STUDY GUIDE

HISTORY OF INDIA

(1772 TO 1947 A.D)

PREPARED BY

Dr. C. AMOSE

Associate Professor of History

Head, Department of Public Administration,

Muslim Arts College

Thiruvithancode – 629174

Kanyakumari District.

B.A. History/ Core Paper 9-History of India, (1772-1947 A.D.)

Objectives:

1. To explain the students about the Imperialistic policies of the British Rule.
2. To make the students to understand the various social reforms initiated in India.
3. To understand the Indian upheaval against the Colonial Raj.
4. To estimate the role of Indian leaders in liberating mother India from alien rule.

Unit I

Lord Warren Hastings reforms impeachment Lord Cornwallis - reforms Permanent Revenue Settlement Lord Wellesley - The - Subsidiary system-wars with Hyder Ali and Tipusultan

Unit II

: Lord William Bentinck - reforms - Lord Dalhousie Doctrine of Lapse - policy of annexation The Indian revolt of 1857 Nature, causes and results.

Unit III:

India under the Crown - Lord Canning - Ripon - reforms - Lord Curzon - policies and administration Birth of Indian National Congress - Extremist movement - Home Rule Movement - Ghandhi and his role in the freedom movement - Partition - Independence.

Unit IV: Socio Religious Reform Movements - Brahmo Samaj - Arya Samaj - The Theosophical society Rama Krishna Mission Development of Education Growth of Local - Self Government impact and legacy of British rule in India.

Unit V: Indian National leaders - Dadabai Nauroji G.K. Gokhale B.G. Tilak - Lala Lajpat Roy Annie Besant V.O. Chidambaram Pillai - Jawaharlal Nehru - Kamaraj.

Reference Books:

1. B.K. Keswani, History of Modern India, (1800-1984), Himalaya Publishing House, Delhi, 1996.
2. S.C. Ray Choudri, History of Modern India, Surjeet Publication, Delhi, 1989.
3. S.N. Sen, History of Freedom Movement in India (1857-1947), Wiley Eastern Ltd., Calcutta, 1989.
4. Hukam Chand, History of Modern India, Anmol Publications, Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2005.
5. V.D. Mahajan, History of Modern India, S. Chand and Co, NewDelhi, 1972.

HISTORY OF INDIA 1772-1947 AD

UNIT I

Lord Warren Hastings

Warren Hastings FRS (6 December 1732 – 22 August 1818) was a British colonial administrator, who served as the first Governor of the Presidency of Fort William (Bengal), the head of the Supreme Council of Bengal, and so the first Governor-General of Bengal in 1772–1785. He and Robert Clive are credited with laying the foundation of the British Empire in India. He was an energetic organizer and reformer. In 1779–1784 he led forces of the East India Company against a coalition of native states and the French. Finally, the well-organized British side held its own, while France lost influence in India. In 1787, he was accused of corruption and impeached, but after a long trial acquitted in 1795. He was made a Privy Councillor in 1814.

Early life

Warren Hastings was born in Churchill, Oxfordshire, in 1732 to Reverend Penyston Hastings and his wife Hester (née Warren), who died soon after he was born. The family had been lords of the manor and patrons of the living of Daylesford in direct line from 1281 until 1715. It was relinquished after there had been a considerable loss of family wealth due to support given to Charles I. Young Warren was brought up by his grandfather and educated in a charity school with the poorest children in the Gloucestershire village of Daylesford. At some point he was rescued by an uncle who sent him to London.

Hastings attended Westminster School, where he coincided with the future Prime Ministers Lord Shelburne and the Duke of Portland and with the poet William Cowper. He quickly excelled as a top scholar but was forced to leave at sixteen, when his uncle died. He joined the British East India Company in 1750 as a clerk (writer) and sailed out to India, reaching Calcutta in August 1750. There he built up a reputation for diligence and spent his free time learning about India and mastering Urdu and Persian. His work won him promotion in 1752 when he was sent to Kasimbazar, a major trading post in Bengal, where he worked

for William Watts. While there he gained further experience in the politics of East India.

British traders still relied on the whims of local rulers, so that the political turmoil in Bengal was unsettling. The elderly moderate Nawab Alivardi Khan was likely to be succeeded by his grandson Siraj ud-Daulah, but there were several other claimants. This made British trading posts throughout Bengal increasingly insecure, as Siraj ud-Daulah was known to harbour anti-European views and be likely to launch an attack once he took power. When Alivardi Khan died in April 1756, the British traders and a small garrison at Kasimbazar were left vulnerable. On 3 June, after being surrounded by a much larger force, the British were persuaded to surrender to prevent a massacre. Hastings was imprisoned with others in the Bengali capital, Murshidabad, while the Nawab's forces marched on Calcutta and captured it. The garrison and civilians were then locked up under appalling conditions in the Black Hole of Calcutta.

For a while Hastings remained in Murshidabad and was even used by the Nawab as an intermediary, but fearing for his life, he escaped to the island of Fulta, where a number of refugees from Calcutta had taken shelter. While there, he met and married Mary Buchanan, the widow of one of the victims of the Black Hole. Shortly afterwards a British expedition from Madras under Robert Clive arrived to rescue them. Hastings served as a volunteer in Clive's forces as they retook Calcutta in January 1757. After this swift defeat, the Nawab urgently sought peace and the war came to an end. Clive was impressed with Hastings when he met him, and arranged for his return to Kasimbazar to resume his pre-war activities. Later in 1757 fighting resumed, leading to the Battle of Plassey, where Clive won a decisive victory over the Nawab. Siraj ud-Daulah was overthrown and replaced by his commander-in-chief Mir Jafar, who initiated policies favourable to the East India Company traders, before falling out with them and being overthrown.

British Resident

In 1758 Hastings became the British Resident in the Bengali capital of Murshidabad – a major step forward in his career – at the instigation of Clive. His role in the city was ostensibly that of an ambassador but as Bengal came

increasingly under the dominance of the East India Company he was often given the task of issuing orders to the new Nawab on behalf of Clive and the Calcutta authorities. Hastings personally sympathised with Mir Jafar and regarded many of the demands placed on him by the company as excessive. Hastings had already developed a philosophy that was grounded in trying to establish a more understanding relationship with India's inhabitants and their rulers, and he often tried to mediate between the two sides.

During Mir Jafar's reign the East India Company exerted an increasingly large role in the running of the region, and effectively took over the defence of Bengal against external invaders when Bengal's troops proved insufficient for the task. As he grew older, Mir Jafar became gradually less effective in ruling the state, and in 1760 EIC troops ousted him from power and replaced him with Mir Qasim. Hastings expressed his doubts to Calcutta over the move, believing they were honour-bound to support Mir Jafar, but his opinions were overruled. Hastings established a good relationship with the new Nawab and again had misgivings about the demands he relayed from his superiors. In 1761 he was recalled and appointed to the Calcutta council.

Conquest of Bengal

Hastings was personally angered when investigating trading abuses in Bengal. He alleged that some European and British-allied Indian merchants were taking advantage of the situation to enrich themselves personally. Persons travelling under the unauthorised protection of the British flag engaged in widespread fraud and illegal trading, knowing that local customs officials would be cowed into not interfering with them. Hastings felt this was bringing shame on Britain's reputation and urged the authorities in Calcutta to put an end to it. The Council considered his report but ultimately rejected Hastings' proposals. He was fiercely criticised by other members, many of whom had themselves profited from the trade.

Ultimately, little was done to stem the abuses, and Hastings began to consider quitting his post and returning to Britain. His resignation was only delayed by the outbreak of fresh fighting in Bengal. Once on the throne Qasim

proved increasingly independent in his actions, and he rebuilt Bengal's army by hiring European instructors and mercenaries who greatly improved the standard of his forces. He felt gradually more confident and in 1764 when a dispute broke out in the settlement of Patna he captured its British garrison and threatened to execute them if the East India Company responded militarily. When Calcutta dispatched troops anyway, Mir Qasim executed the hostages. British forces then went on the attack and won a series of battles culminating in the decisive Battle of Buxar in October 1764. After this Mir Qasim fled into exile in Delhi, where he died in 1777. The Treaty of Allahabad (1765) gave the East India Company the right to collect taxes in Bengal on behalf of the Mughal Emperor.

Hastings resigned in December 1764 and sailed for Britain the following month. He left deeply saddened by the failure of the more moderate strategy that he had supported, but which had been rejected by the hawkish members of the Calcutta Council. Once he arrived in London Hastings began spending far beyond his means. He stayed in fashionable addresses and had his picture painted by Joshua Reynolds in spite of the fact that, unlike many of his contemporaries, he had not amassed a fortune while in India. Eventually, having run up enormous debts, Hastings realised he needed to return to India to restore his finances, and applied to the East India Company for employment. His application was initially rejected as he had made many political enemies, including the powerful director Laurence Sulivan. Eventually an appeal to Sulivan's rival Robert Clive secured Hastings the position of deputy ruler at the city of Madras. He sailed from Dover in March 1769. On the voyage on board the *Duke of Grafton* he became ill and he was cared for by the German Baroness Marian von Imhoff (1749–1837) and her husband. He fell in love with the Baroness and they began an affair, seemingly with her husband's consent. Hastings' first wife, Mary, had died in 1759, and he planned to marry the Baroness once she had obtained a divorce from her husband. The process took a long time and it was not until 1777 when news of divorce came from Germany that Hastings was finally able to marry her.

Madras and Calcutta

Hastings arrived in Madras shortly after the First Anglo-Mysore War of 1767–1769, when the forces of Hyder Ali had threatened the capture of the city. The Treaty of Madras (4 April 1769) ended the war but failed to settle the dispute and three further Anglo-Mysore Wars followed (1780–1799). During his time at Madras Hastings initiated reforms of trading practices which cut out the use of middlemen and benefited both the Company and the Indian labourers, but otherwise the period was relatively uneventful for him.

By this stage Hastings shared Clive's view that the three major British Presidencies (settlements) – Madras, Bombay and Calcutta – should be brought under single rule rather than being governed separately as they currently were. In 1772 he was appointed to be Governor of Calcutta, the most important of the Presidencies. In Britain moves were underway to reform the divided system of government and establish single rule across all of British-controlled regions in India with its capital in Kolkata (Calcutta). Hastings became the first Governor General in 1773.

While Governor, Hastings launched a major crackdown on bandits operating in Bengal, which proved largely successful. He also faced the severe Bengal Famine, which resulted in between two and ten million deaths.

Governor- general

The Regulating Act of 1773 brought the presidencies of Madras and Bombay under Bengal's control. It raised Hastings from Governor to the new post of Governor-General, but limited his power by making the Governor-General one member of a five-man Supreme Council.[20] This was so confusingly structured that it was difficult to tell what constitutional position Hastings actually held.

War with France

In 1777 during the American War of Independence (1775–1783), the Americans had captured a British field army at the Battle of Saratoga during the Saratoga campaign. This emboldened the French to sign a military alliance with the new United States of America, and declare war on Great Britain. The

French concentrated in the Caribbean islands, and on India. Meanwhile, the presidencies of Madras and Bombay became involved in serious quarrels with the greatest of the native states. Madras with the formidable Hyder Ali of Mysore and with the Nizam of Hyderabad, and Bombay with the Marathas. France sent a fleet under Admiral Pierre André de Suffren. The combination meant Hastings faced a formidable challenge, with only Oudh as an ally.[23] In six years of intense and confused fighting, 1779–1784. Hastings sent one army marching across India to help Bombay, and another to Madras. His greatest achievement was in breaking up the hostile coalition. By 1782 he made peace with the Marathas. The French fleet had been repeatedly delayed. Suffren finally arrived in 1782 to discover that the Indian coalition had fallen apart, that Hastings had captured all the French ports, and Suffren could achieve nothing. When the wars ended in 1784, British rule in India had not changed, but the French position was now much weaker. The East India Company now had an efficient system in operation. However, Hastings's multiple wartime operations needed large sums of money and London sent nothing. His methods of using the local treasuries later became the main line of attack in the impeachment brought against him.

Bhutan and Tibet

In 1773, Hastings responded to an appeal for help from the Raja of the princely state of Cooch Behar to the north of Bengal, whose territory had been invaded by Zhidar, the Druk Desi of Bhutan the previous year. Hastings agreed to help on the condition that Cooch Behar recognise British sovereignty. The Raja agreed and with the help of British troops they pushed the Bhutanese out of the Duars and into the foothills in 1773.

The Druk Desi returned to face civil war at home. His opponent Jigme Senge, the regent for the seven-year-old Shabdrung (the Bhutanese equivalent of the Dalai Lama), had supported popular discontent. Zhidar was unpopular for his corvee tax (he sought unreasonably to rebuild a major dzong in one year), as well as for his overtures to the Manchu Emperors which threatened Bhutanese independence. Zhidar was soon overthrown and forced to flee to Tibet, where he was imprisoned and a new Druk Desi, Kunga Rinchen, installed in his place.

Meanwhile, the Sixth Panchen Lama, who had imprisoned Zhidar, interceded on behalf of the Bhutanese with a letter to Hastings, imploring him to cease hostilities in return for friendship. Hastings saw the opportunity to establish relations with both the Tibetans and the Bhutanese and wrote a letter to the Panchen Lama proposing "a general treaty of amity and commerce between Tibet and Bengal".

In February 1782, news reached the headquarters of the EIC in Calcutta of the reincarnation of the Panchen Lama. Hastings proposed sending a mission to Tibet with a message of congratulation, designed to strengthen amicable relations established by Bogle on his earlier visit. With the assent of the EIC Court of Directors, Samuel Turner was appointed chief of the Tibet mission on 9 January 1783 with fellow EIC employee Samuel Davis as "Draftsman & Surveyor". Turner returned to the Governor-General's camp at Patna in 1784 where he reported he had been unable to visit the Tibetan capital at Lhasa, but received a promise that merchants sent there from India would be encouraged.

Turner was instructed to obtain a pair of yaks on his travels, which he duly did. They were transported to Hasting's menagerie in Calcutta and on the Governor-General's return to England, the yaks went too, although only the male survived the difficult sea voyage. Noted artist George Stubbs subsequently painted the animal's portrait as *The Yak of Tartary* and in 1854 it went on to appear, albeit stuffed, at The Great Exhibition at Crystal Palace in London. Hasting's return to England ended any further efforts to engage in diplomacy with Tibet.

Impeachment

In 1785, after 10 years of service, during which he helped extend and regularise the nascent Raj created by Clive of India, Hastings resigned. He was replaced by the Earl Cornwallis; Cornwallis served as Commander-in-Chief of British India and Governor of the Presidency of Fort William, also known as the Bengal Presidency.

On return to England, Hastings was impeached in the House of Commons for alleged crimes in India, notably embezzlement, extortion and coercion, and an alleged judicial killing of Maharaja Nandakumar. At first thought unlikely to succeed, the prosecution was managed by MPs including Edmund

Burke, encouraged by Sir Philip Francis, whom Hastings had wounded during a duel in India, Charles James Fox and Richard Brinsley Sheridan. When the charges of the indictment were read, the 20 counts took Edmund Burke two full days to read. According to historian Mithi Mukherjee, the trial instituted debate between two radically opposed visions of empire – one based on ideas of power and conquest in pursuit of the exclusive national interests of the colonizer, and one represented by Burke, of sovereignty based on a recognition of the rights of the colonized.

The House sat for 148 days over a period of seven years during the investigation. The investigation was pursued at great cost to Hastings personally: he complained constantly that the cost of defending himself from the prosecution was bankrupting him. He is rumoured once to have said that the punishment would have been less extreme had he pleaded guilty. The House of Lords acquitted him of all charges on 24 April 1795. The Company subsequently compensated him with £4,000 annually, retroactive to the date he returned to England, but did not reimburse his legal fees, which he claimed to have been 70,000. He collected the stipend for nearly 29 years. Throughout the years of the trial, Hastings lived in considerable style at his leased town house, Somerset House, Park Lane. He subsequently sold the lease at auction for 9,450.

Among many who supported him in print was the pamphleteer Ralph Broome. Others disturbed by the perceived injustice of the proceedings included Frances Burney. Letters and journals of Jane Austen and her family, who knew Hastings, show they followed the trial closely.

Charles Cornwallis, 1st Marquess Cornwallis

Charles Cornwallis, 1st Marquess Cornwallis, KG, PC (31 December 1738-5 October 1805), styled Viscount Brome between 1753 and 1762 and known as the Earl Comwallis between 1762 and 1792, was a British Army general and official. In the United States and the United Kingdom, he is best remembered as one of the leading British generals in the American War of Independence. His surrender in 1781 to a combined American and French force at the siege of Yorktown ended significant hostilities in North America. He later served as a civil and military

governor in Ireland, where he helped bring about the Act of Union; and in India, where he helped enact the Cornwallis Code and the Permanent Settlement.

Born into an aristocratic family and educated at Eton and Cambridge, Cornwallis joined the army in 1757, seeing action in the Seven Years' War. Upon his father's death in 1762 he became Earl Cornwallis and entered the House of Lords. From 1766 until 1805 he was Colonel of the 33rd Regiment of Foot He next saw military action in 1776 in the American War of Independence. Active in the advance forces of many campaigns, in 1780 he inflicted an embarrassing defeat on the American army at the Battle of Camden. He also commanded British forces in the March 1781 Pyrthic victory at Guilford Court House. Cornwallis surrendered his army at Yorktown in October 1781 after an extended campaign through the Southern states, marked by disagreements between him and his superior, General Sir Henry Clinton.

Despite this defeat, Cornwallis retained the confidence of successive British governments and continued to enjoy an active career. Knighted in 1786, he was in that year appointed to be Governor-General and commander-in-chief in India. There he enacted numerous significant reforms within the East India Company and its territories, including the Cornwallis Code, part of which implemented important land taxation reforms known as the Permanent Settlement. From 1789 to 1792 he led British and Company forces in the Third Anglo-Mysore War to defeat the Mysorean ruler Tipu Sultan.

Returning to Britain in 1794, Cornwallis was given the post of Master-General of the Ordnance. In 1798 he was appointed Lord Lieutenant and Commander-in-chief of Ireland, where he oversaw the response to the 1798 Irish Rebellion, including a French invasion of Ireland, and was instrumental in bringing about the Union of Great Britain and Ireland Following his Irish service, Cornwallis was the chief British signatory to the 1802 Treaty of Amiens and was reappointed to India in 1805. He died in India not long after his arrival.

Early life and family

Cornwallis was born in Grosvenor Square in London, though his family's estates were in Kent. He was the eldest son of Charles Cornwallis, 5th Baron

Cornwallis His mother, Elizabeth, was the daughter of Charles Townshend, 2nd Viscount Townshend, and niece of Sir Robert Walpole. His uncle, Frederick, was Archbishop of Canterbury, Frederick's twin brother, Edward, was a military officer, colonial governor, and founder of Halifax, Nova Scotia His brother William became an Admiral in the Royal Navy. His other brother, James, eventually inherited the carldom from Cornwallis's son, Charles.

The family was established at Brome Hall, near Eye, Suffolk, in the 14th century, and its members would represent the county in the House of Commons over the next three hundred years. Frederick Cornwallis, created a Baronet in 1627, fought for King Charles I, and followed King Charles II into exile. He was made Baron Cornwallis, of Eye in the County of Suffolk, in 1661, and by judicious marriages, his descendants increased the importance of his family you to assist in operations which will certainly be carried on in the Chesapeake as soon as we are relieve from our apprehension of a superior fleet and the season will admit.

Clinton provided Cornwallis with a relatively modest force of British, German, and provincial (Loyalist) regiments about 3,000 men with which to accomplish all of this 151 The forces he was given to accomplish this were limited by the necessity of keeping a large British force in New York under Clinton to shadow Washington. Cornwallis was expected to recruit more Loyalists, who were believed to be more numerous in the southern colonies

Cornwallis established a series of outposts in South Carolina, but keeping communication and supply lines open was an ongoing challenge. Supplies not available locally (like uniforms, camp gear, arms, and ammunition) were delivered all too infrequently, supply ships were frequent targets of local privateers, and bad weather impeded the work. In order to help provide fresh food and forage for his troops, Cornwallis established two commissioners. The first was responsible for administering goods confiscated from Patriots (he avoided confiscating supplies from Loyalists since he depended on them for manpower and intelligence), and the second for administering land that was confiscated.

A chronic shortage of hard currency (another supply only infrequently delivered to Charleston) made it difficult to purchase supplies from any source,

either Patriot or Loyalist Cornwallis also attempted to reestablish civil authority under British or Loyalist oversight. Although these attempts met with limited success, they were continually undermined by Patriot activity, both political and military, and the indifferent abuses of British and Loyalist forces. Patriot militia companies constantly harassed Loyalists, small British units, and supply and communication lines.

In August 1780 Cornwallis's forces met a larger but relatively untried army under the command of Horatio Gates at the Battle of Camden, where they inflicted heavy casualties and routed part of the force. This served to keep South Carolina clear of Continental forces, and was a blow to rebel morale. The victory added to his reputation, although the rout of the American rebels had as much to do with the failings of Gates (whose rapid departure from the battlefield was widely noted) as it did the skill of Cornwallis. In London, Cornwallis was perceived as a hero, and was viewed by many there as the right man to lead the British forces to victory over the rebels.

As the opposition seemed to melt away. Cornwallis optimistically began to advance north into North Carolina while militia activity continued to harass the troops he left in South Carolina Attempts by Cornwallis to rally Loyalist support were dealt significant blows when a large gathering of them was defeated at Kings Mountain, only a day's march from Cornwallis and his army, and another large detachment of his army was decisively defeated at Cowpens 15 He then clashed with the rebuilt Continental army under General Nathanael Greene at Guilford Court House in North Carolina, winning a Pyrrhic victory with a bayonet charge against a numerically superior enemy In the battle, he controversially ordered grape shot to be fired into a mass of combat that resulted in friendly casualties but helped break the American line.

Cornwallis then moved his forces to Wilmington on the coast to resupply. Cornwallis himself had generally been successful in his battles, but the constant marching and the losses incurred had shrunk and tired out his army Greene, whose army was still intact after the loss at Guilford Courthouse, shadowed Cornwallis

toward Wilmington, but then crossed into South Carolina, where over the course of several months American forces regained control over most of the state.

Early military career

Cornwallis was educated at Eton College and Clare College, Cambridge. While playing hockey at Eton, his eye was injured by an accidental blow from Shute Barrington, later Bishop of Durham. He obtained his first commission as Ensign in the 1st Foot Guards, on 8 December 1757 He then sought and gained permission to engage in military studies abroad. After travelling on the continent with a Prussian officer, Captain de Roguin, he studied at the military academy of Turin Upon completion of his studies in Turin in 1758, he travelled to Geneva, where he learned that British troops were to be sent to North America in the Seven Years' War. Although he tried to reach his regiment before it sailed from the Isle of Wight, he learnt upon reaching Cologne that it had already sailed. He managed instead to secure an appointment as a staff officer to Lord Granby.

A year later, he participated in the Battle of Minden, a major battle that prevented a French invasion of Hanover. After the battle, he purchased a captaincy in the 85th Regiment of Foot. In 1761, he served with the 12th Foot and was promoted to Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel. He led his regiment in the Battle of Villinghausen on 15-16 July 1761, and was noted for his gallantry. In 1762 his regiment was involved in heavy fighting during the Battle of Wilhelmsthal A few weeks later they defeated Saxon troops at the Battle of Lutterberg and ended the year by participating in the siege of Cassel.

Parliament and politics

In January 1760 Cornwallis became a Member of Parliament, entering the House of Commons for the village of Eye in Suffolk. He succeeded his father as 2nd Earl Cornwallis in 1762, which resulted in his elevation to the House of LordsHe became a protege of the leading Whig magnate, and future Prime Minister, Lord Rockingham He was one of five peers who voted against the 1765 Stamp Act out of sympathy with the colonists in the following years, he maintained a strong degree of support for the colonists during the tensions and crisis that led to the War of Independence Op 14 July 1768, he married Jemima

Tullekin Jones, daughter of a regimental colonel The union was, by all accounts, happy. They settled in Culford, Suffolk, where their children, Mary (28 June 1769-17 July 1840), and Charles were born. Jemima died on 14 April 1779.

American War of Independence

During the postwar years, Cornwallis remained active in military matters. He became colonel of the 33rd Regiment of Foot in 1766 On 29 September 1775 he was promoted to major general. With the outbreak of the war in North America, Cornwallis put his previous misgivings aside and sought active service; proposing an expedition to the southern colonies.

Early campaigns

Promoted to lieutenant general in North America, he began his service in 1776 under General Sir Henry Clinton with the failed siege of Charleston. He and Clinton then sailed for New York City, where they participated in General William Howe's campaign for New York City. Cornwallis was often given a leading role during this campaign; his division was in the lead at the Battle of Long Island, and he chased the retreating George Washington across New Jersey after the city fell Howe recognized the successful close of the campaign "much to the honor of his lordship and the officers and soldiers under his command.

General Howe granted Cornwallis leave in December 1776, however, it was cancelled after Washington launched his surprise attack on Trenton on 26 December. Howe ordered Cornwallis to return to New Jersey to deal with Washington Cornwallis gathered together garrisons scattered across New Jersey and moved them towards Trenton. On 2 January 1777, as he advanced on Trenton, his forces were engaged in extended skirmishing that delayed the army's arrival at Washington's position on the Assunpink Creek until late in the day. Cornwallis was unable to dislodge Washington in the battle that followed.

Cornwallis prepared his troops to continue the assault on Washington's position the next day, but critically failed to send out adequate patrols to monitor the Americans. During the night, Washington's forces slipped around Cornwallis's and attacked the British outpost at Princeton. Washington's success was aided by a

deception: he had men maintain blazing campfires and keep up sounds of camp activity during his movement. Cornwallis spent the winter in New York and New Jersey, where the forces under his command were engaged in ongoing skirmishes with the Americans.

