soldiers realized that the numerical inferiority of the British Indian army was one of the causes of the Revolt. The British soldiers were increased in number which means, the expenditure also increased. Artillery and other advanced means of warfare were in the care of British hands. In order to break down the unity of the Indian soldiers, they were divided and separated.

6. *Change in the British Policy towards Indian states*

To appease native princes, the British declared that they would honour all treaties and the agreement entered into by the East India Company with the native rulers. Further, Doctrine of Lapse was abandoned and the right to adoption recognized. The Indian princes were assured that their territories would never be annexed. Henceforth, the continual existence of Native States was guaranteed. However, there were clearly defined restrictions and limitations to them. The military prowess was greatly reduced.

7. *Rise of Nationalism*

The sacrifices of some great Indian rulers during the Revolt of 1857 aroused feelings of Nationalism among men. Nana Sahib, Rani of Jhansi and Bahadur Shah became National heroes. People celebrated their heroism and their attempts to fight for freedom. The revolt became a symbol of challenge to the mighty British power in India. According to Tara Chand, "the memory of 1857 substantiated the later movement, infused courage into the hearts of the fighters furnished a historical basis for the grim struggle and gave it a moral stimulus - (its) memory distorted but hallowed with the sanctity, perhaps did more damage to the cause of the British rule in India than the revolt itself".

Nature-Interpretations

The Revolt of 1857 was born out of various features ranging from the British policy of conquest and expansion to the colonial exploitation of India. Geographically speaking, it affected north-western, north and central India. The 'Sepoy Mutiny' – as it was labelled initially by the colonial official writings, focused on the 'Mutiny' theme. To colonial officials and writers it was the handiwork of a set of discontented sipahis who were unhappy with the introduction, in 1857, of the new Enfield rifle, with its distinct ammunition, which required the bullet to be bitten before loading. Rumours that the grease used on the bullets was either from the fat of cattle or pigs had symbolic implications. Thus, whereas cows were considered 'sacred' by the Hindus, the Muslims considered pigs to be 'polluting'. This created strong animosities and was located as an attack on Hindu and Muslim religious beliefs. As can be expected, this understanding gave primacy to the religious factor and reinforced a line of thinking which saw the Revolt as a 'Muslim conspiracy', that gained acceptance among contemporary officials. Syed Ahmad Khan (1817 - 1898) wrote a tract (*Asbab-e-Baghawat-e-Hind* viz. 'The Causes of the Indian Revolt')

to counter this allegation, where he sought to examine the underlying features that determined the nature of 1857. And taken together these seem to be the basis for formulations like the ‘clash of civilizations’, echoes of which are heard even today in the post- 9/11 context. Contemporary writings in the mid-nineteenth century generated political hysteria and racism, which legitimized the barbaric image of the ‘Indian’. Nevertheless, the 1857 Revolt demonstrated the way English opinion itself was divided at home. Thus, Chartists like Ernest Jones hailed the Revolt and unmasked the colonial exploitation of India (*The Revolt of Hindustan; or, The New World*, London, 1857). Of course the most serious dissenting voice was that of Karl Marx who linked the colonial exploitation of India to the anger that was displayed by the people during the Revolt. Marx and Engels hailed the unity displayed by the different religious communities who opposed British colonialism (Marx and Engels, *The First War of Independence, 1857-1859*, Moscow, 1975). Interestingly, the Indian National Congress after its formation (1885) actually denounced the 1857 Revolt, given the social background of most of the leaders who were pro-British in their thinking. However, by the end of the nineteenth century the Revolt attracted and inspired the first generation of the Indian nationalists. Thus, V.D.Savarkar, who was perhaps the first Indian to write about the Revolt in 1909, called it *The Indian War of Independence of 1857*. His pronationalist stance made Savarkar reject the colonial assertion that linked the Revolt with the greased cartridges. As he put it, if this had been the issue it would be difficult to explain how it could attract Nana Sahib, the Emperor of Delhi, the Queen of Jhansi and Khan Bahadur Khan to join it. Besides, he also focused on the fact that the Revolt continued even after the English Governor General had issued a proclamation to withdraw the offending greased bullets. Savarkar went ahead and connected the Revolt to the ‘atrocities’ committed by the British. At the same time, the importance he gave to religion illustrates the influence of the imperialist writers on him. From the 1920s, efforts were made to analyze the Revolt from a Marxist position by pioneers like M.N. Roy (M.N. Roy in collaboration with Abani Mukherji, *India in Transition*, 1922) and Rajni Palme Dutt (*India Today*, 1940). Roy was rather dismissive about 1857 and saw in its failure the shattering of the last vestiges of feudal power. He was emphatic about the ‘revolution of 1857’ being a struggle between the worn out feudal system and the newly introduced commercial capitalism, that aimed to achieve political supremacy. In contrast, Romesh Palme Dutt saw 1857 as a major peasant revolt, even though it had been led by the decaying feudal forces, fighting to get back their privileges and turn back the tide of foreign

domination. Consequently, one witnesses the beginnings of a process that interrogated and critiqued the internal feudal order, even while lauding the popular basis of the Revolt. The access to sources after the independence of India saw interesting developments related to the studies on the 1857 Revolt. What developed was a rather sophisticated Nationalist historiography that harped on the complexities of the Revolt. It included Nationalist historians like R.C. Majumdar, S.B. Chaudhuri, S.N. Sen, and K.K. Datta, (viz. R.C. Majumdar, *The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857*, 1957; S.B. Chaudhuri, *Civil Revolt in the Indian Mutinies, 1857-59*, 1957 and *Theories of the Indian Mutiny*, 1965; S.N. Sen, *Eighteen Fifty- Seven*, 1957; and, K.K. Datta, *Reflections on the Mutiny*, 1967). These historians were not uniformly comfortable with the idea that the 1857 Revolt was the 'First War of Indian Independence'. Moreover, they referred to ideas like nationalism that were supposedly witnessed during 1857 or saw the very inception of the national movement contained in the Revolt. Nevertheless, they went very clearly beyond the simple categorizations that had seen Two dominant and opposing narratives – lauding the British, the victors who had 'won' the war and the claims of the 'rebellious Indians', who had been 'defeated'. This meant a shift in focus, with efforts being made to locate the internal contradictions (viz. the Indian 'rich', which included the moneylenders and buniyas) and the popular basis of 1857 and not concentrate merely on the influential classes which had been the focus of contemporary British officials. It is here that Nationalist historiography worked on and developed the legacy of the Marxists, even as some Nationalist historians inscribed their disapproval of seeing it as the 'First War of Independence'. In this sense at least, the Nationalist historians accorded a space – howsoever limited – to the popular basis of the Revolt. Since peasants did not/do not write their histories, they did not document their interaction with the 1857 Revolt. But, is it possible to ignore the folklore and traditions of resistance associated with the 1857 Revolt? Moreover, can one afford to ignore the connections between 1857 and the peasant revolts of the preceding phase, or those outside the northern region of India? One can for example refer here to the Revolts of the Bhills in 1852 (in Khandesh, Dhar and Malwa), the Santals in 1855-6 (in Rajmahal, Bhagalpur, Birbhum), the Mapillas over the 1836-1854 period in Malabar, the Kandhas in Ghumsar and Baudh (1855-60), the Savaras of Parliakhemedi (1856-57), r, for that matter, the Indigo Revolt in Bengal (that began in 1859 and was directed against white planters) – inspite of being told repeatedly about the role of the Permanent Settlement and the bhadraloks, that supposedly left Bengal as a 'zone of peace' in this phase Unless one loca tes

historical processes in a narrow, factual manner, it would be indeed almost impossible to assume that peasants cannot think or incorporate components from the past while struggling against colonial rule as well as their immediate oppressors. In this sense at least, it is difficult to study the Revolt unless one takes into account the social history of peasant protest prior to 1857 and in the phase after it. This would show the peasants in a bitter anti-imperialist political struggle, where the internal exploiter in the form of the *sahukar* or *buniya* was not spared. It would also undermine a point that has almost got frozen as common sense – viz. that the impact of the 1857 Revolt was not felt outside the Indo-Gangetic plain. With the passage of time the development of other historical approaches generated a lot of debates on the nature of 1857 among historians. The first exhaustive work on the Revolt was published in 1957 to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the event. Edited by P.C.Joshi (*1857: A Symposium, 1957*), it focused on both the diversities and the specificities of the 1857 Revolt. This included assessing 1857 against the colonial backdrop, examining aspects of participation and focusing in a major way on the internal contradictions. This volume also sought to highlight dimensions of popular culture by incorporating folk poems that have survived. One has in mind here the contributions especially of P.C.Joshi and Talmiz Khaldun. In many ways this work inspired a serious spell of writings on the Revolt. Here mention must be made of Eric Stokes who examined issues ranging from the way the nature of 1857 was conditioned by the background, the demographic and ecological features to the social composition and the role of the peasants, especially the ‘rich’ peasants’ (viz. *Peasant and the Raj: Studies in Peasant Society and Agrarian Revolt in Colonial India, 1978*; and his *The Peasant Armed: The India Revolt of 1857, 1986*). Interestingly, his research guided Stokes to reassess his position. Thus, whereas in his first work he had focused on the ‘rich’ peasant leadership and mobilization, in *Peasant Armed* Stokes enlarged the social basis of peasant participation in the Revolt. However, it was left to historians like Rudrangshu Mukherjee (*Awadh in Revolt, 1857-58: A Study of Popular Resistance, 1984*) and Tapti Roy (*The Politics of a Popular Uprising: Bundelkhand in 1857, 1994*) to enrich our understanding of the Revolt by their focus on the popular level of the Revolt. Their effort was based on specific area studies – viz. Awadh and Bundelkhand – that brought to light fascinating complexities of popular militancy that had remained ignored. Alongside, historians like Iqtidar Alam Khan have studied questions related to organization (‘The Gwalior Contingent in 1857-58: A Study of the Organization and Ideology of the Sepoy Rebels,’ *Social Scientist*, January-April 1998, pgs. 53-

75; hereafter S.Sct.), Gautam Bhadra and Saiyid Zaheer Husain Jafri have focused on the middle level leadership ('Four Rebels of Eighteen Fifty Seven', in Ranajit Guha, ed. *Subaltern Studies IV*, 1985, pgs. 229-75; and 'Profile of a Saintly Rebel - Maulavi Ahmadullah Shah' in S.Sct., respectively). Scholars like Khaldun (in P.C.Joshi, pgs. 1-70) and E.I.Brodkin ('The Struggle for Succession: Rebels and Loyalists in the Indian Mutiny of 1857', in *Modern Asian Studies*, 1972, pages 277-90) have focused on activities in the areas where British authority had been subverted, and if 1857 was indeed a restorative Revolt. More recently – since the 1990s – historians have focused on the popular dimensions of 1857. Here one can refer to scholars like K.S.Singh who have highlighted the participation of adivasi ('The 'Tribals' and the 1857 Uprising', S.Sct. pgs. 76-85); Badri Narayan who has focused on low and outcastes and popular culture ('Dalits and Memories of 1857', ICHR Conference Proceedings, December 2006, unpublished; and 'Popular Culture and 1857: Memory Against Forgetting', S.Sct. pgs. 86-94); and Rajat Ray who has studied the mentalities of 1857 (*The Felt Community: Commonality and Mentality before the Emergence of Indian Nationalism*, 2003, pgs. 353-534). Moreover, working within the paradigms of cultural studies scholars like Jenny Sharpe (*Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text*, 1993) and Nancy Paxton (*Writing Under the Raj: Gender, Race and Rape in the British Colonial Imagination, 1830-1947*, 1999) have delineated the way the theme of the 'rape' of white women that was virtually created to fuel racism, which emerged as a major fall-out of the Revolt. What needs to be emphasized is that the 1857 Revolt represents possibly one of the most powerful and dramatic anti-colonial movements which united the peasants and the landed sections against the ruthless imperialist onslaught over the first half of the nineteenth century. At the same time, it also questioned the internal exploiters like the moneylenders and buniyas. What has been delineated illustrates the evolution of the historiography on the 1857 Revolt. As seen, historians have shifted their focus from the mutinous 'sepoys', and seeing in it the origins of Indian nationalism to studying the diversities of the Revolt both in terms of popular participation and regions affected by it as also highlighting the internal contradictions. Presently some historians are engaged in researching gender-related issues, which would undoubtedly enrich our understanding of the Revolt of 1857.

Queen's proclamation

On November 1, 1858, a grand Darbar was held at Allahabad. Here Lord Canning sent forth the royal proclamation which announced that the queen had assumed the government of India. This proclamation declared the future policy of the British Rule in India. 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 ditto official measures and given 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.

Indigo strike

The Indigo revolt was a peasant movement and subsequent uprising of indigo farmers against the indigo planters that arose in Bengal in 1859. After 1858, the face off between the British India Government and the farmers increased in magnitude and changed its character. Now farmers started agitating directly against the Government, foreign owners of tea gardens and Indian landlords-moneylenders.

The Indigo revolt (Nilbidraha) that arose in Bengal, was directed against British planters who forced peasants to take advances and sign fraudulent contracts which forced the peasants to grow Indigo under terms which were the least profitable to them.

Indigo was identified as a major cash crop for the East India Company's investments in the 18th Century. Indigo had worldwide demand similar to cotton piece-goods, opium and salt. Indigo planting in Bengal dated back to 1777. With expansion of British power in Bengal, indigo planting became more and more commercially profitable due to the demand for blue dye in Europe. It was introduced in large parts of Burdwan, Bankura, Birbhum, Murshidabad, etc.

European Indigo planters had a monopoly over Indigo farming. The foreigners used to force Indian farmers to harvest Neel and to achieve their means they used to brutally suppress the farmer.

The European indigo planters left no stones unturned to make money. They mercilessly pursued the peasants to plant indigo instead of food crops. They provided loans, called dadon at a very high interest. Once a farmer took such loans he remained in debt for whole of his life before

passing it to his successors. The farmers were totally unprotected from the brutal indigo planters, who resorted to mortgages or destruction of their property if they were unwilling to obey them.

Farmers were illegally beaten up, detained in order to force them to sell Neel at non-profitable rates.

If any farmer refused to grow Indigo and started growing rice, he was kidnapped, women and children were attacked, and crop was looted, burnt and destroyed.

If farmer approached court, the European judge would rule in favour of the European planter.

The privileges and immunities enjoyed by the British planters placed them above the law and beyond all judicial control.

Government rules favoured the planters. By an act in 1833, the planters were granted a free hand in oppression. Sometimes even the zamindars, money lenders and other influential persons sided with the planters. Finally Indigo peasants launched revolt in Nadia district of Bengal presidency. They refused to grow Indigo. If police tried to intervene, they were attacked. European Planters responded by increasing the rent and evicting farmers. It led to more agitations and confrontations.

In April 1860 all the cultivators of the Barasat subdivision and in the districts of Pabna and Nadia resorted to strike. They refused to sow any indigo. The strike spread to other places in Bengal. The Biswas brothers of Nadia, Kader Molla of Pabna, Rafique Mondal of Malda were popular leaders. Even some of the zamindars supported the revolt, the most important of whom was Ramratan Mullick of Narail.

The revolt was ruthlessly suppressed. Large forces of police and military, backed by the British Government and some of the zamindars, mercilessly slaughtered a number of peasants. In spite of this, the revolt was fairly popular, involving almost the whole of Bengal. The revolt enjoyed the support of all categories of the rural population, missionaries, the Bengal intelligentsia and Muslims. The Bengal intelligentsia played an important role by organizing a powerful campaign in support by using Press as the tool. It had a deep impact on the emerging nationalist intellectuals.

Harish Chandra Mukherjee thoroughly described the plight of the poor peasants in his newspaper The Hindu Patriot. The Hindu Patriot, first published as a weekly in January 1853, from the very beginning took a hostile tone toward the indigo planters. Sisir Kumar Ghosh, who later found Amrita Bazar Patrika, was one of the important mufasal correspondents of the Patriot. He reported from Nadia and Jessore. His brave fight for justice for the ryots became invaluable in a situation where there was no political organisation to support the people's cause.

Dinabandhu Mitra's play Nil Darpan (The Mirror of Indigo) reflected the peasants' feelings toward the indigo planters. It effectively brought out the fact that indigo planters forced the ryots to cultivate without remuneration, confined, beat and compelled the villagers as well as corrupted their own servants. With such powerful expression Nil Darpan became an example of an awakening of intelligentsia, to gain their sympathy towards the peasantry.

The revolt as a non-violent revolution (except in few instances) and gives this as a reason why the indigo revolt was a success compared to the Sepoy Revolt.

Historically, the Indigo Rebellion can be termed the first form resistance of the countryside against the British in economic and social terms. Unlike the spontaneous revolt of the soldiers in the Sepoy Mutiny, this countryside revolt evolved over the years and, in the process, rallied different strata of society against the British – a thread of dissent that lasted many decades thereafter.

Many consider this revolt as a forerunner of the non-violent passive resistance later successfully adopted by Gandhi.

Indigo Rebellion not only forewarned agrarian uprisings, but also showed the shape of things to come.

One historian says: "Although the hard pressed ryots and minor landholders looked upon the great Zamindars for their initial encouragement, not frequently, the Zamindars lost control of the movement... and initiative devolved to the lower classes."

Indigo Rebellion was not a class struggle in anyway as there was no struggle between the Zamindars and the peasantry; rather the real objective of the Zamindars was to oppose the

encroachment of Europeans on principle and to fight for their own vested interests, though they espoused the cause of peasantry and cultivators against the planters.”

The revolt had a strong effect on the government, which immediately appointed the “Indigo Commission” in 1860. In the commission report, E. W. L. Tower noted that “not a chest of Indigo reached England without being stained with human blood”.

Government issued a notification that the Indian farmers cannot be compelled to grow indigo and that it would ensure that all disputes were settled by legal means. By the end of 1860, Indigo planters shut down their factories and cultivation of indigo was virtually wiped out from Bengal.

Evidently it was a major triumph of the peasants to incite such emotion in the European’s minds. Thus the revolt was a success

Dinabandhu Mitra’s 1859 Bengali play Nildarpan was based on Indigo revolt. It was also essential to the development of theater in Bengal and influenced Girish Chandra Ghosh, who, in 1872, would establish The National Theatre in Calcutta where the first ever play commercially staged was Nildarpan.

In order to feel the pulse of the local people, following the popularity of this play, W.S. Seton-Karr, Secretary to the Governor of Bengal, assigned Rev. James to translate the work into English and circulate it among like-minded Britons. The planters, depicted as villains in the drama, instead of taking on the Government, fell upon the unfortunate translator. In the ensuing libel case, the jury found Rev. James Long guilty. The sentence was a fine of Rs. 1,000 and a month’s imprisonment.

The indigo rebellion has been portrayed in drama, poetry and popular history in Bengal, thereby drawing the attention of the intelligentsia. Thus it entered the political awareness and had a far reaching consequence in the later movements of Bengal.

Administrative changes after 1858

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.

Financial difficulties led the Government to further decentralise 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.

The Indian army was carefully reorganised after 1858. Some changes were made necessary by the transfer of power to the Crown. Thus the East India Company's European forces were merged with the Crown troops. But the army was reorganised 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 minimise, 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 *sitbedar*. Secondly, the organisation 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 chances 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. Soldiers from Avadh, 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, the Sikhs, Gurkhas, and Pathans, who had assisted in the suppression of the Revolt, were declared to be martial and were recruited in large numbers. In addition, 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.

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 honeymoon 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 reorganised to exclude Indians from an effective share in administration. Previously at least lip-service had been paid to the idea that the British were "preparing" the Indians for self-government. The view was now openly put forward that 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.

Module II:

Social and Political Consciousness in India

Socio-religious movements

The 19th C was marked by strenuous attempts to rediscover, reassesses and regenerates Indian society by eschewing orthodoxy and eradicating social evils which had been eating the very vitals of the Indian society and especially the Hindu society. The religious and social reformers emphasized that the truths revealed by the sages and theologians of ancient ages in India, should be seen the right perspectives. The main streams of the new movements may be summed up as purging of society of superstitions reaping the fruits of science and restoration of the society there were movements in almost every part of India. The leaders of the movements made missionary tours over different regions of the country for promoting rational outlook. Social reformers were religious reformers also they tried to promote social reforms on the basis of religious scriptures. Other reformers encouraged interpretation of religious texts based on rational and scientific thinking they quoted the scriptures to show that there is no place for superstition, cast system and untouchability. The reformers promoted the ideas of equality and fraternity which helped national awakening.

Brahmo Samaj

In 1828, Raja Ram Mohan Roy founded an organization called 'Brahma Samaj'. Historians consider this organization the forerunner which paved the way for reformation in India and its establisher as the 'father of modern India'. Raja Ram was a Brahman from Bengal. He was a British civil coadjutant in India. He visually perceived in British rule of India the best things that were salutary to India. He adored the west European philosophy of democracy, liberalism and humanism. He had a great interest in non- Indian cultures and religions. He was especially impressed by Christianity and other religions which preached the subsistence of one Almighty God. Raja Ram endeavored to engender an incipient Hindu religion philosophy and enfolded in it the subsistence of one God and other notions, which were then not the predominant features in Hinduism. He assailed some Hindu traditions and features among them caste system, child espousements, Sati - burning of the live wife over her dead husband's pyre, idolatry and

other credence's. He endeavored to transmute the popular Hindu traditions and claimed that the popular Hindu traditions were different from the authentic Hindu notions. Raja Ram and his organization 'Brahma Samaj' endeavored to transmute the gregarious order of India. He established newspapers and schools all around India. He convinced the British in 1829 to outlaw Sati. But during that period there wasn't yet an Indian ethos among the Indians. Indians were never one nation but always an accumulation of different entities. They were habituated to different rulers including non- Indians. From their perspective the British were just another ruler over them. But the main contribution of the Brahma Samaj to the society of India was that it evoked issues that were prevalent to people all around the Indian sub-continent. The notions of this organization were the inspiration for other organizations and sundry secular political parties, like the Indian National Congress, which were later on engendered in India

Arya Samaj

Dayanand Saraswati was an important Hindu religious scholar, reformer, and founder of the Arya Samaj, a Hindu reform movement. He was the first to give the call for "Swarajya— India for Indians" – in 1876, later taken up by Lokmanya Tilak. Denouncing the idolatry and ritualistic worship prevalent in Hinduism at the time, he worked towards reviving Vedic ideologies. Subsequently the philosopher and President of India, S. Radhakrishnan, called him one of "makers of Modern India," as did Sri Aurobindo. One of his notable disciples was Shyamji Krishna Varma, who founded India House in London and guided other revolutionaries. Others who were influenced by and followed him included Madam Cama, Pransukh Yadav, Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, Lala Hardyal, Madan Lal Dhingra, Bhagat Singh, Swami Shradhdhanand, Sukhabodhananda, Mahatma Hansraj and Lala Lajpat Rai. One of his most influential works is the book Satyarth Prakash, which contributed to the Indian independence movement. He was a sanyasi (ascetic) from boyhood, and a scholar, who believed in the infallible authority of the Vedas. Dayananda advocated the doctrine of karma and skepticism in dogma, and emphasized the ideals of brahmacharya (celibacy) and devotion to God. The Theosophical Society and the Arya Samaj were united from 1878 to 1882, becoming the Theosophical Society of the Arya Samaj. Among Maharishi Dayananda's contributions are his promoting of the equal rights of women, such as the right to education and reading of Indian scriptures and his translation of the Vedas from Sanskrit into Hindi so that the common person might be able to read them. Aum or

Om is considered by the Arya Samaj to be the highest and most proper name of God. Dayananda set about the difficult task of reforming Hinduism with dedication despite attempts on his life. He traveled the country challenging religious scholars and priests to discussions and won repeatedly on the strength of his arguments. He believed that Hinduism had been corrupted by divergence from the founding principles of the Vedas and that Hindus had been misled by the priesthood for the priests' self-aggrandizement. Hindu priests discouraged the laity from reading Vedic scriptures and encouraged rituals, such as bathing in the Ganges River and feeding of priests on anniversaries, which Dayananda pronounced as superstitions or self-serving practices. By exhorting the nation to reject such superstitious notions, his aim was to educate the nation to go back to the Vedas. While he wanted the people to follow the Vedic life, he also exhorted the nation to accept social reforms like the abolition of untouchability, sati, and dowry, as well as the adoption of Hindia's the national language. Through his teachings, preachings, sermons and writings he inspired the nation to aspire to Swarajya (self governance), nationalism, and spiritualism. He advocated the equal rights and respects to women and advocated the full education of a girl child. Far from borrowing concepts from other religions, as Raja Ram Mohan Roy had done, Swami Dayananda was critical of Islam and Christianity as well as of other Indian faiths like Jainism and Buddhism, in integration to denouncing idolatry in Hinduism, as may be visually perceived in his book Satyarth Prakash. He was against what he considered to be the corruption of the pristine faith in his own country. Unlike many other reform forms of kineticism within Hinduism, the Arya Samaj's appeal was addressed not only to the inculcated few in India, but to the world as a whole as evidenced in the sixth principle of the Arya Samaj. In fact his edifications professed universalism for the all living beings and not for any particular sect, faith, community or nation. Arya Samaj sanctions and emboldens converts to Hinduism. Dayananda's concept of dharma is verbalized in the "Notions and Disbeliefs" section of Satyarth Prakash. He verbalized, "I accept as Dharma whatever is in full conformity with impartial equity, veracity and the like; that which is not opposed to the edifications of God as embodied in the Vedas. Whatever is not liberate from partiality and is inequitable, partaking of untruth and the like, and opposed to the edifications of God as embodied in the Vedas—that I hold as adharmā". He additionally verbalized "He, who after conscientious cerebrating, is ever yare to accept truth and abnegate falsehood; who counts the jubilation of others as he does that of his own self, him I call just". Dayananda's Vedic message was to accentuate reverence and reverence for other human

beings, fortified by the Vedic notion of the divine nature of the individual—divine because the body was the temple where the human essence (soul or "atma") had the possibility to interface with the engenderer ("Paramatma"). In the ten principles of the Arya Samaj, he enshrined the conception that "All actions should be performed with the prime objective of benefiting mankind", as opposed to following dogmatic rituals or revering idols and symbols. In his own life, he interpreted mokshato be a lower calling (due to its benefit to one individual) than the calling to emancipate others. Dayananda's "back to the Vedas" message influenced many ruminators. Taking the cue from him, Sri Aurobindo decided to probe for obnubilated psychological designations in the Vedas. Swami Dayananda's creation, the Arya Samaj, unequivocally condemns idol worship, animal sacrifice, ancestor worship, pilgrimages, priest craft, offerings made in temples, the caste system, untouchability, child marriages and discrimination against women on the grounds that all these lacked Vedic sanction. The Arya Samaj discourages dogma and symbolism and encourages skepticism in beliefs that run contrary to common sense and logic. To many people, the Arya Samaj aims to be a "universal society" based on the authority of the Vedas

Ramakrishna Mission

Ramakrishna Paramahansa (1836–1886), regarded as a 19th-century saint, was the founder of the Ramakrishna Order of monks and is regarded as the spiritual founder of the Ramakrishna movement. Ramakrishna was a priest in the Dakshineswar Kali Temple and attracted several monastic and householder disciples. Narendranath Dutta, who later became Vivekananda was one of the chief monastic disciples. Shortly before his death in 1886, Ramakrishna gave the ochre cloths to his young disciples, who were planning to become renunciates. Ramakrishna entrusted the care of these young boys to Vivekananda. After Ramakrishna's death, the young disciples of Ramakrishna gathered and practised spiritual disciplines. They took informal monastic vows on a night which to their pleasant surprise turned out to be the Christmas Eve in 1886. After the death of Ramakrishna in 1886, the monastic disciples formed the first Math (monastery) at Baranagore. Later Vivekananda became a wandering monk and in 1893 he was a delegate at the 893 Parliament of the World's Religions. His speech there, beginning with "Sisters and brothers of America" became famous and brought him widespread recognition. Vivekananda went on lecture tours and held private discourses on

Hinduism and spirituality. He also founded the first Vedanta Society in the United States at New York. Soon after his return to Kolkata, Swami Vivekananda accomplished another important task of his mission on earth. He founded on 1 May 1897 a unique type of organization known as Ramakrishna Mission, in which monks and lay people would jointly undertake propagation of Practical Vedanta, and various forms of social service, such as running hospitals, schools, colleges, hostels, rural development centers etc, and conducting massive relief and rehabilitation work for victims of earthquakes, cyclones and other calamities, in different parts of India and other countries. Though he was a Hindu monk and was hailed as the first Hindu missionary in modern times, he exhorted his followers to be true to their faith but respect all religions of the world as his guru Ramakrishna had taught that all religions are pathways to God. One such example is his exhortation that one can be born in a church but he or she should not die in a church meaning that one should realise the spiritual truths for themselves and not stop at blindly believing in doctrines taught to them. The same year, famine relief was started at Sargachi by Swami Akhandananda, a direct disciple of Ramakrishna. Swami Brahmananda, a direct disciple of Ramakrishna was appointed as the first president of the Order. After the death of Vivekananda in 1902, Sarada Devi, the spiritual counterpart of Ramakrishna, played an important role as the advisory head of a nascent monastic organisation. Gayatri Spivak writes that Sarada Devi "performed her role with tact and wisdom, always remaining in the background. The Ramakrishna Mission is administered by a Governing Body, which is composed of the Trustees of Ramakrishna Math. The headquarters of Ramakrishna Math at Belur (popularly known as Belur Math) serves also as the headquarters of Ramakrishna Mission. A branch centre of Ramakrishna Math is managed by a team of monks posted by the Trustees led by a head monk with the title Adyaksha. A branch centre of Ramakrishna Mission is governed by a Managing Committee consisting of monks and lay persons appointed by the Governing Body of Ramakrishna Mission whose Secretary functions as the executive head. All the monks of the Ramakrishna Order form the democratic base of the administration. A representative meeting of all monks is held every three years when the report of all the activities of the Organization are approved and the accounts passed and guidance sought for further development. This conference places its seal of approval on the decisions taken by the Trustees elected by them and gives policy guidance. The scope of the Administration follows the detailed rules made by Swami Vivekananda when he was the General President of Ramakrishna Mission after the monastic

brothers opined that there should be specific rules for the work of the Ramakrishna Mission (as the Ramakrishna Movement is commonly known). These rules were dictated by Swami Vivekananda to Swami Suddhananda, between 1898 to 1899, and has been accepted as the consensus of the opinion of all the monks of the Ramakrishna Mission then, consisting of all the disciples of Sri Ramakrishna and their disciples. Later for clear and formal legal confirmation of these rules, a Trust Deed was registered by Swami Vivekananda and many of the other disciples of Sri Ramakrishna, during 1899 – 1901.