Cornwallis continued to serve under Howe on his campaign for control of the rebel capital, Philadelphia. Cornwallis was again often in an advance role, leading the flanking manoeuvre at the Battle of Brandywine, and playing key roles at Germantown and Fort Mercer With the army in winter quarters in Philadelphia, Cornwallis finally returned home for leave Upon his return in 1778, Howe had been replaced by Clinton as commander in chief, and Cornwallis was now second in command.

The entry of France into the war prompted the British leaders to redeploy their armed forces for a more global war, and Philadelphia was abandoned. Cornwallis commanded the rearguard during the overland withdrawal to New York City and played an important role in the Battle of Monmouth on 28 June 1778. After a surprise attack on the British rearguard, Cornwallis launched a counter-attack which checked the enemy advance.Even though Clinton praised Cornwallis for his performance at Monmouth, he eventually came to blame him for failing to win the day In November 1778, Cornwallis once more returned to England to be with his ailing wife Jemima, who died in February 1779.

Southern theatre

Cornwallis returned to America in July 1779, where he was to play a central role as the lead commander of the British "Southern strategy" (which was to invade the south on the assumption that a significantly more Loyalist population would rise up and assist in putting the rebellion down)At the end of 1779, Henry Clinton and Cornwallis transported a large force south and initiated the second siege of Charleston during the spring of 1780, which resulted in the surrender of the Continental forces under Benjamin Lincoln. After the siege of Charleston and the destruction of Abraham Buford's Virginia regiments at Waxhaw, Clinton returned to New York, leaving Cornwallis in command in the south. The relationship

between Clinton and Cornwallis had noticeably soured during the Charleston campaign, and they were barely on speaking terms when Clinton left.

The task Clinton left Cornwallis with was to, first and foremost, preserve the gains made by taking Charleston, and only then engage in offensive moves. Clinton's orders gave Cornwallis wide latitude in how to achieve the goal of pacifying both South and North Carolina, after which Clinton expected Cornwallis to move into Virginia. Clinton wrote, "I should wish In October 1785, Cornwallis wrote dismissively of Prussian military manoeuvres while in Hanover, writing that "Their manoeuvres were such as the worst General in England would be booted at for practising two lines coming up within six yards of one another, and firing in one another's faces till they had no ammunition left nothing could be more ridiculous.

Governor-General of India

In 1786, Cornwallis was made a Knight Companion of the Most Noble Order of the Garter. The same year he accepted appointment as Governor-General and commander in chief in India. He had in 1782 been offered the governor-generalship only, but refused the post until he also received military command as well.

Reforms of Cornwallis

Cornwallis engaged in reforms of all types, that affected many areas of civil, military. and corporate administration According to historian Jerry Dupont, Cornwallis was responsible for "laying the foundation for British rule throughout India and setting standards for the services, courts and revenue collection that remained remarkably unaltered almost to the end of the British era He also enacted important reforms in the operations of the British East India Company and, with the notable exception of the Kingdom of Mysore, managed to keep the company out of military conflicts during his tenure.

Prior to Cornwallis's tenure, company employees were allowed to trade on their own accounts and use company ships to send their own goods back to Europe.

This practice was tolerated when the company was profitable, but by the 1780s the company's finances were not in good shape. Cornwallis eliminated the practice, increasing employee salaries in compensation. He also worked to reduce nepotism and political favouritism, instituting the practice of merit- based advancement.

Cornwalls code

Criminal and civil justice systems in the company's territories were a confusing overlay of legal systems, jurisdictions, and methods of administration. Cornwallis had the company take over the few remaining judicial powers of the Nawab of Bengal, the titular local ruler of much of the Bengal Presidency, and gave some judicial powers to company employees. In 1790 he introduced circuit courts with company employees as judges, and set up a court of appeals in Calcutta. He had the legal frameworks of Muslim and Hindu law translated into English, and promulgated administrative regulations and a new civil and criminal code. This work, introduced in 1793, was known as the Cornwallis Code. One consequence of the code was that it instituted a type of racism, placing the British as an elite class on top of the complex status hierarchy of caste and religion that existed in India at the time. Cornwallis held racist views, in a manner common at the time; of mixed European-Indians, he wrote, "...as on account of their colour & extraction they are considered in this country as inferior to Europeans, I am of opinion that those of them who possess the best abilities could not command that authority and respect which is necessary in the due discharge of the duty of an officer.

Cornwallis's attitude toward the lower classes did, however, include a benevolent and somewhat paternalistic desire to improve their condition. He introduced legislation to protect native weavers who were sometimes forced into working at starvation wages by unscrupulous company employees, outlawed child slavery, and established in 1791 a Sanskrit college for Hindus that is now the Government Sanskrit College in Benares He also established a mint in Calcutta that, in addition to benefiting the poor by providing a reliable standard currency, was a forerunner of India's modern currency.

Cornwallis received dispatches in Wilmington informing him that another British army under Generals William Phillips and Benedict Arnold had been sent to Virginia. Believing that North Carolina could not be subdued unless its supply lines from Virginia were cut, he decided to join forces with Phillips.

Virginia campaign

On arrival in Virginia, Cornwallis took command of Phillips' army. Phillips, a personal friend of Cornwallis, died one week before Cornwallis reached his position at Petersburg He then sought to fulfil orders Clinton had given to Phillips, and raided the Virginia countryside, destroying American military and economic targets.

In March 1781, in response to the threat posed by Arnold and Phillips, General Washington dispatched the Marquis de Lafayette to defend Virginia. The young Frenchman had 3,200 men at his command, but British troops under Cornwallis's command totalled 7.200. Lafayette skirmished with Cornwallis, avoiding a decisive battle while gathering reinforcements. It was during this period that Cornwallis and Clinton exchanged a series of letters in which Clinton issued a number of confusing, contradictory, and not entirely forceful orders.

Cornwallis eventually received firm orders from Clinton to choose a position on the Virginia Peninsula-referred to in contemporary letters as the "Williamsburg Neck-and construct a fortified naval post to shelter ships of the line. In complying with this order. 1611 Cornwallis put himself in a position to become trapped in the area of Yorktown. With the arrival of the French fleet under the Comte de Grasse and General Washington's combined French- American army, Cornwallis found himself cut off. After the Royal Navy fleet under Admiral Thomas Graves was defeated by the French at the Battle of the Chesapeake, and the French siege train arrived from Newport, Rhode Island, his position became untenable.

He surrendered after about three weeks' siege to General Washington and the French commander, the Comte de Rochambeau, on 19 October 1781 Comwallis, apparently not wanting to face Washington, claimed to be ill on the

day of the surrender, and sent Brigadier General Charles O'Hara in his place to surrender his sword formally. Washington had his second-in-command, Benjamin Lincoln, accept Cornwallis's sword.

Return to Britain

Cornwallis returned to Britain with Benedict Arnold, and they were cheered when they landed in Britain on 21 January 1782. His surrender did not mark the end of the war, though it ended major fighting in the American theatre. Because he was released on parole, Cornwallis refused to serve again until the war came to an end in 1783. An attempt failed to exchange him for Henry Laurens, an American diplomat who was released from the Tower of London in anticipation that Cornwallis would be freed from his parole.

His tactics in America, especially during the southern campaign, were a frequent subject of criticism by his political enemies in London, principally General Clinton, who tried to blame him for the failures of the southern campaign This led to an exchange of pamphlets between the two men in which Cornwallis had much the better of the argumentCornwallis also retained the confidence of King George III and the government of the earl of Shelburne, but he was placed in a financially precarious state by his inability to be on active duty.

In August 1785 he was sent to Prussia as an ambassador to the court of Frederick the Great to sound out a possible alliance He attended manoeuvres along with the Duke of York where they encountered his old opponent Lafayette.

In January 1792 the army, now well-provisioned, set out for Seringapatam. Arriving before the city on 5 February, Cornwallis quickly eliminated Tipu's defensive positions outside the city, and then began siege operations. Tipu requested negotiations on 23 February, and peace was agreed on 18 March Cornwallis and his allies demanded the cession of half of the Mysorean territory, much of which went to the allies. As a guarantee of Tipu's performance, two of his sons were delivered to Cornwallis as hostages Cornwallis and other British

commanders, in a move appreciated by their soldiers, donated prize money awarded them to be distributed among the rank and file.

For his success in conducting the war, Cornwallis was created Marquess Cornwallis in 1792, although he did not learn of it until the following year. He returned to England the following year, and was succeeded by Sir John Shore.

Master of the Ordnance

Upon his return to Britain in 1794, he found it militarily engaged in the French Revolutionary Wars. After he was sent on an ultimately fruitless diplomatic mission to stop the fighting, he was appointed master of the ordnance, a post he held until 1798. In this position he was responsible for much of the British Army's military infrastructure, overseeing its storage depots and supply infrastructure, as well as commanding its artillery and engineering forces. He oversaw improvements to Britain's coastal defences, and was able to expand Woolwich Academy's artillery training program to address a significant shortage of qualified artillery officers. His attempts to significantly reform the military were hampered by the ongoing war.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland

In June 1798 he was appointed Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and Commander-in-Chief, Ireland His appointment, which had been discussed as early as 1797, was made in response to the outbreak in late May of the Irish Rebellion of 1798 His appointment was greeted unfavourably by the Irish elite, who preferred his predecessor Lord Camden, and suspected he had liberal sympathies with the predominantly Catholic rebels. However, he struck up a good working relationship with Lord Castlereagh, whom he had appointed as Chief Secretary for Ireland.

In his combined role as both Lord Lieutenant and Commander-in-Chief of the Royal Irish Army Cornwallis oversaw the defeat of both the Irish rebels and a French invasion force led by General Jean Humbert that landed in Connacht in August 1798. Panicked by the landing and the subsequent British defeat at the Battle of Castlebar, Pitt despatched thousands of reinforcements to Ireland,

swelling British forces there to 60,000 The French invaders were defeated and forced to surrender at the Battle of Ballinamuck, after which Cornwallis ordered the execution by lot of a number of Irish rebels. During the autumn Cornwallis secured government control over most of the island, and organised the suppression of the remaining supporters of the United Irish movement.

Cornwallis was also instrumental in securing passage in 1800 of the Act of Union by the Parliament of Ireland, a necessary step in the creation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland The process, which essentially required the buying of Parliamentary votes through patronage and the granting of peerages, was one that Cornwallis found quite distasteful: he wrote "My occupation is now of the most unpleasant nature, negotiating and jobbing with the most corrupt people under heaven. I despise and hate myself every hour for engaging in such dirty work, and am supported only by the reflection that without an Union.

Permanent settlement

Part of the Cornwallis Code was an important land taxation reform known in India as the Permanent Settlement. This reform permanently altered the way the company collected taxes in its territories, by taxing landowners (known as zamindars) based on the value of their land and not necessarily the value of its produce. In the minds of Cornwallis and its architects, the reforms would also protect land tenants (ryots) from the abusive practices of the zamindars intended to maximize production Cornwallis, a landed gentleman himself, especially believed that a class of landed gentry would naturally concern themselves with the improvement of the lands, thus also improving the condition of its tenants. Nevertheless, the Permanent Settlement effectively left the peasants at the mercy of the landowners. While the Company fixed the land revenue to be paid by the landowners, the zamindars were left free to extract as much as they could from the peasantry.

Diplomacy and war with Mysore

Cornwallis had been sent to India with instructions to avoid conflict with the company's neighbours Early in his tenure, he abrogated agreements with the Maratha Empire and the Nizam of Hyderabad that he saw as violating the 1784 Treaty of Mangalore that ended the Second Anglo-Mysore War. This ensured the company's non-involvement in the Maratha- Mysore War (1785-1787). He was, however, manoeuvred into the establishment of a new company based at Penang (in present-day Malaysia), where conflict was avoided when he agreed to pay a stipend to the local rajah for use of the base. Fort Cornwallis in Penang is named for Cornwallis.

The King of Nepal appealed to Cornwallis in 1792 for military assistance. Cornwallis declined the king's request, sending instead Colonel William Kirkpatrick to mediate the dispute. Kirkpatrick was the first Englishman to see Nepal, by the time he reached Kathmandu in 1793, the parties had already resolved their dispute.

Third Anglo-Mysore War

The company was unavoidably drawn into war with Mysore in 1790. Tipu Sultan, Mysore's ruler, had expressed contempt for the British not long after signing the 1784 Treaty of Mangalore, and also expressed a desire to renew conflict with them. In late 1789 he invaded the Kingdom of Travancore, a company ally according to that treaty, because of territorial disputes and Travancore's harbouring of refugees from other Mysorean actions. Cornwallis ordered company and Crown troops to mobilize in response. The 1790 campaign against Tipu was conducted by General William Medows, and it was a limited success. Medows successfully occupied the Coimbatore district, but Tipu counterattacked and was able to reduce the British position to a small number of strongly held outposts. Tipu then invaded the Carnatic, where he attempted unsuccessfully to draw the French into the conflict. Because of Medows weak campaigning, Cornwallis personally took command of the British forces in 1791.

When the war broke out, Cornwallis negotiated alliances with the Marathas and Hyderabad Cornwallis ascended the Eastern Ghats to reach the Deccan Plateau in February 1791 After successfully besieging Bangalore, Cornwallis then joined forces with Hyderabadi forces that he described as "extremely defective in almost every point of military discipline", and their presence in the army ultimately presented more difficulties than assistance. These forces then marched toward the Mysorean capital at Seringapatam, compelling Tipu to retreat into the city at the Battle of Arakere on 15 May. Dwindling provisions, exacerbated by Tipu's slash-and- burn tactics, forced Cornwallis to abandon the idea of besieging Seringapatam that season, so he retreated to Bangalore.

The coastal township of Cornwallis, New Zealand was named after him by his nephew, William Cornwallis Symonds. A building is named after him at the University of Kent, as are boarding houses at The Royal Hospital School and Culford School in Suffolk Statues of Cornwallis can be seen in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, Fort Museum, Fort St. George, Chennai, and in the Victoria Memorial, Kolkata. The public house "The Marquis of Comwallis" in Layham, Suffolk, was named after him. Roads named after him include Cornwallis Street in Liverpool, Cornwallis Road in the London Borough of Islington, and Cornwallis Road in Oxford.

Comwallis was the recipient of the first British commemorative statue sent to the Indian subcontinent. On his retirement in 1792, and in celebration of his victory over Tipu Sultan, the British residents of Madras (renamed Chennai in 1996) voted in May that year to commission a portrait in oils, and a statue, for their city A request was sent, through Sir John Call, to the Council of the Royal Academy in London to hold a competition Only one artist submitted a model, and that was Thomas Banks, RA. The statue was unveiled on the Parade Grounds of Fort St. George, Madras, on 15 May 1800, after being exhibited at the Royal Academy. The eight- foot-tall marble with its pedestal base depicts the children of Tipu Sultan being handed over to Cornwallis as part of the treaty to end the war. Cornwallis wears the robes of a Garter Knight After Independence, the statue was

moved to the Reading Room of the Connemara Library, Madras, before it was transferred to the entrance of the Fort Museum in 1948.

The first British statue to be erected in Calcutta, the capital of British India, was also to Cornwallis. The marble portrait statue, with figures of Fortitude and Truth on each side of the plinth's base, was completed by John Bacon, Jr., and was a variant of the statue finished by John Bacon Sr. for East India House in London. In this work, Cornwallis appears as a hero wearing a Roman kilt and carrying a sheathed short sword. A cornucopia symbolizing the abundance pouring into the coffers of the East India Company (EIC) is behind the left foot.

A third statue, for Bombay, was commissioned from the studios of John Bacon Jr. Bacon was paid £5250 for the standing figure, which portrayed Cornwallis wearing an officer's tailcoat, breeches, brocade and an immense cloak. The statue was covered by a protective cupola on Elphinstone Circle, before it was damaged in August 1965 and removed to the grounds of the Bhau Daji Lad Museum, Byculla, Bombay.

The last memorial erected to Cornwallis in British India was his mausoleum at Ghazipur, completed in 1824 and funded by a public subscription raised by the people of Bengal. Designed by Thomas Fraser, the free-standing marble cenotaph, topped by a funerary urn, was created by John Flaxman, RA. It was commissioned by the Court of Directors of the East India Company at a General Meeting held in February 1822. Flaxman completed the work in March 1824 and it was shipped to India in April. Flaxman received £525 for his portrait medallion of Cornwallis, carved in relief for two of the four panels. The two others have a figure of a Hindu and Muslim, heads bowed in mourning (a typical motif for Flaxman). The reverse has a figure of a British soldier and an Indian sepoy, also in mourning.

British Empire must be dissolved. "Although Cornwallis recognised that the union with Ireland was unlikely to succeed without Catholic emancipation, he and William Pitt were unable to move King George on the subject. Pitt consequently resigned, and Cornwallis also resigned his offices, returning to London in May 1801.

Treaty of Amiens

Expecting an opportunity to relax at home, Cornwallis was instead despatched not long after his return to take command of Eastern District with orders to lead the defences of eastern Britain against a threatened French invasion. Cornwallis was then sent to France to finalise peace terms with Bonaparte. The peace negotiations were made possible in Britain by financial pressure brought on by the ongoing wars and by Bonaparte's desire to consolidate his hold on the Continent. Pitt's resignation brought Henry Addington to power, and he appointed Cornwallis as plenipotentiary minister to France.

The negotiations resulted in the Treaty of Amiens, which Cornwallis signed on behalf of the United Kingdom on 25 March 1802 The treaty ended the War of the Second Coalition, but the peace was short-lived. Actions by Bonaparte over the next year alarmed the other European powers, and the United Kingdom refused to withdraw forces from Malta as specified in the treaty. By May 1803 war was again declared. Cornwallis is often seen as being partially responsible for conceding too much in the negotiations, although much had already been granted to France in the preliminary negotiations.

Death and legacy

In 1805 Cornwallis was reappointed Governor-General of India by Pitt (who had again become Prime Minister), this time to curb the expansionist activity of Lord Wellesley (older brother of Colonel Arthur Wellesley, later Duke of Wellington) He arrived in India in July 1805, and died on 5 October of a fever at Gauspur in Ghazipur, at that time in the Varanasi kingdom. Cornwallis was buried there, overlooking the Ganges River where his memorial is a protected monument maintained by the Archaeological Survey of India (There is also a memorial to him in St Paul's Cathedral.

His son Charles became the 2nd Marquess. Having five daughters but no sons, the marquessate became extinct on his death, but he was succeeded in his

remaining titles by his uncle, the brother of the general, the Right Reverend James Cornwallis.

Cornwallis appears in the 1835 novel Horse-Shoe Robinson by John Pendleton Kennedy. a historical romance set against the background of the Southern campaigns in the American War of Independence, and interacts with the fictional characters in the book. He is depicted as courtly in manner, but tolerant, or even supportive, of brutal practices against those found deficient among his own forces, and against enemy prisoners. In the 2000 film The Patriot about the events leading up to Yorktown, Cornwallis was portrayed by English actor Tom Wilkinson.

In Ireland his legacy also includes the Wicklow Military Road (now the R115) through the Wicklow Mountains Fictional accounts of the rebellion, such as The Year of the French by Thomas Flanagan, feature Cornwallis.

In India, he is remembered for his victory against Tipu Sultan in the Mysore war and his promulgation of revenue and judicial acts. Fort Cornwallis, founded in 1786 in George Town, Prince of Wales Island (now the island part of the Malaysian state of Penang), is named for him. He is remembered for his deeds in England.

Lord Wellesley

Lord Wellesley remained Governor General of Fort Williams from 1798 to 1805. During his tenure, the Fourth and last Anglo-Mysore war was fought and Tipu was killed in this war. The Second Anglo Maratha war also happened in which Bhonsle, Scindia and Holkar were defeated. Wellesley followed the policy of “subsidiary alliance”, which was accepted by the rulers of Mysore, Jodhpur, Jaipur, Bundi, Macheri, Bharatpur, Oudh, Tanjore, Berar, Peshwa and Nizam of Hyderabad. The *Censorship of Press Act, 1799* was also brought under his tenure and Fort William College was established in 1800 to train civil servants.

Fourth Anglo Mysore War

In 1798, the troops of Napoleon had sailed to Egypt and had defeated its rulers. One of subsequent step of Napoleon would be to capture the British Possessions in India. The key to such step was Kingdom of Mysore, whose ruler Tipu had sought France as ally. In a letter to Tipu, Napoleon said that he would send his innumerable forces to India to drive out the British. However, this plan was never executed because French were defeated in the *Battle of Nile (1798)* by British.

War with tipu sulthan

Meanwhile, Lord Wellesley had decided to crush Tipu. His forces marched into Mysore and seized Shrirangpatnam. One of the commanders of Tipu, Mir Sadiq was bought by the British, he deceived Tipu and the result was that Tipu, amid the English advantageous position, was shot and killed. Tipu had used the iron cased rockets in the Third and Fourth Mysore wars. It led the British to develop their own versions of the Rockets. The **Woodyar dynasty** was restored on the throne of the Mysore and Mysore came indirectly under the British. Thus, with the end of Fourth Mysore war, Mysore became a *princely state with suzerainty of the East India Company.*

Second Anglo Maratha War

For twenty years after the First Anglo-Maratha war had ended in 1782, there was no battle between Maratha and British. Meanwhile Tipu, the most ardent enemy of British had been eliminated.

The Marathas were still powerful but rather than a united single force, the Marathas were a confederation of several states. The most prominent among them were Scindia, Holkar, Gaikwad and Bhonsle.

These veterans contested for power and their rivalry made the British come alive. The result was that the Maratha veterans fought with each other in the **Battle of Poona** in 1802 when Yashwant Rao Holkar attacked the forces of Scindia and Peshwa Bajirao-II. The combined armies of Scindia and Peshwa were defeated by the Holkar. Peshwa flee from Pune and approached to British for help.

British signed the Treaty of Bassein in 1802. As per this treaty, the British promised to place a force of around 6000 troops to be permanently stationed with

Peshwa in Poona. In return the British got the territorial districts that would yield the revenue of *26 Lakh rupees*. Baji Rao II was also required to :

- Not to enter into any treaty without consulting British
- Not to declare war without consulting the British
- Not to claim over Surat and Baroda.

Thus, Peshwa entered into a subsidiary alliance system with the British. Marathas took it as surrender to National Honor. The war was fought between the broken Maratha Confederacy and British between 1803 and 1805 as *Second Anglo Maratha war*.

During this war, the Marathas were engaged at several places by British without letting them unite. In 1803, Baji Rao-II entered Poona with British forces. In the same year, Aurangabad and Gwalior were taken under British control. Bhosle lost Cuttack, Balasore and west of Wardha river. Scindia lost Jaipur, Jodhpur, Gohad, Ahamad Nagar, Bharuch, Ajanta etc. Both of Scindia and Bhosle accepted the **Treaty of Bassein** and gave their sovereignty to British.

Holkar approached Delhi and tried to capture it but he was defeated in Deeg, Bharatpur. At last he also signed a treaty and lost the places north of Chambal and Bundelkhand. With this war, the Maratha had been reduced to nothing.

Subsidiary Alliance System

The Subsidiary Alliance System was a Treaty between the company and the Indian native rulers. In return for a payment or subsidy, the company would place garrison troops in that ruler's territory to fight against their enemies. Subsidiary alliance system was *originally the idea of Dupleix*, who used to rent his army to Indian rulers. Similarly, Clive had also made similar kind of arrangement with Oudh. Lord Wellesley made is an important part of his imperialistic designs. He made the Nawab and Nizams subsidiary allies by signing almost 100 such treaties.

Key principles of a subsidiary alliance were as follows:

- The Indian ruler would accept British Forces in his territory and also pay their cost of maintenance.
- The ruler will accept a British Resident in his state.

- The ruler would not enter into any further alliance or war with any other power without permission from the British.
- The ruler would not employ any European other than British.
- In case there is any conflict, the resolution as decided by British would be accepted to him.
- The ruler would acknowledge East India Company as paramount power in India.

In return for the above conditions, the East India Company would pledge to protect the state from external dangers and internal disorders. If the Indian ruler fails to make required payments, a part of his territory would be taken away as penalty.

First ruler to sign this treaty with Wellesley was Nizam of Hyderabad (September 1798 and 1800). He was followed by Ruler of Mysore (1799), Raja of Tanjore (October 1799), Nawab of Oudh (November 1801), Peshwa (December 1801), Bhonsle Raja of Berar (December 1803), Sindhia (February 1804) and others including Jodhpur, Jaipur, Macheri, Bundi and Bharatpur etc.

Censorship Act 1799

In 1780, **James Augustus Hickey** published first newspaper in India titled "Bengal Gazette" or "Calcutta General Advertiser". This was too outspoken and its press was seized soon. Then there was a general proliferation of the newspapers including The Calcutta Gazette (1784), The Bengal Journal (1785), The Oriental Magazine of Calcutta (1785), The Calcutta Chronicle (1786), The Madras Courier (1788) and The Bombay Herald (1789).

In 1799, Lord Wellesley brought the **Censorship of Press Act** to stop the French from publishing anything which could harm British in any way. This act *brought all the newspapers under the Government scrutiny before their publication*. This act was later extended in 1807 and covered all kinds of Press Publications newspapers, magazine, books and Pamphlets. The rules were relaxed when Lord Hastings came into power.

Fort William College 1800

The initial attempt to train the Civil Servants locally was done by **Lord Wellesley**. Within the campus of the Fort William, he founded Fort Williams College on 10 July 1800. The idea was to teach the British rookies understand the

Oriental Culture, tradition, law and administration to better coordinate in the "governance".

Successors of Lord Wellesley 1805-1807

The adventures of Lord Wellesley were good, but they were costly. The continuous wars with Mysore and Marathas, his policy of launching educational projects in India caused the financial strain which made the Court of Directors impatient. He was recalled in July 1805 and once again **Lord Cornwallis** was sent to India. He was advised by his peers to bring peace in the British dominions which were under the threats with the wounded lions such as Holkars and Scindias. He came in the rainy season and the bad weather of India claimed his life. He was succeeded by Sir **George Barlow**, an intimate adviser of John Shore and Lord Wellesley. His term was till 1807 when there was a **mutiny at Vellore** in 1806.

UNIT – II

LORD WILLIAM BENTINCK

Lieutenant General **Lord William Henry Cavendish-Bentinck** GCB GCH PC (14 September 1774 – 17 June 1839), known as **Lord William Bentinck**, was a British soldier and statesman who served as the Governor of Fort William (Bengal) from 1828 to 1834 and the First Governor-General of India from 1834 to 1835. He has been credited for significant social and educational reforms in India, including abolishing sati, forbidding women to witness the cremations on the ghats of Varanasi, suppressing female infanticide and human sacrifice. Bentinck said, "the dreadful responsibility hanging over his head in this world and the next, if… he was to consent to the continuance of this practice (sati) one moment longer." Bentinck after consultation with the army and officials passed the Bengal Sati Regulation, 1829. The challenge came from the Dharma Sabha which appealed in the Privy Council, however the ban on Sati was upheld. He reduced lawlessness by eliminating thuggee – which had existed for over 450 years – with the aid of his chief captain, William Henry Sleeman. Along with Thomas Babington Macaulay he introduced English as the language of instruction in India. Mysore was annexed under his presidency.

Bentinck was born in Buckinghamshire, the second son of Prime Minister William Bentinck, 3rd Duke of Portland, and Lady Dorothy (née Cavendish), only daughter of William Cavendish, 4th Duke of Devonshire. On the marriage the family name became *Cavendish-Bentinck*. He was educated at Westminster School, a boys' public school in Westminster, London.

Early career

In 1783, at the age of 9, he was given the sinecure of Clerk of the Pipe for life. Bentinck joined the Coldstream Guards on 28 January 1791 at the age of 16, purchasing an ensign's commission. He was promoted to captain-lieutenant (lieutenant) in the 2nd Regiment of Dragoons on 4 August 1792, and to captain in the 11th Regiment of Light Dragoons on 6 April 1793. He was promoted to major in the 28th Foot on 29 March 1794 and to lieutenant-colonel in the 24th Dragoons that July. On 9 January 1798, Bentinck was promoted to colonel. In

1803 he was, to some surprise, appointed Governor of Madras, and was promoted to major-general on 1 January 1805. Although his tenure was moderately successful, it was brought to an end by the Vellore Mutiny in 1806, prompted by Bentinck's order that the native troops be forbidden to wear their traditional attire. Only after serious violence was order restored and the offending policy rescinded, and Bentinck was recalled in 1807.

After service in the Peninsular War, including as a brigade commander at the Battle of Corunna, Bentinck was appointed commander of British troops in Sicily. He was brevetted to lieutenant-general on 3 March 1811. A Whig, Bentinck used this position to meddle in internal Sicilian affairs, effecting the withdrawal from government of Ferdinand I of the Two Sicilies in favour of his son, Francis I of the Two Sicilies, the reactionary Queen's disgrace, and an attempt to devise a constitutional government for the troubled island, all of which ultimately ended in failure. In 1814, Bentinck landed with British and Sicilian troops at Genoa, and commenced to make liberal proclamations of a new order in Italy which embarrassed the British government (which intended to give much of Italy to Austria), and led, once again, to his recall in 1815.

Bentinck in Sicily

As conditions in Sicily began to deteriorate at the beginning of the 19th century, England began worrying about its interests in the Mediterranean. Internal dissensions in the Sicilian government and an ever-increasing suspicion that Queen Maria Carolina was in correspondence with the French Occupation of Sicily as its object led to the appointment of Bentinck as British representative to the Court of Palermo in July 1811. At the beginning of his time at the head of Sicilian affairs, politicians in London opposed the Bourbon rule and appealed for Sicilian annexation. Bentinck was sympathetic to the cause and plight of the Sicilians and "was quickly convinced of the need for Britain to intervene in Sicilian affairs, not so much for Britain's sake as for the well-being of the Sicilians." He was also one of the first of the dreamers to see a vision of a unified Italy.

The English, however, were content to support the Bourbons if they were willing to give the Sicilians more governmental control and a greater respect of

their rights. Bentinck saw this as the perfect opportunity to insert his ideas of a Sicilian constitution. Opposition to the establishment of a constitution continued to surface, Maria Carolina proving to be one of the toughest. Her relationship with Bentinck can be summed up in the nickname that she gave him: *La bestia feroce* (the ferocious beast). Bentinck, however, was determined to see the establishment of a Sicilian Constitution and shortly thereafter exiled Maria Carolina from Palermo. On 18 June 1812 the Parliament assembled in Palermo and, about a month later, on 20 July 1812 the constitution was accepted and written on the basis of 15 articles, on the drafts prepared by Prince Belmonte and other Sicilian noblemen. With the establishment of the constitution the Sicilians had now gained an autonomy they had never experienced before. The constitution set up the separation of the legislative and executive powers and abolished the feudalistic practices that had been established and recognised for the past 700 years.

Bentinck's success in establishing a Sicilian constitution lasted only a few years. On 8 December 1816, a year after Ferdinand IV returned to the throne of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, the constitution was abolished and Sicily was reunited with Naples. The constitutional experiment was deemed a failure although it cannot be said to be his alone. The Sicilian nobles were inexperienced and in the face of the difficulties of 1814 and 1815 could not sustain a constitution without British support, which was withdrawn in the wake of the end of the Napoleonic wars. The British no longer had an invested interest in the internal affairs of Sicily now that the threat of French invasion had been removed. The establishment of a Sicilian constitution that was facilitated by Bentinck was not to be soon forgotten. The ideas found therein and the small taste of freedom lingered in the memories of the Sicilians and had an influence on the desire for autonomy that was at the base of the Sicilian revolutions of 1820 and 1848.

Italian adventure

Sailing from Sicily on 30 January 1814, Bentinck first made for Naples. There he reluctantly signed an armistice with Joachim Murat; whom he personally detested as being a man whose "whole life had been a crime," yet whom Britain found it expedient to detach from his brother-in-law, Napoleon, by guaranteeing

his Kingdom of Naples in return for an alliance. Having instructed the forces under his command in Sicily to make a landing at Livorno, Bentinck then travelled north, with a day's stop in Rome, to join them. The disembarkation at Livorno began on 9 March and took three days to complete, Murat's Neapolitans already having occupied the port beforehand.

Napoleon's sister Elisa, though having now abandoned her Grand Duchy of Tuscany, had nevertheless not given up completely in attempting to salvage something out of the collapse of her brother's Empire. Having obtained from Murat - husband of her sister Caroline - the guarantee that he would obtain the consent of the Coalition he had just joined to her retention of the Principality of Lucca and Piombino in return for having rendered up Tuscany without a fight, she had, by the time of Bentinck's appearance at Livorno, retired to Lucca. Upon hearing of his landing, she sent a delegation to gain assurances that Murat's pact would be respected. Bentinck replied that it would not. If she did not depart immediately, he said, she would be arrested. With 2,000 British troops dispatched towards the city to carry out this threat, the heavily pregnant Elisa had no choice but to abandon the last of her territories and flee north, where she eventually fell into allied hands at Bologna.

Elisa quit Lucca on 13 March. The next day, Bentinck issued a proclamation from Livorno calling on the Italian nation to rise in a movement of liberation. "*Italians!*" he declared, "*Great Britain has landed her troops on your shores; she holds out her hand to you to free you from the iron yoke of Buonaparte...hesitate no longer...assert your rights and your liberty. Call us, and we will hasten to you, and then, our forces joined, will effect that Italy may become what in the best times she was*". In thus attempting to bring about his long-nurtured dream of an independent Italian nation-state in the north and centre (he did not consider the Neapolitans and Sicilians 'Italians'), Bentinck was quite publicly repudiating the policy of his own Government - which was intending to largely restore the status quo ante bellum in Italy; with Austria in possession of Lombardy and the King of Sardinia re-established in Piedmont. For the next month, Bentinck was therefore operating as effectively an independent actor representative of Britain only, as Rosselli says, in the widest sense: in that he held himself to be furthering

Britain's *true* interests, regardless of whether the current Government recognised them or not.

Ordering his troops north to besiege Genoa, Bentinck himself now headed to Reggio Emilia for a conference with Murat. At this conference on the 15th, he brazenly demanded that Tuscany be handed over to himself and evacuated by the Neapolitan forces then in possession of it. It was necessary, he argued, that Tuscany be under British jurisdiction, as otherwise he would have no logistical base from which to conduct future operations - to which Murat replied that it was the same argument on his side which dictated his own necessary possession of it.[31] Suddenly threatening to turn his forces against Naples itself and restore the rightful Ferdinand IV if Murat did not give way, Bentinck was quickly reprimanded in a firm note from Castlereagh reminding him that he was instructed to co-operate in every way with Murat and Austria. At which he reluctantly withdrew his bid for Tuscany - which he had likely been hoping to turn into the nucleus of a free Italian state under his own aegis - and left for Genoa. There had, in any case, been no discernable response from the Tuscans to Bentinck's proclamation, while in Genoa he would find a welcoming audience at last.

Bentinck had been ordered to take and occupy Genoa in the name of the King of Sardinia. But when the city surrendered to him on 18 April 1814, he instead proclaimed - contrary to the intentions of the Coalition - the restoration of the Republic of Genoa and the repeal of all laws passed since 1797, much to the enthusiasm of the Genoese. At the same time, he dispatched an expeditionary force to Corsica to attempt to revive the Anglo-Corsican Kingdom of 1794–1796 and gain for Britain another useful base in the Mediterranean. In Genoa meanwhile, on the 24th, he received representations from the provisional government in Milan beseeching Britain's support for the maintenance of an independent Kingdom of Italy rather than the restoration of Austria's rule over Lombardy. With Napoleon's abdication of both the French and Italian thrones on 11 April, the government in Milan was in search of a new sovereign who would better bolster their chances of survival and, in seeking to bind Britain to their cause, the suggestion was put to Bentinck that Prince Adolphus, Duke of Cambridge, the seventh son of George III, would be a welcome candidate. Though

Bentinck recommended they might look to Archduke Francis of Este as a more realistic candidate in order to mollify the Austrians.

With Napoleon's double abdication on 11 April however - though the news took time to cross the Alps - Bentinck's capacity to influence events on the ground while, with the war against the Emperor still raging, all was still to a great extent up in the air, largely came to an end. As did his Government's motive for toleration. His erratic behaviour over the recent months had led the Prime Minister Lord Liverpool to brand him simply "mad", and his scope of authority was sharply reduced; though he was not finally dismissed from his grand post as Commander-in-Chief in the Mediterranean until April the following year.

First governor-general of India

Lord William Bentinck was the first governor general of British-occupied India. Everyone else before him was the Governor of Bengal (Fort William). On his return to England, Bentinck served in the House of Commons for some years before being appointed Governor-General of Bengal in 1828. His principal concern was to turn around the loss-making East India Company, to ensure that its charter would be renewed by the British government.

Educational reforms

Bentinck engaged in an extensive range of cost-cutting measures, earning the lasting enmity of many military men whose wages were cut. Although historians emphasise his more efficient financial management, his modernising projects also included a policy of westernisation, influenced by the Utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and James Mill, which was more controversial. He also reformed the court system.

Educational reforms

Bentinck made English the medium of instruction after passing the English Education Act 1835. English replaced Persian as the language of the higher courts. He founded the Calcutta Medical college after the committee appointed by him found that "The Native Medical Institution established in 1822 , The Committee headed by Dr John Grant as president and J C C Sutherland, C E Trevelyan,

Thomas Spens, Ram Comul Sen and M J Bramley as members found the education, examination system, training and lack of practical anatomy clearly below standards" and recommended its closure, which Bentinck accepted and he opened the Calcutta Medical college which offered western medical education and opening of this college is seen as Introduction of Western Science into India. It was the first western medical college in Asia and it was open to all without discrimination of caste or creed. James Ranald Martin compares the foundation of this college to Bentinck's other acclaimed act of abolishing Sati.

Social reforms

Abolition of Sati

Bentinck decided to put an immediate end to *Sati* immediately upon his arrival in Calcutta. Ram Mohan Roy warned Bentinck against abruptly ending *Sati*. However, after observing that the judges in the courts were unanimously in favor of the ban, Bentinck proceeded to lay the draft before his council. Charles Metcalfe, the Governor's most prominent counselor, expressed apprehension that the banning of *Sati* might be "used by the disaffected and designing" as "an engine to produce insurrection." However these concerns did not deter him from upholding the Governor's decision "in the suppression of the horrible custom by which so many lives are cruelly sacrificed."

Thus on Sunday morning of 4 December 1829 Lord Bentinck issued Regulation XVII declaring *Sati* to be illegal and punishable in criminal courts. It was presented to William Carey for translation. His response is recorded as follows: "Springing to his feet and throwing off his black coat he cried, 'No church for me to-day... If I delay an hour to translate and publish this, many a widow's life may be sacrificed,' he said. By evening the task was finished."

On 2 February 1830 this law was extended to Madras and Bombay. The ban was challenged by a petition signed by "several thousand… Hindoo inhabitants of Bihar, Bengal, Orissa etc" and the matter went to the Privy Council in London. Along with British supporters, Ram Mohan Roy presented counter-petitions to parliament in support of ending Sati. The Privy Council rejected the petition in 1832, and the ban on *Sati* was upheld.

Female infanticide

Bentinck prohibited female infanticide and the custom of certain of newly born girls to be killed and against human sacrifices. Although his reforms met little resistance among native Indians at the time, Indian enemies repeated a story to the effect that he had once planned to demolish the Taj Mahal and sell off the marble. According to Bentinck's biographer John Rosselli, the story arose from Bentinck's fund-raising sale of discarded marble from Agra Fort and of the metal from the Great Agra Gun, the largest cannon ever cast, a historical artefact which dated to the reign of Akbar the Great. Bentinck removed flogging as a punishment in the Indian Army.

Saint Helena Act 1833

The Saint Helena Act 1833, also called the Charter Act of 1833, was passed during Bentinck's tenure and, accordingly, the monopoly of the East India Company was abolished. The Governor-General of Bengal became the Governor-General of India. This Act added a law member to the executive council of the governor general. Bishops of Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta were to be appointed for the benefit of the Christians in India.

Bentinck returned to the UK in 1835 and refused a peerage, partly because he had no children and partly because he wanted to stand for Parliament again. He again entered the House of Commons as a Member for Glasgow.

James Andrew Broun-Ramsay, 1st Marquess of Dalhousie

James Andrew Broun-Ramsay, 1st Marquess of Dalhousie KT PC (22 April 1812 – 19 December 1860), also known as **Dalhousie**, styled **Ramsay** until 1838 and known as **The Earl of Dalhousie** between 1838 and 1849, was a Scottish statesman and colonial administrator in British India. He served as Governor-General of India from 1848 to 1856. He established the foundations of the modern educational system in India by adding mass education in addition to elite higher education. He introduced passenger trains to the railways, the electric telegraph and uniform postage, which he described as the "three great engines of social improvement". He also founded the Public Works Department in India. To

his supporters he stands out as the far-sighted Governor-General who consolidated East India Company rule in India, laid the foundations of its later administration, and by his sound policy enabled his successors to stem the tide of rebellion. His period of rule in India directly preceded the transformation into the Victorian Raj period of Indian administration. He was denounced by many in Britain on the eve of his death as having failed to notice the signs of the brewing Indian Rebellion of 1857, having aggravated the crisis by his overbearing self-confidence, centralizing activity and expansive annexations.

Early life

James Andrew Broun-Ramsay was the third and youngest son of George Ramsay, 9th Earl of Dalhousie (1770–1838), one of Wellington's generals, who, after being Governor General of Canada, became Commander-in-Chief in India, and of his wife, Christian (*née* Broun) of Coalstoun, Haddingtonshire (East Lothian). The 9th Earl was in 1815 created Baron Dalhousie of Dalhousie Castle in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, and had three sons, of whom the two elder died young. James Andrew Broun-Ramsay, his youngest son, was described as small in stature, with a firm chiseled mouth and high forehead.

Several years of his early boyhood were spent with his father and mother in Canada. Returning to Scotland he was prepared for Harrow School, where he entered in 1825. Two years later he and another student, Robert Adair, were expelled after bullying and nearly causing the death of George Rushout, nephew of John Rushout, 2nd Baron Northwick. Until he entered university, Dalhousie's entire education being entrusted to the Rev. Mr Temple, incumbent of a quiet parish in Staffordshire. In October 1829, he passed on to Christ Church, Oxford, where he worked fairly hard, won some distinction, and made many lifelong friends. His studies, however, were so greatly interrupted by the protracted illness and death in 1832 of his only surviving brother, that Lord Ramsay, as he then became, had to content himself with entering for a pass degree, though he was placed in fourth class of honours for Michaelmas 1833. He then travelled in Italy and Switzerland, enriching with copious entries the diary which he religiously kept up through life, and storing his mind with valuable observations.

Early political career

An unsuccessful but courageous contest at the general election in 1835 for one of the seats in parliament for Edinburgh, fought against such veterans as the future speaker, James Abercrombie, afterwards Lord Dunfermline, and John Campbell, future lord chancellor, was followed in 1837 by Ramsay's return to the House of Commons as member for Haddingtonshire. In the previous year he had married Lady Susan Hay, daughter of the Marquess of Tweeddale, whose companionship was his chief support in India, and whose death in 1853 left him a heartbroken man. In 1838 his father who died after a long illness, while less than a year later he lost his mother.

Succeeding to the peerage, the new earl soon made his mark in a speech delivered on 16 June 1840 in support of Lord Aberdeen's Church of Scotland Benefices Bill, a controversy arising out of the Auchterarder case, in which he had already taken part in the General Assembly in opposition to Dr Chalmers. In May 1843 he became Vice-President of the Board of Trade, Gladstone being President, and was sworn in as a privy counsellor. He was also given the honorary post of Captain of Deal Castle the same year. Succeeding Gladstone as President of the Board of Trade in 1845, he threw himself into the work during the crisis of the Railway Mania with such energy that his health partially broke down under the strain. In the struggle over the Corn Laws he ranged himself on the side of Sir Robert Peel, and, after the failure of Lord John Russell to form a ministry he resumed his post at the board of trade, entering the cabinet on the retirement of Lord Stanley. When Peel resigned office in June 1846, Lord John offered Dalhousie a seat in the cabinet, an offer which he declined from a fear that acceptance might involve the loss of public character. Another attempt to secure his services in the appointment of president of the railway board was equally unsuccessful; but in 1847 he accepted the post of Governor-General of India in succession to Lord Hardinge, on the understanding that he was to be left in entire and unquestioned possession of his own personal independence with reference to party politics.

Governor- general of India

Dalhousie took charge of his dual duties as Governor-General of India and Governor of Bengal on 12 January 1848, and shortly afterwards he was honoured with the green ribbon of the Order of the Thistle. During this period, he was an extremely hard worker, often working sixteen to eighteen hours a day. The shortest workday Dalhousie would take began at half-past eight and would continue until half-past five, remaining at his desk even during lunch. During this period, he sought to expand the reach of the empire and rode long distances on horseback, in spite of having a bad back.

In contrast to many of the past leaders of the British Empire in India, he saw himself as an Orientalist monarch and believed his rule was that of a modernizer, attempting to bring the British intellectual revolution to India. A staunch utilitarian, he sought to improve Indian society under the prevalent Benthamite ideals of the period. However, in his attempt to do so he ruled with authoritarianism, believing these means were the most likely to increase the material development and progress of India. His policies, especially the doctrine of lapse, contributed to a growing sense of discontent among sectors of Indian society and therefore greatly contributed to the Indian Rebellion of 1857, which directly followed his departure from India.

In 1849, under Dalhousie's command, the British captured the princely state of Punjab. In the process he captured the famous Koh-i-Noor diamond from the twelve-year old Punjabi Maharaja Duleep Singh. According to usual practise the treasury of Duleep Singh was considered war booty and Duleep Singh was forced to hand over the diamond. The Koh-i-Noor diamond was presented to Queen Victoria and displayed in 1851 and at the Dublin Exhibition in 1853 and the World's Fair in London in 1862. The diamond features in a number of, often contradictory ways. It was afterall war booty and old-fashioned plunder imperialism (Kinsey D.C. 2009, 392). Between 1858 and 1882 Duleep Singh, who was living in England at that time, reclaimed the Koh-i-Noor diamond arguing that it has been taken unjustly and without compensation.

He also commanded the Second Burmese War in 1852, resulting in the capture of parts of Burma. Under his reign, the British implemented the policy of 'lapse and annexation' which ensured that if a king did not have any sons for a natural heir, the kingdom would be annexed to the British Empire. Using this policy, the British annexed some of the princely states. The annexation of Awadh made Dalhousie very unpopular in the region. This and other callous actions of the governor-general created bitter feelings among the Indian soldiers in the British Army, which finally led to the Indian Rebellion of 1857. Dalhousie and the British called this uprising the 'Sepoy mutiny' – Sepoy being the common term for native Indian soldiers in British service. Dalhousie was an able administrator, though forceful and tough. His contribution in the development of communication — railways, roads, postal and telegraph services — contributed to the modernization and unity of India. His notable achievement was the creation of modern, centralized states.

Shortly after assuming his duties, in writing to the president of the Board of Control, Sir John Hobhouse, he was able to assure him that everything was quiet. This statement, however, was to be falsified by events almost before it could reach Britain.

Second Anglo-Sikh War

On 19 April 1848 Vans Agnew of the civil service and Lieutenant Anderson of the Bombay European regiment, having been sent to take charge of Multan from Diwan Mulraj, were murdered there, and within a short time the troops and sardars joined in open rebellion. Dalhousie agreed with Sir Hugh Gough, the commander-in-chief, that the British East India Company's military forces were neither adequately equipped with transport and supplies, nor otherwise prepared to take the field immediately. He afterward decided that the proper response was not merely for the capture of Multan, but also the entire subjugation of the Punjab. He therefore resolutely delayed to strike, organized a strong army for operations in November, and himself proceeded to the Punjab. With evidence that the revolt was spreading outwards, Dalhousie declared, "Unwarned by

precedent, uninfluenced by example, the Sikh nation has called for war; and on my words, sirs, war they shall have and with a vengeance."

Despite the successes gained by Herbert Edwardes in the Second Anglo-Sikh War with Mulraj, and Gough's indecisive victories at Ramnagar in November, at Sadulpur in December, and at Chillianwala in the following month, the stubborn resistance at Multan showed that the task required the utmost resources of the government. At length, on 22 January 1849, the Multan fortress was taken by General Whish, who was thus set at liberty to join Gough at Gujarat. Here a complete victory was won on 21 February at the Battle of Gujrat, the Sikh army surrendered at Rawalpindi, and their Afghan allies were chased out of India. In spite of substantial attempts by Sikh and Muslim forces to polarize opposition through religious and anti-British sentiment, Dalhousie's military commanders were able to maintain the loyalty of troops, with the exception of a small number of Gurkah deserters. For his services the Earl of Dalhousie received the thanks of the Parliament and a step in the peerage, as Marquess.

The war being now over, Dalhousie, without specific instructions from his superiors, annexed the Punjab. Believing in inherent superiority of British rule over the "archaic" Indian system of rule, Dalhousie attempted to dismantle local rule, fulfilling the imperial goals of the Anglicizer Lord Bentinck. However, the province quickly became ruled by a group of "audacious and eccentric and often Evangelical pioneers". In an attempt to minimize further conflict, he removed a number of these officials, establishing what he believed to be a more logical and rational system in which the Punjab was systematically divided into districts and divisions, governed by District officers and Commissioners respectively. This lasting system of rule established governance through a young maharaja under a triumvirate of the Governor General.

Governance under the established "Punjab School" of Henry and John Lawrence was initially successful, partially due to the system of local cultural respect, while still maintaining British values against acts of widow burning, female infanticide, and burying of lepers alive by small segments of the Indian populace. However, Punjabi rule eventually came to be seen as despotic, largely

because of the expansion of judicial system. Although often unpredictable or despotic, many Indians in "rationalized" provinces preferred their previous native rule.

Second Burmese War

One further addition to the empire was made by conquest. The Burmese court at Ava was bound by the Treaty of Yandaboo, 1826, to protect British ships in Burmese waters.[2] But there arose a dispute between the Governor of Rangoon and certain British shipping interests (the Monarch and the Champion). The facts of the event were obscured by conflicts between colonial administrators reporting to the admirals of the navy, rather than the company or civil authorities. The nature of the dispute was mis-represented to Parliament, and Parliament played a role in further "suppressing" the facts released to the public, but most of the facts were established by comparative reading of these conflicting accounts in what was originally an anonymous pamphlet, *How Wars are Got Up in India*; this account by Richard Cobden remains almost the sole contemporaneous account of who actually made the decision to invade and annex Burma.

In defending the pretext for invasion after the fact, Dalhousie quoted the maxim of Lord Wellesley that any insult offered to the British flag at the mouth of the Ganges should be resented as promptly and fully as an insult offered at the mouth of the Thames. Attempts were made to solve the dispute by diplomacy. The Burmese eventually removed the Governor of Rangoon but this not considered sufficient. Commodore Lambert, despatched personally by Dalhousie, deliberately provoked an incident and then announced a war.