Aligarh movement

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, one of the architects of modern India was born on October 17, 1817 in Delhi and started his career as a civil servant. The 1857 revolt was one of the turning points of Syed Ahmed's life. He clearly foresaw the imperative need for the Muslims to acquire proficiency in the English language and modern sciences if the community were to maintain its social and political identity, particularly in Northern India. He was one of those early pioneers who recognized the critical role of education for the empowerment of the poor and backward Muslim community. In more than one ways Sir Syed was one of the greatest social reformers and a great national builder of modern India. He began to prepare the road map for the formation of a Muslim University by starting various schools. He instituted Scientific Society in 1863 to create a scientific temperament among the Muslims and to make the Western knowledge available to Indians in their own language. The Aligarh Institute Gazette, an organ of the Scientific Society was started in March 1866 and succeeded in transforming the minds in the traditional Muslim Society. Anyone with an average level of commitment would have backed off in the face of strong opposition but Sir Syed responded by bringing out another journal 'Tehzibul Akhlaq' which was rightly named in English as Mohammedan Social Reformer'. In 1875, Sir Syed founded the Madarsatul Uloom in Aligarh and patterned the MAO College after Oxford and Cambridge universities that he visited on a trip to London in 1869. His objective was to build a college in tune with the British education system but without compromising its Islamic values. He wanted this College to act as a bridge between the old and the new, the East and the West. While he fully appreciated the need and urgency of imparting instruction based on Western learning, he was not oblivious to the value of Oriental learning and wanted to preserve and transmit to posterity the rich legacy of the past. Dr. Sir Mohammad Iqbal observed that "the

real greatness of Sir Syed consists in the fact that he was the first Indian Muslim who felt the need of a fresh orientation of Islam and worked for it--- his sensitive nature was the first to react to modern age". The aim of Sir Syed was not merely restricted to establishing a college at Aligarh but at spreading a network of Muslim managed educational institutions throughout the length and breadth of the country. Keeping in view this, he instituted All India Muslim Educational Conference in 1886 that revived the spirit of Muslims at national level. The Aligarh Movement motivated the Muslims to help open a number of educational institutions. It was the first of its kind of such Muslim NGO in India, which awakened the Muslims from their deep slumber and infused social and political wareness among them. He contributed much to the development of the modern society of the subcontinent. During Sir Syed's own life time, 'The Englishman', a renowned British magazine of the 19th century remarked in a note on November 17, 1885: 'Sir Syed's life "strikingly illustrated one of the best phases of modern history"'. He died on March 27, 1898 and lies buried next to the main mosque at AMU. This most respected and important educational centre for Indian Muslims was initially founded as Mohammedan Anglo Oriental College (MAOC) at Aligarh in 1875 by Sir Saiyad Ahmed Khan and subsequently raised to the status of Aligarh Muslim University (AMU) in 1920. Aligarh Muslim University (AMU), known more as a movement than an academic institution is one of the most important chapters of Indian history as far as the sociology of Hindu-Muslim relation is concerned. Sir Saiyad said: "This is the first time in the history neither of Mohammedans of India, that a college owes it nor to the charity or love of learning of an individual, nor to the spending patronage of a monarch, but to the combined wishes and the united efforts of a whole community. It has its own origin in course which the history of this county has never witnessed before. It is based on principles of toleration and progress such as find no parallel in the annals of the east." Sir Saiyad' famous speech which he made while foundation of MAO College was laid down by Lord Lytton on 18th January, 1877 is the soul of Aligarh Movement. Sir Saiyad said: "from the seed which we sow today, there may spring up a mighty tree, whose branches, like those of the banyan of the soil, shall in their turn strike firm roots into the earth, and themselves send forth new and vigorous saplings". It's a common misconception that Sir Saiyad and Aligarh Movement is anti-oriental studies (Islamic and Eastern studies) and MAO College was started in a reactionary movement to counter the religious school, Darul-Uloom Deoband, started by Maulana Qasim Nanotvi (another student of Sir Saiyad's teacher Maulana Mamlook Ali

Nanotvi). In fact Sir Saiyad had a broader vision and had put forward the need of the hour to get equipped with the modern education to improve the social and economical conditions of Muslims of India. He never discouraged or denied the importance of religious and oriental studies. By his individual means and with the help of Muslim Educational Conference, he always tried to modernize the Madarasas, update their syllabus as per the need of the hour

Satyasodhak movement

Satyasodhak samaj was founded by Jyotiba Phule in 1873. It means truth seeking society. It is securing social justice for the weaker sections. In 1851 he opened girl's school at Pune and established a good library for the low castes and a night school for adults. Jyotiba rejected cast distinctions and the supremacy of the Brahmins over the non Brahmins. He opened orphanages and widow homes and encouraged the adoption of children of the widows. He took keen interest in improving the living condition of the mill workers. His contempt the practice of child marriage, infanticide and shaving the heads of the widows. He wanted to keep out the priests from performing marriage ceremonies. He put forth his views in his book Gulam-Giri.

Pandita Ramabai

Ramabai was born on April 23, 1858 in Dakshina Kannada District, Gangamoola, now in Karnataka. Her Family belongs to Mala Kattemane Dongare Family. Her father, Anant Shastri, was an intellectual Brahmin, who from his study of Hindu texts, believed that women should be edified. His second wife, Ramabai's mother, Lakshmibai, was a child bride nine years of age. Against the prevailing Hindu traditions, he decided to inculcate her. The village Brahmins responded by ostracizing him, so Shastri left the village to make a home in the forest. The family peregrinates from place to place. However he could her father would lecture on the desideratum for female inculcation. He edified Ramabai to read and write Sanskrit, as well as how to interpret vedic texts. By the age of twelve, Ramabai had memorized 18,000 verses from the Puranas. Besides Sanskrit, Ramabai learned the Marathi, Kanarese, Hindustani, and Bengali languages. When her parents died in the 1877 famine, Ramabai and her brother decided to perpetuate their father's work. She and her brother peregrinated all over India. Ramabai's fame as a lecturer reached Calcutta, where the pandits invited her to verbalize. In 1878, Calcutta University, conferred on her the denomination of Pandita, as well as the highest denomination of Saraswati

in apperception of her interpretations of sundry Sanskrit works. The theistic reformer Keshab Chandra Sen gave her a replica of the Vedas, the most sacred of all Hindu literature, and inspired her to read them. Postmortem of her brother in 1880, Ramabai espoused Bengali lawyer, Bipin Behari Medhvi and they had a daughter whom they designated Mano. Medhvi was a Sudra, so her espousment was inter-caste, albeit it was considered infelicitous for a Hindu to espouse into a lower caste. They were espoused in a civil ceremony on 13 November 1880. Ramabai resolved to spend her life endeavoring to more preponderant the status of women in India. She studied and discussed issues which circumvent Indian women, especially Hindu traditions. She verbalized against the practice of child espousment and the resulting constraints on the lives of child widows. Husband and wife had orchestrated to commence a school for child widows, when Medhvi died in 1882. After Medhvi's death, Ramabai peregrinate to Pune where she founded Arya Mahila Samaj, which is Sanskrit for "Noble Women's Society". The purport of the society was to promote the cause of women's edification and deliverance from the oppression of child espousment. When in 1882 a commission was appointed by Regime of India to look into edification, Ramabai gave evidence afore it. In an address to Lord Ripon's Edification Commission, she declared with fervor, "In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the edified men of this country are opposed to female edification and the felicitous position of women. If they observe the slightest fault, they magnify the grain of mustard-seed into a mountain, and endeavor to ruin the character of a woman." She suggested that edifiers be trained and women school inspectors be appointed. Further, she verbally expressed that as the situation in India was that women's conditions were such that women could only medically treat them, Indian women should be admitted to medical colleges. Ramabai's evidence engendered a great sensation and reached Queen Victoria. It bore fruit later in starting of the Women's Medical Kineticism by Lady Dufferin. In 1883 Ramabai received a scholarship to train as an edifier in England. During her time here she converted to Christianity and joined the Anglican Church. She developed a more clear vision at this time for what would become her future ministry in India. She dreamed of founding schools in India that amalgamated edification and industry. She additionally realized the desideratum for Kindergarten school in India. In 1886 she was invited to America so she intently studied the kindergarten systems in America. When she returned to India, she commenced homes for the destitute and Christian churches. Ramabai coalesced her Christian ideals with her Indian culture to promote transmutation in India. She withal lectured across

America for three years on the plight of women and child widows in India; and when the amabai Substructure was composed in America to amass funds for her projects in India, more than 30,000 was accumulated. More than 10,000 facsimiles of her book, High Caste Hindu Women were sold in America, the profits from which were utilized give shelter to destitute women in India. It was there that an association was composed to fund her school for child widows. By April 1889 she had commenced a home-cum-school in Bombay, which she denominated as Sharda Sadan. This was the first home for widows in Maharashtra- the only other home was in Bengal, commenced by a Mr. Sen, As Ramabai was a Christian and the school was funded by missionaries, local citizens viewed it with extreme caution and wariness. She brought in Sharada, an adolescent Indian lady, after whom the Sadan was designated while she was pregnant. But as Sharada relucted Pandita's urge to take up Christianity, Ramabai drove her out 11 days after her distribution which was vigorously criticised. Sharada fell ill and eventually died. Ramabai peregrinate to Poona, name transmuted to Mukti Sadan. When they were hit by the 1900 famine, Ramabai and her auxiliaries were able to rescue several hundred women. According to ManMohan Kaur there were as many as 1900 people in the Sadan. A school was organized 400 children were accommodated in the Kindergarten, A training school for edifiers wad additionally opened and an Industrial School with gardens, fields, oil press, dairy, laundry, ovens, etc. It additionally edified sewing, weaving, and embroidery. In 1889, Ramabai established the Mukti Mission in Pune, as a refuge and a Gospel witness for puerile widows deserted and abused by their families; she withal established Krupa Sadan, a home for "fallen" women, who had been cast out of society. Ramabai additionally commenced SHARDA SADAN, which additionally provided housing, edification, vocational training and medical accommodations for many needy groups including widows, orphans and the blind. In 1896, during a rigorous famine Ramabai toured the villages of Maharashtra with a caravan of bullock carts and rescued thousands of outcast children, child widows, orphans, and other destitute women and brought them to the shelter of Mukti and Sharada Sadan. A learned woman kenning seven languages, she additionally translated the Bible into her mother tongue - Marathi - from the pristine Hebrew and Greek. Ramabai was born on April 23, 1858 in Dakshina Kannada District, Gangamoola, now in Karnataka. Her Family belongs to Mala Kattemane Dongare Family. Her father, Anant Shastri, was an tellectual Brahmin, who from his study of Hindu texts, believed that women should be educated. His second wife, Ramabai's mother, Lakshmibai, was a child bride nine years of age.

Against the prevailing Hindu traditions, he decided to educate her. The village Brahmins responded by ostracizing him, so Shastri left the village to make a home in the forest. The family moved from place to place. Whenever he could her father would lecture on the need for female education. He taught Ramabai to read and write Sanskrit, as well as how to interpret vedic texts. By the age of twelve, Ramabai had memorized 18,000 verses from the Puranas. Besides Sanskrit, Ramabai learned the Marathi, Kanarese, Hindustani, and Bengali languages. When her parents died in the 1877 famine, Ramabai and her brother decided to continue their father's work. She and her brother traveled all over India. Ramabai's fame as a lecturer reached Calcutta, where the pandits invited her to speak. In 1878, Calcutta University, conferred on her the title of Pandita, as well as the highest title of Saraswati in recognition of her interpretations of various Sanskrit works. The theistic reformer Keshab Chandra Sen gave her a copy of the Vedas, the most sacred of all Hindu literature, and encouraged her to read them. After the death of her brother in 1880, Ramabai married Bengali lawyer, Bipin Behari Medhvi and they had a daughter whom they named Mano. Medhvi was a Sudra, so her marriage was inter-caste, even though it was considered inappropriate for a Hindu to marry into a lower caste. They were married in a civil ceremony on 13 November 1880. Ramabai resolved to spend her life attempting to better the status of women in India. She studied and discussed issues which surround Indian women, especially Hindu traditions. She spoke against the practice of child marriage and the resulting constraints on the lives of child widows. Husband and wife had planned to start a school for child widows, when Medhvi died in 1882. After Medhvi's death, Ramabai moved to Pune where she founded Arya Mahila Samaj, which is Sanskrit for "Noble Women's Society". The purpose of the society was to promote the cause of women's education and deliverance from the oppression of child marriage. When in 1882 a commission was appointed by Government of India to look into education, Ramabai gave evidence before it. In an address to Lord Ripon's Education Commission, she declared with fervor, "In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the educated men of this country are opposed to female education and the proper position of women. If they observe the slightest fault, they magnify the grain of mustard-seed into a mountain, and try to ruin the character of a woman." She suggested that teachers be trained and women school inspectors be appointed. Further, she said that as the situation in India was that women's conditions were such that women could only medically treat them, Indian women should be

admitted to medical colleges. Ramabai's evidence created a great sensation and reached Queen Victoria. It bore fruit later in starting of the Women's Medical Movement by Lady Dufferin.

Political associations

The Indian National Congress was not the first political association to be established in India. Various associations had been established earlier. The beginning of organized political activity in India generally dates back to the establishment of landholders' society in 1837. It was an association of landholders of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and its principal objective was to guard its class interests. In 1843 was formed another association named Bengal British India society. Its objective was wider, i.e. to protect and promote general public interests. The landholders' society represented the aristocracy of wealth; the Bengal British India society represented the aristocracy of intelligence. In 1851 the two associations were merged, giving rise to a new one, named the British Indian Association. This was the time when the Charter of the British East India Company was due for renewal and a need was felt to make the views of Indians known to the authorities in London. Associations were also formed about this time in Bombay and Madras. These were called the Bombay Association and the Madras Native Association respectively and were established in 1852. All these associations were dominated by wealthy landed gentry. Similar, but lesser known associations were established in other parts of India too. Deccan Association can be mentioned as one of them.

The three Presidency associations sent petitions suggesting changes in East India Company's Charter. These suggestions give us a fairly good idea of the attitude of the publically conscious classes in India at that time. Broadly speaking, the petitioners wanted that Indians should be appointed to the legislative bodies. Company's monopoly of salt and indigo should be abolished and the state should give aid to indigenous industry. It was also stated that the local governments should have greater powers and Indians should have bigger share in the administration of their country. So far as agrarian issues were concerned, a desire was expressed for the preservation of existing interests in land. Each petition also expressed concern about the need to improve the condition of peasants. In the petition sent by members of the British Indian Association it was stated that while Indians acknowledged 'the blessings of an improved form of government', they could not but feel that they had 'not profited by their connection with Great

Britain to the extent which they had a right to look for'. Many of their demands were later taken up by the Congress.

As has already been mentioned, during the 1860s and 1870s ideas of nationalism and patriotism were very much in the air. A number of political associations were established in different parts of the country during this period to propagate the cause of reform in various spheres of administration and to promote political consciousness among various sections of the people. Of these, the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, established by M.G. Ranade, G.V. Joshi, S.H. Chiplankar and his associates in 1870, proved to be the most important. This Sabha brought out a journal from 1878 which did much for arousing political consciousness. To carry on political propaganda in England, some Indian students like Pherozeshab Mehta, Badruddin Tyabji, Dadabhai Naoroji and Manmohan Ghose founded the East India Association in December, 1866. The half century from the establishment of Landholders society in 1837 was more a period of aspirations than of achievements. But the state was set during this period for the emergence of a national body. The need for a national platform began to be keenly felt. In Calcutta, dissatisfaction with the British Indian Association had been growing. Its subscription was Rs. 50 per annum which was too high for the middle class. (According to Lord Curzon's estimate per capita income in British India in 1898 was Rs. 30 per annum.)

Its membership was, therefore, confined to the wealthy people. In 1876 the Indian Association was founded in Calcutta. The membership fee was kept at five rupees, per annum. It soon became very popular amongst the educated people and became a major force in Bengal and subsequently in Indian politics. Surendranath Banerjea, a young member of the middle class who had been ejected from the Indian Civil Service on what appeared to be insufficient grounds was mainly responsible for its establishment. The aims of the Indian Association included developing a strong public opinion, promoting Hindu-Muslim friendship, establishing contact with masses and generating wider awareness amongst the Indian people. These are certainly ingredients of a broad based nationalist movement. Surendranath Banerjea said that the new association was based on the conception of United India derived from the inspiration of Mazzini—the main architect of the German Unification. Many other political bodies were established in other parts of India, like the Madras Mahajan Sabha, the Bombay Presidency Association, the Allahabad

People's Association, and the Indian Association of Lahore etc. Many of these bodies had branches in the Mofussil towns. After 1885 these became the regional arms of the Congress.

East India Association

The East India Association was founded by Dadabhai Naoroji in 1866, in collaboration with Indians and retired British officials in London. It superseded the London Indian Society and was a platform for discussing matters and ideas about India, and to provide representation for Indians to the Government. Naoroji delivered the first lecture to the Association on 2 May 1867. The Association's first President was Lord Lyveden. In 1868, the East India Association had nearly 600 members. This had increased to 1,000 in 1878. Female members were admitted from 1912. The Association produced a journal (Journal of the East India Association) from its inception which included the papers that were delivered before their meetings. Papers and proceedings of these meetings were then produced in the Asiatic Quarterly Review, which eventually superseded the Journal of the East India Association. These lectures were usually delivered in the Association's regular meeting place - Caxton Hall, Westminster (i.e., Westminster Town Hall). Over the course of its existence, the Association would listen to lectures from a wide range of Indian and British men and women on matters ranging from the economic development of India to literature to suffrage. In March 1940, after a lecture delivered by Michael O'Dwyer at Caxton Hall, the former Governor of Punjab at the time of the Amritsar Massacre was shot dead by Udham Singh.

The East India Association incorporated the National Indian Association in 1949 and became the Britain, India and Pakistan Association. In 1966 it amalgamated with the former India Society, now Royal India, Pakistan and Ceylon Society, to become the Royal Society for India, Pakistan and Ceylon. One of the chief objects Mr Naoroji had in view in founding the Association was the awakening of the British people to a due sense of their responsibilities as rulers of India, and his first endeavours were therefore directed to the dissipation of that 'colossal ignorance' of India which had so impressed him on his first arrival in England in 1855. Later on he saw how desirable it was that the Chiefs and Princes of India should be represented in this country, and that all possible assistance should be afforded them in laying their claims and views

before Government for the protection of their interests and the redress of their grievances. So 'all persons interested in India' (whether Indians or Britons) were welcomed as Members of the East India Association

Indian National Congress

The Indian National Congress was founded in December 1885 at Bombay. It marked a new beginning in the history of Indian nationalism. It was the first organized expression of Indian nationalism on an all India Scale. A.O.Hume, a retired English LC.S officer played an important role in its formation. In 1884 Hume founded the Indian National Union. Its objectives were to promote Indian nationalism and establish a close relation between and England, by securing the removal of unjust and harmful laws. Towards the end of 1884 he came to Bombay and discussed with the local leaders regarding a comprehensive programme including the summoning of an annual conference and the formation of a central National Association. A.O. Hume came into contact with Man Mohan Gosh, W.C. Banerjee, S.N.Sen and A.M. Bose. He met the viceroy Lord Dufferin and discussed his plan. The congress could serve as a focal point for national discontent. Hume made it clear that the congress should serve as a 'safety valve' for revolutionary discontent. Hume as well as other English officials and states men was afraid that the educated Indian might provide leadership to the masses and organize a powerful rebellion against the British government. Hume believed that the National Congress would provide a peaceful and constitutional outlet to the discontent among the educated Indian and would thus help to avoid the outbreak of a popular revolt. W.C. Banerjee popularized the view that the idea of the Indian National Congress was a product of Lord Dufferin's brain, that he suggested it to Mr. Hume who under took to work it out. Dufferin's idea was to have a political organization through which the government could ascertain the real wishes of the people and the save the administration from any possible political outburst of the country. Lala Lajpat Rai maintained to serve as a safety valve for the growing unrest in the country and to strengthen the British Empire. The 'safety valve' Theory is however, is a small part of the truth. More than anything else, the National Congress represented the urge of the politically conscious Indians to set up a national organization to work for their political and economic advancement. We saw that the national movement was already growing in the country as a result of the working of powerful forces. No one man or a group can be given credit for creating this movement. Even Hume's motives were mixed one. In many case, the Indian leaders who co-operated with Hume in starting Indian

National Congress, were patriotic men of high character who willingly accepted Hume's help as they did not want to arouse official hostility towards their efforts at an early stage of political activity. Surendra Nath Banerjee and many leaders of Bengal had not attended the first session of the Indian National Congress. They were busy with the second National Conference at Calcutta; in 1886 they merged with the Indian National Congress. The second session of the congress met in Calcutta on December 1886, under the presidency of Dadabhai Naoroji. From the second session the Indian National Congress became the whole country's congress. Hereafter the Indian National Congress met every year in December in different parts of the country. The number of its delegates soon increased in thousands. Its members consisted of lawyers, journalists, traders, industrialists, teachers and landlords. In 1890 Kadambini Ganguli, the first woman graduate of Calcutta University, addressed the congress session.

Rise of nationalism

The growth of Indian nationalism is closely connected with the anti-colonial movement in India as like all the third world countries. In the process of their struggle against colonialism they identified their unity. Although the impact of colonialism felt differently to everyone the unity of political leadership and movement united them for a cause.

The consolidation of the British East India Company's rule in the Indian subcontinent during the 18th century brought about socio-economic changes which led to the rise of an Indian middle class and steadily eroded pre-colonial socio-religious institutions and barriers. The emerging economic and financial power of Indian business-owners and merchants and the professional class brought them increasingly into conflict with the British Raj. A rising political consciousness among the native Indian social elite (including lawyers, doctors, university graduates, government officials and similar groups) spawned an Indian identity [5] and fed a growing nationalist sentiment in India in the last decades of the nineteenth century. The creation in 1885 of the Indian National Congress in India by the political reformer A.O. Hume intensified the process by providing an important platform from which demands could be made for political liberalisation, increased autonomy, and social reform. [8] The leaders of the Congress advocated dialogue and debate with the Raj administration to achieve their political goals. Distinct from these moderate voices (or loyalists) who did not preach or support violence was the nationalist

movement, which grew particularly strong, radical and violent in Bengal and in Punjab. Notable but smaller movements also appeared in Maharashtra, Madras and other areas across the south.

Causes

Consequence of Foreign Domination

Basically, modern Indian nationalism arose to meet the challenge of foreign domination. The very conditions of British rule helped the growth of national sentiment among the Indian people. It was British rule and its direct and indirect consequences which provided the material, moral and intellectual conditions for the development of a national movement in India. The root of the matter lay in the clash of the interests of the Indian people with British interests in India. The British had conquered India to promote their own interests and they ruled it primarily with that purpose in view, often subordinating Indian welfare to British gain. The Indians, realised gradually that their interests were being sacrificed to those of Lancashire manufacturers and other dominant British interests. They now began to recognise the evils of foreign rule. Many intelligent Indians saw that many of these evils could have been avoided and overcome if Indian and not foreign interests had guided the policies of the Indian Government.