The Burmese Kingdom offered little in the way of resistance. Martaban was taken on 5 April 1852, and Rangoon and Bassein shortly afterwards. Since, however, the court of Ava was unwilling to surrender half the country in the name of "peace", the second campaign opened in October, and after the capture of Prome and Pegu the annexation of the province of Pegu was declared by a proclamation dated 20 December 1853. To any further invasion of the Burmese empire Dalhousie was firmly opposed, being content to cut off Burma's commercial and political access to the outside world by the annexation. Some strangely spoke of

the war as "uniting" territory, but in practice Arakan, Tenasserim and the new territories were still only linked in practical terms by sea.

By what his supporters considered wise policy he attempted to pacify the new province, placing Colonel Arthur Phayre in sole charge of it, personally visiting it, and establishing a system of telegraphs and communications. In practice, the new province was in language and culture very different from India. It could never successfully integrate into the Indian system. The result of the war was to add an expensive new military and political dependency which did not generate sufficient taxes to pay for itself. British Indian rule of Arakan and Tenasserim had been a financial disaster for the Indian Administration. Multiple times in the 1830s questions were raised about getting rid of these territories altogether. Why Dalhousie was so obsessed with increasing the size of a territory that did not generate sufficient revenue to pay for its own administration has never been explained.

One consequential factor of this war was Dalhousie's continuation of the requirement that Sepoys be forced to serve abroad. This created great discontent among Indian sepoys, because it violated the Hindu religious prohibition against travel. In fact, this resulted in the mutiny of several regiments in the Punjab.[14] When this belief that the British were intentionally forcing caste breaking was combined with the widespread belief that the British were intentionally violating Hindu and Muslim purity laws with their new greased cartridges, the consequences (culminating in 1857), would prove to be extremely destructive.

Doctrine of Lapse

The most controversial and tainted 'reform' developed and implemented under Dalhousie was the policy of taking all legal (often illegal too) means possible to assume control over "lapsed" states. Dalhousie, driven by the conviction that all India needed to be brought under British administration, began to apply what was called the doctrine of lapse. Under the doctrine, the British annexed any non-British state where there was a lack of a proper male lineal heir. Under the policy he recommended the annexation of Satara in January 1849,

of Jaitpur and Sambalpur in the same year, and of Jhansi and Nagpur in 1853. In these cases his action was approved by the home authorities, but his proposal to annex Karauli in 1849 was disallowed, while Baghat and the petty estate of Udaipur, which he had annexed in 1851 and 1852 respectively, were afterwards restored to native rule. These annexations are considered by critics to generally represent an uneconomic drain on the financial resources of the company in India.

Educational reforms

Dalhousie had a strong personal commitment to the establishment of a national system of education in India. He ensured the successful administration of the provisions contained in the 1854 dispatch.

Dalhousie declared *that no single change was likely to produce more important and beneficial consequences than female education*. The Educational dispatch of 1854 favoured Women's education. There was shift in government policy under him from higher education for elite towards mass education for both. He along with Bethune are credited with changing policy in favour of Women's education. Dalhousie even personally supported the Bethune Women school from his own money set up by Bethune after his death.[18] Before he left for England he took personal interest and introduced the Hindu Widows' Remarriage Act, 1856, permitting widow remarriage which became an act after being approved by his successor, Lord Canning.

Development of infrastructure

Other measures with the same object were carried out in the Company's own territories. Bengal, long ruled by the Governor-General or his delegate, was placed under its own Lieutenant-Governor in May 1854. The military boards were swept away; selection took the place of seniority in the higher commands; an army clothing and a stud department were created, and the medical service underwent complete reorganization. A department of public works was established in each presidency, and engineering colleges were provided. An imperial system of telegraphs followed. The first link of railway communication was completed in 1855, and well-considered plans mapped out the course of other lines and their method of administration. Dalhousie encouraged private enterprise to develop

railways in India for the good of the people and also to reduce absolute dependence on the government. However, as an authoritarian, utilitarian ruler, Dalhousie brought the railways under state control-attempting to bring the greatest benefit to India from the expanding network.

In addition, the Ganges Canal was completed; and despite the cost of wars in the Punjab and Burma, liberal provision was made for metalled roads and bridges. The construction of massive irrigation works such as the 350-mile Ganges Canal, which contains thousands of miles of distributaries, was a substantial project that was particularly beneficial for the largely agricultural India. In spite of damaging certain areas of farmland by increasing soil salinity, overall the individuals living along the canal were noticeably better fed and clothed than those who were not. Increasing irrigated area resulted in increase in population. Reforms to improve the condition of the increased population such as immunization and establishment of educational institutions were never implemented. This kept the population poor and bonded to agricultural activities promoting bonded labour. Europeanization and consolidation of authority were the keynote of his policy. In nine minutes he suggested means for strengthening the Company's European forces, calling attention to the dangers that threatened the British community, a handful of scattered strangers; but beyond the additional powers of recruitment which at his entreaty were granted in the last charter act of 1853, his proposals were shelved by the home authorities as they represented yet more expense added to the cost of India. In his administration Dalhousie vigorously asserted his control over even minor military affairs, and when Sir Charles Napier ordered certain allowances, given as compensation for the dearness of provisions, to be granted to the sepoys on a system which had not been sanctioned from headquarters, and threatened to repeat the offence, the Governor-General rebuked him to such a degree that Napier resigned his command.

Dalhousie's reforms were not confined to the departments of public works and military affairs. He created an imperial system of post-offices, reducing the rates of carrying letters and introducing postage stamps. He created the department of public instruction; he improved the system of inspection of goals, abolishing the practice of branding convicts; freed converts to other religions from the loss of

their civil rights; inaugurated the system of administrative reports; and enlarged the Legislative Council of India. His wide interest in everything that concerned the welfare of British economic interests in the country was shown in the encouragement he gave to the culture of tea, in his protection of forests, in the preservation of ancient and historic monuments. With the object of making the civil administration more European, he closed what he considered to be the useless college in Calcutta for the education of young civilians, establishing in its place a European system of training them in mufasal stations, and subjecting them to departmental examinations. He was equally careful of the well-being of the European soldier, providing him with healthy recreations and public gardens.

Civil Service reform

To the civil service he gave improved leave and pension rules, while he purified its moral by forbidding all share in trading concerns, by vigorously punishing insolvents, and by his personal example of careful selection in the matter of patronage. No Governor-General ever penned a larger number of weighty papers dealing with public affairs in India. Even after laying down office and while on his way home, he forced himself, ill as he was, to review his own administration in a document of such importance that the House of Commons gave orders for its being printed (Blue Book 245 of 1856). Another consequential set of reforms, were those aimed at modernizing the land tenure and revenue system. Throughout his time in office, Dalhousie disposed large landowners from portions of their estates. He also implemented policies attempting to end the rule of the zamindar tax farmers, as he viewed them as destructive "drones of the soil". However, thousands of smaller landlords had their holdings completely removed as did the relatively poor who leased small parcels of their land while farming the rest. This was particularly significant as the sepoys were often recruited from these economic groups. He introduced a system of open competition as the basis of recruitment for civil servants of the company and thus deprived the Directors of their patronage system under Government of India Act 1853.

Foreign policy

His foreign policy was guided by a desire to reduce the nominal independence of the larger native states, and to avoid extending the political relations of his government with foreign powers outside India. Pressed to intervene in Hyderabad, he refused to do so, claiming on this occasion that interference was only justified if the administration of native princes tends unquestionably to the injury of the subjects or of the allies of the British government. He negotiated in 1853 a treaty with the nizam, which provided funds for the maintenance of the contingent kept up by the British in support of that princes' authority, by the assignment of the Berars in lieu of annual payments of the cost and large outstanding arrears. The Berar treaty, he told Sir Charles Wood, is more likely to keep the nizam on his throne than anything that has happened for 50 years to him, while at the same time the control thus acquired over a strip of territory intervening between Bombay and Nagpur promoted his policy of consolidation and his schemes of railway extension. The same spirit induced him to tolerate a war of succession in Bahawalpur, so long as the contending candidates did not violate British territory.

He refrained from punishing Dost Mohammad for the part he had taken in the Sikh War, and resolutely to refuse to enter upon any negotiations until the amir himself came forward. Then he steered a middle course between the proposals of his own agent, Herbert Edwardes, who advocated an offensive alliance, and those of John Lawrence, who would have avoided any sort of engagement. He himself drafted the short treaty of peace and friendship which Lawrence signed in 1855, that officer receiving in 1856 the Order of the Bath as a Knight Commander in acknowledgement of his services in the matter. While, however, Dalhousie was content with a mutual engagement with the Afghan chief, binding each party to respect the territories of the other, he saw that a larger measure of interference was needed in Baluchistan, and with the Khan of Kalat he authorized Major Jacob to negotiate a treaty of subordinate co-operation on 14 May 1854.

The khan was guaranteed an annual subsidy of Rs. 50,000, in return for the treaty which bound him to the British wholly and exclusively. To this the home

authorities demurred, but the engagement was duly ratified, and the subsidy was largely increased by Dalhousies successors. On the other hand, he insisted on leaving all matters concerning Persia and Central Asia to the decision of the queen's advisers. After the conquest of the Punjab, he began the expensive process of attempting to police and control the Northwest Frontier region. The hillmen, he wrote, regard the plains as their food and prey, and the Afridis, Mohmands, Black Mountain tribes, Waziris and others had to be taught that their new neighbours would not tolerate outrages. But he proclaimed to one and all his desire for peace, and urged upon them the duty of tribal responsibility. Nevertheless, the military engagement on the northwest frontier of India he began grew yearly in cost and continued without pause until the British left Pakistan.

The annexation of Oudh was reserved to the last. The home authorities had asked Dalhousie to prolong his tenure of office during the Crimean War, but the difficulties of the problem no less than complications elsewhere had induced him to delay operations. In 1854 he appointed Outram as resident at the court of Lucknow, directing him to submit a report on the condition of the province. This was furnished in March 1855. The report provided the British an excuse for action based on "disorder and misrule". Dalhousie, looking at the treaty of 1801, decided that he could do as he wished with Oudh as long as he had the king's consent. He then demanded a transfer to the Company of the entire administration of Oudh, the king merely retaining his royal rank, certain privileges in the courts, and a liberal allowance. If he should refuse this arrangement, a general rising would be arranged, and then the British government would intervene on its own terms.

On 21 November 1855, the court of directors instructed Dalhousie to assume the control of Oudh, and to give the king no option unless he was sure that his majesty would surrender the administration rather than risk a revolution. Dalhousie was in bad health and on the eve of retirement when the belated orders reached him; but he at once laid down instructions for Outram in every detail, moved up troops, and elaborated a scheme of government with particular orders as to conciliating local opinion. The king refused to sign the ultimatum (in the form of a "treaty") put before him, and a proclamation annexing the province was therefore issued on 13 February 1856.

In his mind, only one important matter now remained to him before quitting office. The insurrection of the Kolarian Santals of Bengal against the extortions of landlords and moneylenders had been severely repressed, but the causes of the insurrection had still to be reviewed and a remedy provided. By removing the tract of country from local rule, enforcing the residence of British officers there, and employing the Santal headmen in a local police, he created a system of administration which proved successful in maintaining order.

Return to Britain

Dalhousie, on 6 March 1856, set sail for England on board the Company's "Firoze," an object of general sympathy and not less general respect. At Alexandria he was carried by H.M.S. "Caradoc" to Malta, and thence by the "Tribune" to Spithead, which he reached on 13 May. His return had been eagerly looked for by statesmen who hoped that he would resume his public career, by the Company which voted him an annual pension of 5,000 (equivalent to £530,000 in 2019), and by the queen who earnestly prayed for the blessing of restored health and strength; conversely, the outbreak of the "Sepoy Mutiny" led to bitter attacks on the record of his policy, and to widespread criticisms (both fair and unfair) of his political interests and career. His health deteriorated in Malta and at Malvern, Edinburgh, where he sought medical treatment. In his correspondence and public statements, he was careful not to assign blame or cause embarrassment to colleagues in government. During this period, John Lawrence, 1st Baron Lawrence invoked his counsel and influence. By his last wish, his private journal and papers of personal interest were sealed against publication or inquiry for fully 50 years after his death. Established in 1854 by the British Empire in India as a summer retreat for its troops and bureaucrats, the hill station of Dalhousie was named after Lord Dalhousie who was Governor-General of India at that time.

Indian Rebellion of 1857

The **Indian Rebellion of 1857** was a major uprising in India in 1857–58 against the rule of the British East India Company, which functioned as a sovereign power on behalf of the British Crown. The rebellion began on 10 May 1857 in the form of a mutiny of sepoys of the Company's army in the garrison

town of Meerut, 40 mi (64 km) northeast of Delhi. It then erupted into other mutinies and civilian rebellions chiefly in the upper Gangetic plain and central India, though incidents of revolt also occurred farther north and east. The rebellion posed a military threat to British power in that region, and was contained only with the rebels' defeat in Gwalior on 20 June 1858. On 1 November 1858, the British granted amnesty to all rebels not involved in murder, though they did not declare the hostilities to have formally ended until 8 July 1859. Its name is contested, and it is variously described as the **Sepoy Mutiny**, the **Indian Mutiny**, the **Great Rebellion**, the **Revolt of 1857**, the **Indian Insurrection**, and the **First War of Independence**.

The Indian rebellion was fed by resentments born of diverse perceptions, including invasive British-style social reforms, harsh land taxes, summary treatment of some rich landowners and princes, as well as scepticism about the improvements brought about by British rule. Many Indians rose against the British; however, many also fought for the British, and the majority remained seemingly compliant to British rule. Violence, which sometimes betrayed exceptional cruelty, was inflicted on both sides, on British officers, and civilians, including women and children, by the rebels, and on the rebels, and their supporters, including sometimes entire villages, by British reprisals; the cities of Delhi and Lucknow were laid waste in the fighting and the British retaliation.

After the outbreak of the mutiny in Meerut, the rebels quickly reached Delhi, whose 81-year-old Mughal ruler, Bahadur Shah Zafar, was declared the Emperor of Hindustan. Soon, the rebels had captured large tracts of the North-Western Provinces and Awadh (Oudh). The East India Company's response came rapidly as well. With help from reinforcements, Kanpur was retaken by mid-July 1857, and Delhi by the end of September. However, it then took the remainder of 1857 and the better part of 1858 for the rebellion to be suppressed in Jhansi, Lucknow, and especially the Awadh countryside. Other regions of Company-controlled India—Bengal province, the Bombay Presidency, and the Madras Presidency—remained largely calm. In the Punjab, the Sikh princes crucially helped the British by providing both soldiers and support. The large princely states, Hyderabad, Mysore, Travancore, and Kashmir, as well as the smaller ones

of Rajputana, did not join the rebellion, serving the British, in the Governor-General Lord Canning's words, as "breakwaters in a storm".

In some regions, most notably in Awadh, the rebellion took on the attributes of a patriotic revolt against British oppression. However, the rebel leaders proclaimed no articles of faith that presaged a new political system. Even so, the rebellion proved to be an important watershed in Indian and British Empire history. It led to the dissolution of the East India Company, and forced the British to reorganize the army, the financial system, and the administration in India, through passage of the Government of India Act 1858. India was thereafter administered directly by the British government in the new British Raj. On 1 November 1858, Queen Victoria issued a proclamation to Indians, which while lacking the authority of a constitutional provision, promised rights similar to those of other British subjects. In the following decades, when admission to these rights was not always forthcoming, Indians were to pointedly refer to the Queen's proclamation in growing avowals of a new nationalism.

Although the British East India Company had established a presence in India as far back as 1612, and earlier administered the factory areas established for trading purposes, its victory in the Battle of Plassey in 1757 marked the beginning of its firm foothold in eastern India. The victory was consolidated in 1764 at the Battle of Buxar, when the East India Company army defeated Mughal Emperor Shah Alam II. After his defeat, the emperor granted the Company the right to the "collection of Revenue" in the provinces of Bengal (modern day Bengal, Bihar, and Odisha), known as "Diwani" to the Company. The Company soon expanded its territories around its bases in Bombay and Madras; later, the Anglo-Mysore Wars (1766–1799) and the Anglo-Maratha Wars (1772–1818) led to control of even more of India.

In 1806, the Vellore Mutiny was sparked by new uniform regulations that created resentment amongst both Hindu and Muslim sepoys. After the turn of the 19th century, Governor-General Wellesley began what became two decades of accelerated expansion of Company territories. This was achieved either by subsidiary alliances between the Company and local rulers or by direct military

annexation. The subsidiary alliances created the princely states of the Hindu maharajas and the Muslim nawabs. Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, and Kashmir were annexed after the Second Anglo-Sikh War in 1849; however, Kashmir was immediately sold under the 1846 Treaty of Amritsar to the Dogra Dynasty of Jammu and thereby became a princely state. The border dispute between Nepal and British India, which sharpened after 1801, had caused the Anglo-Nepalese War of 1814–16 and brought the defeated Gurkhas under British influence. In 1854, Berar was annexed, and the state of Oudh was added two years later. For practical purposes, the Company was the government of much of India.

Causes of the rebellion

The Indian Rebellion of 1857 occurred as the result of an accumulation of factors over time, rather than any single event. The *sepoys* were Indian soldiers who were recruited into the Company's army. Just before the rebellion, there were over 300,000 sepoys in the army, compared to about 50,000 British. The East India Company's forces were divided into three presidency armies: Bombay, Madras, and Bengal. The Bengal Army recruited higher castes, such as Brahmins, Rajputs and Bhumihar, mostly from the Awadh and Bihar regions, and even restricted the enlistment of lower castes in 1855. In contrast, the Madras Army and Bombay Army were "more localized, caste-neutral armies" that "did not prefer high-caste men". The domination of higher castes in the Bengal Army has been blamed in part for initial mutinies that led to the rebellion.

In 1772, when Warren Hastings was appointed Fort William's first Governor-General, one of his first undertakings was the rapid expansion of the Company's army. Since the sepoys from Bengal – many of whom had fought against the Company in the Battles of Plassey and Buxar – were now suspect in British eyes, Hastings recruited farther west from the high-caste rural Rajputs and Bhumihar of Awadh and Bihar, a practice that continued for the next 75 years. However, in order to forestall any social friction, the Company also took action to adapt its military practices to the requirements of their religious rituals. Consequently, these soldiers dined in separate facilities; in addition, overseas

service, considered polluting to their caste, was not required of them, and the army soon came officially to recognise Hindu festivals. "This encouragement of high caste ritual status, however, left the government vulnerable to protest, even mutiny, whenever the sepoys detected infringement of their prerogatives." Stokes argues that "The British scrupulously avoided interference with the social structure of the village community which remained largely intact."

After the annexation of Oudh (Awadh) by the East India Company in 1856, many sepoys were disquieted both from losing their perquisites, as landed gentry, in the Oudh courts, and from the anticipation of any increased land-revenue payments that the annexation might bring about. Other historians have stressed that by 1857, some Indian soldiers, interpreting the presence of missionaries as a sign of official intent, were convinced that the Company was masterminding mass conversions of Hindus and Muslims to Christianity. Although earlier in the 1830s, evangelicals such as William Carey and William Wilberforce had successfully clamoured for the passage of social reform, such as the abolition of *sati* and allowing the remarriage of Hindu widows, there is little evidence that the sepoys' allegiance was affected by this.

However, changes in the terms of their professional service may have created resentment. As the extent of the East India Company's jurisdiction expanded with victories in wars or annexation, the soldiers were now expected not only to serve in less familiar regions, such as in Burma, but also to make do without the "foreign service" remuneration that had previously been their due.

A major cause of resentment that arose ten months prior to the outbreak of the rebellion was the General Service Enlistment Act of 25 July 1856. As noted above, men of the Bengal Army had been exempted from overseas service. Specifically, they were enlisted only for service in territories to which they could march. Governor-General Lord Dalhousie saw this as an anomaly, since all sepoys of the Madras and Bombay Armies and the six "General Service" battalions of the Bengal Army had accepted an obligation to serve overseas if required. As a result, the burden of providing contingents for active service in Burma, readily accessible only by sea, and China had fallen disproportionately on the two smaller Presidency

Armies. As signed into effect by Lord Canning, Dalhousie's successor as Governor-General, the act required only new recruits to the Bengal Army to accept a commitment for general service. However, serving high-caste sepoys were fearful that it would be eventually extended to them, as well as preventing sons following fathers into an army with a strong tradition of family service. There were also grievances over the issue of promotions, based on seniority. This, as well as the increasing number of British officers in the battalions, made promotion slow, and many Indian officers did not reach commissioned rank until they were too old to be effective.

The Enfield rifle

The final spark was provided by the ammunition for the new Enfield Pattern 1853 rifled musket. These rifles, which fired Minié balls, had a tighter fit than the earlier muskets, and used paper cartridges that came pre-greased. To load the rifle, sepoys had to bite the cartridge open to release the powder. The grease used on these cartridges was rumoured to include tallow derived from beef, which would be offensive to Hindus, and lard derived from pork, which would be offensive to Muslims. At least one Company official pointed out the difficulties this might cause: unless it be proven that the grease employed in these cartridges is not of a nature to offend or interfere with the prejudices of religion, it will be expedient not to issue them for test to Native corps. However, in August 1856, greased cartridge production was initiated at Fort William, Calcutta, following a British design. The grease used included tallow supplied by the Indian firm of Gangadarh Banerji & Co. By January, rumours abounded that the Enfield cartridges were greased with animal fat.

Company officers became aware of the rumours through reports of an altercation between a high-caste sepoy and a low-caste labourer at Dum Dum. The labourer had taunted the sepoy that by biting the cartridge, he had himself lost caste, although at this time such cartridges had been issued only at Meerut and not at Dum Dum. There had been rumours that the British sought to destroy the religions of the Indian people, and forcing the native soldiers to break their sacred code would have certainly added to this rumour, as it apparently did. The Company

was quick to reverse the effects of this policy in hopes that the unrest would be quelled.

On 27 January, Colonel Richard Birch, the Military Secretary, ordered that all cartridges issued from depots were to be free from grease, and that sepoys could grease them themselves using whatever mixture "they may prefer". A modification was also made to the drill for loading so that the cartridge was torn with the hands and not bitten. This, however, merely caused many sepoys to be convinced that the rumours were true and that their fears were justified. Additional rumours started that the paper in the new cartridges, which was glazed and stiffer than the previously used paper, was impregnated with grease. In February, a court of inquiry was held at Barrackpore to get to the bottom of these rumours. Native soldiers called as witnesses complained of the paper "being stiff and like cloth in the mode of tearing", said that when the paper was burned it smelled of grease, and announced that the suspicion that the paper itself contained grease could not be removed from their minds.

Civilian disquiet

Civilian rebellion was more multifarious. The rebels consisted of three groups: the feudal nobility, rural landlords called *taluqdars*, and the peasants. The nobility, many of whom had lost titles and domains under the Doctrine of Lapse, which refused to recognise the adopted children of princes as legal heirs, felt that the Company had interfered with a traditional system of inheritance. Rebel leaders such as Nana Sahib and the Rani of Jhansi belonged to this group; the latter, for example, was prepared to accept East India Company supremacy if her adopted son was recognised as her late husband's heir.[52] In other areas of central India, such as Indore and Saugar, where such loss of privilege had not occurred, the princes remained loyal to the Company, even in areas where the sepoys had rebelled. The second group, the *taluqdars*, had lost half their landed estates to peasant farmers as a result of the land reforms that came in the wake of annexation of Oudh. It is mentioned that throughout Oudh, Bihar Rajput Taluqdars provided the bulk of leadership and played an important role during 1857 in the region. As the rebellion gained ground, the *taluqdars* quickly reoccupied the lands they had

lost, and paradoxically, in part because of ties of kinship and feudal loyalty, did not experience significant opposition from the peasant farmers, many of whom joined the rebellion, to the great dismay of the British. It has also been suggested that heavy land-revenue assessment in some areas by the British resulted in many landowning families either losing their land or going into great debt to money lenders, and providing ultimately a reason to rebel; money lenders, in addition to the Company, were particular objects of the rebels' animosity. The civilian rebellion was also highly uneven in its geographic distribution, even in areas of north-central India that were no longer under British control. For example, the relatively prosperous Muzaffarnagar district, a beneficiary of a Company irrigation scheme, and next door to Meerut, where the upheaval began, stayed relatively calm throughout.

"Utilitarian and evangelical-inspired social reform", including the abolition of sati and the legalisation of widow remarriage were considered by many—especially the British themselves—to have caused suspicion that Indian religious traditions were being "interfered with", with the ultimate aim of conversion. Recent historians, including Chris Bayly, have preferred to frame this as a "clash of knowledges", with proclamations from religious authorities before the revolt and testimony after it including on such issues as the "insults to women", the rise of "low persons under British tutelage", the "pollution" caused by Western medicine and the persecuting and ignoring of traditional astrological authorities. British-run schools were also a problem: according to recorded testimonies, anger had spread because of stories that mathematics was replacing religious instruction, stories were chosen that would "bring contempt" upon Indian religions, and because girl children were exposed to "moral danger" by education.

The justice system was considered to be inherently unfair to the Indians. The official Blue Books, *East India (Torture) 1855–1857*, laid before the House of Commons during the sessions of 1856 and 1857, revealed that Company officers were allowed an extended series of appeals if convicted or accused of brutality or crimes against Indians. he economic policies of the East India Company were also resented by many Indians.

The Bengal Army

Each of the three "Presidencies" into which the East India Company divided India for administrative purposes maintained their own armies. Of these, the Army of the Bengal Presidency was the largest. Unlike the other two, it recruited heavily from among high-caste Hindus and comparatively wealthy Muslims. The Muslims formed a larger percentage of the 18 irregular cavalry units within the Bengal Army, whilst Hindus were mainly to be found in the 84 regular infantry and cavalry regiments. Thus 75% of the cavalry regiments was composed of Indian Muslims, while 80% of the infantry was composed of Hindus. The sepoys were therefore affected to a large degree by the concerns of the landholding and traditional members of Indian society. In the early years of Company rule, it tolerated and even encouraged the caste privileges and customs within the Bengal Army, which recruited its regular infantry soldiers almost exclusively amongst the landowning Rajputs and Brahmins of the Bihar and Awadh regions. These soldiers were known as Purbiyas. By the time these customs and privileges came to be threatened by modernising regimes in Calcutta from the 1840s onwards, the sepoys had become accustomed to very high ritual status and were extremely sensitive to suggestions that their caste might be polluted.

The sepoys also gradually became dissatisfied with various other aspects of army life. Their pay was relatively low and after Awadh and the Punjab were annexed, the soldiers no longer received extra pay (*batta* or *bhatta*) for service there, because they were no longer considered "foreign missions". The junior British officers became increasingly estranged from their soldiers, in many cases treating them as their racial inferiors. In 1856, a new Enlistment Act was introduced by the Company, which in theory made every unit in the Bengal Army liable to service overseas. Although it was intended to apply only to new recruits, the serving sepoys feared that the Act might be applied retroactively to them as well. A high-caste Hindu who travelled in the cramped conditions of a wooden troop ship could not cook his own food on his own fire, and accordingly risked losing caste through ritual pollution.

Onset of the rebellion

Several months of increasing tensions coupled with various incidents preceded the actual rebellion. On 26 February 1857 the 19th Bengal Native Infantry (BNI) regiment became concerned that new cartridges they had been issued were wrapped in paper greased with cow and pig fat, which had to be opened by mouth thus affecting their religious sensibilities. Their Colonel confronted them supported by artillery and cavalry on the parade ground, but after some negotiation withdrew the artillery, and cancelled the next morning's parade.

Mangal Pandey

On 29 March 1857 at the Barrackpore parade ground, near Calcutta, 29-year-old Mangal Pandey of the 34th BNI, angered by the recent actions of the East India Company, declared that he would rebel against his commanders. Informed about Pandey's behaviour Sergeant-Major James Hewson went to investigate, only to have Pandey shoot at him. Hewson raised the alarm. When his adjutant Lt. Henry Baugh came out to investigate the unrest, Pandey opened fire but hit Baugh's horse instead.

General John Hearsey came out to the parade ground to investigate, and claimed later that Mangal Pandey was in some kind of "religious frenzy". He ordered the Indian commander of the quarter guard Jemadar Ishwari Prasad to arrest Mangal Pandey, but the Jemadar refused. The quarter guard and other sepoys present, with the single exception of a soldier called Shaikh Paltu, drew back from restraining or arresting Mangal Pandey. Shaikh Paltu restrained Pandey from continuing his attack.

After failing to incite his comrades into an open and active rebellion, Mangal Pandey tried to take his own life, by placing his musket to his chest and pulling the trigger with his toe. He managed only to wound himself. He was court-martialled on 6 April, and hanged two days later.

The Jemadar Ishwari Prasad was sentenced to death and hanged on 21 April. The regiment was disbanded and stripped of its uniforms because it was felt that it harboured ill-feelings towards its superiors, particularly after this incident. Shaikh

Paltu was promoted to the rank of havildar in the Bengal Army, but was murdered shortly before the 34th BNI dispersed.

Sepoys in other regiments thought these punishments were harsh. The demonstration of disgrace during the formal disbanding helped foment the rebellion in view of some historians. Disgruntled ex-sepoys returned home to Awadh with a desire for revenge.

Unrest during April 1857

During April, there was unrest and fires at Agra, Allahabad and Ambala. At Ambala in particular, which was a large military cantonment where several units had been collected for their annual musketry practice, it was clear to General Anson, Commander-in-Chief of the Bengal Army, that some sort of rebellion over the cartridges was imminent. Despite the objections of the civilian Governor-General's staff, he agreed to postpone the musketry practice and allow a new drill by which the soldiers tore the cartridges with their fingers rather than their teeth. However, he issued no general orders making this standard practice throughout the Bengal Army and, rather than remain at Ambala to defuse or overawe potential trouble, he then proceeded to Simla, the cool hill station where many high officials spent the summer.

Although there was no open revolt at Ambala, there was widespread arson during late April. Barrack buildings (especially those belonging to soldiers who had used the Enfield cartridges) and British officers' bungalows were set on fire.

Meerut

At Meerut, a large military cantonment, 2,357 Indian sepoys and 2,038 British soldiers were stationed along with 12 British-manned guns. The station held one of the largest concentrations of British troops in India and this was later to be cited as evidence that the original rising was a spontaneous outbreak rather than a pre-planned plot.

Although the state of unrest within the Bengal Army was well known, on 24 April Lieutenant Colonel George Carmichael-Smyth, the unsympathetic commanding officer of the 3rd Bengal Light Cavalry, which was composed mainly

of Indian Muslims, ordered 90 of his men to parade and perform firing drills. All except five of the men on parade refused to accept their cartridges. On 9 May, the remaining 85 men were court martialled, and most were sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment with hard labour. Eleven comparatively young soldiers were given five years' imprisonment. The entire garrison was paraded and watched as the condemned men were stripped of their uniforms and placed in shackles. As they were marched off to jail, the condemned soldiers berated their comrades for failing to support them.

The next day was Sunday. Some Indian soldiers warned off-duty junior British officers that plans were afoot to release the imprisoned soldiers by force, but the senior officers to whom this was reported took no action. There was also unrest in the city of Meerut itself, with angry protests in the bazaar and some buildings being set on fire. In the evening, most British officers were preparing to attend church, while many of the British soldiers were off duty and had gone into canteens or into the bazaar in Meerut. The Indian troops, led by the 3rd Cavalry, broke into revolt. British junior officers who attempted to quell the first outbreaks were killed by the rebels. British officers' and civilians' quarters were attacked, and four civilian men, eight women and eight children were killed. Crowds in the bazaar attacked off-duty soldiers there. About 50 Indian civilians, some of them officers' servants who tried to defend or conceal their employers, were killed by the sepoys. While the action of the sepoys in freeing their 85 imprisoned comrades appears to have been spontaneous, some civilian rioting in the city was reportedly encouraged by kotwal (local police commander) Dhan Singh Gurjar.

Some sepoys (especially from the 11th Bengal Native Infantry) escorted trusted British officers and women and children to safety before joining the revolt. Some officers and their families escaped to Rampur, where they found refuge with the Nawab.

The British historian Philip Mason notes that it was inevitable that most of the sepoys and sowars from Meerut should have made for Delhi on the night of 10 May. It was a strong walled city located only forty miles away, it was the ancient capital and present seat of the nominal Mughal Emperor and finally there were no

British troops in garrison there in contrast to Meerut. No effort was made to pursue them.

Delhi

Early on 11 May, the first parties of the 3rd Cavalry reached Delhi. From beneath the windows of the King's apartments in the palace, they called on Bahadur Shah to acknowledge and lead them. He did nothing at this point, apparently treating the sepoys as ordinary petitioners, but others in the palace were quick to join the revolt. During the day, the revolt spread. British officials and dependents, Indian Christians and shop keepers within the city were killed, some by sepoys and others by crowds of rioters.

There were three battalion-sized regiments of Bengal Native Infantry stationed in or near the city. Some detachments quickly joined the rebellion, while others held back but also refused to obey orders to take action against the rebels. In the afternoon, a violent explosion in the city was heard for several miles. Fearing that the arsenal, which contained large stocks of arms and ammunition, would fall intact into rebel hands, the nine British Ordnance officers there had opened fire on the sepoys, including the men of their own guard. When resistance appeared hopeless, they blew up the arsenal. Six of the nine officers survived, but the blast killed many in the streets and nearby houses and other buildings. The news of these events finally tipped the sepoys stationed around Delhi into open rebellion. The sepoys were later able to salvage at least some arms from the arsenal, and a magazine two miles (3 km) outside Delhi, containing up to 3,000 barrels of gunpowder, was captured without resistance.

Many fugitive British officers and civilians had congregated at the Flagstaff Tower on the ridge north of Delhi, where telegraph operators were sending news of the events to other British stations. When it became clear that the help expected from Meerut was not coming, they made their way in carriages to Karnal. Those who became separated from the main body or who could not reach the Flagstaff Tower also set out for Karnal on foot. Some were helped by villagers on the way; others were killed.

The next day, Bahadur Shah held his first formal court for many years. It was attended by many excited sepoys. The King was alarmed by the turn events had taken, but eventually accepted the sepoys' allegiance and agreed to give his countenance to the rebellion. On 16 May, up to 50 British who had been held prisoner in the palace or had been discovered hiding in the city were killed by some of the King's servants under a peepul tree in a courtyard outside the palace.

The news of the events at Meerut and Delhi spread rapidly, provoking uprisings among sepoys and disturbances in many districts. In many cases, it was the behaviour of British military and civilian authorities themselves which precipitated disorder. Learning of the fall of Delhi, many Company administrators hastened to remove themselves, their families and servants to places of safety. At Agra, 160 miles (260 km) from Delhi, no fewer than 6,000 assorted non-combatants converged on the Fort.

The military authorities also reacted in disjointed manner. Some officers trusted their sepoys, but others tried to disarm them to forestall potential uprisings. At Benares and Allahabad, the disarmings were bungled, also leading to local revolts.

In 1857, the Bengal Army had 86,000 men, of which 12,000 were British, 16,000 Sikh and 1,500 Gurkha. There were 311,000 native soldiers in India altogether, 40,160 British soldiers (including units of the British Army) and 5,362 officers. Fifty-four of the Bengal Army's 74 regular Native Infantry Regiments mutinied, but some were immediately destroyed or broke up, with their sepoys drifting away to their homes. A number of the remaining 20 regiments were disarmed or disbanded to prevent or forestall mutiny. Only twelve of the original Bengal Native Infantry regiments survived to pass into the new Indian Army. All ten of the Bengal Light Cavalry regiments mutinied.

The Bengal Army also contained 29 irregular cavalry and 42 irregular infantry regiments. Of these, a substantial contingent from the recently annexed state of Awadh mutinied *en masse*. Another large contingent from Gwalior also mutinied, even though that state's ruler (Jayajirao Scindia) supported the British. The remainder of the irregular units were raised from a wide variety of sources and

were less affected by the concerns of mainstream Indian society. Some irregular units actively supported the Company: three Gurkha and five of six Sikh infantry units, and the six infantry and six cavalry units of the recently raised Punjab Irregular Force.

On 1 April 1858, the number of Indian soldiers in the Bengal army loyal to the Company was 80,053. However large numbers were hastily raised in the Punjab and North-West Frontier after the outbreak of the Rebellion. The Bombay army had three mutinies in its 29 regiments, whilst the Madras army had none at all, although elements of one of its 52 regiments refused to volunteer for service in Bengal.[91] Nonetheless, most of southern India remained passive, with only intermittent outbreaks of violence. Many parts of the region were ruled by the Nizams or the Mysore royalty, and were thus not directly under British rule.

Although most of the mutinous sepoys in Delhi were Hindus, a significant proportion of the insurgents were Muslims. The proportion of *ghazis* grew to be about a quarter of the local fighting force by the end of the siege and included a regiment of suicide *ghazis* from Gwalior who had vowed never to eat again and to fight until they met certain death at the hands of British troops. However, most Muslims did not share the rebels' dislike of the British administration and their ulema could not agree on whether to declare a jihad. Some Islamic scholars such as Maulana Muhammad Qasim Nanautavi and Maulana Rashid Ahmad Gangohi took up arms against the colonial rule, but many Muslims, among them ulema from both the Sunni and Shia sects, sided with the British. Various Ahl-i-Hadith scholars and colleagues of Nanautavi rejected the jihad. The most influential member of Ahl-i-Hadith ulema in Delhi, Maulana Sayyid Nazir Husain Dehlvi, resisted pressure from the mutineers to call for a jihad and instead declared in favour of British rule, viewing the Muslim-British relationship as a legal contract which could not be broken unless their religious rights were breached.

The Sikhs and Pathans of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province supported the British and helped in the recapture of Delhi. The Sikhs in particular feared reinstatement of Mughal rule in northern India because they had been persecuted by the Mughal dynasty. They also felt disdain towards

the *Purbiyas* or 'Easterners' (Biharis and those from the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh) in the Bengal Army. The Sikhs felt that the bloodiest battles of the First and Second Anglo-Sikh wars (Chillianwala and Ferozeshah), had been won by British troops, while the Hindustani sepoys had refused to meet the Sikhs in battle. These feelings were compounded when Hindustani sepoys were assigned a very visible role as garrison troops in Punjab and awarded profit-making civil posts in the Punjab. The varied groups in the support and opposing of the uprising is seen as a major cause of its failure.

The revolt

A wood-engraving of Nynee Tal (today Nainital) and accompanying story in the *Illustrated London News*, 15 August 1857, describing how the resort town in the Himalayas served as a refuge for British families escaping from the rebellion of 1857 in Delhi and Meerut.

Bahadur Shah Zafar was proclaimed the Emperor of the whole of India. Most contemporary and modern accounts suggest that he was coerced by the sepoys and his courtiers to sign the proclamation against his will. In spite of the significant loss of power that the Mughal dynasty had suffered in the preceding centuries, their name still carried great prestige across northern India. Civilians, nobility and other dignitaries took an oath of allegiance. The emperor issued coins in his name, one of the oldest ways of asserting imperial status. The adhesion of the Mughal emperor, however, turned the Sikhs of the Punjab away from the rebellion, as they did not want to return to Islamic rule, having fought many wars against the Mughal rulers. The province of Bengal was largely quiet throughout the entire period. The British, who had long ceased to take the authority of the Mughal Emperor seriously, were astonished at how the ordinary people responded to Zafar's call for war.

Initially, the Indian rebels were able to push back Company forces, and captured several important towns in Haryana, Bihar, the Central Provinces and the United Provinces. When British troops were reinforced and began to counterattack, the mutineers were especially handicapped by their lack of centralized command and control. Although the rebels produced some natural

leaders such as Bakht Khan, whom the Emperor later nominated as commander-in-chief after his son Mirza Mughal proved ineffectual, for the most part they were forced to look for leadership to rajahs and princes. Some of these were to prove dedicated leaders, but others were self-interested or inept.

In the countryside around Meerut, a general Gurjar uprising posed the largest threat to the British. In Parikshitgarh near Meerut, Gurjars declared Choudhari Kadam Singh (Kuddum Singh) their leader, and expelled Company police. Kadam Singh Gurjar led a large force, estimates varying from 2,000 to 10,000. Bulandshahr and Bijnor also came under the control of Gurjars under Walidad Khan and Maho Singh respectively. Contemporary sources report that nearly all the Gurjar villages between Meerut and Delhi participated in the revolt, in some cases with support from Jullundur, and it was not until late July that, with the help of local Jats, and the princely states, the British managed to regain control of the area.

Mufti Nizamuddin, a renowned scholar of Lahore, issued a Fatwa against the British forces and called upon the local population to support the forces of Rao Tula Ram. Casualties were high at the subsequent engagement at Narnaul (Nasibpur). After the defeat of Rao Tula Ram on 16 November 1857, Mufti Nizamuddin was arrested, and his brother Mufti Yaqinuddin and brother-in-law Abdur Rahman (alias Nabi Baksh) were arrested in Tijara. They were taken to Delhi and hanged.

Siege of Delhi

The British were slow to strike back at first. It took time for troops stationed in Britain to make their way to India by sea, although some regiments moved overland through Persia from the Crimean War, and some regiments already *en route* for China were diverted to India.

It took time to organise the British troops already in India into field forces, but eventually two columns left Meerut and Simla. They proceeded slowly towards Delhi and fought, killed, and hanged numerous Indians along the way. Two months after the first outbreak of rebellion at Meerut, the two forces met near Karnal. The combined force, including two Gurkha units serving in the Bengal Army under

contract from the Kingdom of Nepal, fought the rebels' main army at Badli-ke-Serai and drove them back to Delhi.

The Company's army established a base on the Delhi ridge to the north of the city and the Siege of Delhi began. The siege lasted roughly from 1 July to 21 September. However, the encirclement was hardly complete, and for much of the siege the besiegers were outnumbered and it often seemed that it was the Company forces and not Delhi that were under siege, as the rebels could easily receive resources and reinforcements. For several weeks, it seemed likely that disease, exhaustion and continuous sorties by rebels from Delhi would force the besiegers to withdraw, but the outbreaks of rebellion in the Punjab were forestalled or suppressed, allowing the Punjab Movable Column of British, Sikh and Pakhtun soldiers under John Nicholson to reinforce the besiegers on the Ridge on 14 August. On 30 August the rebels offered terms, which were refused.

An eagerly awaited heavy siege train joined the besieging force, and from 7 September, the siege guns battered breaches in the walls and silenced the rebels' artillery. An attempt to storm the city through the breaches and the Kashmiri Gate was launched on 14 September. The attackers gained a foothold within the city but suffered heavy casualties, including John Nicholson. Major General Archdale Wilson, the British commander, wished to withdraw, but was persuaded to hold on by his junior officers. After a week of street fighting, the British reached the Red Fort. Bahadur Shah Zafar had already fled to Humayun's tomb. The British had retaken the city.

The troops of the besieging force proceeded to loot and pillage the city. A large number of citizens were killed in retaliation for the British and Indian civilians that had been slaughtered by the rebels. During the street fighting, artillery was set up in the city's main mosque. Neighbourhoods within range were bombarded; the homes of the Muslim nobility that housed innumerable cultural, artistic, literary and monetary riches were destroyed.

The British soon arrested Bahadur Shah Zafar, and the next day the British agent William Hodson had his sons Mirza Mughal and Mirza Khizr Sultan and grandson Mirza Abu Bakr shot under his own authority at the Khooni

Darwaza (the bloody gate) near Delhi Gate. On hearing the news, Zafar reacted with shocked silence, while his wife Zinat Mahal was content, as she believed her son was now Zafar's heir.[110] Shortly after the fall of Delhi, the victorious attackers organised a column that relieved another besieged Company force in Agra, and then pressed on to Cawnpore, which had also recently been retaken. This gave the Company forces a continuous, although still tenuous, line of communication from the east to the west of India.

Cawnpore (Kanpur)

In June, sepoys under General Wheeler in Cawnpore (now Kanpur) rebelled and besieged the British entrenchment. Wheeler was not only a veteran and respected soldier but also married to an Indian woman. He had relied on his own prestige and his cordial relations with Nana Sahib to thwart rebellion, and took comparatively few measures to prepare fortifications and lay in supplies and ammunition.

The besieged endured three weeks of the Siege of Cawnpore with little water or food, suffering continuous casualties to men, women and children. On 25 June Nana Sahib made an offer of safe passage to Allahabad. With barely three days' food rations remaining, the British agreed, provided they could keep their small arms and that the evacuation should take place in daylight on the morning of the 27th (the Nana Sahib wanted the evacuation to take place on the night of the 26th). Early in the morning of 27 June, the British party left their entrenchment and made their way to the river where boats provided by the Nana Sahib were waiting to take them to Allahabad. Several sepoys who had stayed loyal to the Company were removed by the mutineers and killed, either because of their loyalty or because "they had become Christian". A few injured British officers trailing the column were also apparently hacked to death by angry sepoys. After the British party had largely arrived at the dock, which was surrounded by sepoys positioned on both banks of the Ganges, with clear lines of fire, firing broke out and the boats were abandoned by their crew, and caught or were set on fire using pieces of red-hot charcoal. The British party tried to push the boats off but all except three remained stuck. One boat with over a dozen wounded men initially escaped, but later

grounded, was caught by mutineers and pushed back down the river towards the carnage at Cawnpore. Towards the end, rebel cavalry rode into the water to finish off any survivors. After the firing ceased the survivors were rounded up and the men shot. By the time the massacre was over, most of the male members of the party were dead while the surviving women and children were removed and held hostage to be later killed in the Bibighar massacre. Only four men eventually escaped alive from Cawnpore on one of the boats: two private soldiers, a lieutenant, and Captain Mowbray Thomson, who wrote a first-hand account of his experiences entitled *The Story of Cawnpore* (London, 1859).

During his trial, Tatya Tope denied the existence of any such plan and described the incident in the following terms: the British had already boarded the boats and Tatya Tope raised his right hand to signal their departure. That very moment someone from the crowd blew a loud bugle, which created disorder and in the ongoing bewilderment, the boatmen jumped off the boats. The rebels started shooting indiscriminately. Nana Sahib, who was staying in Savada Kothi (Bungalow) nearby, was informed about what was happening and immediately came to stop it. Some British histories allow that it might well have been the result of accident or error; someone accidentally or maliciously fired a shot, the panic-stricken British opened fire, and it became impossible to stop the massacre.

The surviving women and children were taken to Nana Sahib and then confined first to the Savada Kothi and then to the home of the local magistrate's clerk (the Bibighar) where they were joined by refugees from Fatehgarh. Overall five men and 206 women and children were confined in the Bibigarh for about two weeks. In one week 25 were brought out, dead from dysentery and cholera. Meanwhile, a Company relief force that had advanced from Allahabad defeated the Indians and by 15 July it was clear that Nana Sahib would not be able to hold Cawnpore and a decision was made by Nana Sahib and other leading rebels that the hostages must be killed. After the sepoys refused to carry out this order, two Muslim butchers, two Hindu peasants and one of Nana's bodyguards went into the Bibigarh. Armed with knives and hatchets, they murdered the women and children. After the massacre, the walls were covered in bloody hand prints, and the

floor littered with parts of human limbs. The dead and the dying were thrown down a nearby well. When the 50-foot (15 m) deep well was filled with remains to within 6 feet (1.8 m) of the top, the remainder were thrown into the Ganges.

Lucknow

Very soon after the events at Meerut, rebellion erupted in the state of Awadh (also known as Oudh, in modern-day Uttar Pradesh), which had been annexed barely a year before. The British Commissioner resident at Lucknow, Sir Henry Lawrence, had enough time to fortify his position inside the Residency compound. The defenders, including loyal sepoys, numbered some 1700 men. The rebels' assaults were unsuccessful, so they began a barrage of artillery and musket fire into the compound. Lawrence was one of the first casualties. He was succeeded by John Eardley Inglis. The rebels tried to breach the walls with explosives and bypass them via tunnels that led to underground close combat. After 90 days of siege, the defenders were reduced to 300 loyal sepoys, 350 British soldiers and 550 non-combatants.

On 25 September, a relief column under the command of Sir Henry Havelock and accompanied by Sir James Outram (who in theory was his superior) fought its way from Cawnpore to Lucknow in a brief campaign, in which the numerically small column defeated rebel forces in a series of increasingly large battles. This became known as 'The First Relief of Lucknow', as this force was not strong enough to break the siege or extricate themselves, and so was forced to join the garrison. In October, another larger army under the new Commander-in-Chief, Sir Colin Campbell, was finally able to relieve the garrison and on 18 November, they evacuated the defended enclave within the city, the women and children leaving first. They then conducted an orderly withdrawal, firstly to Alambagh 4 miles (6.4 km) north where a force of 4,000 were left to construct a fort, then to Cawnpore, where they defeated an attempt by Tantia Tope to recapture the city in the Second Battle of Cawnpore.

In March 1858, Campbell once again advanced on Lucknow with a large army, meeting up with the force at Alambagh, this time seeking to suppress the rebellion in Awadh. He was aided by a large Nepalese contingent advancing from

the north under Jung Bahadur Kunwar Rana. General Dhir Shamsher Kunwar Rana, the youngest brother of Jung Bahadur, also led the Nepalese forces in various parts of India including Lucknow, Benares and Patna. Campbell's advance was slow and methodical, with a force under General Outram crossing the river on cask bridges on 4 March to enable them to fire artillery in flank. Campbell drove the large but disorganised rebel army from Lucknow with the final fighting taking place on 21 March. There were few casualties to Campbell's own troops, but his cautious movements allowed large numbers of the rebels to disperse into Awadh. Campbell was forced to spend the summer and autumn dealing with scattered pockets of resistance while losing men to heat, disease and guerrilla actions.

Jhansi

Jhansi State was a Maratha-ruled princely state in Bundelkhand. When the Raja of Jhansi died without a biological male heir in 1853, it was annexed to the British Raj by the Governor-General of India under the doctrine of lapse. His widow Rani Lakshmi Bai, the Rani of Jhansi, protested against the denial of rights of their adopted son. When war broke out, Jhansi quickly became a centre of the rebellion. A small group of Company officials and their families took refuge in Jhansi Fort, and the Rani negotiated their evacuation. However, when they left the fort they were massacred by the rebels over whom the Rani had no control; the British suspected the Rani of complicity, despite her repeated denials.

By the end of June 1857, the Company had lost control of much of Bundelkhand and eastern Rajasthan. The Bengal Army units in the area, having rebelled, marched to take part in the battles for Delhi and Cawnpore. The many princely states that made up this area began warring amongst themselves. In September and October 1857, the Rani led the successful defence of Jhansi against the invading armies of the neighbouring rajas of Datia and Orchha.

On 3 February, Sir Hugh Rose broke the 3-month siege of Saugor. Thousands of local villagers welcomed him as a liberator, freeing them from rebel occupation. In March 1858, the Central India Field Force, led by Sir Hugh Rose, advanced on and laid siege to Jhansi. The Company forces captured the city, but the Rani fled in disguise.

After being driven from Jhansi and Kalpi, on 1 June 1858 Rani Lakshmi Bai and a group of Maratha rebels captured the fortress city of Gwalior from the Scindia rulers, who were British allies. This might have reinvigorated the rebellion but the Central India Field Force very quickly advanced against the city. The Rani died on 17 June, the second day of the Battle of Gwalior, probably killed by a carbine shot from the 8th King's Royal Irish Hussars according to the account of three independent Indian representatives. The Company forces recaptured Gwalior within the next three days. In descriptions of the scene of her last battle, she was compared to Joan of Arc by some commentators.