The foundations of the Indian nationalist movement lay in the fact that increasingly British rule became the major cause of India's economic backwardness. It became the major barrier to India's further economic, social, cultural, intellectual, and political development. Moreover, this fact began to be recognised by an increasingly larger number of Indians. Every class, every section of Indian society gradually discovered that its interests were suffering at the hands of the foreign rulers. The peasant saw that the Government took away a large part of his produce as land revenue; that the Government and its machinery—the police, the courts, the officials—favoured and protected the zamindars and landlords, who rack-rented him, and the merchants and money-lenders, who cheated and exploited him in diverse ways and who took away his land from him. Whenever the peasant struggled against landlord, money-lender oppression, the police and the army suppressed him in the name of law and order. The artisan or the handicraftsman saw that the foreign regime had helped foreign competition to ruin him and had done nothing to rehabilitate him. Later, in the 20th century, the worker in modern factories, mines, and plantations found that, in spite of lip sympathy, the Government sided with the capitalists, especially the foreign capitalists. Whenever he tried to organise trade unions and to

improve his lot through strikes, demonstrations, and other struggles, Government machinery was freely used against him. Moreover, he soon realised that the growing unemployment could be checked only by rapid industrialisation which only an independent government could bring about.

All these three classes of Indian society—the peasants, the artisans, the workers, constituting the overwhelming majority of Indian population— discovered that they had no political rights or powers, and that virtually nothing was being done for their intellectual or cultural improvement. Education did not percolate down to them. There were hardly any schools in villages and the few that were there were poorly run. The doors of higher education were barred to them in practice. Moreover, many of them belonged to the lower castes and had still to bear social and economic oppression by the upper castes. Other sections of Indian society were no less dissatisfied. The rising intelligentsia—the educated Indians—used their newly acquired modern knowledge to understand the sad economic and political condition of their country. Those who had earlier, as in 1857, support'd British rule in the hope that, though alien, it would modernise and industrialise the country were gradually disappointed. Economically, they had hoped that British capitalism would help develop India's productive forces as it had done at home. Instead, they Found that British policies in India, guided by the British capitalists at home, were keeping the country economically backward or underdeveloped and checking the development of its productive forces. In fact, economic exploitation by Britain was increasing India's poverty. They began to complain of the extreme costliness of the Indian administration, of the excessive burden of taxation especially on the pea-santry, of the destruction of India's indigenous industries, of official attempts to check the growth of modern industries through a pro-British tariff policy, of the neglect of nation-building and welfare activities such as education, irrigation, sanitation, and health services. In brief, they could see that Britain was reducing India to the statue of an economic colony, a source of raw materials for British industries, a market for British manufactures, and a field for the investment of British capital. Consequently, they began to realise that so long as imperialist control of the Indian economy continued, it would not be possible to develop it, especially so far as industrialisation was involved. Politically, educated Indians found that the British had abandoned all previous pretensions of guiding India towards self-government. Most of the British officials and political leaders openly declared that the British were in India to stay. Moreover, instead of increasing the

freedom of speech, of the press, and of the person, the Government increasingly restricted them. British officials and writers declared Indians to be unfit for democracy or self-government. In the field of culture, the rulers were increasingly taking a negative and even hostile attitude towards higher education and the spread of modern ideas.

Moreover, the Indian intelligentsia suffered from growing unemployment. The few Indians who were educated were not able to find employment and even those who did find jobs discovered that most of the better paid jobs were reserved for the English middle and upper classes, who looked upon India as a special pasture for their sons. Thus, educated Indians found that the economic and cultural development of the country and its freedom from foreign control alone could provide them with better employment opportunities. The rising Indian capitalist class was slow in developing a national political consciousness. But it too gradually saw that it was suffering at the hands of imperialism. Its growth was severely checked by the government trade, tariff, taxation, and transport policies. As a new and weak class it needed active government help to counterbalance many of its weaknesses. But no such help was given. Instead, the Government and its bureaucracy favoured foreign capitalists who came to India with their vast resources and appropriated the limited industrial field. The Indian capitalists were particularly opposed to the strong competition from foreign capitalists. In the 1940's many of the Indian industrialists demanded that "all British investments in India be repatriated." And, in 1945, M.A. Master, President of the Indian Merchants' Chamber warned: "India would prefer to go without industrial development rather than allow the creation of new East India Companies in this country, which would not only militate against her economic independence but would also effectively prevent her from acquiring her political freedom." The Indian capitalists too therefore realised that there existed a contradiction between imperialism and their own independent growth, and that only a national government would create conditions for the rapid development of Indian trade and industries.

Administrative and Economic Unification of the Country Nationalist sentiments grew easily among the people because India was unified and welded into a nation during the 19th and 20th centuries. The British had gradually introduced a uniform and modern system of government throughout the country and thus unified it administratively. The destruction of the rural and local self-sufficient economy and the introduction of modern trade and industries on an

all-India scale had increasingly made India's economic life a single whole and inter-linked the economic face of people living in different parts of the country. For example, if famine or scarcity occurred in one part of India, prices and availability of foodstuffs were affected in all other parts of the country too. This was not usually the case before the 19th century. Similarly, the products of a factory in Bombay were sold far north in Lahore or Peshawar. The lives of the workers and capitalists in Madras, Bombay, or Calcutta were closely linked with the lives of the countless peasants in rural India. Furthermore, introduction of the railways, telegraphs, and unified postal system had brought the different parts of the country together and promoted mutual contact among the people, especially among the leaders.

Western Thought and Education As a result of the spread of modern western education and thought during the 19th century, a large number of Indians imbibed a modern rational, secular, democratic, and nationalist political outlook. They also began to study, admire, and emulate the contemporary nationalist movements of European nations. Rousseau, Paine, John Stuart Mill, and other western thinkers became their political guides, while Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Irish nationalist leaders became their political heroes. These educated Indians were the first to feel the humiliation of foreign subjection. By becoming modern in their thinking, they also acquired the ability to study the evil effects of foreign rule. They were inspired by the dream of a modern, strong, prosperous, and united India. In course of time, the best among them became the leaders and organisers of the national movement. It should be clearly understood that it was not the modern educational system that created the national movement which was the product of the conflict of interests between Britain and India. That system only enabled the educated Indians to imbibe western thought and thus to assume the leadership of the national movement and to give it a democratic and modern direction. In fact, in the schools and colleges, the authorities tried to inculcate notions of docility and servility to foreign rule. Nationalist ideas were a part of the general spread of modern ideas. In other Asian countries such as China and Indonesia, and all over Africa, modern and nationalist ideas spread even though modern schools and colleges existed on a much smaller scale. Modern education also created a certain uniformity and community of outlook and interests among the educated Indians. The English language played an important role in this respect. It became the medium for the spread of modern ideas. It also became the medium of communication and exchange of ideas between educated Indians

from -different linguistic regions of the country. This point should not, however, be over-emphasised. In fact English soon became a barrier to the spread of modern knowledge among the common people. It also acted as a wall separating the educated urban people from the common people, especially in the rural areas. Consequently, it came about that modern ideas spread faster and deeper in many countries where they were propagated through indigenous languages than in India where emphasis on English confined them to a narrow urban section. This fact was fully recognised by the Indian political leaders. From Dadabhai Naoroji, Sayyid Ahmed Khan, and Justice Ranade to Tilak and Gandhiji, they agitated for a bigger role for the Indian languages in the educational system. In fact, so far as the common people were concerned, the spread of modern ideas occurred through the developing Indian languages, the growing literature in them, and most of all the popular Indian language press. More important than a common language was the fact that modern education introduced identical courses of study all over the country. The books prescribed in the new schools and colleges tended to give the students a common political and economic outlook. Consequently, educated Indians tended to have common views, feelings, aspirations and ideal

The Sole of the Press and Literature The chief instrument through which the nationalist-minded Indians spread the message of patriotism and modern economic, social and political ideas and created an all-India consciousness was the press. Large numbers of nationalist newspapers made their appearance during the second half of the 19th century. In their columns, the official policies were constantly criticised; the Indian point of view was put forward; the people were asked to unite and work for national welfare; and ideas of self-government, democracy, industrialisation, etc., were popularised among the people. The press also enabled nationalist workers living in different parts of the country to exchange views with one another. Some of the prominent nationalist newspapers of the period were the Hindu Patriot, the Amrita Bazar Patrika, the Indian Mirror, the Bengalee, the Som Prakash and the Sanjivani in Bengal; the Rast Gofar, the Native Opinion, the Indu Prakash, the Mahratta, and the Kesari in Bombay; the Hindut the Swadcsamitran, the Andhra Prakasika, and the Kerala Palrika in Madras; the Advocate, the Hindustani, and the Azad in U. P.; and the Tribune, the Akhbar-i-Am, and the Kofhi-Noor in the Punjab National literature in the form of novels, essays, and patriotic poetry also played an important role in arousing national consciousness. Ban- kim Chandra Chatterjee

and Rabindranath Tagore in Bengali, Lakshminath Bezbarua in Assamese; Vishnu Shastri Chiplunkar in Marathi, Subramanya Bharati in Tamil; Bharatendu Harishchandra in Hindi; and Altaf Husain Hall in Urdu were some of the prominent nationalist writers of the period.

Racial Arrogance of the Rulers

An important though secondary factor in the growth of national sentiments in India was the tone of racial superiority adopted by many Englishmen in their dealings with Indians. Many Englishmen openly insulted even educated Indians and sometimes even assaulted them, a particularly odious and frequent form taken by racial arrogance was the failure of justice whenever an Englishman was involved in a dispute with an Indian. Indian newspapers often published instances in which an Englishman had hit and killed an Indian but escaped -very lightly, often with a mere fine. This was not only because of conscious partiality by the judges and administrators but even more because of racial prejudice. As G.O. Trevelyan pointed out in 1864: "The testimony of a single one of our countrymen has more weight with the court than that of any number of Hindoos, a circumstance which puts a terrible instrument of power into the hands of an unscrupulous and grasping Englishman". Racial arrogance branded all Indians irrespective of their caste, religion, province, or class with the badge of inferiority. They were kept out of exclusively European clubs and were often not permitted to travel in the same compartment in a train with the European passengers, This made them conscious of national humiliation, and led them to think of themselves as one people when facing Englishmen.

By the 1870's it was evident that Indian nationalism had gathered enough strength and momentum to appear as a major force on the Indian political scene. However, it required the reactionary regime of Lord Lytton to give it visible form and the controversy around the Ilbert Bill to make it take up an organised form. During Lytton's viceroyalty from 1876-80 most of the import duties on British textile imports were removed to please the textile manufacturers of Britain. This action was interpreted by Indians as proof of the British desire to ruin the small but growing textile industry of India. It created a wave of anger in the country and led to widespread nationalist agitation. The Second War against Afghanistan aroused vehement agitation against the heavy cost of this imperialist war which the Indian Treasury was made to bear. The Arms Act of 1878, which disarmed the people, appeared to them as an effort to emasculate the entire

nation. The Vernacular Press Act of 1878 was condemned by the politically conscious Indians as an attempt to suppress the growing nationalist criticism of the alien government. The holding of the Imperial Durbar at Delhi in 1877 at a time when the country was suffering from a terrible famine led people to believe that their rulers cared very little even for their lives. In 1878, the government announced new regulations reducing the maximum age limit for sitting in the Indian Civil Service Examination from 21 years to 19. Already Indian students had found it difficult to compete with English boys since the examination was conducted in England and in English. The new regulations further reduced their chances of entering the Civil Service. The Indians now realised that the British had no intention of relaxing their near-total monopoly of the higher grades of services in the administration.

Module III:

Nationalist Movement

Pre-Gandhian Era

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 piece meal 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 addressing 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”.

Economic critique of colonialism

The Indian National Movement was the most deeply and firmly rooted in an understanding of the nature and character of imperialistic domination and exploitation. Its early leaders, known as moderates, were the first in the 19th century to develop an economic critique of imperialism. This critique was also perhaps their important contribution to the development of the national movement in India. The early nationalist complained of India's growing poverty and economic backwardness. The failure of modern industry and agriculture were due to the imperialist policy of the British. The nationalist leaders like Dadabai Naoroji and Romesh Chandra Dutt initiated and carried out the economic analysis of British rule during the period 1870-1905. They raised the basic questions regarding the nature and purpose of British rule. Eventually, they were able to trace the process of colonization of the Indian economy and conclude that colonization was the main obstacle to Indian 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. The essence of the 19th century colonialism lay in the transformation of India into a supplier of raw materials and a market for British manufactured commodities and field for investment of British capital. The early Indian national leaders organized powerful intellectual agitation against colonial economic policies. The nationalist economic agitation started with the assertion that Indians were becoming poorer every day. Dada Bai Naoroji declared from public platform and press that Indian is starving, he is dying off at the slightest touch, living on insufficient food”.

R.C. Dutt in his book 'Economic history of India' wrote 'If India is poor today it is through the operation of economic causes'. In the course of their search for the cause of India's poverty, the nationalist underlined factors and forces which had been brought into play by the colonial rulers and the colonial's structure. The early nationalist asserted that genuine economic development was possible only if Indian capital itself initiated and developed the causes of industrialization. Foreign capital represented the exploitation of Indian resources. Another major problem highlighted by the early nationalists was that of the decline and ruin of India's

traditional handicrafts. It was the result of deliberate policy of destroying Indian industries in the interest of British manufactures. The nationalist view that the foreign trade and railways represented not economic development but colonialisation and under development of the economy and the railways had not been co-ordinated with the industrial needs. They ushered in a commercial revolution not an industrial revolution, which enabled the imported goods to undersell domestic industrial products. More over they said that the benefits of railway construction in terms of encouragement is steel and machine industry and to the foreign capital investment. The nationalist criticized the policy of free trade, which was ruining Indian handicrafts industries. The important point of the nationalist critiques of colonialism was the Drain theory. The nationalist leaders pointed out that a larger part of India's was being transferred or drained to Britain in the form of salaries and pensions of British civil and military officers working in India, interest on loan, profit of British capitalist in India and home charges or expenses of the Indian Government of Britain.

Dadabai Naoroji

He was the first Asian to be a British MP and the first Indian to become a Professor at Elphinstone Institution in 1850. The 'Grand Old Man of India' and the 'Father of Indian Nationalism' are the epithets to explain the personality of this great man who was an educator, cotton trader and social leader. He is none other than Dadabhai Naoroji, who was born on 4th September 1825 at Khadak in Mumbai. He was a Member of Parliament (MP) in the United Kingdom House of Commons between 1892 and 1895. Dadabhai Naoroji played a crucial role in founding the Indian National Congress along with two other famous politicians of that time i.e. A.O. Hume and Dinshaw Edulji Wacha. Dadabhai Naoroji's concept of wealth drain from India during British rule got huge attention. He mentioned the same concept in his book Poverty and Un-British Rule in India. After completing his schooling, Dadabhai Naoroji finished his Masters degree in Mathematics and worked as a professor in the same subject. He achieved many honors during his academic career and after completing his education from the Elphinstone Institution, he became a partner of the first Indian commercial company founded in Britain. So, he went to England for managing Cama and Co. While staying in England, he was very keen in exposing the wretchedness in India and what Indians were going through during British rule. In 1866, he established the East India Association in England. This was a platform to put forward the

grievances of Indians in Britain. To promote these further branches of the association were also established in different parts of India.

Poverty and Un British rule in India

Dadabhai Naoroji's theory of the Drain of Wealth Dadabhai Naoroji was the first man to say that internal factors were not the reasons of poverty in India but poverty was caused by the colonial rule that was draining the wealth and prosperity of India. In 1867, Dadabhai Naoroji put forward the 'drain of wealth' theory in which he stated that the Britain was completely draining India. He mentioned this theory in his book Poverty and Un-British Rule in India. Further in his book, he stated the loss of 200-300 million pounds of revenue to Britain. Dadabhai Naoroji considered it as a major evil of British in India. On the footsteps of Dadabhai Naoroji, R. C. Dutt also promoted the same theory by keeping it as a major theme of his book Economic History in India. The drain of wealth was the portion of India's wealth and economy that was not available to Indians for consumption. Dadabhai Naoroji gave six factors that caused external drain. These are:

1. External rule and administration in India. Funds and labour needed for economic development was brought in
2. By immigrants but India did not draw immigrants.
3. All the civil administration and army expenses of Britain were paid by India.
4. India was bearing the burden of territory building both inside and outside India.
5. India was further exploited by opening the country to free trade.
6. Major earners in India during British rule were foreigners. The money they earned was never invested in India to buy anything. Moreover they left India with that money.

Not only this, but through different services such as railways, was India giving a huge amount to Britain. On the other hand, trade as well as Indian labour was deeply undervalued. Along with this, the East India Company was buying products from India with Indian money and exporting it to Britain. Dadabhai Naoroji was respected both in Britain as well as India for his loyalty towards British and services for Indians. For this reason, he was elected as the President of the Indian National Congress, not once or twice but for three times i.e. in 1886, 1893 and 1906. Dadabhai Naoroji was a greater supporter of free education especially to women and children in India as his mother had to struggle a lot to provide the same to him. He was very keen in providing education and making it free. He also wanted to uplift the condition of women in

India. For this, he laid the foundation of Jyan Prasarak Mandal, the only girls' high school in Bombay (present day Mumbai). His contribution to politics was also immense. He was the founder of Bombay Association and established it in 1852. Further, the London Indian Society was established by him along with N.C. Banarjee for the betterment of relationships between Indian and Englishmen. His entire life was dedicated to the cause and betterment of India.

Programmes and Policies of Moderates

The starting point of the early leaders of the Congress, often called moderates was their abiding faith that British rule was a great boon to India and a dispensation of providence. There were many factors responsible for their faith. First, the British had brought peace and order to the country after more than a century of disorder and anarchy that had been let loose on the land after the breakup of the Mughal Empire. Besides, the moderates were grateful to the British for the introduction of Western type of administrative machinery and justice, rapid means of transport and communication, local self governing institutions, the free press, and above all for English education which, according to them, had brought new light to the country, Loyalty to the British, therefore, was the kernel of the political creed of the moderates. The Congress- declared Dadabhai Naoroji, was not a nursery for sedition and rebellion against the British government but another stone in the foundation of the stability of that Government.

Secular Nationalism

The progressive part of the ideology of the liberals was their secular nationalism. They firmly believed that in spite of all the diversities, India was a nation. They tried to ignore and bypass all the caste and communal differences and focused the attention of educated classes on the questions of common interest. Despite the advocacy of many an English politician and some of their Indian disciples that India's degradation was due to her social and religious decay and, therefore, social and religious reforms should precede political reforms, the moderates tenaciously maintained the secular character of the Congress and kept the social and religious problems away from politics.

No Doctrinaire Liberty

Although the democratic ideals of liberty, equality and representative government had great fascination for them, they were not doctrinaire philosophers. Their ideal of liberty was not a reproduction of the western concept. They did not believe in the principle of laissez faire. They stood for state protection of industries and looked to the government for social reform, education,

and protection of agriculture, trade and industries, for measures of health and sanitation, famine relief and other matters of national advancement. But at the same time they were great champions of civil liberties of the people. They fought boldly for freedom of thought and expression, freedom of the press and personal liberty.

No Doctrinaire Equality

Similarly, they had nothing to do with the doctrinaire concept of equality. They believed that the Indians were not capable of managing their political and civil affairs, and, therefore, it was necessary for them to pass through a period of tutelage under the guardianship of the British. Yet they fought consistently for racial equality between Indians and Englishmen, and for social and religious equality among Indians themselves. Objectives of the Congress: There was broad uniformity in the objectives and methods of the Congress during the first twenty years in its history. Every year it passed a roughly similar set of resolutions dealing with three broad types of grievances: political, administrative and economic.

(1) Political Demands

The principal political demand was the establishment of genuine consultative councils, both at the centre and in the provinces, increase in the number of members of existing councils, introduction of the principle of election, placing of all legislative and financial measures including the budget before the councils and the right of interpretation to the members of Legislature. Thus, the immediate perspective fell far short of self-government or democracy. It was for the first time in 1906 that Dadabhai Naoroji in his President address, declared, "self-government or Swaraj" like that of the United Kingdom or the colonies to be the distant goal of the Congress. An equally important political demand was the abolition of the hated India Council.

2. Administrative Demands

(i) *Employment* – The question of employment of Indians in the public services engaged the attention of the Congress from the very beginning. It was demanded that competitive examinations should be held, simultaneously in India and England open to all classes of her Majesty's subjects, that a classified list of appointments be made in order of merit, and that the age for competition should be not less than 19 and not more than 23. Similarly, it was insisted that the higher branches of Medical, P.W.D., Railway; opium, customs and Telegraph services be thrown open to Indians.

(ii) *Reduction of Military Expenditure* - The military, problem was another important matter to which the Congress devoted serious thought from the outset. The main demands in this connection were the ever mounting military expenditure should be reduced, an equitable portion of that expenditure be borne by the British, treasury and a system of volunteering for Indians be introduced. The most noteworthy feature of the Congress stand on the military affairs was its unqualified condemnation of the forward aggressive policy of the government. The annexation of Burma, the Tibetan expedition of Lord Curzon and the forward frontier policy were severely criticized.

(iii) *Legal Rights* - The Congress from the beginning was solicitous about safeguarding the legal rights of the people. The first demand in this connection was separation of executive from judicial function: Another important demand was the establishment of the system of trial by jury.

(iv) *Education* - In the field of education the Congress demanded that the government should extend primary education, broaden secondary education, and maintain at its highest possible level higher education. Particular emphasis was laid on technical education for Indians.

3. *Economic Demands*

The economic issues raised were all bound with the general poverty of the masses, to the, first few years the official view of the Congress was that the drain of wealth caused by the employment of foreign agency in the administration of the country and the growing military expenditure were the main causes of the economic rain of the masses. Resolutions were passed calling for an enquiry into India's growing poverty and famines demanding cuts in Home charges and military expenditure and funds for technical education to promote Indian industries, and an end to unfair tariffs and excise duties. The new land revenue system was also held responsible for the economic decline of the country and the main demands were introduction of Permanent Settlement and fixity of land revenue over the rest of the country. The early Congress was concerned not only with the interests of the English educated professional groups, zamindars or industrialists. It passed numerous resolutions on salt tax, treatment of Indian coolies abroad, and sufferings caused by forest administration. The Constitutional Method The method which the

early Congress adopted for the redress of their grievances is commonly known as the constitutional method. It excluded not only rebellion, aiding or abetting foreign invasion and resort to violence, but all well-organized agitation. Even if their demands remain underdressed, they could not think of setting afoot an agitation that had the remotest possibility of arousing genuine indignation and dissatisfaction of the masses against the British Government. Even a peaceful agitation was inconsistent with their views and aims. The method of the moderates was an appeal to the sense of justice and generosity of British statesmen and people. Its essence was prayers and petitions. The early Congress concentrated, on building up through petitions. Speeches and articles a fool-proof logical case aimed at convincing the liberal-minded public opinion of the land of Cobden, Bright, Mill and Gladstone. Finally, the Congress politicians argued that the attainment of self-Government by other colonies of the British Empire was proof positives of the fact that the real intention of the English rulers was to train Indian gradually in democratic institutions. As the time would come, India would also get at their hands the same type of government which they had conferred on other colonies.

– **Gokhale**

Gopala Krishna Gokhale was a greatest leader of the Indian national movement. He was a follower of Mahadev Ranade, popularly known as the socrates of Maharashtra. Gokhale was a strong believer in the policy of modernization and reasonableness. He was considered as the Guru of Mahatma Gandhi. Gokhale was born in a Marath Brahmin family at Kolhapur. After graduation in 1884, Gokhale joined the Deccan Educational Society founded by Ranade. He served the society for twenty years in various capacities as a school master, professor and principal of Fergusson College Poona; He edited the journal of Poona Sarvajanik Sabha. Gokhale made his first appearance in the congress platform at the Allahabad session in 1899. In 1902 he was elected to the imperial legislative council. In the council Gokhale made his mark as an eloquent and persuasive speaker. In the legislative council Gokhale greatly criticized the Indian official finance and spoke with considerable insight on the budget. He also exposed the hollowness of the British pretension in the matter of appointment of Indian to higher service. He worked as a joint secretary of the Indian National Congress and later in 1905 presided over the Banaras session. In 1906 he went to England to educate the British about the situation created by the partition of Bengal and

played a great part, officially and unofficially in the formulation of the Minto- Morley reforms of 1909. In 1910 Gokhale was again elected to the imperial council. He also served as a member of Indian Public Service Commission (1912-15) and urged to increase the share of Indians in higher service. Gokhale made heroic efforts in the imperial legislation council for introduction of free and compulsory education throughout India. In his 'political philosophy' Gokhale was a true liberal. He was a believer in moderation and reasonableness. He stood for the speed of western education and principles of liberalism and democracy. He was convinced about the evils and weakness of Indian society. He clearly saw reactionary rule of the Anglo- Indian bureaucracy. He played the difficult role of an intermediary between rulers and the ruled. He interpreted the popular aspirations and the government difficulties to the congress. This, on occasions, made him unpopular with both. The Extremist in the congress found fault with his moderation and dubbed him as faint hearted moderate, while the government on occasions charged him with holding Extremist views and being a seditionist in disguise. Gokhale put forward his views in a very candid language. 1905 Gokhale laid the foundation of the 'servants of India society', with a view to the training of national missionaries for the service of India, and to promote by all constitutional means, the true interest of the Indian people. Gokhale played a remarkable role in spreading ideology of nationalism and democracy. He played the role of moderates and extremist. In his political view he was a moderate, but in his social outlook he was an extremist and revolutionary. He wanted to reform Indian society by the introduction of modern education and administrative reforms.

Criticism of the Moderates' Ideology

During the first twenty years, 1885-1905, the Congress was controlled by moderates. Their ideology and methodology both have been criticized on various grounds. Neither their political ideology was correct nor were their means effective. Their liberal nationalism was a queer mixture of patriotism-and loyalty to the British. Their thinking that the British rule was beneficial for the country was wrong. Their belief in the British sense of justice was also not correct. The later events proved that the British imperialists only understood the language of strength and pressure instead of truth and justice. Besides, the moderate leaders were not the leaders of the masses. Except Gokhale, no moderate leader was prepared for individual sacrifice for the attainment of the goal of freedom. Moreover, the constitutional methodology adopted by moderates was not effective. Till 1918, despite petitions, memorandums, prayers and

deputations, the British government did not show any real interest towards the legitimate demands of Indians. That is why the extremists later on described the moderate's methodology as political mendicancy.

In spite of the basic weaknesses of the political thought and practice of the moderates, they rendered significant service to the country. The annual sessions of the Congress gave a concrete form to the idea of national unity. The congress inculcated among the people of diverse races, religions, castes and languages, the sentiment of nationalism and patriotism. Even more important was the establishment of traditions of organized political activity. Finally, the moderates made a bold attempt to give a secular direction to Indian politics. However, from the practical point of view the moderates did not meet with any amount of success. None of their demands was conceded by the government.

Partition of Bengal

The partition of Bengal was the most important event during the rule of Lord Curzon. It was carried out mainly for the convenience of administration. Bengal in those days was the biggest province of India extending over 1, 89, 000 square miles with a population of 80 million. It was comprising of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa and was under the central of one lieutenant Governor. After Lord Curzon took charge as Governor General of India the discussion over the Partition began due to the following issues:

1. **Vastness of Province:** The Province was spread over the area of 1, 89, 000 square miles with the population of 80 million, which was too vast to be managed by one lieutenant Governor. He could not make a tour for the whole province due to its vastness once in his tenure.
2. **Difference of Language:** There was also the difference of Languages and civilization of the natives of West Bengal and East Bengal. The natives of West Bengal considered themselves superior in civilization to the resident of East Bengal. The Condition demanded for the division of Provinces.
4. **Need of the time:** The division of Bengal was the need of the time to develop trade in East Bengal and to promote the Port of Chittagong, which could be done only by division of the Provinces.

5. Partition: The Partition of Bengal was thus calculated to restore efficiency in the Government and administration on one hand and encouraged local initiatives for progress and development on the other. Lord Curzon partitioned Bengal and formed two new provinces of manageable size – East and West Bengal. East Bengal consisted of Dacca, Mamansingh, Assam, Kaula, Rangpur, and Bogra district, the Dacca was capital of East Bengal constituted a majority regions comes under present Bangladesh, while the Bihar and Orissa constituted a separate province to be called as West Bengal with the capital of Calcutta. East Bengal contained a population of eighteen million Muslims and twelve million Hindus. Whereas West Bengal had a population fifty four million of which 42 million where Hindus.

Annulment of the Partition

When Lord Harding assumed charge as Governor General of India Indians again became active and sent a representation to him for the annulment of partition of Bengal. He recommended the same to the British Prime Minister for Indian Affairs. On the occasion of the visiting His Majesty George V to holding of Durbar at Delhi on 12th December 1911 the partition of Bengal was cancelled. The united Bengal was placed under a Governor and Assam was placed under a Chief Commissioner.

Swadeshi and Boycott movement

The Swadeshi Movement had its genesis in the anti-partition movement which was started to oppose the British decision to partition Bengal. The Government's decision to partition Bengal had been made public in December 1903. The official reason given for the decision was that Bengal with a population of 78 million (about a quarter of the population of British India) had become too big to be administered. This was true to some extent, but the real motive behind the partition plan was the British desire to weaken Bengal, the nerve centre of Indian nationalism. This it sought to achieve by putting the Bengalis under two administrations by dividing them (i) on the basis of language (thus reducing the Bengalis to a minority in Bengal itself as in the new proposal Bengal proper was to have 17 million Bengalis and 37 million Hindi and Oriya speakers), and (ii) on the basis of religion, as the western half was to be a Hindu majority area (42 million out of a total 54 million) and the eastern half was to be a Muslim majority area (18 million out of a total of 31 million). Trying to woo the Muslims, Curzon, the viceroy at that time, argued that Dacca could become the capital of the new Muslim majority province, which would provide them with a unity not experienced by them since the days of old

Muslim viceroys and kings. Thus, it was clear that the Government was up to its old policy of propping up Muslim communalists to counter the Congress and the national movement.

Lala Lajpat Rai

He was popularly known as Punjab Kesari. He was part of the Lal Bal Pal trio. He was also associated with activities of Punjab National Bank and Lakshmi Insurance Company in their early stages. He sustained serious injuries by the police when leading a non-violent protest against the Simon Commission and died less than three weeks later. His death anniversary (17 November) is celebrated as Martyrs' Day in India. Lal Bal Pal (Lala Lajpat Rai, Bal Gangadhar Tilak, and Bipin Chandra Pal) were a triumvirate of assertive nationalists in British-ruled India in the early 20th century, from 1905 to 1918. They advocated the Swadeshi movement involving the boycott of all imported items and the use of Indian-made goods in 1907 during the anti-Partition agitation in Bengal which began in 1905. The last and final years of the nineteenth century saw a radical sensibility emerge among some Indian intellectuals. This position burst onto the national all-India scene in 1905 with the Swadeshi movement - the term is usually rendered as "self reliance" or "self sufficiency". Lal-Bal-Pal mobilized Indians across the country against the Bengal partition, and the demonstrations, strikes and boycotts of British goods that began in Bengal soon spread to other regions in a broader protest against the Raj. The militant nationalist movement gradually faded with the arrest of its main leader Bal Gangadhar Tilak and retirement of Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo Ghosh from active politics.

Home rule movement

Many Indian leaders saw clearly that the government was not likely to give any real concessions unless popular pressure was brought to bear upon it. Hence, a real mass political movement was necessary. Some other factors were leading the nationalist movement in the same direction. The World War, involving mutual struggle between the imperialist powers of Europe, destroyed the myth of the racial superiority of the western nations over the Asian peoples. Moreover the War led to increased misery among the poorer classes of Indians, for them the War had meant heavy taxation and soaring profit of the daily necessities of life. They were getting ready to join any militant movement of protest. Consequently, the war years were years of intense nationalist political agitation.

But this mass agitation could not be carried out under the leadership of the Indian National Congress, which had become, under Moderate leadership, a passive and inert political organisation with no political work among the people to its credit. Therefore, two Home Rule Leagues were started in 1915-16, one under the leadership of Lokamanya Tilak and the other under the leadership of Annie Besant, and S. Subramaniya Iyer. The two Home Rule Leagues carried out intense propaganda all over the country in favour of the demand for the grant of Home Rule or self-government to India after the War, it was during this agitation that Tilak gave the popular slogan: "Home Rule is my birth-right, and I will have it. The two Leagues made rapid progress and the cry of Home Rule resounded throughout the length and breadth of India. The war period also witnessed the growth of the revolutionary movement.

Tilak's activities were confined to Bombay Presidency and the Central province while Annie Besant popularized this movement in the rest of India. The branches of the league were set up all over the country. Tilak made a whirlwind tour of the country in 1916 and in his speeches he said, "Swaraj is my birthright and I will have it". He said that Home Rule through was the only cure of India's political ills and the grievances of the Indians. He preached the idea of Home Rule through his two news papers - the Kesari and the Maratha. Annie Besant also toured the country and created a lot of enthusiasm among the people for the cause of Home Rule. She carried on the propaganda in favour of it in the newspapers named New India and Common Weal. The movement reached its peak in 1917. The Government got panicky at the activities of the Home Rule Movement and it thought of suppressing it with a heavy hand. The Government made use of Defense of India Act to curb the activities of the agitators. Students were prohibited from attending Home Rule meetings. Tilak was prosecuted for his fiery and exciting speeches and his entry in Punjab and Delhi was banned. Important leaders of the movement including Annie Besant were interned. Various restrictions were imposed on the press by using the Indian Press Act of 1910. But the repressive policy followed by the Government only added fuel to the fire. Strikes, agitation and protest meetings were organized throughout the country. The government realized the seriousness of the demonstrations that broke out in support of the Home Rule League. The Indians seemed to be prepared to pay any price to achieve the Home Rule. Therefore to appease the nationalists, the Secretary of State for India made a declaration on August 20, 1917 announcing the British policy towards India. He said, "The policy of his

Majesty's Government was the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of the responsible government in India as an integral part of the Empire." As a result the Home Rule Movement died out gradually.

Importance of the Home Rule Movement:

The Home Rule Movement has its own importance in the history of National Movement of India. It was an important milestone in the history of the Indian freedom movement. It transformed the national movement into the peoples' movement as more and more people began to take part in it. It worked as a light house when the political atmosphere in the country was full of disappointment. It put new life in the national movement. It gave definite shape and direction to the movement for Swaraj. It also influenced the foreign statesmen and several of the American leaders. Many British members also supported the demand for Home Rule to the Indians.

Annie Besant

President of Theosophical Society of India; founded Home Rule League in 1916 and demand self rule in India; became first woman president of Indian National Congress. Annie Besant was a prominent Theosophist, social reformer, political leader, women's rights activist, writer and orator. She was of Irish origin and made India her second home. She fought for the rights of Indian and was the first woman president of Indian National Congress. Annie Besant was born as Annie Wood on October 1, 1847 in a middle-class family in London. She was of Irish origin. Her father died when she was only five. Annie's mother supported the family by running a boarding house for boys at Harrow. As a young woman she traveled widely in Europe and this widened her outlook. Annie Besant was married in 1867 to a clergyman called Frank Besant. But the marriage did not last long. They legally separated in 1873. Annie Besant had two children from the marriage. After her separation Annie began to question not only her long-held religious beliefs but the whole of conventional thinking. She began to write attacks on the Churches and the way they controlled people's lives. In particular she attacked the status of the Church of England as a state-sponsored faith. Annie Besant fought for the causes she thought were right, such as, women's rights, secularism, birth control, Fabian socialism and workers' rights. She became interested in Theosophy as a way of knowing God. Theosophical Society was against discrimination of race, color, gender and preached Universal brotherhood. To serve humanity at large was its supreme goal. It was as a member of Theosophical Society of India that she arrived in India in 1893. She toured the entire country of India. It gave her first hand

information about India and middle-class Indians who were affected more by British rule and its system of education. Her long-time interest in education resulted in the founding of the Central Hindu College at Benares (1898). She also became involved in Indian freedom movement. In 1916, she founded Home Rule League which advocated self rule by Indians. She became the President of Indian National Congress in 1917. She was the first woman to hold that post. She started a newspaper, "New India", criticized British rule and was jailed for sedition. After the arrival of Gandhiji on Indian national scene, differences arose between Mahatma Gandhi and Annie Besant. Gradually, she withdrew from active politics.

Bal Gangadhar Tilak

Bal Gangadhar Tilak was a social reformer and freedom fighter. He was one of the prime architects of modern India and strongest advocates of Swaraj (Self Rule). He was universally recognized as the "Father of Indian Movement". Tilak was a brilliant politician as well as a profound scholar who believed that independence is the foremost necessity for the well being of a nation.

Life:

Bal Gangadhar Tilak was born on July 22, 1856 in a middle class family in Ratnagiri, a small coastal town in southwestern Maharashtra. Tilak's father, Gangadhar Shastri, was a noted Sanskrit scholar and school teacher at Ratnagiri. His mother's name was Paravti Bai Gangadhar. In 1886, following his father's transfer, the entire family shifted to Poona. Tilak was a brilliant student and also very good in mathematics. Since his childhood, Tilak had an intolerant attitude towards injustice and he was truthful and straightforward in nature. Though, he was among the India's first generation of youth to receive a modern, college education Tilak was a critic of the educational system, the British had provided for the Indians. According to him, the education was not at all adequate. After graduating from Deccan College, Pune in 1877, Tilak also cleared the L.L.B. from the Elphinston College, Mumbai. Later, he helped found a school that laid emphasis on nationalism.

Social Reforms

After completing his education, Tilak spurned the lucrative offers of government service and decided to devote himself to the larger cause of national awakening. He was a great reformer and throughout his life he emphasized on the concepts of women education and women empowerment. Tilak educated all of his daughters and did not marry them till they were over 16.

To inspire a sense of unity, he introduced the festivals like 'Ganesh Chaturthi' and Shivaji Jayanti'. Today, Ganesh Chaturthi is considered as the prime festival of the Marathis. It is a sheer tragedy that for his allegiance towards extremism, Tilak and his contribution were not given the recognition, he actually deserved.

Newspapers

Bal Gangadhar Tilak launched two newspapers called 'Maharatta' (English) and 'Kesari' (Marathi). Both the newspaper stressed on making the Indians aware of the glorious past and empowered them to be self reliant. In other words, the newspaper actively propagated the cause of national freedom. In 1896, when the entire nation was gripped by the famine and plague, the British government declared that there was no cause for anxiety. The government also rejected the need to start a 'Famine Relief Fund'. The attitude of the government was severely criticized by both the newspapers. Tilak fearlessly published reports about the havoc caused by famine and plague and government's utter irresponsibility and indifference.

Extremism

Bal Gangadhar Tilak joined the Indian National Congress Party in 1890. Realizing that the constitutional agitation in itself was futile against the British, Tilak opposed the moderate views of the party. This subsequently made him stand against the prominent leaders like Gopal Krishna Gokhale. He was waiting for an armed revolt to broom-away the British. His movement was based on the principles of Swadeshi (Indigenous), Boycott and Education. But his methods also raised bitter controversies within the Indian National Congress Party and the movement itself. As a result, Tilak formed the extremist wing of Indian National Congress Party. Tilak was well supported by fellow nationalists Bipin Chandra Pal in Bengal and Lala Lajpat Rai in Punjab. The trio was referred to as the Lal-Bal-Pal. A massive trouble broke out between the moderate and extremist factions of the Indian National Congress Party in the 1907 session of the Congress Party. As a result of which, the Congress split into two factions.

. During 1908-1914, Bal Gangadhar Tilak spent six years rigorous imprisonment in Mandalay Jail, Burma. He was deported because of his alleged support to the Indian revolutionaries, who had killed some British people. Following his growing fame and popularity, the British government also tried to stop the publication of his newspapers. His wife died in Pune while he was languishing in Mandalay prison. Tilak returned to India in 1915 when the political situation was fast changing under the shadow of World War I. There was unprecedented

jubilation in India after Tilak was free and back in India. After seeing such a grand welcome, Tilak decided to re-unite with his fellow nationalists and founded the All India Home Rule League in 1916 with Joseph Baptista, Annie Besant and Muhammad Ali Jinnah.

Lucknow Pact

Lucknow Pact, (December 1916), agreement made by the Indian National Congress headed by Maratha leader Bal Gangadhar Tilak and the All-India Muslim League led by Muhammad Ali Jinnah; it was adopted by the Congress at its Lucknow session on December 29 and by the league on Dec. 31, 1916. The meeting at Lucknow marked the reunion of the moderate and radical wings of the Congress. The pact dealt both with the structure of the government of India and with the relation of the Hindu and Muslim communities. On the former count, the proposals were an advance on Gopal Krishna Gokhale's "political testament." Four-fifths of the provincial and central legislatures were to be elected on a broad franchise, and half the executive council members, including those of the central executive council, were to be Indians elected by the councils themselves. Except for the provision for the central executive, these proposals were largely embodied in the Government of India Act of 1919. The Congress also agreed to separate electorates for Muslims in provincial council elections and for weightage in their favour (beyond the proportions indicated by population) in all provinces except the Punjab and Bengal, where they gave some ground to the Hindu and Sikh minorities. This pact paved the way for Hindu-Muslim cooperation in the Khilafat movement and Mohandas Gandhi's noncooperation movement from 1920.

Module IV:

Indian National Movement

This phase is known as the period of mass nationalism in India. In which people from all walks of life began to participate in national freedom struggle. 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.

Gandhian Era

The role of Mahatma Gandhi in Indian Freedom Struggle is considered the most significant as he single-handedly spearheaded the movement for Indian independence. The peaceful and non-violent techniques of Mahatma Gandhi formed the basis of freedom struggle against the British yoke. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi was born on 2nd October 1869. After he came back to India from South Africa, where he worked as a barrister, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, who led the Congress party, introduced Mahatma Gandhi to the concerns in India and the struggle of the people. The Indian independence movement came to a head between the years 1918 and 1922. A series of non-violence campaigns of Civil Disobedience Movement were launched by the Indian National Congress under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. The focus was to weaken the British government through non cooperation. The protests were mainly against abolition of salt tax, land revenue, reducing military expenses etc.

Before returning to India Gandhi went to England. In the meantime, the First World War broke out. In this situation Gandhi considered it his duty to help the British government. He decided to organise an Ambulance Corps of the Indians. However, after some time due to

differences with the British officials, Gandhi dissociated himself from it. He received a Kaiser-i-Hind Gold Medal in the New Year Honours list of 1915. Gandhi reached India on January 9, 1915 and was given a warm welcome for his partial victory in South Africa. In India, the moderate leader Gokhale was his political Guru. He wanted Gandhi to join the Servants of India Society. But Gandhi could not become its member because some members of the society strongly opposed his entry. Gokhale had extracted a promise from Gandhi that he would not express any opinion on political matters for a year. Keeping his vow, Gandhi spent 1915, and most of 1916 touring India and visiting places as far as Sindh and Rangoon, Banaras and Madras. He also visited Rabindranath Tagore's Shantiniketan and the kumbh fair at Hardwar. All this helped Gandhi in the better understanding of his countrymen and the conditions in India. In 1915 Gandhi had set up an Ashram at Ahmedabad on the bank of the Sabarmati. Here Gandhi lived with his close associates who were being trained in the rigorous of moral and emotional life essential for a satyagrahi. At this time Gandhi took very little interest in political matters, and mostly at meetings he spoke on his experiences in South Africa and the ideas he had formulated there. When Annie Besant approached Gandhi to join her in founding a Home Rule League he refused on the ground that he did not wish to embarrass the British government during the war. In 1915, he attended the Congress session, but avoided speaking on important issues like self government. Gandhi welcomed the unity move of bringing back Tilak and others who were earlier excluded from the Congress. But at the same time Gandhi made it clear that he did not belong to any group. He attended the reunited session of the Congress but refused to speak on issues which would have meant aligning himself with a particular group. He spoke strongly on the indentured labourers recruitment and a resolution was passed for the abolition of this practice.

Gandhian programmes

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 nonviolence. He also set out to experiment with his new method of struggle.

Ahimsa

Truth or Satya, for Gandhiji, is God himself. He therefore changed the statement, "God is Truth", later in his life into, "Truth is God" and suggested that it was one of the fundamental discoveries of his life's experiments. It is Truth, he says, that exists; what does not exist is untruth. The life of man, for Gandhiji, is a march of his pursuit in search of Truth or God. According to Gandhiji, truth is what the inner self experiences at any point of time; it is an answer to one's conscience; it is what responds to one's moral self. He was convinced that "knowledge alone" leads a person to the truth while ignorance takes one away from the truth. Satyagraha means struggle for Satya, or truth. Satyagraha is not merely the insistence on truth; it is, in fact, holding on to truth through ways which are moral and non-violent; it is not the imposition of one's will over others, but it is appealing to the reasoning of the opponent; it is not coercion but is persuasion. Gandhiji highlights several attributes of satyagraha. It is a moral weapon and does not entertain ill-feeling towards the adversary; it is a non-violent device and calls upon its user to love his enemy; it does not weaken the opponent but strengthens him morally; it is a weapon of the brave and is constructive in its approach. For Gandhiji, a Satyagrahi is always truthful, morally imbued, non-violent and a person without any malice; he is one who is devoted to the service of all. Truth, he firmly believed, can be attained only through non-violence which was not negative, meaning absence of violence, but was positively defined by him as love. Resort to nonviolence is recourse to love. In its positive sense, non-violence means love for others; in its negative sense, it seeks no injury to others, both in words as well as deeds. Gandhiji talked of non-violence of different people. There is the non-violence of the brave: one has the force but he does not use it as a principle; there is the non-violence of the weak: one does not have faith in non-violence, but he uses it for attaining his objectives; there is the nonviolence of the coward: it is not non-violence, but impotency, more harmful than violence. For Gandhiji, violence was a better option than cowardice. Through non-violence one appeals to the truth that nestles in people and makes the latter realize it in themselves, come around, and join hands in the common march to truth along with those whom they earlier considered as their adversaries. Given the enmeshing of means and ends, Gandhiji, often saw Love, Truth, God and Non-

violence as interchangeable terms. Truth or God or Self-realization being man's ultimate goal in life, this goal can be attained only through non-violence or ahimsa.

Hartal

There was widespread condemnation of the bills in the whole country. Gandhi also launched his campaign against the bills. He said that the proposed powers were out of all proportion to the danger, particularly when the Viceroy possessed emergency powers of legislation by ordinance. He also stated that they were instruments of distrust and repression, nullifying the proposed reforms. Moreover, he opposed not just the content of the bills, but also the manner in which they were foisted in the country without regard to public opinion. He formed a Satyagraha Sabha on 24th February 1919 in Bombay to protest against the Rowlatt Bills. Its members signed a pledge to proclaim their determination "to refuse civilly to obey these laws (i.e., the Rowlatt Bills) and such other laws as a committee hitherto appointed may think fit and we (members) further affirm that in this struggle we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property." While launching the Satyagraha agitation against the Rowlatt bills Gandhi said: "It is my firm belief that we shall obtain salvation only through suffering and not by reforms dropping on us from the English –they use brute force, we soul force." Despite strong opposition in the whole country the government remained firm. The Council passed one of the bills, though all the non-official members voted against it. The Viceroy gave assent to the bill on March 21, 1919. A group of liberals like Sir D.E. Wacha, Surendranath Banerjee, T.B. Sapru and Srinivas Sastri opposed Gandhi's move of starting Satyagraha. Their reason for opposing the Satyagraha was that it would hamper the Reforms. Some of them also felt that the ordinary citizen would find it difficult to civilly disobey the Act. Annie Besant also condemned the Satyagraha on the grounds that there was nothing in the Act to resist civilly, and that to break laws at the dictate of others was 'exceedingly dangerous. But the younger and radical elements of Annie Besant's Home Rule League supported Gandhi: They formed the main cadre of Satyagraha movement in different parts of the country. In organizing this Satyagraha, Gandhi was also assisted by certain Pan- Islamic Leaders, particularly Abdul Bari of Firangi Ulema group at Lucknow, and some radical members of the Muslim League. M.A. Jinnah also opposed the Rowlatt Bill vehemently and warned the Government of the dangerous consequences if the government persisted in clamping on the people of India the "lawless law". Gandhi inaugurated his Satyagraha by calling upon the countrymen to observe a

day of 'hartal' when business should be suspended and people should fast and pray as a protest against the Rowlatt Act. The date for the 'hartal' was fixed for 30th March but it was changed to April 6th. The success of hartal varied considerably between regions and between towns and the countryside. In Delhi a hartal was observed on 30th March and ten people were killed in police firing. Almost in all major towns of the country, the hartal was observed on the 6th April and the people responded enthusiastically. Gandhi Early struggles described the hartal a 'magnificent success. Gandhi intensified the agitation on 7th April by advising the satyagrahis to disobey the laws dealing with prohibited literature and the registration of newspapers. These particular laws were selected because disobedience was possible for an individual without leading to violence. Four books including Hind Swaraj of Gandhi, which were prohibited by Bombay Government in 1910 were chosen for sale as an action of defiance against the government. Gandhi left Bombay on the 8th to promote the Satyagraha agitation in Delhi and Punjab. But, as his entry in Punjab was considered dangerous by the government, so Gandhi was removed from the train in which he was travelling at Palwal near Delhi and was taken back to Bombay. The news of Gandhi's arrest precipitated the crisis. The situation became tense in Bombay and violence broke out in Ahmedabad and Virangam. In Ahmedabad the government enforced martial law. The Punjab region as a whole and Amritsar, in particular, witnessed the worst scenes of violence. In Amritsar, the news of Gandhi's arrest coincided with the arrest of two local leaders Dr. Kitchlew and Dr. Satyapal on 10th April. This led to mob violence and government buildings were set on fire, five Englishmen were murdered, and a woman, assaulted. The civil authority lost its control of the city. On 13th April, General Dyer ordered his troops to fire on a peaceful unarmed crowd assembled at Jallianwala Bagh. Most of the people were not aware of the ban on meetings, and they were shot without the slightest warning by General Dyer who later on said that it was no longer a question of merely dispersing the crowd, but one of 'producing a moral effect

Champanan

Gandhi's first great experiment in satyagraha came in 1917 in Champanan, 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. Having heard of Gandhi's campaigns in south Africa, several peasants of champanan 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 in to the naked poverty in which the peasants of India lived

Ahammedabad mill strike

In1918,intervend 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.

Kheda

The Kheda district of Gujarat was on the verge of famine owing to failure of the crops. The yield had been so low that the cultivators, especially the poorer section, were unable to pay the revenue. But the government insisted that the yield had not been so bad and that the cultivators should pay the tax. Gandhi saw the justice of the cause of the cultivators and advised them to offer Satyagraha by not paying their taxes.

Many leaders, like Vallabhbhai Patel, Shankarlal Banker, Mahadev Desai and others, took an active part in this struggle. The campaign came to an unexpected end. There had been signs that it might fizzle out, but after four months' struggle there came an honourable settlement. The Government said that if well-to-do cultivators paid up the poorer section would be granted suspension. This was agreed to and the campaign ended.The Kheda Satyagraha marked the beginning of an awakening among the peasants of Gujarat, the beginning of their true political education. In addition it gave to the educated public workers the chance to establish contact with the actual life of the peasants.

Rowlatt Act

During the years 1917 and 1918 Gandhi took little interest in all India issues. He protested against internment of Annie Besant, and also demanded the release of Ali brothers (Mahomed Ali and Shaukat Ali) who were actively associated with the Khilafat issue. ~nlikkot her political leaders of the time, he did not take active interest in the Reform proposals. But it was the British decision to pass 'Rowlatt Act' which forced him to plunge nto national politics in a forceful manner.