Indore

Colonel Henry Marion Durand, the then-Company resident at Indore, had brushed away any possibility of uprising in Indore.[130] However, on 1 July, sepoys in Holkar's army revolted and opened fire on the cavalry pickets of the Bhopal Contingent (a locally raised force with British officers). When Colonel Travers rode forward to charge, the Bhopal Cavalry refused to follow. The Bhopal Infantry also refused orders and instead levelled their guns at British sergeants and officers. Since all possibility of mounting an effective deterrent was lost, Durand decided to gather up all the British residents and escape, although 39 British residents of Indore were killed.

Bihar

The rebellion in Bihar was mainly concentrated in the Western regions of the state; however, there were also some outbreaks of plundering and looting in Gaya district. One of the central figures was Kunwar Singh, the 80-year-old Rajput Zamindar of Jagdispur, whose estate was in the process of being sequestrated by the Revenue Board, instigated and assumed the leadership of revolt in Bihar. His efforts were supported by his brother Babu Amar Singh and his commander-in-chief Hare Krishna Singh.

On 25 July, mutiny erupted in the garrisons of Danapur. Mutinying sepoys from the 7th, 8th and 40th regiments of Bengal Native Infantry quickly moved towards the city of Arrah and were joined by Kunwar Singh and his men. Mr. Boyle, a British railway engineer in Arrah, had already prepared an outbuilding on

his property for defence against such attacks. As the rebels approached Arrah, all British residents took refuge at Mr. Boyle's house. A siege soon ensued – eighteen civilians and 50 loyal sepoys from the Bengal Military Police Battalion under the command of Herwald Wake, the local magistrate, defended the house against artillery and musketry fire from an estimated 2000 to 3000 mutineers and rebels.

On 29 July 400 men were sent out from Danapur to relieve Arrah, but this force was ambushed by the rebels around a mile away from the siege house, severely defeated, and driven back. On 30 July, Major Vincent Eyre, who was going up the river with his troops and guns, reached Buxar and heard about the siege. He immediately disembarked his guns and troops (the 5th Fusiliers) and started marching towards Arrah, disregarding direct orders not to do so. On 2 August, some 6 miles (9.7 km) short of Arrah, the Major was ambushed by the mutineers and rebels. After an intense fight, the 5th Fusiliers charged and stormed the rebel positions successfully. On 3 August, Major Eyre and his men reached the siege house and successfully ended the siege.

After receiving reinforcements, Major Eyre pursued Kunwar Singh to his palace in Jagdispur; however, Singh had left by the time Eyre's forces arrived. Eyre then proceeded to destroy the palace and the homes of Singh's brothers. In addition to Kunwar Singh's efforts, there were also rebellions carried out by Hussain Baksh Khan, Ghulam Ali Khan and Fateh Singh among others in Gaya, Nawada and Jehanabad districts.

In Lohardaga district of South Bihar (now in Jharkhand), a major rebellion was led by Thakur Vishwanath Shahdeo who was part of the Nagavanshi dynasty. He was motivated by disputes he had with the Christian Kol tribals who had been grabbing his land and were implicitly supported by the British authorities. The rebels in South Bihar asked him to lead them and he readily accepted this offer. He organised a *Mukti Vahini* (people's army) with the assistance of nearby zamindars including Pandey Ganpat Rai and Nadir Ali Khan.

Punjab

Punjab was a very large administrative division, centred on Lahore. It included not only the present-day Indian and Pakistani Punjabi regions but also the North West Frontier districts bordering Afghanistan.

Much of the region had been the Sikh Empire, ruled by Ranjit Singh until his death in 1839. The kingdom had then fallen into disorder, with court factions and the Khalsa (the Sikh army) contending for power at the Lahore Durbar (court). After two Anglo-Sikh Wars, the entire region was annexed by the East India Company in 1849. In 1857, the region still contained the highest numbers of both British and Indian troops.

The inhabitants of the Punjab were not as sympathetic to the sepoys as they were elsewhere in India, which limited many of the outbreaks in the Punjab to disjointed uprisings by regiments of sepoys isolated from each other. In some garrisons, notably Ferozepore, indecision on the part of the senior British officers allowed the sepoys to rebel, but the sepoys then left the area, mostly heading for Delhi. At the most important garrison, that of Peshawar close to the Afghan frontier, many comparatively junior officers ignored their nominal commander, General Reed, and took decisive action. They intercepted the sepoys' mail, thus preventing their coordinating an uprising, and formed a force known as the "Punjab Movable Column" to move rapidly to suppress any revolts as they occurred. When it became clear from the intercepted correspondence that some of the sepoys at Peshawar were on the point of open revolt, the four most disaffected Bengal Native regiments were disarmed by the two British infantry regiments in the cantonment, backed by artillery, on 22 May. This decisive act induced many local chieftains to side with the British.

Jhelum in Punjab saw a mutiny of native troops against the British. Here 35 British soldiers of Her Majesty's 24th Regiment of Foot (South Wales Borderers) were killed by mutineers on 7 July 1857. Among the dead was Captain Francis Spring, the eldest son of Colonel William Spring. To commemorate this event St. John's Church Jhelum was built and the names of those 35 British soldiers are carved on a marble lectern present in that church.

The final large-scale military uprising in the Punjab took place on 9 July, when most of a brigade of sepoys at Sialkot rebelled and began to move to Delhi. They were intercepted by John Nicholson with an equal British force as they tried to cross the Ravi River. After fighting steadily but unsuccessfully for several hours, the sepoys tried to fall back across the river but became trapped on an island. Three days later, Nicholson annihilated the 1,100 trapped sepoys in the Battle of Trimmu Ghat.

The British had been recruiting irregular units from Sikh and Pakhtun communities even before the first unrest among the Bengal units, and the numbers of these were greatly increased during the Rebellion, 34,000 fresh levies eventually being raised. At one stage, faced with the need to send troops to reinforce the besiegers of Delhi, the Commissioner of the Punjab (Sir John Lawrence) suggested handing the coveted prize of Peshawar to Dost Mohammed Khan of Afghanistan in return for a pledge of friendship. The British Agents in Peshawar and the adjacent districts were horrified. Referring to the massacre of a retreating British army in 1842, Herbert Edwardes wrote, "Dost Mahomed would not be a mortal Afghan ... if he did not assume our day to be gone in India and follow after us as an enemy. British cannot retreat – Kabul would come again." In the event Lord Canning insisted on Peshawar being held, and Dost Mohammed, whose relations with Britain had been equivocal for over 20 years, remained neutral.

In September 1858 Rai Ahmad Khan Kharal, head of the Khurrul tribe, led an insurrection in the Neeli Bar district, between the Sutlej, Ravi and Chenab rivers. The rebels held the jungles of Gogaira and had some initial successes against the British forces in the area, besieging Major Crawford Chamberlain at Chichawatni. A squadron of Punjabi cavalry sent by Sir John Lawrence raised the siege. Ahmed Khan was killed but the insurgents found a new leader in Mahr Bahawal Fatyana, who maintained the uprising for three months until Government forces penetrated the jungle and scattered the rebel tribesmen.

Bengal and Tripura

In September 1857, sepoys took control of the treasury in Chittagong. The treasury remained under rebel control for several days. Further mutinies on 18 November saw the 2nd, 3rd and 4th companies of the 34th Bengal Infantry Regiment storming the Chittagong Jail and releasing all prisoners. The mutineers were eventually suppressed by the Gurkha regiments. The mutiny also spread to Kolkata and later Dhaka, the former Mughal capital of Bengal. Residents in the city's Lalbagh area were kept awake at night by the rebellion. Sepoys joined hands with the common populace in Jalpaiguri to take control of the city's cantonment. In January 1858, many sepoys received shelter from the royal family of the princely state of Hill Tippera. The interior areas of Bengal proper were already experiencing growing resistance to Company rule due to the Muslim Faraizi movement.

Gujarat

In central and north Gujarat, the rebellion was sustained by land owner Jagirdars, Talukdars and Thakors with the support of armed communities of Bhil, Koli, Pathans and Arabs, unlike the mutiny by sepoys in north India. Their main opposition of British was due to Inam commission. The Bet Dwarka island, along with Okhamandal region of Kathiawar peninsula which was under Gaekwad of Baroda State, saw a revolt by the Waghers in January 1858 who, by July 1859, controlled that region. In October 1859, a joint offensive by British, Gaekwad and other princely states troops ousted the rebels and recaptured the region.

Orissa

During the rebellion, Surendra Sai was one of the many people broken out of Hazaribagh jail by mutineers. In the middle of September Surendra established himself in Sambalpur's old fort. He quickly organised a meeting with the Assistant Commissioner (Captain Leigh), and Leigh agreed to ask the government to cancel his and his brother's imprisonment while Surendra dispersed his followers. This agreement was soon broken, however, when on 31 September escaped the town and make for Khinda, where his brother was located with a 1,400 man

force.[153] The British quickly moved to send two companies from the 40th Madras Native Infantry from Cuttack on 10 October, and after a forced march reached Khinda on 5 November, only to find the place abandoned as the rebels retreated to the jungle. Much of the country of Sambalpur was under the rebels' control, and they maintained a hit and run guerrilla war for quite some time. In December the British made further preparations to crush the uprising in Sambalpur, and it was temporarily transferred from the Chota Nagpur Division into the Orissa Division of the Bengal Presidency. On the 30th a major battle was fought in which Surendra's brother was killed and the mutineers were routed. In January the British achieved minor successes, capturing a few major villages like Kolabira, and in February calm began to be restored. However, Surendra still held out, and the jungle hampered British parties from capturing him. Additionally, any native daring to collaborate with the British were terrorized along with their family. After a new policy that promised amnesty for mutineers, Surendra surrendered in May 1862.

British Empire

The authorities in British colonies with an Indian population, sepoy or civilian, took measures to secure themselves against copycat uprisings. In the Straits Settlements and Trinidad the annual Hosay processions were banned, riots broke out in penal settlements in Burma and the Settlements, in Penang the loss of a musket provoked a near riot, and security was boosted especially in locations with an Indian convict population.

Results of the war

Both sides committed atrocities against civilians. In Oudh alone, some estimates put the toll at 150,000 Indians killed during the war, with 100,000 of them being civilians. The capture of Delhi, Allahabad, Kanpur and Lucknow by British forces were followed by general massacres. Another notable atrocity was carried out by General Neill who massacred thousands of Indian mutineers and Indian civilians suspected of supporting the rebellion. The rebels' murder of British women, children and wounded soldiers (including sepoys who sided with the British) at Cawnpore, and the subsequent printing of the events in the British papers, left many British soldiers outraged and seeking revenge. Aside from

hanging mutineers, the British had some "blown from cannon", (an old Mughal punishment adopted many years before in India), in which sentenced rebels were tied over the mouths of cannons and blown to pieces when the cannons were fired. A particular act of cruelty on behalf of the British troops at Cawnpore included forcing many Muslim or Hindu rebels to eat pork or beef, as well as licking buildings freshly stained with blood of the dead before subsequent public hangings.

Most of the British press, outraged by the stories of alleged rape committed by the rebels against British women, as well as the killings of British civilians and wounded British soldiers, did not advocate clemency of any kind towards the Indian population. Governor General Canning ordered moderation in dealing with native sensibilities and earned the scornful sobriquet "Clemency Canning" from the press and later parts of the British public. In terms of sheer numbers, the casualties were much higher on the Indian side. A letter published after the fall of Delhi in the *Bombay Telegraph* and reproduced in the British press testified to the scale of the Indian casualties:

All the city's people found within the walls of the city of Delhi when our troops entered were bayoneted on the spot, and the number was considerable, as you may suppose, when I tell you that in some houses forty and fifty people were hiding. These were not mutineers but residents of the city, who trusted to our well-known mild rule for pardon. I am glad to say they were disappointed. From the end of 1857, the British had begun to gain ground again. Lucknow was retaken in March 1858. On 8 July 1858, a peace treaty was signed and the rebellion ended. The last rebels were defeated in Gwalior on 20 June 1858. By 1859, rebel leaders Bakht Khan and Nana Sahib had either been slain or had fled.

Edward Vibart, a 19-year-old officer whose parents, younger brothers, and two of his sisters had died in the Cawnpore massacre, recorded his experience:

The orders went out to shoot every soul.... It was literally murder... I have seen many bloody and awful sights lately but such a one as I witnessed yesterday I pray I never see again. The women were all spared but their screams on seeing

their husbands and sons butchered, were most painful... Heaven knows I feel no pity, but when some old grey bearded man is brought and shot before your very eyes, hard must be that man's heart I think who can look on with indifference ... Some British troops adopted a policy of "no prisoners". One officer, Thomas Lowe, remembered how on one occasion his unit had taken 76 prisoners – they were just too tired to carry on killing and needed a rest, he recalled. Later, after a quick trial, the prisoners were lined up with a British soldier standing a couple of yards in front of them. On the order "fire", they were all simultaneously shot, "swept... from their earthly existence".

The aftermath of the rebellion has been the focus of new work using Indian sources and population studies. In *The Last Mughal*, historian William Dalrymple examines the effects on the Muslim population of Delhi after the city was retaken by the British and finds that intellectual and economic control of the city shifted from Muslim to Hindu hands because the British, at that time, saw an Islamic hand behind the mutiny. Approximately 6,000 of the 40,000 British living in India were killed.

Reaction in Britain

The scale of the punishments handed out by the British "Army of Retribution" was considered largely appropriate and justified in a Britain shocked by embellished reports of atrocities carried out against British troops and civilians by the rebels. Accounts of the time frequently reach the "hyperbolic register", according to Christopher Herbert, especially in the often-repeated claim that the "Red Year" of 1857 marked "a terrible break" in British experience. Such was the atmosphere – a national "mood of retribution and despair" that led to "almost universal approval" of the measures taken to pacify the revolt.

Incidents of rape allegedly committed by Indian rebels against British women and girls appalled the British public. These atrocities were often used to justify the British reaction to the rebellion. British newspapers printed various eyewitness accounts of the rape of English women and girls. One such account was published by *The Times*, regarding an incident where 48 English girls as young as 10 had been raped by Indian rebels in Delhi. Karl Marx criticized this story as false

propaganda, and pointed out that the story was written by a clergyman in Bangalore, far from the events of the rebellion, with no evidence to support his allegation. Individual incidents captured the public's interest and were heavily reported by the press. One such incident was that of General Wheeler's daughter Margaret being forced to live as her captor's concubine, though this was reported to the Victorian public as Margaret killing her rapist then herself.[178] Another version of the story suggested that Margaret had been killed after her abductor had argued with his wife over her.

During the aftermath of the rebellion, a series of exhaustive investigations were carried out by British police and intelligence officials into reports that British women prisoners had been "dishonoured" at the Bibighar and elsewhere. One such detailed enquiry was at the direction of Lord Canning. The consensus was that there was no convincing evidence of such crimes having been committed, although numbers of British women and children had been killed outright. The term 'Sepoy' or 'Sepoyism' became a derogatory term for nationalists, especially in Ireland.

Bahadur Shah Zafar (the last Mughal emperor) in Delhi, awaiting trial by the British for his role in the Uprising. Photograph by Robert Tytler and Charles Shepherd, May 1858

The proclamation to the "Princes, Chiefs, and People of India", issued by Queen Victoria on 1 November 1858. "We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligation of duty which bind us to all our other subjects." (p. 2)

Bahadur Shah was arrested at Humanyun's tomb and tried for treason by a military commission assembled at Delhi, and exiled to Rangoon where he died in 1862, bringing the Mughal dynasty to an end. In 1877 Queen Victoria took the title of Empress of India on the advice of Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli.

The rebellion saw the end of the East India Company's rule in India. In August, by the Government of India Act 1858, the company was formally dissolved and its ruling powers over India were transferred to the British Crown. A new British government department, the India Office, was created to handle the

governance of India, and its head, the Secretary of State for India, was entrusted with formulating Indian policy. The Governor-General of India gained a new title, Viceroy of India, and implemented the policies devised by the India Office. Some former East India Company territories, such as the Straits Settlements, became colonies in their own right. The British colonial administration embarked on a program of reform, trying to integrate Indian higher castes and rulers into the government and abolishing attempts at Westernization. The Viceroy stopped land grabs, decreed religious tolerance and admitted Indians into civil service, albeit mainly as subordinates.

Essentially the old East India Company bureaucracy remained, though there was a major shift in attitudes. In looking for the causes of the Rebellion the authorities alighted on two things: religion and the economy. On religion it was felt that there had been too much interference with indigenous traditions, both Hindu and Muslim. On the economy it was now believed that the previous attempts by the Company to introduce free market competition had undermined traditional power structures and bonds of loyalty placing the peasantry at the mercy of merchants and money-lenders. In consequence the new British Raj was constructed in part around a conservative agenda, based on a preservation of tradition and hierarchy.

On a political level it was also felt that the previous lack of consultation between rulers and ruled had been another significant factor in contributing to the uprising. In consequence, Indians were drawn into government at a local level. Though this was on a limited scale a crucial precedent had been set, with the creation of a new 'white collar' Indian elite, further stimulated by the opening of universities at Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, a result of the Indian Universities Act. So, alongside the values of traditional and ancient India, a new professional middle class was starting to arise, in no way bound by the values of the past. Their ambition can only have been stimulated by Queen Victoria's Proclamation of November 1858, in which it is expressly stated, "We hold ourselves bound to the natives of our Indian territories by the same obligations of duty which bind us to our other subjects...it is our further will that... our subjects of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of

which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity, duly to discharge."

Acting on these sentiments, Lord Ripon, viceroy from 1880 to 1885, extended the powers of local self-government and sought to remove racial practices in the law courts by the Ilbert Bill. But a policy at once liberal and progressive at one turn was reactionary and backward at the next, creating new elites and confirming old attitudes. The Ilbert Bill had the effect only of causing a white mutiny and the end of the prospect of perfect equality before the law. In 1886 measures were adopted to restrict Indian entry into the civil service.

Military reorganisation

Captain C Scott of the Gen. Sir. Hope Grant's Column, Madras Regiment, who fell on the attack of Fort of Kohlee, 1858. Memorial at the St. Mary's Church, Madras

The Bengal army dominated the Indian army before 1857 and a direct result after the rebellion was the scaling back of the size of the Bengali contingent in the army. The Brahmin presence in the Bengal Army was reduced because of their perceived primary role as mutineers. The British looked for increased recruitment in the Punjab for the Bengal army as a result of the apparent discontent that resulted in the Sepoy conflict.

The rebellion transformed both the native and British armies of British India. Of the 74 regular Bengal Native Infantry regiments in existence at the beginning of 1857, only twelve escaped mutiny or disbandment. All ten of the Bengal Light Cavalry regiments were lost. The old Bengal Army had accordingly almost completely vanished from the order of battle. These troops were replaced by new units recruited from castes hitherto under-utilised by the British and from the minority so-called "Martial Races", such as the Sikhs and the Gurkhas.

The inefficiencies of the old organisation, which had estranged sepoys from their British officers, were addressed, and the post-1857 units were mainly organised on the "irregular" system. From 1797 until the rebellion of 1857, each regular Bengal Native Infantry regiment had had 22 or 23 British officers, who

held every position of authority down to the second-in-command of each company. In irregular units there were fewer British officers, but they associated themselves far more closely with their soldiers, while more responsibility was given to the Indian officers. The British increased the ratio of British to Indian soldiers within India. From 1861 Indian artillery was replaced by British units, except for a few mountain batteries. The post-rebellion changes formed the basis of the military organisation of British India until the early 20th century.

Unit –III
India Under the Crown

Charles Canning

Charles Canning, 1st Earl Canning, KG, GCB, KSI, PC (14 December 1812 – 17 June 1862), also known as The Viscount Canning and Clemency Canning, was a British statesman and Governor-General of India during the Indian Rebellion of 1857 and the first Viceroy of India after the transfer of power from the East India Company to the Crown of Queen Victoria in 1858 after the rebellion was crushed.

Canning is credited for ensuring that the administration and most departments of the government functioned normally during the rebellion and took major administrative decisions even during the peak of the Rebellion in 1857, including establishing the first three modern Universities in India, the University of Calcutta, University of Madras and University of Bombay based on Wood's despatch. Canning passed the Hindu Widows' Remarriage Act, 1856 which was drafted by his predecessor Lord Dalhousie before the rebellion. He also passed the General Service Enlistment Act of 1856.

After the rebellion he presided over a smooth transfer and reorganisation of government from the East India company to the crown, the Indian Penal Code was drafted in 1860 based on the code drafted by Macaulay and came into force in 1862. Canning met the rebellion '"with firmness, confidence, magnanimity and calm" as per his biographer. Canning was very firm during the rebellion but after that he focused on reconciliation and reconstruction rather than retribution and issued a clemency proclamation.

Born at Gloucester Lodge, Brompton, near London, Canning was the youngest child of George Canning and Joan, Viscountess Canning, daughter of Major-General John Scott, his father was Prime Minister for a few months in 1827. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1833, as first class in classics and second class in mathematics.[16]

In 1836 he entered Parliament, being returned as member for the town of Warwick in the Conservative interest. He did not, however, sit long in the House

of Commons; for, on the death of his mother in 1837, he succeeded to the peerage and entered the House of Lords. His first official appointment was that of Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in the administration formed by Sir Robert Peel in 1841, his chief being the Earl of Aberdeen. This post he held till January 1846; and from January to July of that year, when the Peel administration was broken up, Lord Canning filled the post of First Commissioner of Woods and Forests.

He served on the Royal Commission on the British Museum (1847–49).[1] He declined to accept office under the Earl of Derby; but on the formation of the coalition ministry under the Earl of Aberdeen in January 1853, he received the appointment of Postmaster General. In this office, he showed not only a large capacity for hard work but also general administrative ability and much zeal for the improvement of the service. He retained his post under Lord Palmerston's ministry until July 1855, when, in consequence of the departure of Lord Dalhousie and a vacancy in the governor-generalship of India, he was selected by Lord Palmerston to succeed to that great position. This appointment appears to have been made rather on the ground of his father's great services than from any proof as yet given of special personal fitness on the part of Lord Canning. The new governor sailed from England in December 1855 and entered upon the duties of his office in India at the close of February 1856.

According to the Encyclopædia Britannica of 1911, "In the year following his accession to office, the deep-seated discontent of the people broke out in the Indian Rebellion of 1857. Fears were entertained, and even the friends of the Governor-General to some extent shared them, that he was not equal to the crisis. But the fears proved groundless. He had a clear eye for the gravity of the situation, a calm judgment, and a prompt, swift hand to do what was really necessary. ... He carried the Indian empire safely through the stress of the storm, and, what was perhaps a harder task still, he dealt wisely with the enormous difficulties arising at the close of such a war. ... The name of Clemency Canning, which was applied to him during the heated animosities of the moment, has since become a title of honour." He was derisively called "Clemency" on account of a Resolution dated 31 July 1857, which distinguished between sepoys from regiments which had

mutinied and killed their officers and European civilians, and those Indian soldiers who had disbanded and dispersed to their villages, without being involved in violence. While subsequently regarded as a humane and sensible measure, the Resolution made Canning unpopular at a time when British popular opinion favoured collective and indiscriminate reprisals.

The Encyclopædia Britannica of 1911 continues, "While rebellion was raging in Oudh he issued a proclamation declaring the lands of the province forfeited, and this step gave rise to much angry controversy. A secret despatch, couched in arrogant and offensive terms, was addressed to Canning by Lord Ellenborough, then a member of the Derby administration, which would have justified the Governor-General in immediately resigning. But from a strong sense of duty, he continued at his post, and ere long the general condemnation of the despatch was so strong that the writer felt it necessary to retire from office. Lord Canning replied to the despatch, calmly and in a statesman-like manner explaining and vindicating his censured policy" and in 1858 he was rewarded by being made the first Viceroy of India.

The Encyclopædia Britannica of 1911 adds, "In April 1859 he received the thanks of both Houses of Parliament for his great services during the rebellion. He was also made an extra civil grand cross of the Order of the Bath, and in May of the same year he was raised to the dignity of an Earl, as Earl Canning. ...By the strain of anxiety and hard work his health and strength were seriously impaired, while the death of his wife was also a great shock to him; in the hope that rest in his native land might restore him, he left India, reaching England in April 1862. But it was too late. He died in London on 17 June. About a month before his death he was created a Knight of the Garter. As he died without issue the titles became extinct."

Prior to the rebellion, Canning and his wife, Charlotte, had desired to produce a photographic survey of Indian people, primarily for their own edification. This project was transformed into an official government study as a consequence of the rebellion, after which it was seen as useful documentation in the effort to learn more about native communities and thereby better understand

them. It was eventually published as an eight-volume work, The People of India, between 1868 and 1875.

Lord Ripon:

In 1880 A.D. election took place in England in which Liberal party came to power and its Leader Gladstone became the Prime Minister of England. When Gladstone came to power, Viceroy Lord Lytton, resigned. Gladstone sent Lord Ripon as viceroy of India in 1880. Ripon was industrious, able with a deep moral earnestness. He may be described as Gladstone's agent in India. Ripon was liberal in his attitude and made some remarkable changes in the administrative system of India.

He granted various facilities to the Indians. P.E. Roberts writes about Lord Ripon, "He was a true liberal of Gladstonian Era with a strong belief in the virtues of peace, laissez faire, and self government." Ripon was a true Democrat. He took some steps towards liberalizing the administration in India. His aim was to give popular and political education to the Indians. He formulated the local self government and laid the foundations of representative institutions in India.

Reforms of Ripon:

Repeal of Vernacular Press Act, 1882:

Lord Ripon repealed the Vernacular Press Act of 1878 passed by Lord Lytton by Act III of 1882 and thus news papers published in vernacular languages were allowed equal freedom with the rest of the Indian Press. This action of Ripon went a long way in conciliating public opinion.