In 1917 the Government of India had appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Justice Sydney Rowlatt to investigate "revolutionary crime" in the country and to recommend legislation for its suppression. After a review of the situation, the Rowlatt committee proposed a series of change in the machinery of law to enable the British government to deal effectively with the revolutionary activities. In the light of these recommendations the Government of India drafted two bills and presented them to the Imperial Legislative Council on 6 February 1919. The government maintained that the bills were 'temporary measures' which aimed at preventing 'seditious crimes'. The new bills attempted to make war-time restrictions permanent. They provided trial of offences by a special court consisting of three high court judges. There was no provision of appeal against the decision of this court which could meet in camera and take into consideration evidence not admissible under the Indian Evidence Act. The bill also proposed to give authority to the government to search a place and arrest a person without a warrant. Detention without a trial for maximum period of two years was also provided in the bills. The bills were regarded by nationalist leaders as an effort to conciliate a section of official and non-official white opinion which had resented Montagu's Reform proposals. There was widespread condemnation of the bills in the whole country. Gandhi also launched his campaign against the bills. He said that the proposed powers were out of all proportion to the danger, particularly when the Viceroy possessed emergency powers of legislation by ordinance. He also stated that they were instruments of distrust and repression,'nullifying the proposed reforms. Moreover, he opposed not just the content of the bills, but also the manner in which they were foisted in the country without regard to public opinion. He formed a Satyagraha Sabha on 24th February 1919 in Bombay to protest against the Rowlatt Bills. Its members signed a pledge proclaim~ngth eir determination "to refuse civilly to obey these laws (i.e., the Rowlatt Bills) and such other laws as

a committee hitherto appointed may think fit and we (members) further affirm that in this struggle we will faithfully follow truth and refrain from violence to life, person or property." While launching the Satyagraha agitation against the Rowlatt bills Gandhi said: "It is my firm belief that we shall obtain salvation only through suffering and not by reforms dropping on us from the English –they use brute force, we soul force." Despite strong opposition in the whole country the government remained firm. The Council passed one of the bills, though all the non-official members voted against it. The Viceroy gave assent to the bill on March 21, 1919. A group of liberals like Sir D.E. Wacha, Surendranath Banerjee, T.B. Saprú and Srinivas Sastri opposed Gandhi's move of starting Satyagraha. Their reason for opposing the Satyagraha was that it would hamper the Reforms. Some of them also felt that the ordinary citizen would find it difficult to civilly disobey the Act. Annie Besant also condemned the Satyagraha on the grounds that there was nothing in the Act to resist civilly, and that to break laws at the dictate of others was 'exceedingly dangerous. But the younger and radical elements of Annie Besant's Home Rule League supported Gandhi: They formed the main cadre of Satyagraha movement in different parts of the country. In organising this Satyagraha, Gandhi was also assisted by certain Pan-Islamic Leaders, particularly Abdul Bari of Firangi Mah. Ulema group at Lucknow, and some radical members of the Muslim League. M.A. Jinnah also opposed the Rowlatt Bill vehemently and warned the Government of the dangerous consequences if the government persisted in clamping on the people of India the "lawless law". Gandhi inaugurated his Satyagraha by calling upon the countrymen to observe a day of 'hartal' when business should be suspended and people should fast and pray as a protest against the Rowlatt Act. The date for the 'hartal' was fixed for 30th March but it was changed to April 6th. The success of hartal varied considerably between regions and between towns and the countryside. In Delhi a hartal was observed on 30th March and ten people were killed in police firing. Almost in all major towns of the country, the hartal was observed on the 6th April and the people responded enthusiastically. Gandhi described the hartal a 'magnificent success. Gandhi intensified the agitation on 7th April by advising the satyagrahis to disobey the laws dealing with prohibited literature and the registration of newspapers. These particular laws were selected because disobedience was possible for an individual without leading to violence. Four books including Hind Swaraj of Gandhi, which were prohibited by Bombay Government in 1910 were chosen for sale as an action of defiance against

the government. Gandhi left Bombay on the 8th to promote the Satyagraha agitation in Delhi and Punjab. But, as his entry in Punjab was considered dangerous by the government, so Gandhi was removed from the train in which he was travelling at Palwal near Delhi and was taken back to Bombay. The news of Gandhi's arrest precipitated the crisis. The situation became tense in Bombay and violence broke out in Ahmedabad and Virangam. In Ahmedabad the government enforced martial law.

The Punjab region as a whole and Amritsar, in particular, witnessed the worst scenes of violence. In Amritsar, the news of Gandhi's arrest coincided with the arrest of two local leaders Dr. Kitchlew and Dr. Satyapal on 10th April. This led to mob violence and government buildings were set on fire, five Englishmen were murdered, and a woman, assaulted. The civil authority lost its control of the city. On 13th April, General Dyer ordered his troops to fire on a peaceful unarmed crowd assembled at Jallianwala Bagh. Most of the people were not aware of the ban on meetings, and they were shot without the slightest warning by General Dyer who later on said that it was no longer a question of merely dispersing the crowd, but one of 'producing a moral effect.' According to official figures, 379 persons were killed but the unofficial accounts gave much higher figures, almost three times of the official figures. The martial law was immediately enforced in Punjab also on the 13 April

Jalian Walla Bagh

The Jallianwala Bagh massacre, also known as the Amritsar massacre, was a seminal event in the British rule of India. On 13 April 1919, a crowd of nonviolent protesters, along with Baishakhi pilgrims, had gathered in the Jallianwala Bagh garden in Amritsar, Punjab to protest against the arrest of three Freedom Fighters, Dr. Satyapal, Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlew and Mahatma Gandhi, despite a curfew which had been recently declared. On the orders of Brigadier-General Reginald Dyer, the army fired on the crowd for ten minutes, directing their bullets largely towards the few open gates through which people were trying to run out. The figures released by the British government were 370 dead and 1200 wounded. Other sources place the number dead at well over 1000. This "brutality stunned the entire nation", resulting in a "wrenching loss of faith" of the general public in the intentions of Britain. The ineffective inquiry and the initial accolades for Dyer by the House of Lords fuelled widespread anger, leading to the Non-cooperation Movement of 1920–22.

On Sunday, 13 April 1919, Dyer was convinced of a major insurrection and he banned all meetings, however this notice was not widely disseminated. That was the day of Baisakhi, the main Sikh festival, and many villagers had gathered in the Bagh. On hearing that a meeting had assembled at Jallianwala Bagh, Dyer went with fifty Gurkha riflemen to a raised bank and ordered them to shoot at the crowd. Dyer continued the firing for about ten minutes, until the ammunition supply was almost exhausted; Dyer stated that 1,650 rounds had been fired, a number which seems to have been derived by counting empty cartridge cases picked up by the troops.[5] Official British Indian sources gave a figure of 379 identified dead, with approximately 1,100 wounded. The casualty number estimated by the Indian National Congress was more than 1,500, with approximately 1,000 dead. Dyer was initially lauded by conservative forces in the empire, but in July 1920 he was censured and forced to retire by the House of Commons. He became a celebrated hero in Britain among most of the people connected to the British Raj, for example, the House of Lords, but unpopular in the House of Commons, which voted against Dyer twice. The massacre caused a re-evaluation of the army's role, in which the new policy became "minimum force", and the army was retrained and developed suitable tactics for crowd control. Some historians consider the episode as a decisive step towards the end of British rule in India, although others believe that greater self-government was inevitable as a result of India's involvement in World War I.

Khilafat

During the First World War, Turkey joined the central powers against Britain. The sympathy of Indian Muslims, who regarded the Sultan of Turkey as their spiritual leader or Khalifa, was naturally with Turkey. After the war with defeat of Turkey, the Allied powers removed the Khalifa from power in Turkey which aggrieved the Indian Muslims against the British Government. Hence the Muslims started the Khilafat movement in India for the resumption of Khalifa's position. A Khilafat Committee was formed under the leadership of Mahammad Ali, Shaukat Ali, Maulana Azad and Hasrat Mohini to organise a country-wide agitation. The main object of Khilafat Movement was to force the British Government to change its attitude towards Turkey and to restore the Sultan. October 17, 1919 was observed as Khilafat Day, when the Hindus along with Muslims in fasting observed hartal on that day. An All India Khilafat Conference was held at Delhi on November 23, 1919 with Gandhi as its president. The

Conference resolved to withdraw all cooperation from the Government, if the Khalifat demands were not met. Congress leaders, like Lokamanya Tilak and Mahatma Gandhi, viewed the Khalifat Movement as an opportunity to bring about Hindu-Muslim unity against British. A joint Hindu- Muslim deputation met the Viceroy on the Khalifat issue, but it failed to yield any result. The central Khalifat Committee met at Allahabad from 1st to 3rd June, 1920 which was attended by a number of congress leaders. In this meeting a programme of Non- Cooperation towards the Government was declared. It was to include boycott of titles, can offered by the Government, boycott of civil services, army and police and non-payment of taxes to the Government. Gandhi insisted that unless the Punjab and Khilafat wrongs were undone, there was to be non-cooperation with the Government.

Non-Coperation movement

The Gandhi Era in the Indian Freedom Struggle took place with the Non Cooperation Movement. This movement was led by Mahatma Gandhi and the Indian National Congress. This was the first-ever series of nationwide movement of nonviolent resistance. The movement took place from September 1920 until February 1922. In the fight against injustice, Gandhi's weapons were non-cooperation and peaceful resistance. But after the massacre and related violence, Gandhi focused his mind upon obtaining complete selfgovernment. This soon transformed into Swaraj or complete political independence. Thus, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, the Congress Party was re-organized with a new constitution, with the aim of Swaraj. Mahatma Gandhi further extended his non-violence policy to include the Swadeshi Policy, which meant the rejection of foreign-made goods. Mahatma Gandhi addressed all the Indians to wear Khadi (homespun cloth) instead of British-made textiles. He strongly appealed to all Indians to spend some time spinning khadi for supporting the independence movement of India. This was a policy to include women in the movement, as this was not considered a respectable activity. Moreover; Gandhi also urged to boycott the British educational institutions, to resign from government jobs, and to leave British titles. Nobel laureate Rabindranath Tagore resigned the title knight from the British soon after the Jalianwalabagh Massacre as a protest. When the movement reached great success, it ended unexpectedly after the violent clash in Chauri Chaura, Uttar Pradesh. Following this, Mahatma Gandhi was also arrested and sentenced to 6 years imprisonment. Indian National Congress was divided into two segments. Furthermore, support among the Hindu and Muslim people was also breaking down. However; Mahatma Gandhi only served around 2 years and was

released. Non-Cooperation was a movement of passive resistance against British rule, which was initiated by Mahatma Gandhi. To resist the dominance of the British Government and advance the Indian nationalist cause, the non-cooperation movement was a non-violent movement that prevailed nationwide by Indian National Congress under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. This movement took place from September 1920 to February 1922 and initiated Gandhi era in the Independence Movement of India. The Rowlatt Act, Jaliwanwala Bagh massacre and Martial Law in Punjab caused the native people not to trust the British Government anymore. The Montagu- Chelmsford Report with its diarchy could satisfy a few only. Until then Gandhi believed the justice and fair-play of the British Government, but after this incidences he felt that Non-cooperation with the Government in a non-violent way must be started. In the meantime the Muslims in India also revolted against the harsh terms of the Treaty of Sevres between Allies and Turkey and they started Khilafat movement. Gandhi also decided to stand beside them. Gandhiji's idea of winning over Muslim support also helped in Non-Cooperation Movement of India. Gandhi had given a notice to the Viceroy in his letter of 22nd June in which he had affirmed the right recognized `from time immemorial of the subject to refuse to assist a ruler who misrules`. After the notice had expired the Non-Cooperation movement was launched formally on 1st August of 1920. At the Calcutta Session on September, 1920 the program of the movement was stated. The programs of Non-cooperation involved the surrender of titles and offices and resignation from the nominated posts in the government body. It included not attending Government duties, Durbars and other functions, withdrawing children from government schools and colleges and establishment of national schools and colleges. The people of India were instructed to boycott the British courts and establish the private judicial courts. The Indians should use Swadeshi cloth and boycott the foreign clothes and other things. Gandhiji strictly advised the Non- Cooperators to observe truth and nonviolence. The decision taken in Calcutta Session was supported in the Nagpur Session of the Congress on December; 1920. The decision was also taken for the betterment of the party organization. Any adult man or woman could take Congress membership for 4 annas as subscription. This adoption of new rules gave a new energy to the Non- Cooperation movement and from January of 1921 the movement gained a new momentum. Gandhi along with Ali Brothers went to a nationwide tour during which he addressed the Indians in hundreds of meetings. In the first month of the movement, about nine thousand students left schools and colleges and joined the national institutions. During this

period about eight hundred national institutions were established all over the country. The educational boycott was most successful in Bengal under the leadership of Chitta Ranjan Das and Subhas Chandra Bose. In Punjab also the educational boycott was extensive under the leadership of Lala Lajpat Rai. The other active areas were Bombay, Bihar, Orissa, Assam, Uttar Pradesh. The movement also affected Madras. The boycott of law courts by the lawyers was not as successful as the educational boycott was. The leading lawyers like, Motilal Nehru, CR Das, Mr Jayakar, V Patel, Asaf Ali Khan, S Kitchlew and many others gave up their lucrative practices and many followed their path inspired by their sacrifice. Bengal again led in this matter and Andhra, UP, Karnataka and Punjab followed the state. However the most successful item of the Non-Cooperation was the boycott of foreign clothes. It took such an extensive form that value of import of the foreign clothes reduced from hundred and two crores in 1920-21 to fifty-seven crores in 1921-22. Although some of the veteran political leaders like the Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, Annie Besant opposed Gandhiji's plan but the younger generation supported him fully. Muslim leaders like Maulana Azad, Mukhtar Ahmed Ansari, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Abbas Tyabji, Maulana Mohammad Ali and Maulana Shaukat Ali also supported him. In the month of July 1921, the Government had to face a new challenge. Mohammad Ali and other leaders believed that it was `religiously unlawful for the Muslims to continue in the British army` and they were arrested for their view. Gandhi and other Congress leaders supported Muhammad Ali and issued a manifesto. The next dramatic event was visit of Prince of Wales on 17th November, 1921. The day on which Prince boarded on Bombay Port the day was observed as a `Hartal Divas` all over India. The Prince was greeted with empty streets and closed shops wherever he went. The Non-Cooperators gained more and more energy at their success and became more aggressive. The congress volunteer corps turned into a powerful parallel police. They used to march in formation and dressed in uniform. Congress had already granted permission to the Provincial Congress Committees to sanction total disobedience including non-payment of taxes. The Non-Co operational movement had other effects also which are not very direct. In UP it became difficult to distinguish between a Non-Co operational meeting and a peasant meeting. In Malabar and Kerala the Muslim tenants roused against their landlords. In Assam the labors of tea-plantation went with strike. In Punjab the Akali Movement was considered as a part of Non-Cooperation movement. The Non-Cooperation movement particularly strengthened in Bengal. The movement was not only seen in Kolkata but it also

agitated the rural Bengal and an elemental awakening was observed. The movement reached a climax after the Gurkha assault on coolies on the river port of Chandpur (20- 21st May). The whole Eastern Bengal was under the lash of the movement under the leadership of JM Sengupta. The other example was the Anti-Union Board agitation in Midnapur led by Birendranath Sashmal. As the Non-Cooperation movement proceeded the woman of India, especially from Bengal wanted to take active part in the protest movement. The women nationalists were assembled under the Mahila Karma Samaj or the Ladies organization Board of the Pradesh Congress Committee of Bengal. The ladies members of that organization arranged meeting and circularized the spirit of Non- Cooperation. Women volunteers were enlisted to take part in the movement. The ladies from many respected families led them. CR Das's wife Basanti Devi and sister Urmila Devi, JM Sengupta's wife Nellie Sengupta, Mohini Devi, Labanya Prabha Chanda played significant role in this movement. Picketing of foreign wine and cloth shops and selling of Khaddar in the streets were the point of attention of this movement. The Government proclaimed Sections 108 and 144 of the code of criminal procedure at various centers of agitation. The Congress Volunteer Corpse was declared illegal. By December 1921 More than thirty thousand people were arrested from all over the India. Except Gandhiji, most of the prominent leaders were inside jail. In mid-December Malaviya initiated a negotiation, which was futile. The conditions were like that it offered sacrifice of Khilafat leaders, which Gandhiji could never accept. At that time Gandhiji was also under a pressure from the higher leaders of Congress to start the mass civil disobedience. Gandhiji gave an ultimatum to the Government but the British Government paid no attention to it. In response, Gandhiji initiated a civil disobedience movement in Bardoli Taluqa of Surat district of Gujrat. Unfortunately at this time the tragedy of Chauri Chaura occurred that change the course of the movement, where a mob of three thousand people killed twentyfive policemen and one nspector. Gandhi was in support of complete nonviolence and this incident was too much for him to bear. He ordered to suspend the movement at once. Thus, on February 12th, 1922 the Non-Cooperation movement totally stopped. There were limitations in achievements of Non-Cooperation Movement as it apparently failed to achieve its object of securing the Khilafat and changing the misdeeds of Punjab. The Swaraj could not be achieved in a year as it was promised. The retreat of the February 1922 was only temporary. The movement slowed down gradually. The part of Battle was over but the war continued.

Civil disobedience movement

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 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. 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.

Khan Abdul Gafra Khan

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan was a Pashtun independence activist and a spiritual leader nicknamed as "Frontier Gandhi" due to his political activities and close association with the Indian leader, Mahatma Gandhi. He was a lifelong pacifist who advocated non-violent opposition and founded the Khudai Khidmatgar ("Servants of God") in order to protest against the British-controlled army by means of peaceful protests and political activism. He was a devout Muslim with an unwavering faith in the compatibility of Islam and nonviolence. He held

liberal views and championed for women's rights which made him much popular among the masses. He was strongly against the partition of India and dreamed of creating a united, independent and secular India. However, this was not to be and India was partitioned in 1947, causing him great distress and made him utter to the Congress his now-famous words of despair—"You have thrown us to the wolves." After the partition he remained active in social and political activism and was frequently arrested for his activities which many Pakistanis felt were pro-Indian. The government even offered him a Ministry in the government in an attempt to reconcile with him, but nothing could stop him from fighting for the causes he believed in. Abdul Ghaffar Khan was a Pashtun political and spiritual leader of India. He was widely respected for his non-violent resistance to the British's sway over the country and was known to be a devout follower of the great Mahatma Gandhi. Abdul Ghaffar Khan was a Pashtun political as well as a spiritual leader of India. He was well-known and respected for his non-violent resistance to the British's sway over the entire country. A lover of peace and harmony and a devout follower of the great Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, Abdul Ghaffar Khan used to be called by people by many names like Badshah Khan or Bacha Khan meaning 'King of Chiefs' and Sarhaddi Gandhi. Read on to know more about the biography of Abdul Ghaffar Khan. Khan maintained a very close friendship with Gandhiji, who advocated adherence of non-violent methods for winning back freedom from the hands of the British. The two of them nurtured deep love and respect for one another and worked in alliance till the time India gained its independence in the year 1947. The leading Khudai Khidmatgar (servants of God) organization, of which Abdul Ghaffar Khan was reverent member, worked in close partnership with the Indian National Congress against the British Empire. On many occasions, when other members of the Indian National Congress disagreed with Mahatma Gandhi on any particular issue, Abdul Ghaffar Khan all throughout the life history of their friendship, remained Gandhiji's strongest supporter. He refused when the Congress proffered him its presidency in 1931, but, nevertheless remained a member of the Congress Working Committee for a long time. Abdul Ghaffar Khan was a champion of women's rights and nonviolence and for this, the public simply adored him. His entire life, Khan's trust in the non-violent methods or in the compatibility of Islam and nonviolence never waned. So strong was his kinship with Gandhiji that in India that he was often referred to as the 'Frontier Gandhi'. While there were some Pashtuns who wanted to stay united

with India, others favored the creation of Pakistan. Abdul Ghaffar Khan, however, vehemently opposed the partition of India. As such, he was often seen as anti-Muslim by some.

Round Table Conferences

The Simon Commissions in India induced the dissatisfaction throughout India. It met a violent resistance in India and later the British Government organized for the Round Table conferences in order to take into consideration the demands and grievances of the Indians directly. Demands for Swaraj, or self-rule, in India had been growing increasingly strong. By the year 1930, many British politicians believed that India needed to move towards dominion status. As announced by the viceroy on behalf of the Government of England on October 31, 1929, Round Table Conference was convened in London. After lengthy discussions, three basic principles were agreed in the Conference and the British Government was made to accept those principles. Three basic principles were put forwards in the Round Table Conference. According to the agreement, it was demanded that form of the new government of India was to be an All India federation. The federal government, subject to some reservations would be responsible to the federal Legislature, according to the agreement. The provincial autonomy was also demanded by the Congress in the Round Table Conference. However, Ramsay MacDonald, the British Prime Minister, made a momentous declaration on behalf of His Majesty's Government. According to the view of His Majesty's government it was declared that the responsibility of the government should be placed upon legislatures, Central and Provincial with certain provisions as was considered necessary. The absence of the Congress representations in Round Table conference led to a second session of the Round Table conference, where the Congress representatives would participate. Several efforts were made in that direction by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru and Sir M.R. Jayakar, which led to the famous Gandhi-Irwin Pact, which was signed in March 1931. According to the Poona Pact, all political prisoners were released and the Civil Disobedience Movement was called off.

In the second Round Table Conference, Gandhiji was appointed as the representative of the Congress, which was convened from 1st September to 1st December in the year 1931. But the significant issue of the Second Round Table conference was to solve the communal problem, which was not solved. This was because; Mr. Jinnah inflexibility was secretly supported by the British statesman like the Secretary of State for India; Sir Samuel Hoare. Disappointed by the

result of the session of the Second Round Table Conference, Gandhiji returned to India and Subsequently arrested on his arrival in the country.

Ramsay Macdonald announced that in default of an agreed settlement as regards the respective quanta of representation of different communities, the British Government would have to arbitrate their claims. Subsequently, on August 4, 1932, Macdonald's infamous "Communal Award" came into existence. The concept of Communal Award was related to the representation of different communities in the provincial legislatures. However the "Communal Award" declared by Ramsay Macdonald was partially modified by the Poona Pact. This was accepted by the Hindu rulers due to Gandhiji, who wanted to prevent a political breach between the so-called caste Hindus and the Scheduled Castes. Consequently the third Round Table Conference was again convened in London on November 17th to December 24th in the years 1932. A White paper was issued in the year March 1933. The details of the working basis of the new constitution of India were enumerated in the White Paper. It was declared that according to the new constitution, there would be dyarchy at the Center and the responsible governments in the center. In February 1935, a bill was introduced in the House of Commons by the Secretary of State for India, which subsequently passed and enacted as the Government of India Act, 1935. Thus the Government of India Act came into existence in the Third Round Table Conference. The Government of India Act drew its materials from the Simon Commission, the report of the All-Parties conference i.e. the Nehru Report, the discussions at the three successive Round Table Conferences, the detail enumerated in the White Paper and the reports of the Joint Select Committees.

Poona Pact

The Poona Pact refers to an agreement between Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar and Mahatma Gandhi signed on 24 September 1932 at Yerwada Central Jail in Pune . It was signed by Pt Madan Mohan Malviya and some Hindu leaders and Dr BR Ambedkar and some Dalit leaders to break the fast unto death undertaken by Gandhi in Yarwada jail to annul Macdonald Award giving separate electorate to Dalits for electing members of state legislative assemblies in British India There shall be seats reserved for the Depressed Classes out of general electorate. Seats in the Provincial Legislatures. Election to these seats shall be by joint electorates subject, however, to the following procedure

All members of the Depressed Classes registered in the general electoral roll of a constituency will form an electoral college which will elect a panel of four candidates belonging to the Depressed Classes for each of such reserved seats by the method of the single vote and four persons getting the highest number of votes in such primary elections shall be the candidates for election by the general electorate. The representation of the Depressed Classes in the Central Legislature shall likewise be on the principle of joint electorates and reserved seats by the method of primary election in the manner provided for in clause above for their representation in the provincial legislatures.

Central Legislature

In the Central Legislature 18 per cent of the seats allotted to the general electorate for British India in the said legislature shall be reserved for the Depressed Classes. The system of primary election to a panel of candidates for election to the Central and Provincial Legislatures as herein-before mentioned shall come to an end after the first ten years, unless terminated sooner by mutual agreement under the provision of clause 6 below.

The system of representation of Depressed Classes by reserved seats in the Provincial and Central Legislatures as provided for in clauses (1) and (4) shall continue until determined otherwise by mutual agreement between the communities concerned in this settlement. The Franchise for the Central and Provincial Legislatures of the Depressed Classes shall be as indicated, in the Lothian Committee Report. There shall be no disabilities attached to any one on the ground of his being a member of the Depressed Classes in regard to any election to local bodies or appointment to the public services. Every endeavor shall be made to secure a fair representation of the Depressed Classes in these respects, subject to such educational qualifications as may be laid down for appointment to the Public Services. In every province out of the educational grant an adequate sum shall be ear-marked for providing educational facilities to the members of Depressed Classes.

Constructive Programmes

Mahatma Gandhi was the modern emancipator of caste system of Hindu society. In his writings in 'Young India' and 'Harijan' stressed on the problems of untouchability and its removal from its roots. To him, Bhagavad-Gita has never taught that a Chandal was in any

inferior than a Brahmin. According to Mahatma Gandhi, the Hindu scripture like Upanishad, Bhagavat Gita, Smritis and other writings were not consistent with truth and Non-violence or other fundamental and universal principle of ethics. We are all the sons of same God. To him, there was only one Varna in India i.e. the Shudras. He desired that all the Hindus voluntarily call themselves Shudras. Gandhi called them (untouchables) as 'Harijans' which literally meaning is son of the God. For the upliftment of Harijans he founded the "Harijan Sevak Sangh". To abolish the disparities between caste Hindus and untouchables was its main function. The Sangh is truly based on welfare of the society Gandhi experienced social discrimination for the first time when he was in South Africa where he engaged himself against the discriminatory attitude of the South African Government against Indians. The problems were akin to that of untouchability as migrants were treated as inferior to the local population which enjoyed numerous basic rights legally not available to Indians. It was then that Gandhi realized the extent of the impact of social discrimination on the underprivileged sections of the society including untouchables.

He thought it was necessary to reconstruct the life of the nation. This was only possible through alleviating the social status of untouchables. He always considered untouchability as a cruel and inhuman institution. It violated human dignity. He did not believe that the imperial ambitions of Britain were alone responsible for our slavery but it was the negligence of our national duty which was primarily responsible for it. As he always thought untouchability an evil in Hinduism, he had no hesitation in Hinduism itself Removal of untouchability was the responsibility of the caste-Hindus towards Hinduism.

Gandhi called upon the Harijans to magnify their own faults so that they looked as big as mountains and they make regular attempts to overcome them. He said to untouchables, "Never believe that since others have the same faults we need not mind our own. No matter what others do, it is your dharma to overcome the feelings which you find in yourselves." In the process of regeneration of the nation, Gandhi waged an incessant war. He said, "If we are children of the same God how can there be any rank among us." According to him, there was only one Varna, in India, the Sudras. He desired that all the Hindus voluntarily call themselves Sudras. He criticized those who would claim superiority over fellowmen. He thought there was no such thing as inherited superiority. He was happy and felt satisfied to call himself a scavenger, a

spinner, a weaver, and a laborer. He was troubled to see the appalling plight of untouchables in different regions of the country. Its eradication greatly agitated his mind and he devised ways and means from time to time, through his speeches and writings.