The First Factory Act, 1881:

To improve the lot of the factory workers in towns, he passed the first Factory Act in 1881. The Act prohibited the employment of children under the

age of seven, limited the number of working hours for children below the age of twelve and required that dangerous machinery should be fenced properly.

The Act also made provision for one hour rest during the working period and four days leave in a month for the workers. Inspectors were appointed to supervise the implementation of these measures. Thus for the first time he British Government tried to improve the working conditions of labourers in factories.

Economic Reforms: Financial Decentralization, 1882:

Lord Ripon like his predecesser, Lord Mayo was the follower of the policy of financial decentralization. Ripon divided the sources of revenue into three categories, Viz. Imperial, Provincial and Divided.

1. Imperial Heads:

Revenue from Customs, Posts and Telegraphs, Railways, Opium, Salt, Mint, Military Receipts, Land Revenue etc. were included in the imperial head. The Central Government was required to meet the expenses of central administration out of this revenue.

2. Provincial Heads:

Revenue from Jails, Medical slices, Printing, Roads, General Administration, etc. were included in the provincial heads. As the income from provincial heads was insufficient for provincial expenses, a part of Land revenue was assigned to the provinces.

3. Divided Heads:

The revenue from Excise, Stamps, Forests, Registration etc. was divided in equal proportion among the Central and Provincial Governments. The

system of Divided Heads started by Ripon remained operative till it was modified by the Reforms of 1919.

Local Self Government:

Lord Ripon is still remembered by the Indians for his attempts to establish local self government. Lord Ripon believed that the aim of Local Self Government was to train the Indians to manage their own affairs themselves.

Lord Ripon wrote, "What I want is a gradual training of the best, most intelligent and influential men in the community, to take an interest and active part in the management of their local affairs." Ripon made it clear that he was advocating for the decentralization of administration not with a view of improving administration but as an instrument of political and popular education.

The idea of local self government was not a new one. Municipalities had already existed in big towns but the Government nominated the municipal commissioner. In rural areas there were committees to, manage local affairs such as sanitation, the repair and construction of roads, maintenance of ferries, education etc.

However the local committees were all under official control. Moreover the area served by their committees was too large. So that their members were not sufficiently acquitted with the needs of the people of different localities. Lord Ripon sought to remove these obstacles in the sphere of Local Self government by his resolution of 1882.

Accordingly, in rural areas District Boards and Local Boards known as "tahsil or "taluk boards were established. The members were to be elected by rent-payers rather than nominated by the Government. In towns the powers and responsibilities of the Municipalities were enlarged. The members were to be partly elected and partly nominated.

The chairman was to be a non-official member. The nominated members should not be more than one third of the total strength. The management of health, education, roads and communications were to remain under the control of the local boards. The local bodies were given certain financial powers but the Government retained the powers of inspection.

The local bodies were kept free from government control. But if the Boards were not discharging their duties properly, then the Government had the right to dissolve them. But usually, the government did not interfere in the affairs of the local bodies. The Local Self Government Acts were passed in different provinces during 1883-85. The work of lighting, cleaning of streets, sanitation, education, water supply, medical aid etc. was assigned to the local bodies of Madras, Punjab and Bengal.

Educational Reforms:

Lord Ripon appointed an Education Commission in 1882 under the chairmanship of Sir William Hunter to review the progress of education in India, since Wood's dispatch of 1854. The commission laid emphasis on the special responsibility of the state for the improvement and expansion of primary education.

It recommended that the management of elementary schools was to be entrusted to the newly established local and municipal boards under the supervision and control of the Government.

The Commission was satisfied with the system of Grants-in-aid, urged its extension for secondary and higher education and also recommended that the Government should withdraw as early as possible from the direct management of secondary schools. It also made suggestion for the improvement in commercial and vocational education. The commission also made suggestions for the spread of female education. Lord Ripon accepted most of the recommendations of the commission.

Other Reforms:

During that time the recruitment to Indian Civil Service examination was held in England only and the age limit was 18. Ripon urged for the simultaneous examination both in India and in England He failed in his objective because he could not motivate the Government. However he succeeded in enhancing the age limit from 18 to 21.

The Ilbert Bill Controversy, 1883-84:

Lord Ripon was a Liberal and he did not believe in castecism. So he sought to abolish "Judicial disqualifications based on race distinction." According to the criminal procedure code of 1873 no magistrate or sessions judge except in presidency towns could try an European British subject unless he himself was of European birth.

Hence Lord Ripon sought the help of Sir C.P. Ilbert, the law member of the viceroy's council to abolish the "judicial disqualification based on race distinction". Sir Ilbert introduced a bill popularly known as the Ilbert Bill on 2nd February 1883 and through this bill the British European subjects were brought under the jurisdiction of Indian magistrates and judges.

But the bill was vehemently opposed by the European Community in India who formed a Defence Association to defence their special privileges. They passed resolutions urging the British Government to recall him before the expiration of the period of his office. After a prolonged tug of war Ripon bowed before the storm of agitation and modified the bill.

The amended bill provided that every European subject brought before a District Magistrate or Session Judge whether an Indian or European could claim to be tried by a Jury of twelve, at least seven of whom were to be Europeans or Americans. Though the Ilbert Bill controversy widened the racial feeling between the Indian and the Europeans yet it helped the Indians to learn

the lesson that a powerful Government could be deviated from its purpose by organized agitation. It also intensified the feeling of unity among the Indian people.

Ripon resigned from his post in 1884 before the term of his viceroyalty was over. He was very popular with the Indians. According to Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya, "Ripon was the greatest and the most beloved Viceroy whom India has known." Ripon is remembered according to Surendra Nath Banarjee for, "the Purity of his intentions, the loftiness of his ideas, righteousness of his policy and his hatred of Racial disqualifications."

At the time of his departure for England the priests blessed him and offered him gifts. He was the only person who realized that the people of India should themselves make effort to attain freedom. Report's doings in India marked the beginning of the political' life in India. His departure was followed by the establishment of Indian National Congress in 1885.

George Curzon, 1st Marquess Curzon of Kedleston:

George Nathaniel Curzon, 1st Marquess Curzon of Kedleston, KG, GCSI, GCIE, PC, FRS, FBA (11 January 1859 – 20 March 1925), styled Lord Curzon of Kedleston between 1898 and 1911 and then Earl Curzon of Kedleston between 1911 and 1921, was a British statesman, Conservative politician, and writer who served as Viceroy of India from 1899 to 1905.

During the First World War, Curzon was Leader of the House of Lords and from December 1916 served in the small War Cabinet of Prime Minister David Lloyd George and in the War Policy Committee. He went on to serve as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs at the Foreign Office from 1919 to 1924.

In 1923, Curzon was a contender for the office of Prime Minister, but Bonar Law and some other leading Conservatives preferred Stanley Baldwin for the office.

Early Life:

Curzon was educated at Balliol College, Oxford and was later a Prize Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford Curzon was the eldest son and the second of the eleven children of Alfred Curzon, 4th Baron Scarsdale (1831–1916), who was the Rector of Kedleston in Derbyshire. George Curzon's mother was Blanche (1837–1875), the daughter of Joseph Pocklington Senhouse of Netherhall in Cumberland. He was born at Kedleston Hall, built on the site where his family, who were clergyman and priests, had lived since the 12th century. His mother, exhausted by childbirth, died when George was 16; her husband survived her by 41 years. Neither parent exerted a major influence on Curzon's life. Scarsdale was an austere and unindulgent father who believed that landowners should stay on their land and not indefinitely tour the world for pleasure. He disapproved of the journeys across Asia between 1887 and 1895 which made his son one of the most travelled men to be a member of any British cabinet. An influential presence in Curzon's childhood was that of his brutal, sadistic governess, Ellen Mary Paraman, whose tyranny in the nursery stimulated his combative qualities and encouraged the obsessional side of his nature. Paraman used to beat him and periodically forced him to parade through the village wearing a conical hat bearing the words liar, sneak, and coward. Curzon later noted, "No children well born and well-placed ever cried so much and so justly."

He was educated at Wixenford School, Eton College, and Balliol College, Oxford. His over-intimate relationship at Eton College with Oscar Browning led to the latter's dismissal. A spinal injury incurred while riding during his adolescence was a lifelong impediment to Curzon that required him to wear a metal corset for the remainder of his life.

Curzon was President of the Union and Secretary of the Oxford Canning Club (a Tory political club named for George Canning), but as a consequence of the extent of his time-expenditure on political and social societies, he failed to achieve a first class degree in Greats, although he subsequently won both the Lothian Prize Essay and the Arnold Prize, the latter for an essay on Sir Thomas More, about whom he knew little. In 1883, Curzon received the most prestigious

fellowship at the university, a Prize Fellowship at All Souls College. While at Eton and at Oxford, Curzon was a contemporary and close friend of Cecil Spring Rice and Edward Grey.[8] However, Spring Rice contributed, alongside John William Mackail, to the composition of a famous sardonic doggerel about Curzon that was published as part of The Balliol Masque, about which Curzon wrote in later life "never has more harm been done to one single individual than that accursed doggerel has done to me." It read:

- My name is George Nathaniel Curzon,
- I am a most superior person.
- My cheek is pink, my hair is sleek,
- I dine at Blenheim once a week.

When Spring-Rice was assigned to the British Embassy to the United States in 1894–1895, he was suspected by Curzon of trying to prevent Curzon's engagement to the American Mary Leiter, whom Curzon nevertheless married. However, Spring Rice assumed for a certainty, like many of Curzon's other friends, that Curzon would inevitably become Foreign Secretary: he wrote to Curzon in 1891, 'When you are Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs I hope you will restore the vanished glory of England, lead the European concert, decide the fate of nations, and give me three months' leave instead of two'.

Early Political Career:

Curzon became Assistant Private Secretary to the Marquess of Salisbury in 1885, and in 1886 entered Parliament as Member for Southport in south-west Lancashire. His maiden speech, which was chiefly an attack on home rule and Irish nationalism, was regarded in much the same way as his oratory at the Oxford Union: brilliant and eloquent but also presumptuous and rather too self-assured. Subsequent performances in the Commons, often dealing with Ireland or reform of the House of Lords (which he supported), received similar verdicts. He was Under-Secretary of State for India in 1891–92 and Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in 1895–98.

Asian travels and writings:

In the meantime he had travelled around the world: Russia and Central Asia (1888–89), a long tour of Persia (September 1889 – January 1890), Siam, French Indochina and Korea (1892), and a daring foray into Afghanistan and the Pamirs (1894). He published several books describing central and eastern Asia and related policy issues. A bold and compulsive traveller, fascinated by oriental life and geography, he was awarded the Patron's Medal of the Royal Geographical Society for his exploration of the source of the Amu Darya (Oxus). His journeys allowed him to study the problems of Asia and their implications for British India, while reinforcing his pride in his nation and her imperial mission.

Curzon believed Russia to be the most likely threat to British India, Britain's most valuable possession, from the 19th century through the early 20th century. In 1879 Russia had begun construction of the Transcaspian Railway along the Silk Road, officially solely to enforce local control. The line starts from the city of Kyzyl-Su, formerly Krasnovodsk (nowadays Turkmenbashi) (on the Caspian Sea), travels southeast along the Karakum Desert, through Ashgabat, continues along the Kopet Dagh Mountains until it reaches Tejen. Curzon dedicated an entire chapter in his book Russia in Central Asia to discussing the perceived threat to British control of India. This railway connected Russia with the most wealthy and influential cities in Central Asia at the time, including the Persian province of Khorasan, and would allow the rapid deployment of Russian supplies and troops into the area. Curzon also believed that the resulting greater economic interdependence between Russia and Central Asia would be damaging to British interests.

Persia and the Persian Question, written in 1892, has been considered Curzon's magnum opus and can be seen as a sequel to Russia in Central Asia. Curzon was commissioned by The Times to write several articles on the Persian political environment, but while there he decided to write a book on the country as whole. This two-volume work covers Persia's history and governmental structure, as well as graphics, maps and pictures (some taken by Curzon himself). Curzon was aided by General Albert Houtum-Schindler and the Royal Geographical Society (RGS), both of which helped him gain access to material to

which as a foreigner he would not have been entitled to have access. General Schindler provided Curzon with information regarding Persia's geography and resources, as well as serving as an unofficial editor.

Curzon was appalled by his government's apathy towards Persia as a valuable defensive buffer to India from Russian encroachment. Years later Curzon would lament that "Persia has alternatively advanced and receded in the estimation of British statesmen, occupying now a position of extravagant prominence, anon one of unmerited obscurity."

First Marriage (1895-1906):

In 1895 he married Mary Victoria Leiter, the daughter of Levi Ziegler Leiter, an American millionaire of German Mennonite origin and co-founder of the Chicago department store Field & Leiter (later Marshall Field). Initially, he had just married her for her money so he could save his estate but subsequently developing feelings for her. Mary had a long and nearly fatal illness near the end of summer 1904, from which she never really recovered. Falling ill again in July 1906, she died on the 18th of that month in her husband's arms, at the age of 36 It was the greatest personal loss of his life.

She was buried in the church at Kedleston, where Curzon designed his memorial for her, a Gothic chapel added to the north side of the nave. Although he was neither a devout nor a conventional churchman, Curzon retained a simple religious faith; in later years he sometimes said that he was not afraid of death because it would enable him to join Mary in heaven.

They had three daughters during a firm and happy marriage: Mary Irene, who inherited her father's Barony of Ravensdale and was created a life peer in her own right; Cynthia, who became the first wife of the fascist politician Sir Oswald Mosley; and Alexandra Naldera ("Baba"), who married Edward "Fruity" Metcalfe, the best friend, best man and equerry of Edward VIII. Mosley exercised a strange fascination for the Curzon women: Irene had a brief romance with him before either were married; Baba became his mistress; and Curzon's second wife, Grace, had a long affair with him.

Viceroy of India (1899-1905):

Curzon, in 1901, had famously said, "As long as we rule India we are the greatest power in the world. If we lose it, we shall drop straightaway to a third-rate power."

In January 1899 Curzon was appointed as Viceroy of India.[4] He was created a baron in the peerage of Ireland as Baron Curzon of Kedleston, in the County of Derby, on his appointment. As Viceroy, he was ex officio Grand Master of the Order of the Indian Empire and Order of the Star of India. This peerage was created in the Peerage of Ireland (the last so created) so that he would be free, until his father's death, to re-enter the House of Commons on his return to Britain.

Reaching India shortly after the suppression of the frontier risings of 1897–98, he paid special attention to the independent tribes of the north-west frontier, inaugurated a new province called the North West Frontier Province, and pursued a policy of forceful control mingled with conciliation. In response to what he called "a number of murderous attacks upon Englishmen and Europeans", Curzon advocated at the Quetta Durbar extremely draconian punishments which he believed would stop what he viewed as such especially abominable crimes. In his own private correspondence, Curzon pondered "Is it possible, under the law, to flog these horrible scoundrels before we execute them? Supposing we remove them for execution to another and distant jail, could we flog them in the first jail before removal? I believe that if we could postpone the execution for a few weeks and give the criminal a few good public floggings - or even one, were more not possible - it would act as a real deterrent. But I have a suspicion that British law does not smile upon anything so eminently practical." The only major armed outbreak on this frontier during the period of his administration was the Mahsud–Waziri campaign of 1901.

In the context of the Great Game between the British and Russian Empires for control of Central Asia, he held deep mistrust of Russian intentions. This led him to encourage British trade in Persia, and he paid a visit to the Persian Gulf in 1903. Curzon argued for an exclusive British presence in the Gulf, a policy originally proposed by John Malcolm. The British government was already making

agreements with local sheiks/tribal leaders along the Persian Gulf coast to this end. Curzon had convinced his government to establish Britain as the unofficial protector of Kuwait with the Anglo-Kuwaiti Agreement of 1899. The Lansdowne Declaration in 1903 stated that the British would counter any other European power's attempt to establish a military presence in the Gulf. Only four years later this position was abandoned and the Persian Gulf declared a neutral zone in the Anglo-Russian Agreement of 1907, prompted in part by the high economic cost of defending India from Russian advances

At the end of 1903, Curzon sent a British expedition to Tibet under Francis Younghusband, ostensibly to forestall a Russian advance. After bloody conflicts with Tibet's poorly armed defenders, the mission penetrated to Lhasa, where the Treaty of Lhasa was signed in September 1904.

During his tenure, Curzon undertook the restoration of the Taj Mahal and expressed satisfaction that he had done so. Curzon was influenced by Hindu philosophy and quoted:

India has left a deeper mark upon the history the philosophy and the religion of mankind than any other terrestrial unit in the universe.

Within India, Curzon appointed a number of commissions to inquire into education, irrigation, police and other branches of administration, on whose reports legislation was based during his second term of office as viceroy. Reappointed Governor-General in August 1904, he presided over the 1905 partition of Bengal.

In ‘Lion and the Tiger : The Rise and Fall of the British Raj, 1600-1947’, Denis Judd wrote: "Curzon had hoped… to bind India permanently to the Raj. Ironically, his partition of Bengal, and the bitter controversy that followed, did much to revitalize Congress. Curzon, typically, had dismissed the Congress in 1900 as ‘tottering to its fall’. But he left India with Congress more active and effective than at any time in its history."

Curzon was determined to address the British maltreatment of Indians. In particular, he incurred the displeasure of many in the European community in India by pressing for severe punishment for Europeans who had attacked Indians. On

two occasions, he imposed collective punishment on British Army units which had attacked Indians: when soldiers of the West Kent Regiment raped a Burmese woman, he had the whole regiment exiled to Aden without leave. He later imposed similar punishment on the 9th Queen's Royal Lancers for the murder of an Indian cook.

Curzon proposed the Partition of Bengal and put it into effect on 16 October 1905 creating the new province of Eastern Bengal and Assam.

Indian Army.

Curzon also took an active interest in military matters. In 1901, he founded the Imperial Cadet Corps, or ICC. The ICC was a corps d'elite, designed to give Indian princes and aristocrats military training, after which a few would be given officer commissions in the Indian Army. But these commissions were "special commissions" which did not empower their holders to command any troops. Predictably, this was a major stumbling block to the ICC's success, as it caused much resentment among former cadets. Though the ICC closed in 1914, it was a crucial stage in the drive to Indianise the Indian Army's officer Corps, which was haltingly begun in 1917.

Military organisation proved to be the final issue faced by Curzon in India. It often involved petty issues that had much to do with clashes of personality: Curzon once wrote on a document "I rise from the perusal of these papers filled with the sense of the ineptitude of my military advisers", and once wrote to the Commander-in-Chief in India, Kitchener, advising him that signing himself "Kitchener of Khartoum" took up too much time and space, which Kitchener thought petty (Curzon simply signed himself "Curzon" as if he were a hereditary peer, although he later took to signing himself "Curzon of Kedleston"). A difference of opinion with Kitchener, regarding the status of the military member of the council in India (who controlled army supply and logistics, which Kitchener wanted under his own control), led to a controversy in which Curzon failed to obtain the support of the home government. He resigned in August 1905 and returned to England.

Return to Britain:

Arthur Balfour's refusal to recommend an earldom for Curzon in 1905 was repeated by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Liberal Prime Minister, who formed his government the day after Curzon returned to England. In deference to the wishes of the King and the advice of his doctors, Curzon did not stand in the general election of 1906 and thus found himself excluded from public life for the first time in twenty years. It was at this time, the nadir of his career, that he suffered the greatest personal loss of his life.

Mary died in 1906 and Curzon devoted himself to private matters, including establishing a new home.

After the death of Lord Goschen in 1907, the post of Chancellor of Oxford University fell vacant. Curzon successfully became elected as Chancellor of Oxford after he won by 1,001 votes to 440 against Lord Rosebery. He proved to be quite an active chancellor – "[he] threw himself so energetically into the cause of university reform that critics complained he was ruling Oxford like an Indian province."

House of Lords:

In 1908, Curzon was elected a representative peer for Ireland, and thus relinquished any idea of returning to the House of Commons. In 1909–1910 he took an active part in opposing the Liberal government's[4] proposal to abolish the legislative veto of the House of Lords, and in 1911 was created Baron Ravensdale, of Ravensdale in the County of Derby, with remainder (in default of heirs male) to his daughters, Viscount Scarsdale, of Scarsdale in the County of Derby, with remainder (in default of heirs male) to the heirs male of his father, and Earl Curzon of Kedleston, in the County of Derby, with the normal remainder, all in the Peerage of the United Kingdom.

He became involved with saving Tattershall Castle, Lincolnshire, from destruction. This experience strengthened his resolve for heritage protection. He was one of the sponsors of the Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment

Act 1913. He served as President of the Committee commissioning the Survey of London which documented the capital's principal buildings and public art.

On 5 May 1914, he spoke out against a bill in the House of Lords that would have permitted women who already had the right to vote in local elections the right to vote for members of Parliament.

First World War:

Curzon joined the Cabinet, as Lord Privy Seal, when Asquith formed his coalition in May 1915. Like other politicians (e.g. Austen Chamberlain, Arthur Balfour) Curzon favoured British Empire efforts in Mesopotamia, believing that the increase in British prestige would discourage a German-inspired Muslim revolt in India. Curzon was a member of the Dardanelles Committee and told that body (October 1915) that the recent Salonika expedition was "quixotic chivalry". Early in 1916 Curzon visited Sir Douglas Haig (newly appointed Commander-in-Chief of British forces in France) at his headquarters in France. Haig was impressed by Curzon's brains and decisiveness, and considered that he had mellowed since his days as Viceroy (Major-General Haig had been Inspector-General of Cavalry, India, at the time) and had lost "his old pompous ways". Curzon served in Lloyd George's small War Cabinet as Leader of the House of Lords from December 1916, and he also served on the War Policy Committee. With Allied victory over Germany far from certain, Curzon wrote a paper (12 May 1917) for the War Cabinet urging that Britain seize Palestine and possibly Syria. Like other members of the War Cabinet, Curzon supported further Western Front offensives lest, with Russian commitment to the war wavering, France and Italy be tempted to make a separate peace.

At the War Policy Committee (3 October 1917) Curzon objected in vain to plans to redeploy two divisions to Palestine, with a view to advancing into Syria and knocking Turkey out of the war altogether. Curzon's commitment wavered somewhat as the losses of the Third Battle of Ypres mounted. In the summer of 1917 the Chief of the Imperial General Staff (CIGS) General William Robertson sent Haig a biting description of the members of the War Cabinet, who he said were all frightened of Lloyd George; he described Curzon as "a gasbag".

During the crisis of February 1918, Curzon was one of the few members of the government to support Robertson, threatening in vain to resign if he were removed. Despite his opposition to women's suffrage (he had been co-president of the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage), the House of Lords voted conclusively in its favour.

Second Marriage (1917)

After a long affair with the romantic novelist Elinor Glyn, Curzon married the former Grace Elvina Hinds in January 1917. She was the wealthy Alabama-born widow of Alfredo Huberto Duggan (died 1915), a first-generation Irish Argentinian appointed to the Argentine Legation in London in 1905. Elinor Glyn was staying with Curzon at the time of the engagement and read about it in the morning newspapers.

Grace had three children from her first marriage, two sons, Alfred and Hubert, and a daughter, Grace Lucille. Alfred and Hubert, as Curzon's step-sons, grew up within his influential circle. Curzon had three daughters from his first marriage, but he and Grace (despite fertility-related operations and several miscarriages) did not have any children together, which put a strain on their marriage. Letters written between them in the early 1920s imply that they still lived together, and remained devoted to each other. In 1923, Curzon was passed over for the office of Prime Minister partly on the advice of Arthur Balfour, who joked that Curzon "has lost the hope of glory but he still possesses the means of Grace" (a humorous allusion to the well known "General Thanksgiving" prayer of the Church of England, which thanks God for "the means of grace, and for the hope of glory").

In 1917, Curzon bought Bodiam Castle in East Sussex, a 14th-century building that had been gutted during the English Civil War. He restored it extensively, and then bequeathed it to the National Trust.

Foreign Secretary (1919-24)

Relations with Lloyd George:

Curzon did not have David Lloyd George's support. Curzon and Lloyd George had disliked one another since the 1911 Parliament Crisis. The Prime Minister thought him overly pompous and self-important, and it was said that he used him as if he were using a Rolls-Royce to deliver a parcel to the station; Lloyd George said much later that Churchill treated his Ministers in a way that Lloyd George would never have treated his: "They were all men of substance — well, except Curzon." Multiple drafts of resignation letters written at this time were found upon Curzon's death. Despite their antagonism, the two were often in agreement on government policy. Lloyd George needed the wealth of knowledge Curzon possessed so was both his biggest critic and, simultaneously, his largest supporter. Likewise, Curzon was grateful for the leeway he was allowed by Lloyd George when it came to handling affairs in the Middle East.

Other cabinet ministers also respected his vast knowledge of Central Asia but disliked his arrogance and often blunt criticism. Believing that the Foreign Secretary should be non-partisan, he would objectively present all the information on a subject to the Cabinet, as if placing faith in his colleagues to reach the appropriate decision. Conversely, Curzon would take personally and respond aggressively to any criticism.

It has been suggested that Curzon's defensiveness reflected institutional insecurity by the Foreign Office as a whole. During the 1920s the Foreign Office was often a passive participant in decisions which were mainly reactive and dominated by the Prime Minister. The creation of the job of Colonial Secretary, the Cabinet Secretariat and the League of Nations added to the Foreign Office's insecurity.

Policy under Lloyd George:

After nine months as acting Secretary while Balfour was at the Paris Peace Conference Curzon was appointed Foreign Secretary in October 1919. He gave his name to the British government's proposed Soviet-Polish boundary, the Curzon

Line of December 1919. Although during the subsequent Russo-Polish War, Poland conquered ground in the east, after World War II, Poland was shifted westwards, leaving the border between Poland and its eastern neighbours today approximately at the Curzon Line.