Gandhi called Harijans as men of God and felt that all the religions of the world consider God pre-eminently as the Friend of the Friendless, Help of the Helpless, and Protector of the Weak. He questioned that in India who could be more friendless, helpless, or weaker than the 40 million or more Hindus of India who were classified as “untouchables.” Therefore, if there were people who could be fitly described as men of God, they were surely these helpless, friendless, and despised people. He said that if India became free with untouchability intact, the untouchables would become worse under that Swaraj than they were before the freedom for the simple reason that the weakness and failings would then be buttressed up by the accession of power. Mahatma Gandhi used newspapers including Harijan and Young India to propagate his anti-untouchability views. In his writings he stressed the problem of untouchability and its removal from its roots. He felt that Hinduism, in reality, did not permit untouchability. The Bhagavad Gita never taught that an untouchable was in any way inferior to a Brahman. A Brahman was no more a Brahman, once he became insolvent and considered himself, a superior being. Gandhi felt that untouchability would not be removed by the force of even law. It could only be removed, when the majority of Hindus felt that it was a crime against God and man and were ashamed of it. The aid of law had to be invoked when it came in the way of reform, i.e., opening of a temple. He described the social position of untouchables as follows: “Socially they are lepers. Economically they are worse than slaves. Religiously they are denied entrance to places we miscall ‘houses of God’”. Gandhiji never stopped fighting against untouchability. He considered it a blot on Hinduism. He said that a religion that established the worship of the cow could not in all probability countenance or warrants a cruel and inhuman boycott of human beings. Hindus would never deserve freedom, nor get it if they allowed their noble religion to be disgraced by the retention of the taint of untouchability. He found Harijan Sevak Sangh in 1932. G.D. Birla was its president and Thakkar Bapa its Secretary. He always preached among the Harijans, the importance of cleanliness abstention from carrion-eating and intoxicating drinks and drugs, requirement of taking education themselves and giving it to their children, also abstention from eating the leavings from caste Hindus’ plates. Gandhi, therefore, was concerned with the issues of Dalits no less than any other leader. His heart went out to them and he worked

very hard and sincerely for their upliftment. The fact that he had many other tasks on hand did not stop him from taking up their cause and he devoted considerable time and energy to bring an end to untouchability. 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 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 had scheme had a few remarkable provisions like inclusion of a basic handicraft in the syllabus. Gandhis concept of Ramarajya , self autonomous villages and swadeshi was the base of rural reconstruction.

Khadi

In the decade before the travelling campaign, Gandhi had promoted his view that khadi or Indian hand-spun and hand-woven cotton would solve many problems in villages. First, khadi was Indian cotton and not imported as other kinds of cotton and it was therefore available to a larger part of the Indian society. Second, spinning cloth and distributing it would provide a second income that was needed in villages, where wages were low and villagers could be without work for up to one third of the year. Third, khadi would eliminate the need for cotton mills and foreign goods in the villages. Fourth, wearing khadi would mean that there would not be large differences in clothing among villagers. If everyone in addition kept to the rules of religious cleanliness, there would be no outward difference between an untouchable and someone of a higher caste. In 1934 Gandhi exclaimed that his view of khadi had not changed since he had first tried to implement the spinning of khadi in 1919. On the contrary, he was even more dedicated to promoting khadi and claimed that khadi is the only solution for the deep and deepening distress of the untouchables. Khadi has been said by, among others, Brown to be Gandhi's attempt at an economic reform in India. Brown explains that in contrast to other leading figures such as Ambedkar, Gandhi wanted to avoid the organisation of labour and class struggle as seen in Europe. He wanted to solve the problems in India with solutions originating on the subcontinent. Khadi was one of these solutions along with temple-entry for untouchables. The main reason for Gandhi's emphasis on spinning was that it was universally applicable in all of India. This part of his rhetoric could therefore appeal to more Indians than could templeentry, for instance. In addition to the positive aspects of khadi such as its availability and universal applicability together with the prospect of having an additional income, the spinning of khadi lessened the gap between rich and poor in some areas. Gandhi believed that the spinning khadi privately could give a small profit to a family or a village, but working in mills provided only limited earnings for a limited number of workers. The profit in the cotton industry lay only in the hands of a handful of people, making them much richer off the labours of others. The spinning of khadi was completely different, creating only differences when it came to how much cotton a family or village could produce and sell.

Even though khadi was one way of improving a family or a village economically, the historian Lisa Trivedi explains that the cloth was not cheaper than mill-spun cloth in general, because of the volume mills could produce in a shorter time. How could the average person afford to buy khadi when it was more expensive than other clothes? Trivedi's impression is that Gandhi and his followers never really faced this criticism but rather focused on how to teach poor villagers how to spin their own clothes. In Gandhi's view, since the profit of khadi went to the poor, as opposed to mill cloth profit, khadi was worth the expense.

Many Congress politicians had a vision for India that differed from that of Gandhi's. They wanted for India to hold its own as a modern, industrialized nation. The thought was that other countries exploited countries that were not industrialized. India therefore had to develop industry in order to be independent and self-sufficient. The priority in Gandhi's economic vision was, according to Brown, the creation of a nonviolent society. Such a society could only exist with a rural economy because it eschewed exploitation – and exploitation led to violence. Becoming industrialized to Gandhi meant that the country moved away from traditional values and opened up to exploitation and dependence. Although the economic vision for India differed between Gandhi and other congress politicians, the common goal was that both sides wanted an economically strong and independent India. Viewing the spinning of khadi in connection to one of Gandhi's overall goals of the campaign, namely mobilization of Indian society, it is possible to see why emphasis was put on khadi. Firstly, it was an Indian product in a time when large parts of the subcontinent were under foreign control by the colonial power. Secondly, khadi provided an additional opportunity to an income or means to make one's own clothes. Finally, khadi could be applied in all of India and was therefore a common denominator that could help Indians connect beyond local communities. Khadi could be related to Indians independent of religious or social differences, and therefore had the potential of increasing the number of Gandhi's supporters. In 1934, Gandhi's focus was on the internal issues of the Indian society, which explains why khadi acquired an even greater role than previously. Efforts to implement spinning and the use of khadi were on a grander scale than earlier. Also, as a result of Gandhi's popularity and his many supporters, more Indians had access to information on khadi than in the campaigns of the 1920s.

Caste eradication programmes

Gandhi and his followers, the main component being the Harijan Sevak Sangh with its provincial branches, therefore propagated cleanliness, sending reformers – including a large number of students – to different towns and villages. This meant that the focus was no longer only on the temples, but on how the lives of the untouchables would have to change in order to gain access to them. In January of 1933, Gandhi was still in goal where he gathered information on the progress of the temple-entry campaign. Reports from supporters all over India were flowing in telling of open temples and the purification of untouchables. By the end of January, Gandhi estimated that no less than five hundred temples had been opened up to untouchables. Politically, there was a new bill presented to the legislative assembly of the Madras Presidency called the Madras Bill. It contained several of Gandhi's suggestions, such as organizing a referendum in every temple the untouchables wanted to enter, thereby letting the majority decide. Untouchability from birth was also to be abolished, giving untouchables the same rights in the use of public facilities like wells, roads and schools. The fact that temples were closed to untouchables was described in the draft text as a social disability imposed by custom that had to be removed by Hindu leaders where the opinion was ripe. The passing of the Madras Bill was of such importance to Gandhi that in early February he proclaimed that in addition to the two goals of the temple-entry movement, the bill would be added as a third goal. Gandhi believed that if the Bills are not passed, it is obvious that the central part of the reform will be hung up almost indefinitely. Meetings were to be held all over the country urging the Government of India to provide all facilities in their power for the consideration of the Bill and appealing to the members of the House not to obstruct it. Their appeal should be that the Bill did not interfere with anybody's private faith and that it would be liberating because it would provide Hindu conscience with complete freedom of action regarding untouchability. The Madras Bill was regarded as a modification of Dr. Subbaroyan's bill, but they both suffered the same fate. Though it did not become a law, it proved that Gandhi and his followers believed a law would help them and that there was political sympathy for the religious temple-entry movement. The newspaper Harijan had had an essential role in publishing articles in favour of the opening of the temple in Guruvayur in addition to spreading Gandhi's views. With the new national temple-entry movement, Harijan was given an even larger role as Gandhi's mouthpiece. In addition to the English, Hindi and Gujarati versions of the paper, arrangements were made to publish the

newspaper in Bengali, Marathi and Tamil – thereby not only covering larger areas of the country geographically, but also larger parts of the literate population. But there was one hiccup: although the newspaper was published in larger areas, the newspaper had problems being spread in the south of India. The reformers in northern India, therefore, could get more information on the campaign in other corners of the subcontinent.

Another attempt to make the removal of untouchability known was made by Gandhi in April, namely the proclamation of Harijan Day. Harijan Day was supposed to be a day with greater dedication, prayer and intensive work for the cause – arranged once every month or every six weeks. In places where work for the untouchables was not possible, the day should be spent collecting money for the untouchable cause. The day was topped by Gandhi announcing a twenty one-day fast on behalf of untouchables, believing that the campaign alone was not going to remove untouchability: It will not be eradicated by money, external organization and even political power for Harijans, though all these three are necessary

Temple entry programmes

When Gandhi spoke of Hindu worship he usually spoke of temples. Gandhi believed that the temple was in the core of everyday life for millions of Hindus, whether they be caste Hindus or untouchables. His vision therefore was of equal access to temples in a system with no high and no low. The caste Hindus would see that they had treated the untouchables badly by excluding them and welcome them into a common religious arena; the temple. Gandhi first mentioned the idea of temple-entry in 1921. It was to be the concrete representation of the abstract idea of abolishing untouchability. Gandhi's goal was equality among Hindus, which would, in turn, take India one step closer to swaraj. One way of achieving equality was taking steps that would enable untouchables to become equals. Gandhi did not believe that India was ready for a temple-entry effort in 1921, however, and appealed to people that they should instead focus on opening wells until the time was right.

In the travelling campaign it was not an option (although it was suggested by several supporters) to build separate temples for untouchables and caste-Hindus since this, in Gandhi's view, would not create religious equality or acceptance. What was acceptable, however, was restricted access inside the temple and restricted hours in which the untouchables could enter. Interestingly, the compromise of separate temples for untouchables was not as easily dismissed

in the travelling campaign against untouchability one year later – In addition to viewing the temple as the centre for acceptance for Hindus, Gandhi also wrote an article in *The Hindu* of what a perfect temple was. The perfect temple would be one where the priest was a devoted man of God who had the least of needs and personal ties. His sole concern would be the welfare of his people. The temple would have to be accessible to the untouchables and other poor in clean surroundings and without discrimination. Around the temple there would be a school, a dispensary, a library and a guesthouse – all under the administration of the temple

With the new year of 1933, Gandhi and his associates widened the scope of the campaign. There were now two goals for the campaign: the first was to open as many temples as possible to Untouchables, and the second was convincing untouchables to conform to the common requisites of temple-entry. Access to all temples was self-explanatory in that it was a logical continuation of the campaign for opening the Guruvayur-temple, but there was one thing that has to be taken into consideration before continuing with the campaign: temples were not uniform. The temple in Guruvayur was a public temple, open to caste-Hindus in the community. A private temple, on the other hand, was built by one person or group and therefore the owners could select who could and could not enter the temple. No potential law could affect the private temples. If the owner wanted untouchables to enter the temple, not law could prevent him. If the owner did not want them to enter, a law could not force him to do so. With the public temples, a law positive to temple-entry would have to be followed. But since there was no such law, taking a referendum or convincing caste-Hindus that untouchables had equal right to enter temples could change the environ, but could not get untouchables into other temples. As a consequence, the temple-entry campaign was mainly focused on opening private temples all over India. As to the second goal of having untouchables conform to the religious rules of the temples, Gandhi and his followers were in favour of the untouchables being accepted into temples on the pre-existing conditions. Since, as we have seen earlier, Gandhi believed that there was no such thing as untouchability by birth, every Hindu could rid himself of impurity. Purity could be achieved by not consuming beef or carrion, to take daily absolutions and to wear clean clothes. Gandhi proclaimed that untouchables should accept the views of caste-Hindus and convince them of the right to temple-entry through conformity and adaptation: If you are polluted by my presence or by my touch, I am quite prepared to consent to a separate period being reserved for you to offer worship by yourselves and give you the same credit for sincerity that I claim for myself. You are as much

entitled to worship in the temple as I think I am. Therefore you offer worship in your time, and I shall offer worship, along with the reformers, during the period reserved for us, and since by tradition you have been taught to think that the efficacy of the idol is diminished by my entering the portals of the temple gate, though I do not believe in it myself, let the priest perform the purification ceremony.

Temple-entry is a spiritual act, transforming the whole society by one single act of admission. It will electrify into a new life the whole of the Harijan population, and it will purify Hinduism as no single act that I can think of can do – Mohandas K. Gandhi in January 1933. When the period for this thesis began in the autumn of 1932, Mohandas Gandhi was in gaol for civil disobedience against the colonial power. There he planned and propagated a fast until death with the intent of opening a temple in Guruvayur in Kerala for untouchables. This fast was abandoned for a new fast in 1933 which, in contrast to his planned fast in 1932, was extended to regard all temples in India and thereby made a national campaign for untouchables. Both Indian and international press covered Gandhi's fasting period and, as we shall see, he wrote a large number of articles and letters both about his reasons for fasting and the goals by undertaking it. Gandhi made it clear early in 1933 that untouchables' access to temples was the key for untouchability in India as a whole to be eradicated: if untouchability became obsolete, Gandhi was convinced that other problems within the Indian society, including economical, political and social problems, would solve themselves. For Gandhi, the fast was a small sacrifice that provided a shift in focus in India from civil disobedience to promoting the situation of the untouchables, though first and foremost in a religious context. The civil disobedience campaigns of the 1920s and early 1930s had gathered the country's population around a common political centre, namely Gandhi and the Indian National Congress, in an attempt to extricate itself from the colonial power. The campaigns of 1932 to 1934, however, focused on society itself and created both unity and opposition within.

Critique of Gandhian programmes by 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 held 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 welfare 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 advise 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 fourfold 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. Ambedkar's 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 culturally 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 a climate 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 organizations

Working class movements

In spite of the obstacles, the Communist Movement gained momentum. In 1927 in Bombay and the Punjab the Workers' and Peasants' parties were formed. These parties attempted to propagate their ideology and programme through the use of press: The Bombay Workers' and Peasants' Party brought out a Marathi weekly, entitled Kranti (Revolution). The Punjab Workers' and Peasants' Party brought out an Urdu weekly, called Mihnatkash (Worker). A Workers' and

Peasants' party was also formed at Meerut in a conference, held in October 1928. This conference was attended by the British Communist, Philip Spratt. The conference passed resolutions, demanding: national independence, abolition of princely order, recognition of workers' right to form trade unions, abolition of Zamindari, land for the landless peasants, establishment of agricultural banks, eight-hour working day, and minimum wages for industrial workers. In December 1928, an all-India conference of workers' and peasants' parties was held at Calcutta under the president Sohan Singh Josh. Here three major decisions were taken: i) This Conference formed an Executive Committee, comprising leading Communists. ii) The Conference emphasized international character of the Communist movement and the need for affiliation of the Communist Party of India with international organization against Imperialism and the Communist International.

This Conference asked the workers to carry on their movement independently instead of identifying themselves with "the so-called bourgeois leadership of the Congress". In the meantime the Communists extended their influence over the Trade Union Organisations by leading the workers' strikes. The Communists played a prominent role in the Railway Workshop strikes of February and September 1927 at Kharagpur. Their influence spread over the Bombay Textile Mill workers. From April to October 1928 the workers of Bombay carried on massive strikes, protesting against the wage-cut strikes, the Communist Girni Kamgar Union played the most prominent role. As a tremendous increase in the strength of this Trade Union in 1928. By December its strength went up to 54,000 members, while the Bombay Textile Labour Union, the veteran liberal trade unionist N.M. Joshi had only 6,749 members. The strikes in industries assumed proportions in 1928. During that year 31.5 million working days were lost of the strikes. The Government held the Communists responsible for the industries. The Government, therefore, planned measures for curbing them. In January 1929, the Viceroy Lord Irwin declared in his speech before the Central Legislative Assembly: "The disquieting spread of Communist doctrines causing anxiety". On 13 April 1929 the Viceroy proclaimed the Ordinance for the purpose of deporting the subversive elements. Simultaneously the Trade Disputes Act was passed. This Act introduced tribunals for settling workers' problems and practically banned such strikes which "coerced" or caused hardship to the people.

A few individuals being moved by the miserable condition of the workers tried to improve their working conditions. For example in Bengal Sasipada Banerjee, a radical Brahmin, founded the working men's club. He also published a journal, the Bharat Sramjibi (Indian

worker) in 1874, and organised night schools to spread education among the jute mill workers. But he did not form a trade union. Similarly in Bombay, N.M. Lokhande, started the weekly *Dinabandhu* in 1880 and founded the Bombay Mill-Hands Association in 1890. This Association, though not a trade union, put forward the demands of : reduction in working hours, a weekly holiday and, compensation for injuries suffered by the workers during work at the factories. j B.P. Wadia, a close associate of Annie Besant formed the Madras Labour Union in t April, 1918. This was the first trade union in India. In Ahmedabad, a centre of cotton textile industry, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi led a strike of the workers in 1918. Referring to the conditions of the woker Gandhi wrote in his autobiography (*The Story of My Experiments with Truth*) that "wages were low, and the labourers had long been agitating for an increment". Gandhi requested the mill-owners to refer the matter to arbitration but they refused. Gandhi then advised the labourers to go on a strike. The strike continued for 21 days. Gandhi began a fast but, after three days a settlement was reached. In 1920 Gandhi formed the *Majur Mahajan* which advocated peaceful relations between the workers and their employers, arbitration and social service.

Trade unionism was slowly gaining ground through the efforts mentioned above. In 1919-20 there was a wave of strikes in many industrial centres such as Kanpur, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Jamshedpur and Ahmedabad. Thousands of workers took part in these strikes. It was against in this background that the All India Trade Union Congress (AITUC) was formed in Bombay in 1920. Lala Lajpat Rai presided over the inaugural session which was attended by prominent nationalist leaders and trade unionists like Motilal Nehru, Annie Besant, C.F. Andrews, B.P. Wadia and N.M. Joshi. The All India Trade Union Congress was the central organisation of the Indian workers. Although strikes became frequent in the 1920s, growth of trade unionism among the workers was~athesrl ow. The Royal Commission on Labour gives two reasons for it:

- i) Differences of language and community were factors that stood in the way of workers unity. In the Bengal Jute mills, for instance, the majority of the workers came from Bihar and U.P.; and Bengali workers were in a minority.
- ii) The jobbers and the employers were opposed to the growth of trade unions. In 1929, only 51 unions with 190,436 members were affiliated to AITUC. But the

majority of the workers were not yet organized in trade unions. The fear of dismissal from jobs also kept the workers away from the trade unions.

Socialist movements

The leaders of the Indian National Congress, who were renowned publicmen and the critics of the British Government and its policies, were aware of Socialism or the Socialist traditions from the beginning. These leaders also came in touch with various Socialist activities. Dababhai Naoroji, for example, had close contacts with British Socialists like H.M. Hyndman and actually attended the International Socialist Conference in Amsterdam (August 1904) where he was given a rousing welcome. Leaders like Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Lala Lajpat Rai were also reported to have maintained from time to time some Socialist connections, and brooded on occasions over the evils of private property and felt the need for providing equal opportunities for all. There were many others within the Congress who were similarly knowledgeable, and even favourably disposed towards Socialism. The fact, however remains that the earlier nationalist leaders did not seriously concern themselves with the Socialist ideology. Perhaps most of them thought that adopting these ideas might weaken the national awakening, and undermine the national unity the Congress was trying to build up. The nationalist movement in India was conceived from the early days of the Congress as a campaign for united opposition to the British misrule or as a combined agitation for the attainment of Swaraj or self-rule. This "unification" or "combination" was to encompass all communities, categories and classes of people, including the rich and the poor, the landlords and the landless, the mill-owners and the workers. It seems that the leaders of the Congress in its early phase were afraid that Socialism, which encourages the resistance of the exploited against the exploiters, and sets up workers against industrialists, and peasants against landlords, would antagonise the wealthy and the well-to-do. In that case their support and their money-power would not be available for the nationalist cause. Such apprehensions were the outcome of insufficient understanding of the nature of relations between the British authorities and their Indian collaborators, as well as of the potentialities of Socialism for teeming millions of poverty-stricken, suffering people in the anti imperialist struggle.

The suspicion with which the earlier nationalists viewed Socialism was actually understandable. Most of them came from the upper strata of the Indian society – the Western educated middle class which included the categories of rentiers, professionals and entrepreneurs.

Such elements would, at the most, sympathise with the misfortunes of the common man from a distance, and that too to the extent that their own interests were not threatened. Furthermore, up to the First World War, the nationalists in the Congress were trying only to win concessions from the British regime through resolutions, representations and debates. They were engaged primarily in constitutional politics and agitations within the limits the British masters allowed them. They had not generally thought of raising mass movements or stirring popular actions, with the solitary exception of the Swadeshi movement (1905-8). Thus, when the masses of Indian people did not form an integral part of their political programme, the earlier nationalists scarcely felt an urge to come closer to them. It would not be, however, correct to surmise, that the earlier nationalists of the Congress had not kept the oppressed, the humiliated and the down-trodden within their sight at all, or had not included them in their scheme of the future in any way. They were convinced that the attainment of self-government or the fulfilment of the political objective in itself would turn India into a happy and prosperous country. Once prosperity returned, they believed that the ills of economic disparity would disappear from the country, and a just and equitable system would emerge.

The year 1927 witnessed a noisy debate developing within the Congress, as well as outside it, among all shades of political opinion. This was helpful to Jawaharlal for the assertion of his recently acquired radicalism. The point of debate was related to the extent and character of Swaraj or self-government that the Congress and others were struggling for. It dramatically took precedence over all other issues in 1927 when the British authorities decided to appoint a commission, consisting solely of British members of Parliament, to consider, under the terms of the Government of India Act of 1919, whether India was fit to receive a further instalment of constitutional government. The "all-white" composition of this commission (the Simon Commission) implied, apart from a crude display of racial arrogance, that the British did not find any one among the Indian public men fit enough to serve in a body that would make recommendation about India's political future. In the appointment of this commission the British government had not only refused to listen to the Indian opinion on a subject which concerned them most, it was also guilty of casting a slur on the competence of Indians who were by implication viewed as unfit to make a constitution for themselves. There was all-round condemnation of the British action all over India. In its Madras session (December 1927), the Congress gave a call for the boycott of the Simon Commission. The boycott, as the later events

showed in 1928, was tumultuous even in the face of brutal governmental repression. Jawaharlal and his associates in the Congress contributed considerably to its success. The visit of the Simon Commission had brought to the forefront the issue of the type of constitution or the kind of independence that India should obtain for itself. By Swaraj the Congress leaders had so far meant the Dominion Status for India (similar to the position of self-governing Australia, New Zealand and South Africa) within the ambit of British Empire. To Jawaharlal and men like him, the acceptance of Dominion Status as the equivalent of independence of India appeared not only to be a recognition of the inevitability of British presence in India, but also a perpetuation of British imperialistic exploitation of India almost through the backdoor. In the Madras session in December 1927, Jawaharlal moved a resolution demanding real independence instead of the mirage of Dominion Status. However, the controversy actually came to a head when an All Parties Conference was convened in February 1928 at the initiative of the Congress. It decided to set up a committee headed by Motilal Nehru to draw up a constitution for India as an answer to the challenge of Birkenhead (incapability of Indians to frame a constitution acceptable to all parties). When the Nehru Committee actually proceeded with its work on the basis of interpreting Indian independence in terms of the attainment of Dominion Status, Jawaharlal had no alternative but to build up an opposition. In organizing resistance against the acceptance of Dominion Status, and gathering support for complete independence or severance of all unequal political and economic ties with Britain, he received the help, notably among others, of young Subhas Chandra Bose, one of the Congress General Secretaries in 1928 like Jawaharlal. There was a mixed reaction among the Congressmen to the formation of the Congress Socialist party. The conservative or Right Wing Congressmen criticized the Congress Socialists "loose talk" about the confiscation of property and class war. Mahatma Gandhi also rejected their idea of class war. Gandhi did not believe in the necessity of the abolition of princely order, zamindari and capitalism. He wanted to bring about a change of heart in the princes, zamindars and capitalists so that instead of considering themselves the owners of the states, zamindaries and factories they should behave as the trustees for their subjects, tenants and workers. But the leftist Congressmen like Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose welcomed the formation of the Congress Socialist Party, though neither Nehru nor Bose joined the party. In the annual session of the Congress, held at Lucknow in April 1936, in his presidential speech Nehru espoused the cause of socialism. He said: I see no way of ending the poverty, vast unemployment, degradation

and subjection of the Indian people except through socialism. That involves vast revolutionary changes in our political and social structure, ending vested interests in the land and industry as well as the feudal autocratic Indian states system. That means ending private property except in a restricted sense and replacement of the present profit system by the higher ideals of cooperative service. In 1936 Nehru inducted three Congress Socialists - Narendra Dev, Jaya Prakash Narayan and Achyut Patwardhan into the Congress Working Committee, besides another leftist, Subhas Chandra Bose. The Faizpur session of the Indian National Congress, held towards the close of 1936 under the presidentship of Jawaharlal Nehru, adopted an agrarian programme, containing such items as reduction of revenue, abolition of feudal dues and levies, introduction of cooperative farming, living wage for the agrarian labourers and formation of peasant unions. In the meantime the Congress Labour Committee asked the Congress ministries, formed in the provinces in 1937, for adopting measures for safeguarding and promoting the interests of workers.

The Congress Socialists played an important role in the Kisan (peasant) movement. Through the efforts of Prof. N.G. Ranga, Indulal Yagnik, and Swami Sahajanand Saraswati the All-India Kisan Sabha was organised. The first All-India Kisan Congress met at Lucknow in 1936. The Kisan organisations demanded the abolition of zamindari, reduction of land tax, and collective affiliation to Congress. The Congress Socialists changed the Congress Party's policy from aloofness to closer involvement in the affairs of princely states. The Congress socialist activists also took part in the democratic movements of the people in the princely states against their autocratic rulers. They agitated for civic rights and responsible government.

The Indian National Movement arose as a result of the social conditions created by British Imperialism, its system of exploitation, and the social and economic forces generated by this system of exploitation. But it was also influenced by the significant world currents of that time, of which the most important were the forces of socialism, represented by the Russian Revolution. The 1905 revolution was a great inspiration for the Indian leaders. The agitation against the Partition of Bengal, reflected in the Swadeshi Movement, belongs to the period immediately afterward. The first political strike by the working class took place in 1912 in Bombay. The impact of the October Revolution on the Indian National Movement was also not direct, but after the success of the Russian Revolution it began to be increasingly realised by the Indian leaders that nothing could be gained either by constitutional method or through the

politics of the bomb. What was most necessary and decisive was the intervention of the masses in political struggle. The 1920's thus saw the formation of Workers' and Peasants' Parties, the All India Trade Union Congress, and increasing workers and peasants struggles. The Non-Cooperation Movement was a direct result of this understanding and organisation. The Russian Revolution also led to the propagation and spread of socialist ideas in India. The first Indian Communists were, in fact, trained in Soviet Russia. In India too, many congressmen under the influence of Marxism and as a result of the participation in people's struggles broke away from the Congress and laid the foundations of the Communist Movement in India. Two major figures were A.K.Gopalan and E.M.S. Namboodiripad. The growth of the Communist Movement lent an altogether new dimension to the Indian National Movement. Class struggle i.e. workers struggle against the Indian capitalist class hence forth became an inherent part of the Indian struggle for freedom. As a result of the growth of the left, the national movement as a whole was also radicalised. Within the Indian National Congress itself there emerged a Congress Socialist group.

Jawaharlal Nehru particularly was deeply influenced by Soviet Russia, particularly by its anti-imperialist thrust. 'Socialism' became a pervasive term in the political vocabulary of the Indian leaders during this time. The 30's saw the Indian National Movement reach a level where bourgeois hegemony of the national movement was seriously challenged by the left. Left oriented students and writers organisations were also formed. . The Indian National Movement became a part of the world wide struggle against Imperialism led by the Soviet Union, and it began also to be recognised as such by Indian leaders. Without the success of the Russian Revolution which weakened Imperialism at the world level, the Indian people' fight against British Imperialism would have been much more difficult. It is not a coincidence that it was with the defeat of Fascism and the capitalist crisis after World War II that a process of decolonisation was precipitated. Indian Independence, along with the Chinese Revolution and the formation of the peoples' democracies in Europe, was won in the context of an uncompromising fight by the Soviet Union against Imperialism.

In India the R.I.N. Mutiny, the Tebhaga and the Telengana Movements (1946-48) about which you will study later played a major role in the history of political independence by India. These were led by the Indian Communists, who saw themselves as part of the world communist movement led by the Communist International. The Indian Communist Party outlined its strategy and tactics on the basis of an analysis of the Indian situation and the correlation of class forces in

India, but in this it was guided by the experience of the successful revolutionary movement against the Russian Autocracy. Russia having been an economically backward country, just as India is, the experience of the Russian Revolution was particularly relevant to India. It is from the Russian experience, and its applicability to the specific Indian conditions, that the Indian Communist Party saw the Indian peoples struggle as a struggle of a two-stage revolution. The British, on their part, saw in every struggle of the masses in India a "Bolshevik conspiracy" and the work of communists. Within a few months of the Russian Revolution they were forced to issue a declaration known as the Montagu Declaration, in which they promised the gradual development of institutions of self-government. They were totally unnerved by the response that the Bolshevik Decree on Peace evoked among the nations struggling for independence. In 1921 when Kisan Sabhas were established all over U.P., the Times Correspondent reported that 'Kisan Soviet' have been established in India. Most of the time the Communists were forced to work underground and were subjected to extreme repression. The Meerut Conspiracy case trial was one example. Through this they sought to do away with what they called the 'Bolshevik menace'. Thus, the positive and electrifying effect of the Russian Revolution in India, as well as the radicalisation of the Indian National Movement which followed, was accompanied by an impact also on the British policy in India. The British became increasingly repressive toward any nationalist upsurge. At the same time they sought to win over the reactionary sections of the Indian society to their side. Finding themselves inadequate to deal with the 'Bolshevik Menace' on their own, they tried. They tried to present the Indian Communists as 'anti-national' in order to render them ineffective. The Russian Revolution: this contributed to the growth of a strong anti-imperialist perspective, and during the freedom movement the Indian nationalist leadership was very clearly and definitely on the side of the democratic struggles of the world. Most important of all, the success of the Russian Revolution and the achievements of the soviet people, brought forth new questions in many developing countries-including India--questions such as what kind of development? development for whom ? It projected in concrete reality the idea that any development must have as its criteria the well being and interests of the vast majority of people. It must answer in some form the aspirations of the people . By building a qualitatively-different society - it brought to the forefront the necessity of revolution and socialism as an answer to the problems of development and social justice

Indian National Army

The Indian National Army was an armed force formed by Indian nationalists in 1942 in Southeast Asia during World War II. The aim of the army was to secure Indian independence with Japanese assistance. Initially composed Indian prisoners of war captured by Japan in the Malayan campaign and at Singapore, it later drew volunteers from Indian expatriate population in Malaya and Burma. The INA was also at the forefront of women's equality, and the formation of a women's regiment, the Rani of Jhansi Regiment was formed as an all-volunteer women's unit to fight the British Raj as well as provide medical services to the INA. Initially formed in 1942 immediately after the fall of Singapore under Mohan Singh, the First INA collapsed in December that year before it was revived under the leadership of Subhas Chandra Bose in 1943 and proclaimed the army of Bose's *Arzi Hukumat-e-Azad Hind* (the Provisional Government of Free India). This second INA fought along with the Imperial Japanese Army against the British and Commonwealth forces in the campaigns in Burma, Imphal and Kohima, and later, against the successful Burma Campaign of the Allies. The end of the war saw a large number of the troops repatriated to India where some faced trial for treason and became a galvanizing point of the Indian Independence movement. The legacy of the INA is controversial given its associations with Imperial Japan and the other Axis powers, the course of Japanese occupations in Burma, Indonesia and other parts of Southeast Asia, as well as Japanese war crimes and the alleged complicity of the troops of the INA in these. However the INA contributed to independence for India, as after the war, the trials of captured INA officers in India provoked massive public outcries in support of their efforts to fight for Indian independence against the Raj, eventually triggering the Bombay mutiny in the British Indian forces. These events are accepted by historians to have played a crucial role in hastening the end of British rule. Japan and Southeast Asia were major refuges for Indian nationalists living in exile before the start of World War II. Japan had sent intelligence missions, notably under Major Iwaichi Fujiwara, into South Asia even before the start of the war to garner support from the Malayan Sultans, overseas Chinese, the Burmese resistance and the Indian movement. These missions were successful in establishing contacts with Indian nationalists in exile in Thailand and Malaya, supporting the establishment and organization of the Indian Independence League (IIL). On 15 February 1943, the Army itself was put under the command of Lt. Col. M.Z. Kiani. A policy forming body was formed with the Director of the Military Bureau, Lt. Col Bhonsle, in charge and clearly placed under the authority

of the IIL. Under Bhonsle served Lt. Col. Shah Nawaz Khan as Chief of General Staff, Major P.K. Sahgal as Military Secretary, Major Habib ur Rahman as commandant of the Officers' Training School and Lt. Col. A.C. Chatterji (later Major A.D. Jahangir) as head of enlightenment and culture. On 4 July 1943, two days after reaching Singapore, Subhas Chandra Bose assumed the leadership of the IIL and the INA in a ceremony at Cathay Building. Bose's influence was notable. His appeal not only re-invigorated the fledgling INA, which previously consisted mainly of POWs, his appeals also touched a chord with the Indian expatriates in South Asia as local civilians, without caste, creed and religion- ranging from barristers, traders to plantation workers, including Khudabadi Sindhi Swarankar working as shop keepers – had no military experience joined the INA, doubled its troop strength. An Officers' Training School for INA officers, led by Habib ur Rahman, and the Azad School for the civilian volunteers were set up to provide training to the recruits. A youth wing of the INA, composed of 45 Young Indians personally chosen by Bose and affectionately known as the Tokyo Boys, were also sent to Japan's Imperial Military Academy to train as fighter pilots. Also, possibly the first time in Asia, and even the only time outside the Soviet Union, a women's regiment, the Rani of Jhansi regiment was raised as a combat force.

Women in Indian National Army

Indian National Army was structured in a way that lodged active participation from women. A women regiment was formed in 1943. INA had John Thivy, Dr. Lakshmi Sehgal, Narayan Karrupiah as well as Janaki Thevar as its members. Among the masses attending Bose's rally on 9 July, Dr. Lakshmi, responded immediately to his appeal to form a Women's Regiment. She visited many families to persuade the women to join the INA. Many were reluctant; however, she managed to gather twenty enthusiastic girls who were willing to break the traditional barriers. The girls presented the guard-of-honour to Bose. He was impressed and invited Dr. Lakshmi to lead the Women's Regiment. On 12 July 1943, Bose announced the formation of the Women's Regiment, naming it "Rani of Jhansi Regiment" which in later years was considered to be a special characteristic of the INA. INA fighters were not invited to join the Indian Army after India's independence. However, a few ex-INA members later have seen prominent public life or held important positions in independent India. The Indian National Army thus rose to power under the able leadership of Bose. Though it was ultimately disbanded, its

heroic attempts at forming an army and taking a radical step towards Indian Independence marked a significant step in the Indian Independence Movement.

INA Trials

The INA trials or the Red Fort Trials refer to the courts martial of a number of officers of the Indian National Army between November 1945 and May 1946 variously for treason, torture, murder and abetment to murder. The first, and most famous, of the approximately ten trials was held in the Red Fort in Delhi, hence deriving the name. In total, approximately ten courts-martial were held. The first of these, and the most celebrated one, was the joint court-martial of Colonel Prem Sahgal, Colonel Gurubaksh Singh Dhillon and Major General Shah Nawaz Khan. The three had been officers in the British Indian Army and taken POW in Malaya or Singapore. They had, like a large number of other troops and officers of the British Indian Army, joined the Indian National Army and later fought in Imphal and Burma alongside the Japanese forces in allegiance to Azad Hind. These three came to be the only defendants in the INA trials who were charged of "Waging War against the King Emperor" (The Indian Army act of 1911 did not have a separate charge for treason) as well as Murder and abetment of Murder. Those charged later only faced trial for torture and murder or abetment of murder. The trials covered arguments based on Military Law, Constitutional Law, International Law, and Politics. These trials attracted much publicity, and public sympathy for the defendants who were perceived as patriots in India, and outcry over the grounds of the trial, as well as general emerging unease and unrest within the troops of the Raj ultimately forced the then Army Chief Claude Auchinleck to commute the sentences of the three defendants in the first trial.

Separatist movements

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

bhajeevan Desai and his Muslim league counterpart Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan and 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 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 government 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 – Sir Pethick 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. 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 work to 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 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 the lord mount batten as viceroy ,successor of lord Wavell, 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.

Hindu Mahasabha

Hindu Mahasabha was founded in 1915 to bring together the diverse local Hindu movements which had roots in North Indian public life, reaching back as far as the previous century. It was remodelled much on the lines of the Congress in the early 1920s by its founders including UP's Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. With branches in most parts of India it put emphasis on social and religious work among Hindus and untouchables, on protection of cows and in the spread of Hindi. The organisation remained more interested in protecting Hindu

interests, particularly at times when the Congress tactics seemed to endanger them. In 1925, a group under the leadership of K. Hedgewar broke away from the Hindu Mahasabha and established the Rastriya Swayamsevak Sangha (RSS), which, since its inception, adopted a more militant stand. Since the mid 1920s, the Hindu Mahasabha's operations in Bengal remained mostly concentrated around the removal of untouchability and the purification of 'polluted' peoples. The leaders of the Hindu Mahasabha with the support of local Congressmen undertook campaigns in favour of the social uplift of the untouchable communities. The Mahasabha's involvement with the lower castes gained much prominence in the early 1930s, especially in the aftermath of Macdonald's Communal Award. The Hindu Mahasabha invited aboriginals to adopt caste Hindu names and register their caste as ksatriya during the census enumeration. In Malda district, Mahasabha activists tried to persuade the aboriginal labourers and sharecroppers to stop work in the fields of Muslim jotedars. They encouraged aboriginals to make a common cause with local Hindu politicians on the one hand and break their connections with the Muslim employers on the other. They thought that such efforts would enable them to thwart the efforts of the leftists to win over the sharecroppers in the northern districts. In the late 1930s, the Mahasabha also lent support to several new Hindu organisations to carry out campaigns in favour of unification of Hindu society. In several districts, Mahasabha activists maintained links with the lower caste leadership. However, this sort of campaign to bring the lower castes into the Hindu community resulted in communal clashes between the lower castes and the Muslims which often took the form of communal riots. Instances of rioting and arson involving the Muslims and the lower caste Hindus were reported from Burdwan, Khulna, Jessore, Dhaka, and Noakhali districts. Interestingly, the 1940s also witnessed a political discord between the Congress and the Mahasabha. The Bengal Congress by selecting caste Hindu candidates could win over the majority of the Hindu Nationalist and Sabha voters. Congress leaders tried to prove that they could represent Hindu interests better than the Hindu Mahasabha. The great Calcutta riot, following the Muslim League's direct action day on 16 August 1946 revived some political hopes for the Sabha. Shyamaprasad mukherjee, in this situation emerged as the sole spokesman of the Hindu Mahasabha in Bengal. In fact under Shyamaprasad's influence Bengali Hindus even toyed with the idea of creating a new Hindu state of West Bengal. As communal politics took over the scene, the Hindu Mahasabha became more interested in setting up Hindu volunteer corps for the defence of Hindu life and property. The Mahasabha even supported the idea of

supplying firearms and ammunitions to Hindu communal organisations. The Mahasabha also arranged military training to Hindu youths by exservicemen. By 1946, the Hindu Mahasabha was successful in mobilising a substantial section of Bengali Hindus of Calcutta in support of its politics of Hindu nationalism. In a sense, it had emerged as a platform for the Hindu bhadrak to resist Muslim dominance in Bengal politics. Many scholars believe that Hindu Mahasabha was responsible for the partition of Bengal in 1947.

All India Muslim League

Muslim League established in December 1906, initially led by Aga Khan and ultimately by muhammed Ali Jinnah, was instrumental in creating public opinion in favour of Muslim nationalism and finally in achieving Pakistan in 1947. The background of the foundation of the Muslim League at Dhaka on 30 December 1906 may be traced back to the establishment of the Indian national congress in 1885. The Western educated Hindu elite with the objectives of sharing power with the raj and motivating it to establish representative government in India established the Congress. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, the most widely respected leader of the Muslim community, warned the Indian Muslims not to join the Congress in the interest of the Muslim community. He started his movement by establishing a college at Aligarh. Sir Syed and like him, many other Muslim leaders believed that the Muslims as a downtrodden nation could get more benefit from the loyalty to the British rather than from any opposition to them. He called upon his followers to devote their energy and attention to popularising English education among the Muslims. This perception and consequent activism has been known as the Aligarh Movement. In the line of this thought Muslim elite like Nawab Abdul Latif, syed amir Ali and others established cultural organisations for propagation of English education among the Muslims in the absence of which the community remained deprived of the benefits of the colonial state. Thus the Muslim cultural organisations like the Mohammedan literary society (1863), central national muhamedan association (1877), Sir Syed's United Indian Patriotic Association (1888) and many other local anzumans became more active in social regenerative activities than in politics.

The Muslim leaders of India met informally once a year in a conference to discuss educational problems of the Muslim community and to disseminate the thought of loyalty to the raj. Such a conference (All India Muslim Education Conference) was held at Shahbag in Dhaka in 1906 Against the backdrop of the Congress sponsored agitation against the partition of Bengal (1905) and the swadeshi movement. Previously, a deputation of Muslim leaders met Governor General

Lord Minto at Simla in order to ventilate problems special to the Muslim community of India. Nawab salimullah of Dhaka, the staunchest supporter of the Partition of Bengal, felt the need to form a political party to counter the anti-partition agitation launched by the Congress cadres. He proposed in this conference to make a political platform with the objectives of safeguarding the interests of the Indian Muslims. Nawab Viqar-ul-Mulk, chairman of the conference, supported the motion and thus the All India Muslim League (AIML) came into being. The objectives of the AIML were to look after the interests of the Muslims; promote their loyalty towards the British government and cultivate harmonious relations of the Muslims with other Indian communities, particularly the Hindus. The immediate object of Nawab Salimullah's move for a Muslim political association was to put up a united stand of the Muslims of the subcontinent against a strong Hindu agitation for the annulment of the Partition of Bengal. The Indian nationalist press dismissed the Muslim League as a rickety structure, destined to a speedy dissolution. It is true that initially the League as a political organisation lacked dynamism as it was founded by those persons who had persistently suggested the Muslims of the subcontinent to keep aloof from politics during the second half of the nineteenth century.

The Muslim League remained in a moribund condition for full one year after its inception in December 1906. But within a few years younger generation of the Muslims with 'middle class background and radical ideas found their way into the politics of the Muslim League. They not only discarded the programme of unqualified loyalty to the British rulers, but also challenged the British colonial rule in India and demanded self-government. In the 1910s the League adopted a creed similar to that of the Indian National Congress. When the Hindu-Muslim relation improved considerably, for instance during the period of Lucknow Agreement (1916) and the period of Khilafat and Non-cooperation Movement AIML became almost a dead organisation. For several years since 1920, the Muslim League was in a state of suspended animation as the Khilafat organisation had taken up all the work of the community at the time, and the League had practically nothing to do. Though founded as a political organisation, the Muslim League did not develop any noticeable political programme even within the framework of loyalty to the raj. It was never a meaningful organisation politically until Muhammad Ali Jinnah took up its leadership in 1935. Implored by many Muslim leaders, Jinnah returned from London to India and took up the presidency of the Muslim League. In view of the ensuing general elections under the India Act of 1935, Jinnah reorganised and restructured the central and provincial branches of the

Muslim League and asked the new committees to get ready for electoral politics ahead. In the elections held in 1937, the Muslim League had an astounding performance in Bengal. Of the total 482 seats reserved for the Muslims in all nine provinces, the League could secure only 104. As high as 36 seats, more than one third of the total, were bagged from Bengal alone. Party-wise, the Muslim League emerged as the second largest group in the legislature, the first being the Congress. The Bengal victory of the League was said to have been scored on account of the combined support of the Western educated Bengal Muslim professionals and the Muslim landed gentry. The Ulama class, it may be noted, tended to remain aloof from the Muslim League activities.

In 1937, AK Fazlul Huq, Chief Minister of Bengal, joined the Muslim League and with that his ministry had become virtually a Muslim League one. Using the immense personal popularity of Huq, Bengal was made the fortress for the League. Fazlul Huq as the leader of the Bengal Muslims moved the Lahore resolution for independent 'homelands' for the Indian Muslims from the platform of the Muslim League. The Lahore Resolution of 1940 had a tremendous effect on the Bengal Muslim public opinion. The Muslim League had formed the ministry under the leadership of Khwaja Nazimuddin in 1943 when Fazlul Huq tendered his resignation on the advice of the Governor, John Herbert. The period from 1943 to 1946 was the period for making the Muslim League a real national organisation. Under the leadership of Huseyn Shaheed Suhrawardy and Abul Hashim, the League became so popular that in the elections of 1946 it bagged 110 seats out of 117 reserved for the Muslims of Bengal. It established the fact that the Muslim League was the sole spokesman of the Bengal Muslim community. The League performance in other Muslim dominated provinces of India was equally enthusiastic besides the North West Frontier Province which was still under the Congress influence. The performance of the League in the elections of 1946 made its leader Muhammad Ali Jinnah the undisputed leader of the Indian Muslims. So far as the Muslim community was concerned, Jinnah was now inevitably to be consulted with in all negotiations and agreements concerning the transfer of power by the British. Six years after the Lahore Resolution, HS Suhrawardy moved the resolution for 'a Muslim state' at the Delhi Convention of the Muslim Legislators. The Muslim League became the organisation for almost every Indian Muslim when the independence came on 14 August 1947. [Sirajul Islam] Bengal Provincial Muslim League with the partition of Bengal in 1905, two wings of the Bengal Muslim League were formed

separately in the new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, and in West Bengal. To help forming the Eastern Bengal and Assam Muslim League (EBAML) a provisional committee was formed in early July 1908 with chowdhury kazemuddin ahmad siddiky as president and Nawab Salimullah as secretary. The EBAML was given a concrete shape on 17 March 1911 at a meeting held at ahsan manzil with Nawab Salimullah and Khan Bahadur nawab ali chaudhury as president and secretary respectively. Eleven noted Muslims from East Bengal were elected vice-presidents while Khalilur Rahman and Maulvi Ameruddin Ahmed were elected joint secretaries. The leadership of the EBAML worked hard to gain support from the AIML in favour of sustaining the new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam in the face of strong Congress opposition. It endeavoured to transform certain Anjumans of district and sub-divisional towns into branches of the League and pleaded to the British authorities for separate electorate and promotion of Muslim education in the form of sending petitions and deputation.

The Calcutta based West Bengal Muslim League (WBML) was formed on 21 January 1909 with Prince Jehander Mirza as president and Syed Shamsul Huda as secretary. Since any literate British Indian Muslim aged 21 years or above could become member of the WBML, its office bearers also included non-Bengali Muslims. The leaders of the WBML often sent representation to the government and adopted resolutions pleading for separate electorates, appointments of Muslims in the government's Executive Council and increasing facilities for Muslim education. But, they hardly cared to work for the permanence of the Partition of Bengal or to organise the League outside Calcutta. Following the annulment of the Partition of Bengal, the EBAML and the WBML were amalgamated into the Bengal Provincial Muslim League (BPML) as the provincial branch of the AIML on 2 March 1912. Nawab Salimullah was elected its president while Nawab Ali Chaudhury and Zahid Suhrawardy were elected secretaries. Barrister abdur rasul was elected as the treasurer and abul kashem as the joint secretary. It was only after the amalgamation of the EBAML and the WBML into the BPML that the organisation maintained a separate party office and frequently held council meetings. But the Muslim League and for that matter its provincial organs were never meaningful organisations politically until Muhammad Ali Jinnah took up its leadership in 1935. It was from November 1943 that some new and effective measures were undertaken to reorganise the BPML under the guidance of Abul Hashim, the new general secretary of the party. By 1946 the BPML succeeded in building itself up as a mass party, and in the Assembly elections of 1946 it achieved a comprehensive

victory capturing 97 per cent of the Muslim seats. Muslim League leaders from Bengal took the lead in moving vital resolutions affecting the fate of the Indian Muslims. They cherished the desire for the implementation of the Lahore Resolution with the hope for the creation of two Muslim states in the Northwest and Northeast of the subcontinent. The BPML leader Abul Hashim considered the resolution at the Delhi Convention of the Muslim Legislators for 'a Muslim state' as a 'betrayal' to their interests. Within two years of achieving Independence, the League began to lose popular support. In the mean time Maulana Abdul Hamid Khan Bhasani and other prominent Muslim Leaguers formed the Awami Muslim League in Dhaka in 1949. Series of labour strikes, communal riots, steep decline in law and order situation, agrarian uprising in some districts, police uprising, soaring prices of essentials, the language issue, and numerous other problems of the new state shattered the high expectations of the people. They now looked for alternative leadership, which was readily provided by the Awami Muslim League of Maulana Bhasani and Krishak Sramik Party of AK Fazlul Huq. These parties including some other smaller parties formed an electoral alliance called United Front and in the elections held in March 1954 got as many as 223 seats whereas the Muslim League could win only 8. Such a defeat of a ruling party is not very unusual, but what is unusual is the fact that the League, being the oldest and a mass based party, could never pick up again in East Pakistan. It could justify its existence winning a couple of seats now and then, though its presence was always marked whenever there was any Martial Law regime, both during the Pakistan as well as Bangladesh periods.

Mohammad Ali Jinnah

The Muslim thought in modern India can be understood properly only in its larger historical setting. It is important to note that the evolution and growth of the Muslim political thought was a complex phenomenon involving historical context of the Muslims' social cultural and political life and interactive process with the colonial rule which had been established in India particularly in the aftermath of the revolt of 1857. Several issues had emerged, such as relative backwardness of Muslims in relation to modern tendencies which had come in the wake of the establishment of the colonial rule. The question of accommodation of various social groups including Muslims in the existing and future power structures became an important issue which was widely debated among all groups. Equally important was the issue of religio-cultural identity of various communities which went through a process of redefinition in the late 19th century as well as the first half of the 20th century. All these issues emerged over the years with

varying responses from different social groups which affected inter- community relations. While all these issues were matter of concern for all, it is important to recognise that the responses of the Muslims to all these issues was not uniform but varied since the Muslims did not constitute a monolithic community. They were divided on lines of language, region and class as any other religious community. Mohammad Ali Jinnah (1876-1948) travelled long distances in his political career finally to become the founding father of Pakistan. He was born on 25th December 1876 in the family of a relatively prosperous business family of Jinnabhai in Karachi. After his initial education in Karachi and Bombay. Jinnah went to England to study law which he completed at the age of 18. At the age of 20 he returned to India to join the Bar first in Karachi and later in Bombay and soon established himself among the legal fraternity of the city. He has won great fame as a subtle lawyer and had acquired a great practice in the legal profession. Jinnah became a part of the Congress led politics by joining the Indian National Congress in 1906. In 1906, he worked as private secretary to Dadabhai Naoroji. Gopalakrishna Gokhale had high hopes from Jinnah as an ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity. Jinnah had the greatest respect and admiration for Gokhale and in a speech in Bombay in May 1915, he said that Gokhale was “a great political rishi, a master of the finance of India and the great champion of education and sanitation”. He was a nationalist in the earlier days. He had won great applause when he defended Lokmanya Tilak in the sedition case of 1916. In 1910 Jinnah was elected to the Imperial Legislative Council by the Muslim electorate of Bombay and in 1916, also he was elected to the Imperial Legislative Council by the same electorate.

Jinnah and the Muslim League:

The all-India Muslim League was started in 1906 and its first session met at Dacca in December 1906 under the leadership of Agakhan. Jinnah was persuaded by the leaders of all India Muslim League to enroll himself as a member of the League. He, however, made it clear that his loyalty to Muslim cause would in no way prove an impediment to the comprehensive interests of the nation . In 1914, Jinnah went to England as a member of the deputation sent by the Indian National Congress in connection with the proposed reform of the Indian council In October 1916, Jinnah presided over the Sixteenth Bombay provincial conference at Ahmadabad. He pleaded for unity between the Hindu and Muslims. He supported the necessity of communal electorates for awakening the Muslims. He also presided at the Lucknow session of the All India Muslim League in December 1916 and pleaded for Hindu-Muslim unity. With the beginning of

the Non-Cooperation movement and the upsurge of mass awakening, Jinnah felt that he did not belong to the Congress. He opposed the main resolution on, Non cooperation at the Nagpur Congress in 1920. As a lawyer he had been a believer in constitutional methods of action and hence he could not fall in love with the radical policy of the Congress which took to non-violent direct action under Gandhi's leadership. Jinnah was opposed to the Nehru Report of 1928 although it had given more seats to the Muslims than they were entitled to on population basis In opposition to Nehru Report, he put forward his fourteen points. The important points include:

- a) Federalism with residuary power in the provinces,
- b) A uniform measure of autonomy for all provinces;
- c) Adequate and effective representation of minorities in legislature
- d) Not less than one-third Muslim representation in the central legislature ie, separate electorates to continue.
- f) Full religious liberty for all communities etc.

In order to get the final approval of the Nehru Report, an All Parties Conference was convened in Calcutta in December 1928. In this meeting Jinnah made a fervent plea with members present there that for the sake of unity among various religious groups and communities particularly the Hindus and Muslim. He remarked thus: 'It is absolutely essential to our progress that Hindu Muslim settlement should be reached, and that all communities should live in friendly and harmonious spirit in this vast country of ours'. He further added by way of caution, majorities are apt to be oppressive and tyrannical and minorities always dread and fear that their interests and rights unless clearly defined and safeguarded by statutory provisions, would suffer, Jinnah was shouted down in this all parties conference. With disappointment Jinnah came back to Bombay and soon after left for England with an intention to settle down there practicing law. All parties conference was a burning point in the political life of Jinnah. Determined to stay in England but on the persuasion of Liaquat Ali Khan, the first Prime Minister of Pakistan, Jinnah decided to return to India in 1934. Soon he was elected as the permanent president of the All India Muslim League. He worked hard to expand the social base of the League. Meanwhile, Jinnah grew into a relentless foe of the Hindu social system and the Congress. There was an opportunity to test the electoral strength of the League in the context of 1937 election which was held under the provisions of the Government of India Act of 1935. The Act was criticised by all including Jinnah. In the election the Muslim League could secure only 109 out of total 482 Muslim seats in

all British provinces. It was nowhere close to forming the majority in Muslim majority provinces. Thus Muslim League adopted an aggressive attitude towards the Congress and the Congress - led ministries in various provinces. It charged them of pursuing anti-Muslim policies and started describing the Congress as caste-Hindu party instead of national party.

Two Nation Theory

In its opposition to the Congress, the Muslim League crossed limits and finally came around to the idea of describing the Muslims of India not as a religious community or a minority in a Hindu-majority country but a distinct nation. Thus according to the League's formulation, India was home to not one but two nations which led the demand that India be partitioned so that there could be separate home land to the Muslim as well. This understanding was put to crystallization in the annual session of the Muslim League held in here on 23rd March, 1940. The Resolution adopted here is popularly known as the Pakistan Resolution or Two nation theory. In this resolution it was said that the Muslims of India on account of religious, cultural and historical distinctiveness in contrast with the Hindus, constituted a nation into themselves. In an article contributed to the Time and Tide, March 9, 1940, he wrote thus: What is the political future of India. The declared aim of the British Government is that India should enjoy Dominion Status in accordance with the statute of West Minister in the shortest practicable time. In order that this end should be brought about, the British government, very naturally, would like to see in India the form of democratic institutions it knows best and thinks best, under which the Government of the country is entrusted to one or other political party in accordance with the turn of the elections. Since then, the Muslim League, under Jinnah, did not look back and never consider any settlement which was not conceding Pakistan. In 1944, in course of Gandhi-Jinnah talks Jinnah vigorously and fanatically stuck to the concept that Muslim are a nation. He wrote in one of his letters to Mahatma Gandhi. 'We maintain and hold that Muslims and Hindu are two major nations by any definition or test as a nation. We are a nation of hundred million, and what is more, we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilisation, language and literature, art and architecture..... In short, we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life .By all canons of International law we are a nation.' He was absolutely uncompromising and he insisted that partition was the sole solution to Hindu- Muslim differences. His views were not subscribed to by several Muslim organisations like Jamiaie- Ulema, The Abraras etc. He said on October 4, 1944, in an interview to the representative of London News Chronicle: 'There is only one

practical realistic way of resolving Muslim-Hindu differences'. This is to divide India into two sovereign parts, of Pakistan and Hindustan, by the recognition of the whole of the North –West Frontier Province, Baluchistan, Sindh, Punjab, Bengal and Assam as sovereign Muslim territories, as they now stand and for each of us to trust the other to give equitable treatment to Hindu minorities in Pakistan and Muslim minorities in Hindustan..... The fact is the Hindu want some kind of agreement which will give them some form of control. They will not reconcile themselves to our complete independence. Jinnah had been inspired by the career of Mustafa Kamal but while Kamal was a modernist, Jinnah pinned his faith in theocracy and Islamic democracy. There was opposition to Jinnah's formulations of Muslim constituting a nation from within the Muslims, apart from the Congress and others. Within one month of passing of the 'Two nation theory' various Muslim political formations from different parts of the country came to form a coalition called Azad Muslim Conference. In April 1940 a huge convention was organised in Delhi where 'Two Nation theory' was challenged, It was argued that while Muslims were a distinct religious community with their cultural world view, they did not constitute a nation as claimed by Jinnah and the Muslim League. In several places the Muslim League had to face electoral challenge from the constituent of this Azad Muslim Conference. It argued that Muslims were not a nation but a religious community and it was an integral part of the single territorial nationhood along with the rest of the people of India. As a political leader, Jinnah was the product of the contradictions and confusions of Indian nationalism. One of his main supports was the British imperialist policy, of divide and rule. The Muslim population, which had received a new impetus from the educational impact of the Aligarh movement and the Pan –Islamist affiliations of Mohammed Ali and Shaukat Ali rallied devotedly round Muhammad Ali Jinnah in its crusade for the theoretic and communal demand for Pakistan

Quit India movement

Quit India or the August movement was started as a final blow to the British during 1942 and in world war. It was largest movement ever in Indian history in which people from all walks participated and all prominent leaders were imprisoned and was led by activists and junior leaders. The Quit India Movement or the August Movement , was a civil disobedience movement launched in India on 8 August 1942 by Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi. The All-India Congress Committee proclaimed a mass protest demanding what Gandhi called "an orderly

British withdrawal" from India. It was for the determined, which appears in his call to Do or Die, issued on 8 August at the Gowaliar Tank Maidan in Mumbai in 1942. The British were prepared to act. Almost the entire INC leadership, and not just at the national level, was imprisoned without trial within hours after Gandhi's speech. Most spent the rest of the war in prison and out of contact with the masses. The British had the support of the Viceroy's Council (which had a majority of Indians), of the Muslims, the Communist Party, the princely states, the Indian imperial Police, the British Indian army and the Indian Civil Service. Many Indian businessmen were profiting from heavy wartime spending and did not support Quit India. Many students paid more attention to Subhas Chandra Bose, who was in exile and supporting the Axis. The only outside support came from the Americans, as President Franklin D. Roosevelt pressured Prime Minister Winston Churchill to give in to Indian demands. The Quit India campaign was effectively crushed. The British refused to grant immediate independence, saying it could happen only after the war ends. Sporadic small-scale violence took place around the country but the British arrested tens of thousands of leaders, keeping them imprisoned until 1945. In terms of immediate objectives, Quit India failed because of heavy-handed suppression, weak coordination and the lack of a clear-cut programme of action. However, the British government realized that India was ungovernable in the long run, and the question for postwar became how to exit gracefully and peacefully.

Factors contributing to the movement

- a) The Congress had to decide its course of action in the wake of:
- b) The failure of the Cripps Mission;
- c) The arrival of Japanese armies on Indian borders;
- d) The rising prices and shortages in food supplies, and the different opinions within the Congress

In 1939, with the outbreak of war between Germany and Britain, India was announced to be a party to the war for being a constituent component of the British Empire. Following this declaration, the Congress Working Committee at its meeting on 10 October 1939, passed a resolution condemning the aggressive activities of the Germans. At the same time the resolution also stated that India could not associate herself with war unless it was consulted first. Responding to this declaration, the Viceroy issued a statement on 17 October wherein he claimed that Britain is waging a war driven by the motif to strengthen peace in the world. He also stated

that after the war, the government would initiate modifications in the Act of 1935, in accordance to the desires of the Indians, Gandhi's reaction to this statement was; "the old policy of divide and rule is to continue. The Congress has asked for bread and it has got stone." According to the instructions issued by High Command, the Congress ministers were directed to resign immediately. Congress ministers from eight provinces resigned following the instructions. The resignation of the ministers was an occasion of great joy and rejoicing for leader of the Muslim League, Mohammad Ali Jinnah. He called the day of 22 December 1939 'The Day of Deliverance'. Gandhi urged Jinnah against the celebration of this day, however, it was futile. At the Muslim League Lahore Session held in March 1940, Jinnah declared in his presidential address that the Muslims of the country wanted a separate homeland, Pakistan. In the meanwhile, crucial political events took place in England. Chamberlain was succeeded by Churchill as the Prime Minister and the Conservatives, who assumed power in England, did not have a sympathetic stance towards the claims made by the Congress. In order to pacify the Indians in the circumstance of worsening war situation, the Conservatives were forced to concede some of the demands made by the Indians. On 8 August, the Viceroy issued a statement that has come to be referred as the "August Offer". However, the Congress rejected the offer followed by the Muslim League. In the context of widespread dissatisfaction that prevailed over the rejection of the demands made by the Congress, Gandhi at the meeting of the Congress Working Committee in Wardha revealed his plan to launch Individual Civil Disobedience. Once again, the weapon of satyagraha found popular acceptance as the best means to wage a crusade against the British. It was widely used as a mark of protest against the unwavering stance assumed by the British. Vinoba Bhave, a follower of Gandhi, was selected by him to initiate the movement. Anti war speeches ricocheted in all corners of the country, with the satyagrahis earnestly appealing to the people of the nation not to support the Government in its war endeavors. The consequence of this satyagrahi campaign was the arrest of almost fourteen thousand satyagrahis. On 3 December 1941, the Viceroy ordered the acquittal of all the satyagrahis. In Europe the war situation became more critical with the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and the Congress realized the necessity for appraising their program. Subsequently, the movement was withdrawn. The Cripps' Mission and its failure also played an important role in Gandhi's call for The Quit India Movement. In order to end the deadlock, the British government on 22 March 1942, sent Sir Stafford Cripps to talk terms with the Indian political parties and secure their support in Britain's war efforts. A

Draft Declaration of the British Government was presented, which included terms like establishment of Dominion, establishment of a Constituent Assembly and right of the Provinces to make separate constitutions. These would be, however, granted after the cessation of the Second World War. According to the Congress this Declaration only offered India a promise that was to be fulfilled in the future. Commenting on this Gandhi said; "It is a post dated cheque on a crashing bank." Other factors that contributed were the threat of Japanese invasion of India and realization of the national leaders of the incapacity of the British to defend India. The Congress gave the call for ousting British but it did not give any concrete line of action to be adopted by the people. The Government had been making preparations to crush the Movement. On the morning of 9 August all prominent Congress leaders including Gandhi were arrested. The news of leaders' arrest shook the people and they came to streets protesting against it. K.G. Mashruwala, who had taken over as editor of Harijan published his personal opinion as to the shape the protest should take: In my opinion looting or burning of offices, bank, granaries etc., is not permissible. Dislocation of traffic communications is permissible in a non-violent manner - without endangering life. The organisation of strikes is best.... Cutting wires, removing rails, destroying small bridges, cannot be objected to in a struggle like this provided ample precaution are taken to safeguard life. Mashruwala maintained that "Gandhiji and the Congress have not lost all hope of goodwill being re-established between the British and the Indian nations, and so provided the effort is strong enough to demonstrate the nations will, self-restraint will never go against us". Before his arrest on 9 August 1942 Gandhi had given the following message to the country: Everyone is free to go the fullest length under Ahimsa to complete deadlock by strikes and other non-violent means. Satyagrahis must go out to die not to live. They must seek and face death. It is only when individuals go out to die that the nation will survive, *Karenge Ya Mareng* (do or die). But while giving this call Gandhi had once again stressed on non-violence: Let every non-violent soldier of freedom write out the slogan 'do or die' on a piece of paper or cloth and stick it on his clothes, so that in case he died in the course of offering, Satyagraha, he might be distinguished by that sign from other elements who do not subscribe to non-violence. The news of his arrest along with other Congress leaders led to unprecedented popular outbursts in different parts of the country. There were hartals, demonstrations and processions in cities and towns. The Congress leadership gave the call, but it was the people who launched the Movement.

Since all the recognized leaders-central, provincial or local-had been arrested, the young and more militant cadets-particularly students with socialist leanings took over as leaders at local levels in their areas. In the initial stages, the Movement was based on non-violent lines. It was the repressive policy of the government which provoked the people to violence. The Gandhian message of non-violent struggle was pushed into the background and people devised their own methods of struggle. These included: attacks on government buildings, police stations and post offices, attacks on railway stations, and sabotaging rail lines, cutting off the telegraph wires, telephones and electric power lines, disrupting road traffic by destroying bridges, and workers going on strike, etc. Most of these attacks were to check the movement of the military and the police, which were being used by the government to crush the Movement. In many areas, the government lost all control and the people established Swaraj. We cite a few such cases: In Maharashtra, a parallel government was established in Satara which continued to function for a long time. In Bengal, Tamuk Jatiya Sarkar functioned for a long time in Midnapore district. This national government had various departments like Law and Order, Health, Education, Agriculture, etc., along with a postal system of its own and arbitration courts. People established Swaraj in Talacher in Orissa.

The suppression of the movement

One of the achievements of the movement was to keep the Congress party united through all the trials and tribulations that followed. The British, already alarmed by the advance of the Japanese army to the India-Burma border, responded by imprisoning Gandhi. All the members of the Party's Working Committee (national leadership) were imprisoned as well. Due to the arrest of major leaders, a young and till then relatively unknown Aruna Asaf Ali presided over the AICC session on 9 August and hoisted the flag; later the Congress party was banned. These actions only created sympathy for the cause among the population. Despite lack of direct leadership, large protests and demonstrations were held all over the country. Workers remained absent en masse and strikes were called. Not all demonstrations were peaceful, at some places bombs exploded, government buildings were set on fire, electricity was cut and transport and communication lines were severed. The British swiftly responded with mass detentions. Over 100,000 arrests were made, mass fines were levied and demonstrators were subjected to public flogging. Hundreds of civilians were killed in violence many shot by the police army. Many national leaders went underground and continued their struggle by broadcasting messages over

clandestine radio stations, distributing pamphlets and establishing parallel governments. The British sense of crisis was strong enough that a battleship was specifically set aside to take Gandhi and the Congress leaders out of India, possibly to South Africa or Yemen but ultimately did not take that step out of fear of intensifying the revolt. The Congress leadership was cut off from the rest of the world for over three years. Gandhi's wife Kasturbai Gandhi and his personal secretary Mahadev Desai died in months and Gandhi's health was failing, despite this Gandhi went on a 21-day fast and maintained his resolve to continuous resistance. Although the British released Gandhi on account of his health in 1944, Gandhi kept up the resistance, demanding the release of the Congress leadership. By early 1944, India was mostly peaceful again, while the Congress leadership was still incarcerated. A sense that the movement had failed depressed many nationalists, while Jinnah and the Muslim League, as well as Congress opponents like the Communists sought to gain political mileage, criticizing Gandhi and the Congress Party.

Do or die

Mahatma Gandhi again became active in the political arena after the outburst of World War II in 1939. On August 8, 1942 Gandhi gave the call for Quit India Movement or Bharat Chhodo Andolan. Soon after the arrest of Gandhi, disorders broke out immediately throughout the country and many violent demonstrations took place. Quit India became the most powerful movement in the freedom struggle. Thousands of freedom fighters were killed or injured by police gunfire, and hundreds of thousands were arrested. He called on all Congressmen and Indians to maintain discipline via non violence and Karo Ya Maro (Do or Die) in order to achieve ultimate freedom. On 9th of August, 1942, Mahatma Gandhi and the entire Congress Working Committee were arrested in Mumbai. In view of his deteriorating health, he was released from the jail in May 1944 because the British did not want him to die in prison and enrage the nation. The cruel restraint of the Quit India movement brought order to India by the end of 1943 although the movement had modest success in its aim. After the British gave clear signs of transferring power to the Indians, Gandhi called off the fight and all the prisoners were released.

Mountbatten Plan and partition

The British government sent a Cabinet Mission to India in March 1946 to negotiate with Indian leaders and agree to the terms of the transfer of power. After difficult negotiations a federal solution was proposed. Despite initial agreement, both sides eventually rejected the

plan. An interim government with representatives of all the Indian parties was proposed and implemented. However, it soon collapsed through lack of agreement. While the Muslim League consented to join the interim government the Indian National Congress refused. By the end of 1946 communal violence was escalating and the British began to fear that India would descend into civil war. The British government's representative, Lord Wavell, put forward a breakdown plan as a safeguard in the event of political deadlock. Wavell, however, believed that once the disadvantages of the Pakistan scheme were exposed, Jinnah would see the advantages of working for the best possible terms inside a united India. He wrote: 'Unfortunately the fact that Pakistan, when soberly and realistically examined, is found to be a very unattractive proposition, will place the Moslems in a very disadvantageous position for making satisfactory terms with India for a Federal Union.' This view was based on a report, which claimed that a future Pakistan would have no manufacturing or industrial areas of importance: no ports, except Karachi, or rail centres. It was also argued that the connection between East and West Pakistan would be difficult to defend and maintain. The report concluded: 'It is hard to resist the conclusion that taking all considerations into account the splitting up of India will be the reverse of beneficial as far as the livelihood of its people is concerned.'

Lord Mountbatten replaced Lord Wavell as Viceroy of India in 1947. Mountbatten's first proposed solution for the Indian subcontinent, known as the 'May Plan', was rejected by Congress leader Jawaharlal Nehru on the grounds it would cause the 'balkanisation of India'. The following month the 'May Plan' was substituted for the 'June Plan', in which provinces would have to choose between India and Pakistan. Bengal and Punjab both voted for partition. On 3 June 1947, Lord Mountbatten announced his plan. The salient features were:- Mountbatten's formula was to divide India but retain maximum unity. The country would be partitioned but so would Punjab and Bengal, so that the limited Pakistan that emerged would meet both the Congress and League's position to some extent. The League's position on Pakistan was conceded to the extent that it would be created, but the Congress position on unity would be taken into account to make Pakistan as small as possible. Whether it was ruling out independence for the princes or unity for Bengal or Hyderabad's joining up with Pakistan instead of India, Mountbatten firmly supported Congress on these issues. The Mountbatten Plan sought to effect an early transfer of power on the basis of Dominion status to two successor states, India and Pakistan. For Britain, Dominion Status offered a chance of keeping India in the commonwealth

for India's economic strength and defence potential were deemed sounder and Britain had a greater value of trade and investment there. The rationale for the early date for transfer of power was securing Congress agreement to Dominion status. The additional benefit was that the British could escape responsibility for the rapidly deteriorating communal situation. A referendum was to be held in NWEP to ascertain whether the people in the area wanted to join India or not. The princely states would have the option of joining either of the two dominions or to remain independent. The Provinces of Assam, Punjab and Bengal were also to be divided. A boundary commission was to be set up to determine the boundaries of these states.

Partition of India

Partition of India was one of the historical steps taken on the basis of religion dividing the nation into two parts namely Union of India (also known as Republic of India) and Dominion of Pakistan (further divided into Islamic Republic of Pakistan and Peoples` Republic of Bangladesh) on 14th and 15th of August 1947. With the dissolution of British India the Partition of India was incorporated through the division of two provinces of Bengal and Punjab as Bengal was divided into East Pakistan and West Bengal and Punjab was further divided into West Punjab and East Punjab.

Origin of Partition of India

The partition of India had been the real instance of peoples` demand through their representatives. The initial demand for a separate state was made by an eminent writer and philosopher Allama Iqbal who raised his voice for a separate electorate for the less represented group of Muslim Communities. With the passage of time this claim became the base of the newly emerging state of Pakistan. Among other reasons division of Indian subcontinent was important for various reasons. One such reason had been the old British policy of divide and rule which came into action in case of division of India and Pakistan. Also with the communal awards the hatred rather differences increased on both sides which could only be pacified through division of state. It was further claimed that the British wanted to make the Muslims their allies to oppose the apparent threat of the Hindu educated class. In order to gain support from the Muslims, the British supported the All-India Muslim Conference. They infused the notion that the Muslims were a separate political entity. In addition to that the Muslims were given separate electorates in local government all over British India by 1900s. With such moves the British followed a divide-and-rule policy in India. Hindus and Muslims were two separate

identities which needed to be separated. All this growing anxiety only brought India closer to division. As a result such demand got its shape in the 1935 session when a formal resolution was passed claiming the separation.

The partition took place at the midnight of 14th and 15th August 1947. Mainly based on Famous Mountbatten Plan, the partition included division of geographical areas, population exchange, administrative structure and army, navy and air force as well. The main affected areas were Bengal, Punjab, Sindh and Jammu & Kashmir. Geographically the division included the division of rivers as well as land areas; the exchange of population meant movement of 14.5 million people crossing the borders with a total of 7,226,000 Muslims and 7,249,000 Hindus from each side. At the midnight of 14th August the ceremony of independence was organized a day after the birth of new state of Pakistan with New Delhi as India's capital.

Impact of Partition of India

On 7th August Mohammad Ali Jinnah along with his old associations went to Karachi. The Constituent Assembly of Pakistan met on 11th August and elected Jinnah as its President. Lord Mountbatten went to Karachi on 13 August and on the following day addressed the Pakistan Constituent Assembly. He attended the inauguration ceremony at Karachi. The birth of Pakistan was an eventful occasion in history. Officially, Pakistan became a Dominion on 15 August 1947, Jinnah was sworn in as Governor-General and Liaqat Ali Khan was sworn in as the new Pakistan Cabinet. The effect of Partition was deep rooted which raised some major issues of the day. One such issue had been the issue of refugees which remained the most painful result of Partition for both the nations. The city of Delhi received the maximum numbers of refugees and overall 35000 refugees landed up in the northern part of India including areas of Panipat and Kurukshetra which were further used as camps for them. Huge expansion of cities took place which brought new areas in every city of northern India. Thus, the Partition of India did not remain a historical event only but came out as the most painful event of passed history. It affected not only the physical location of people but their psychology as well. Ending up into brutal riots all over the country the partition of India is regarded the bitterest experience of modern India.

Indian Independence Act, 1947

The Indian Independence Act 1947 was the legislation passed and enacted by the British Parliament that officially announced the Independence of India and the partition of India. The legislation of Indian Independence Act was designed by the Prime Minister Clement Attlee as Indian Political Parties agreed on the transfer of power from the British Government to the independent Indian Government and the Partition of India. This act received royal assent on 18th July, 1947. The Agreement was made with Lord Mountbatten, which was known as the 3 June Plan or Mountbatten Plan. Indian Independence Act was passed in June 1947, which specified the follows:

* The British rule of India should be over on the midnight of August 15, 1947. An independent dominion of India shall be created out of the United Provinces, Central Provinces, Bombay Presidency, Madras Presidency, the Carnatic, East Punjab, West Bengal, Assam and the Northeast Frontier Agency. The territories of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands and the Lakshadweep Islands are also turned over to the Indian Dominion.

* An independent dominion of Pakistan shall be created out of the provinces of West Punjab, North West Frontier Province, Sindh and East Bengal.

* The all Princely states that were officially related to British Empire were made free from all the treaties and relationships and they could decide which dominion to join. Lord Mountbatten thought that if the princely state remained independent within the dominion that may lead to chaos and thus made their accession a necessity of the Indian Independence Act.

* Both the Indian and Pakistan Dominions would be members of the British Commonwealth and was allowed to leave whenever they pleased.

* Both Dominions of India and Pakistan were completely self-governing in their internal affairs, foreign affairs and national security but the British monarch will continue to be their head of state, represented by the Governor-General of India and a new Governor-General of Pakistan. Both Dominions shall convene their Constituent Assemblies and write their respective constitutions.

* The British monarch shall be permitted to remove the title of Emperor of India from the Royal Style and Titles. King George VI subsequently removed the title by Order in council on June 22, 1948. Lord Mountbatten was the last Viceroy of India under British rules and became the

Governor General of Independent India. Jawaharlal Nehru became the Prime Minister of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad was the President and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was the Deputy Prime minister of India. Five hundred and sixty princely states were annexed with India, among which Junagadh and Hyderabad was took over after military action.

SYLLABUS

HIS5BO9 HISTORY OF MODERN INDIA

Module I: Consolidation of English Power in India

Advent of the Europeans – Plassey – Buxar

Consolidation of English political power – Carnatic wars – Maratha wars

Subsidiary alliance – Native States – Doctrine of Lapse

Economic policies of the British – Permanent Settlement – Ryotwari

Railways – roads – forest policy

Early resistance against the British – Sanyasi rebellion – Santhal, Kol uprisings

1857 – Causes and results – Queen’s proclamation

Indigo strike

Administrative changes after 1858

Module II: Social and Political Consciousness in India

Socio-religious movements

Brahmo Samaj

Arya Samaj

Ramakrishna Mission

Aligarh movement

Satyasodhak movement

Pandita Ramabai

Political associations

East India Association

Indian National Congress

Rise of nationalism – causes

Module III: Nationalist Movement – Pre-Gandhian Era

Economic critique of colonialism – Dadabai Naoroji – Poverty and Un British rule in

India

Programmes and Policies of Moderates – Gokhale

Partition of Bengal

Swadeshi and Boycott movement – Lajpat Rai

Home rule movement – Annie Besant – Tilak

Lucknow Pact

Module IV: Indian National Movement – Gandhian Era
Gandhian programmes – Satyagraha – Ahimsa – Hartal
Early struggles – Champaran – Ahmedabad mill strike – Kheda
Rowlatt Act – Jalian Walla Bagh
Khilafat – Non-Cooperation movement – causes and results
Civil disobedience movement– Gandhi-Irwin Pact- Khan Abdul Gafra Khan
Round Table Conferences – Poona Pact
Constructive Programmes – Khadi – Caste eradication programmes – Temple entry programmes
Critique of Gandhian programmes by Ambedkar
Working class movements
Socialist movements
Indian National Army
Separatist movements –Hindu Mahasabha – All India Muslim League- Mohammad Ali Jinnah
Quit India movement – Do or die
Mountbatten Plan and partition

Maps

1. Major Sites of 1857 Mutiny: Jhansi, Meerut, Aarah, Delhi, Gwalior, Lucknow, Calcutta, Agra, Allahabad, Ambala, Bulandshahr, Kanpur
2. British India and Princely States in 1858
3. Major Sites of Annual sessions of Indian National Congress- Pune, Bombay, Calcutta, Banaras, Madras, Surat, kakkinada, Lahore, Karachi, Allahabad, Lucknow, Gaya, Belgam, Haripura, Tripura, Meerut, jaipur
4. Major Sites of Civil Disobedience Movement- Ahmadabad, Dandi, Midnapur, Peshwar, Vedaranyam, Dharasana, Allahabad, Kanpur, Payyannur

BOOKS FOR STUDY

1. Percival Spear, Oxford History of Modern India 1740- 1947
2. A. R, Desai, Social Background of Indian Nationalism
3. Bipan Chandra et.al., India's Struggle for Independence
4. Sumit Sarkar, Modern India 1885- 1947
5. Sekhara Bandyopadhyaya, From Plassey to Partition: A History of Modern India