Curzon was largely responsible for the Peace Day ceremonies on 19 July 1919. These included the plaster Cenotaph, designed by the noted architect Sir Edwin Lutyens, for the Allied Victory parade in London. It was so successful that it was reproduced in stone, and still stands.

In 1918, during World War I, as Britain occupied Mesopotamia, Curzon tried to convince the Indian government to reconsider his scheme for Persia to be a buffer against Russian advances. British and Indian troops were in Persia protecting the oilfields at Abadan and watching the Afghan frontier – Curzon believed that British economic and military aid, sent via India, could prop up the Persian government and make her a British client state. However, the agreement of August 1919 was never ratified and the British government rejected the plan as Russia had the geographical advantage and the defensive benefits would not justify the high economic cost.

Small British forces had twice occupied Baku on the Caspian in 1918, while an entire British division had occupied Batum on the Black Sea, supervising German and Turkish withdrawal. Against Curzon's wishes, but on the advice of Sir George Milne, the commander on the spot, the CIGS Sir Henry Wilson, who wanted to concentrate troops in Britain, Ireland, India, and Egypt, and of Churchill (Secretary of State for War), the British withdrew from Baku (the small British naval presence was also withdrawn from the Caspian Sea), at the end of August 1919 leaving only three battalions at Batum.

In January 1920 Curzon insisted that British troops remain in Batum, against the wishes of Wilson and the Prime Minister. In February, while Curzon was on holiday, Wilson persuaded the Cabinet to allow withdrawal, but Curzon had the decision reversed on his return, although to Curzon's fury (he thought it "abuse of authority") Wilson gave Milne permission to withdraw if he deemed it necessary. At Cabinet on 5 May 1920 Curzon "by a long-winded jaw" (in Wilson's

description) argued for a stay in Batum. After a British garrison at Enzeli (on the Persian Caspian coast) was taken prisoner by Bolshevik forces on 19 May 1920, Lloyd George finally insisted on a withdrawal from Batum early in June 1920. For the rest of 1920 Curzon, supported by Milner (Colonial Secretary), argued that Britain should retain control of Persia. When Wilson asked (15 July 1920) to pull troops out of Persia to put down the rebellion in Mesopotamia and Ireland, Lloyd George blocked the move, saying that Curzon "would not stand it". In the end, financial retrenchment forced a British withdrawal from Persia in the spring of 1921.

` Curzon worked on several Middle Eastern problems. He designed the Treaty of Sèvres (August 10, 1920) between the victorious Allies and Ottoman Turkey. The treaty abolished the Ottoman Empire and obliged Turkey to renounce all rights over Arab Asia and North Africa. However a new government in Turkey under Kemal Atatürk rejected the treaty. The Greeks invaded Turkey. Curzon tried and failed to induce the Greeks to accept a compromise on the status of Smyrna and failed to force the Turks to renounce their nationalist program. Lloyd George tried to use force at Chanak but lost support and was forced to step down as prime minister. Curzon remained as foreign minister and helped tie down loose ends in the Middle East at the peace conference at Lausanne.

Curzon helped to negotiate Egyptian independence (agreed in 1922) and the division of the British Mandate of Palestine, despite the strong disagreement he held with the policy of his predecessor Arthur Balfour, and helped create the Emirate of Transjordan for Faisal's brother, which may also have delayed the problems there. According to Sir David Gilmour, Curzon "was the only senior figure in the British government at the time who foresaw that its policy would lead to decades of Arab–Jewish hostility".

During the Irish War of Independence, but before the introduction of martial law in December 1920, Curzon suggested the "Indian" solution of blockading villages and imposing collective fines for attacks on the police and army. In 1921 Curzon was created Earl of Kedleston, in the County of Derby, and Marquess Curzon of Kedleston. In 1922, he was the chief negotiator for the Allies of

the Treaty of Lausanne, which officially ended the war with the Ottoman Empire and defined the borders of Turkey. Curzon defended the geopolitical talent of Eyre Crowe, who served as Permanent Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office from 1920 until his death in 1925

Under Bonar Law:

Unlike many leading Conservative members of Lloyd George's Coalition Cabinet, Curzon ceased to support Lloyd George over the Chanak Crisis and had just resigned when Conservative backbenchers voted at the Carlton Club meeting to end the Coalition in October 1922. Curzon was thus able to remain Foreign Secretary when Bonar Law formed a purely Conservative ministry.

In 1922–23 Curzon had to negotiate with France after French troops occupied the Ruhr to enforce the payment of German reparations; he described the French Prime Minister (and former president) Raymond Poincaré as a "horrid little man". Curzon had expansive ambitions and was not much happier with Bonar Law, whose foreign policy was based on "retrenchment and withdrawal", than he had been with Lloyd George. However he provided invaluable insight into the Middle East and was instrumental in shaping British foreign policy in that region.

Passed over for the premiership, 1923:

On Bonar Law's retirement as prime minister in May 1923, Curzon was passed over for the job in favour of Stanley Baldwin, despite his eagerness for the job. This decision was taken on the private advice of leading members of the party including former Prime Minister Arthur Balfour. Balfour advised the monarch that in a democratic age it was inappropriate for the prime minister to be a member of the House of Lords, especially when the Labour Party, which had few peers, had become the main opposition party in the Commons. In private Balfour admitted that he was prejudiced against Curzon, whose character was objectionable to some. George V shared this prejudice. A letter purporting to detail the opinions of Bonar Law but actually written by Baldwin sympathisers was delivered to the King's Private Secretary Lord Stamfordham, though it is unclear how much impact this had in the outcome. Curzon felt he was cheated because J. C. C. Davidson—to

whom Baldwin was loyal—and Sir Charles Waterhouse[1] falsely claimed to Stamfordham that Law had recommended that George V appoint Stanley Baldwin, not Curzon, as his successor Harry Bennett says Curzon's arrogance and unpopularity probably prevented him from becoming prime minister despite his brilliance, great capacity for work and accomplishments.

Winston Churchill, one of Curzon's main rivals, accurately contended that Curzon "sow[ed] gratitude and resentment along his path with equally lavish hands". Even contemporaries who envied Curzon, such as Baldwin, conceded that Curzon was, in the words of his biographer Leonard Mosley, "a devoted and indefatigable public servant, dedicated to the idea of Empire".

Curzon, summoned by Stamfordham, rushed to London assuming he was to be appointed. He burst into tears when told the truth. He later ridiculed Baldwin as "a man of the utmost insignificance", although he served under Baldwin and proposed him for the leadership of the Conservative Party. Curzon remained foreign secretary under Baldwin until the government fell in January 1924. When Baldwin formed a new government in November 1924 he appointed Curzon Lord President of the Council.

Curzon's rejection was a turning point in the nation's political history. Henceforth, by convention peers were deemed to be barred from being leaders of major political parties and from becoming prime minister. In an age of democracy, it was no longer acceptable for the prime minister to be based in an unelected and largely powerless chamber.

Death:

In March 1925 Curzon suffered a severe haemorrhage of the bladder. Surgery was unsuccessful and he died in London on 20 March 1925 at the age of 66. His coffin, made from the same tree at Kedleston that had encased his first wife, Mary, was taken to Westminster Abbey and from there to his ancestral home in Derbyshire, where he was interred beside Mary in the family vault at All Saints Church on 26 March. In his will, proven on 22 July, Curzon bequeathed his estate to his wife and his brother Francis; his estate was valued for probate at £343,279 10s. 4d. (roughly equivalent to £21 million in 2021).

Upon his death the barony, earldom and marquessate of Curzon of Kedleston and the earldom of Kedleston became extinct, while the viscountcy and barony of Scarsdale were inherited by a nephew. The barony of Ravensdale was inherited by his eldest daughter Mary and is today held by his second daughter Cynthia's great-grandson, Daniel Nicholas Mosley, 4th Baron Ravensdale. There is a blue plaque on the house in London where Curzon lived and died, No. 1 Carlton House Terrace, Westminster.

Titles:

On his appointment as Viceroy of India in 1898, he was created Baron Curzon of Kedleston, in the County of Derby. This title was created in the Peerage of Ireland to enable him to potentially return to the House of Commons, as Irish peers did not have an automatic right to sit in the House of Lords. His was the last title to be created in the Peerage of Ireland. In 1908, he was elected a representative of the Irish peerage in the British House of Lords, from which it followed that he would be a member of the House of Lords until death; indeed, his representative peerage would continue even if (as proved to be the case) he later received a United Kingdom peerage entitling him to a seat in the House of Lords in his own right.

In 1911 he was created Earl Curzon of Kedleston, Viscount Scarsdale, and Baron Ravensdale. All of these titles were in the Peerage of the United Kingdom. Upon his father's death in 1916, he also became 5th Baron Scarsdale, in the Peerage of Great Britain. The title had been created in 1761. In the 1921 Birthday Honours, he was created Marquess Curzon of Kedleston The title became extinct upon his death in 1925, as he was survived by three daughters and no sons.

Indian independence movement:

The Indian independence movement was a series of historic events with the ultimate aim of ending British rule in India also known as British Raj. It lasted from 1857 to 1947.

The first nationalistic revolutionary movement for Indian independence emerged from Bengal. It later took root in the newly formed Indian

National Congress with prominent moderate leaders seeking the right to appear for Indian Civil Service examinations in British India, as well as more economic rights for natives. The first half of the 20th century saw a more radical approach towards self-rule by the Lal Bal Pal triumvirate, Aurobindo Ghosh and V. O. Chidambaram Pillai.

The stages independence struggle in the 1920s were characterized by the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and Congress' adoption of Gandhi's policy of non-violence and civil disobedience. Some of the leading followers of Gandhi's ideology were Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhbhai Patel, Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Maulana Azad, and others. Intellectuals such as Rabindranath Tagore, Subramania Bharati, and Bankim Chandra Chattopadhyay spread patriotic awareness. Female leaders like Sarojini Naidu, Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Pritilata Waddedar, and Kasturba Gandhi promoted the emancipation of Indian women and their participation in the freedom struggle.

Few leaders followed a more violent approach. This became especially popular after the Rowlatt Act, which permitted indefinite detention. The Act sparked protests across India, especially in the Punjab province, where they were violently suppressed in the Jallianwala Bagh massacre.

The Indian independence movement was in constant ideological evolution. Essentially anti-colonial, it was supplemented by visions of independent, economic development with a secular, democratic, republican, and civil-libertarian political structure. After the 1930s, the movement took on a strong socialist orientation. It culminated in the Indian Independence Act 1947, which ended Crown suzerainty and partitioned British Raj into Dominion of India and Dominion of Pakistan.

India remained a Crown Dominion until 26 January 1950, when the Constitution of India established the Republic of India. Pakistan remained a dominion until 1956 when it adopted its first constitution. In 1971, East Pakistan declared its own independence as Bangladesh.

Early British Colonialism in India:

The first European to reach India via the Atlantic Ocean was the Portuguese explorer Vasco da Gama, who reached Calicut in 1498 in search of spice. Just over a century later, the Dutch and English established trading outposts on the Indian subcontinent, with the first English trading post set up at Surat in 1613.

Over the next two centuries, the British defeated the Portuguese and Dutch but remained in conflict with the French. The decline of the Mughal Empire in the first half of the eighteenth century allowed the British to establish a foothold in Indian politics. During the Battle of Plassey, the East India Company's Army defeated Siraj ud-Daulah, the Nawab of Bengal, and the company established itself as a major player in Indian affairs. After the Battle of Buxar of 1764, it gained administrative rights over Bengal, Bihar and the Midnapur part of Odisha.

After the defeat of Tipu Sultan, most of southern India came either under the company's direct rule, or under its indirect political control in a subsidiary alliance. The Company subsequently seized control of regions ruled by the Maratha Empire, after defeating them in a series of wars. Much of Punjab was annexed in 1849, after the defeat of Sikh armies in the First (1845–46) and Second (1848–49) Anglo-Sikh Wars.

Robert Clive with Mir Jafar after the Battle of Plassey. Mir Jafar's betrayal towards the Nawab Siraj-ud-Daulah of Bengal in Plassey made the battle one of the main factors of British supremacy in the sub-continent.

The Last Effort and Fall of Tipu Sultan by Henry Singleton, c. 1800. After the defeat of Tipu Sultan of Mysore, most of South India was now either under the company's direct rule, or under its indirect political control.

Early Rebellions:

Maveeran Alagumuthu Kone was an early rebel against the British presence in Tamil Nadu. He became a military leader in the town of Ettayapuram and was defeated in battle against the British and Maruthanayagam's forces. He was executed in 1757. He was considered among the earliest freedom fighters. Tamil

Nadu Government under former Chief Minister J. Jayalalithaa inaugurated his statue in Chennai, opposite to Egmore Railway station.[9]Puli Thevar opposed the Nawab of Arcot, who was supported by the British.

In Eastern India and across the country, Indigenous communities organized numerous rebellions against the British and their fellow members, especially landlords and moneylenders. One of the earliest of these on record was led by Binsu Manki around 1771 over the transfer of Jharkhand to the East India Company. The Rangpur Dhing took place from 1782 to 1783 in nearby Rangpur, Bengal Following the Binsu Manki's revolt in Jharkhand, numerous rebellions across the region took place including the Bhumij Revolt of Manbhum from 1798 to 1799; the Chero Uprising of Palamu in 1800 under the leadership of Bhukan Singh, and two uprising of the Munda community in Tamar region, during 1807 led by Dukan Mank, and 1819-20 under the leadership Bundu and Konta. The Ho Rebellion took place when the Ho community first came in contact with the British, from 1820 to 1821 near Chaibasa on the Roro River in West Singhbhum, but were defeated by the technologically enhanced colonial cavalry.[14][15] A larger Bhumij Revolt occurred near Midnapur in Bengal, under the leadership of Ganga Narain Singh who had previously also been involved in co-leading the Chuar Rebellions in these regions from 1771 to 1809. Syed Mir Nisar Ali Titumir was an Islamic preacher who led a peasant uprising against the Hindu Zamindars of Bengal and the British during the 19th century. Along with his followers, he built a bamboo fort (Bansher Kella in Bengali) in Narkelberia Village, which gained a prominent place into Bengali folk legend. After the storming of the fort by British soldiers, Titumir died of his wounds on 19 November 1831. These rebellions lead to larger regional movements in Jharkhand and beyond such as the Kol Insurrection led by Singhray and Binray Manki, where the Kol (Munda, Oraon, Bhumij and Ho communities) united to rebel against the "outsiders" from 1830 -1833.

Santhal Hul:

The Santhal Hul was a movement of over 60,000 Santhals that happened from 1855 to 1857 (but started as early as 1784) and was particularly led by

siblings - brothers Sidhu, Kanhu, Chand and Bhairav and their sisters Phulo and Jhano from the Murmu clan in its most fervent years that lead up to the Revolt of 1857. More than 100 years of such escalating rebellions created grounds for a large, impactful, millenarian movement in Eastern India that again shook the foundations of British rule in the region, under the leadership of Birsa Munda. Birsa Munda belonged to the Munda community and lead thousands of people from Munda, Oraon, and Kharia communities in "Ulgulaan" (revolt) against British political expansion and those who advanced it, against forceful conversions of Indigenous peoples into Christianity (even creating a Birsaite movement), and against the displacement of Indigenous peoples from their lands. To subdue these rising tensions which were getting increasingly out of control of the British, they aggressively set out to search for Birsa Munda, even setting up a reward for him. They brutally attacked the Dombari Hills where Birsa had repaired a water tank and made his revolutionary headquarters between January 7–9, 1900, murdering a minimum of 400 of the Munda warriors who had congregated there, akin to the attacks on the people at Jallianwallah Bagh, however, receiving much less attention.[24][26] The hills are known as "Topped Buru" today - the mound of the dead.[26] Birsa was ultimately captured in the Jamkopai forest in Singhbhum, and assassinated by the British in jail in 1900, with a rushed cremation/burial conducted to ensure his movement was subdued.

The toughest resistance the Company experienced was offered by Mysore. The Anglo-Mysore Wars were a series of wars fought in over the last three decades of the 18th century between the Kingdom of Mysore on the one hand, and the British East India Company (represented chiefly by the Madras Presidency), and Maratha Confederacy and the Nizam of Hyderabad on the other. Hyder Ali and his successor Tipu Sultan fought a war on four fronts with the British attacking from the west, south, and east, while the Marathas and the Nizam's forces attacked from the north. The fourth war resulted in the overthrow of the house of Hyder Ali and Tipu (who was killed in the final war, in 1799), and the dismantlement of Mysore to the benefit of the East India Company, which won and took control of much of India Pazhassi Raja was the prince regent of the princely state of Cotiote in North Malabar, near Kannur, India between 1774 and 1805. He

fought a guerrilla war with tribal people from Wynad supporting him. He was captured by the British and his fort was razed to the ground.

In 1766 the Nizam of Hyderabad transferred the Northern Circars to the British authority. The independent king Jagannatha Gajapati Narayan Deo II of Paralakhemundi estate situated in today's Odisha and in the northernmost region of the then political division was continuously revolting against the French occupants since 1753 as per the Nizam's earlier handover of his estate to them on similar grounds. Narayan Deo II fought the British at Jelmur fort on 4 April 1768 and was defeated due to superior firepower of the British. He fled to the tribal hinterlands of his estate and continued his efforts against the British until his natural death on the Fifth of December 1771.

Rani Velu Nachiyar (1730–1796):

Rani Velu Nachiyar (1730–1796), was a queen of Sivaganga from 1760 to 1790. Rani Nachiyar was trained in war match weapons usage, martial arts like Valari, Silambam (fighting using stick), horse riding and archery. She was a scholar in many languages and she had proficiency with languages like French, English, and Urdu. When her husband, Muthuvaduganathaperiya Udaiyathevar, was killed in battle with British soldiers and the forces of the Nawab of Arcot, she was drawn into battle. She formed an army and sought an alliance with Gopala Nayaker and Hyder Ali with the aim of attacking the British, whom she successfully challenged in 1780. When the inventories of the Britishers were discovered, she is said to have arranged a suicide attack by a faithful follower, Kuyili, dousing herself in oil and setting herself alight and walking into the storehouse. Rani formed a women's army named "Udaiyaal" in honour of her adopted daughter, who had died detonating a British arsenal. Rani Nachiyar was one of the few rulers who regained her kingdom, and ruled it for a decade more.

Veerapandiya Kattabomman:

Veerapandiya Kattabomman was an eighteenth-century Polygar and chieftain from Panchalankurichi in Tamil Nadu, India who waged the Polygar war against the East India Company. He was captured by the British and hanged in 1799 CE.[30] Kattabomman refused to accept the sovereignty of East India

Company, and fought against them. Dheeran Chinnamalai was a Kongu Nadu chieftain and Palayakkarar from Tamil Nadu who fought against the East India Company. After Kattabomman and Tipu Sultan's deaths, Chinnamalai sought the help of Marathas and Maruthu Pandiyar to attack the British at Coimbatore in 1800. The British forces managed to stop the armies of the allies, forcing Chinnamalai to attack Coimbatore on his own. His army was defeated and he escaped from the British forces. Chinnamalai engaged in guerrilla warfare and defeated the British in battles at Cauvery in 1801, Odanilai in 1802 and Arachalur in 1804.

In 1804 the King of Khordha, Kalinga was deprived of his traditional rights to the Jagannath Temple. In retaliation, a group of armed Paiks attacked the British at Pipili. Jayee Rajguru, the chief of Army of Kalinga requested a common alliance against the British. After Rajguru's death, Bakshi Jagabandhu launched an armed rebellion against the East India Company's rule in Odisha. This is now known as the Paik Rebellion, the first Rebellion against the British East India Company.

Rebellion of 1857:

The Indian rebellion of 1857 was a large uprising in northern and central India against the East India Company. The conditions of service in the company's army and cantonments had increasingly come into conflict with the religious beliefs and prejudices of the sepoys. The predominance of members from the upper castes in the army, perceived loss of caste due to overseas deployment, and rumours of secret designs of the government to convert them to Christianity led to growing discontent. The sepoys were also disillusioned by their low salaries and the racial discrimination practised by British officers in matters of promotion and privileges.

The indifference of the British towards native Indian rulers and the annexation of Oudh furthered dissent. The Marquess of Dalhousie's policy of annexation, the doctrine of lapse and the projected removal of the Mughals from their ancestral palace at Red Fort also led to popular anger.

The final spark was provided by the rumoured use of tallow (from cows) and lard (pig fat) in the newly introduced Pattern 1853 Enfield rifle cartridges. Soldiers

had to bite the cartridges with their teeth before loading them into their rifles, ingesting the fat. This was sacrimonious to both Hindus and Muslims.

Mangal Pandey was sepoy who played a key part in the events immediately preceding the outbreak of the Indian rebellion of 1857. His defiance to his British superiors and later his execution ignited the fire for 1857 Indian Rebellion.

On 10 May 1857, the sepoys at Meerut broke ranks and turned on their commanding officers, killing some of them. They reached Delhi on 11 May, set the company's toll house on fire, and marched into the Red Fort, where they asked the Mughal emperor, Bahadur Shah II, to become their leader and reclaim his throne. The emperor eventually agreed and was proclaimed Shahenshah-e-Hindustan by the rebels. The rebels also murdered much of the European, Eurasian, and Christian population of the city.

Revolts broke out in other parts of Oudh and the North-Western Provinces as well, where civil rebellion followed the mutinies, leading to popular uprisings. The British were initially caught off-guard and were thus slow to react, but eventually responded with force. The lack of effective organisation among the rebels, coupled with the military superiority of the British, brought an end to the rebellion. The British fought the main army of the rebels near Delhi, and after prolonged fighting and a siege, defeated them and reclaimed the city on 20 September 1857. Subsequently, revolts in other centres were also crushed. The last significant battle was fought in Gwalior on 17 June 1858, during which Rani Lakshmibai was killed. Sporadic fighting and guerrilla warfare, led by Tatya Tope, continued until spring 1859, but most of the rebels were eventually subdued.

The Indian Rebellion of 1857 was a turning point. While affirming the military and political power of the British, it led to a significant change in how India was to be controlled by them. Under the Government of India Act 1858, the East India Company's territory was transferred to the British government. At the apex of the new system was a Cabinet minister, the Secretary of State for India, who was to be formally advised by a statutory council; the Governor-General of India (Viceroy) was made responsible to him, while he in turn was responsible to the government.

In a royal proclamation made to the people of India, Queen Victoria promised equal opportunity of public service under British law, and also pledged to respect the rights of native princes.[51] The British stopped the policy of seizing land from the princes, decreed religious tolerance and began to admit Indians into the civil service. However, they also increased the number of British soldiers in relation to native Indian ones, and allowed only British soldiers to handle artillery. Bahadur Shah II was exiled to Rangoon where he died in 1862.

In 1876 the British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli proclaimed Queen Victoria the Empress of India. The British Liberals objected as the title was foreign to British traditions.

The decades following the Rebellion were a period of growing political awareness, the manifestation of Indian public opinion and the emergence of Indian leadership at both national and provincial levels. Dadabhai Naoroji formed the East India Association in 1867 and Surendranath Banerjee founded the Indian National Association in 1876. Inspired by a suggestion made by A.O. Hume, a retired Scottish civil servant, seventy-two Indian delegates met in Bombay in 1885 and founded the Indian National Congress.[53] They were mostly members of the upwardly mobile and successful western-educated provincial elites, engaged in professions such as law, teaching and journalism. At its inception, Congress had no well-defined ideology and commanded few of the resources essential to a political organization. Instead, it functioned more as a debating society that met annually to express its loyalty to the British and passed numerous resolutions on less controversial issues such as civil rights or opportunities in government (especially in the civil service). These resolutions were submitted to the Indian government and occasionally to the British Parliament, but the Congress's early gains were slight. "Despite its claim to represent all India, the Congress voiced the interests of urban elites; the number of participants from other social and economic backgrounds remained negligible.[53] However, this period of history is still crucial because it represented the first political mobilization of Indians, coming from all parts of the subcontinent and the first articulation of the idea of India as one nation, rather than a collection of independent princely states.

Religious groups played a role in reforming Indian society. These were of several religions from Hindu groups such as the Arya Samaj, the Brahmo Samaj, to other religions, such as the Namdhari (or Kuka) sect of Sikhism. The work of men like Swami Vivekananda, Ramakrishna, Sri Aurobindo, V. O. Chidambaram Pillai, Subramanya Bharathy, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, Rabindranath Tagore and Dadabhai Naoroji, as well as women such as the Scots–Irish Sister Nivedita, spread the passion for rejuvenation and freedom. The rediscovery of India's indigenous history by several European and Indian scholars also fed into the rise of nationalism among Indians.

The triumvirate also is known as Lal Bal Pal (Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Bipin Chandra Pal, Lala Lajpat Rai), along with V. O. Chidambaram Pillai, Sri Aurobindo, Surendranath Banerjee, and Rabindranath Tagore were some of the prominent leaders of movements in the early 20th century. The Swadeshi movement was the most successful. The name of Lokmanya began spreading around and people started following him in all parts of the country.

The Indian textile industry also played an important role in the freedom struggle of India. The merchandise of the textile industry pioneered the Industrial Revolution in India and soon England was producing cotton cloth in such great quantities that the domestic market was saturated, and the products had to be sold in foreign markets.

On the other hand, India was rich in cotton production and was in a position to supply British mills with the raw material they required. This was the time when India was under British rule and the East India Company had already established its roots in India. Raw materials were exported to England at very low rates while cotton cloth of refined quality was imported to India and sold at very high prices. This was draining India's economy, causing the textile industry of India to suffer greatly. This led to great resentment among cotton cultivators and traders.

After Lord Curzon announced the partition of Bengal in 1905, there was massive opposition from the people of Bengal. Initially, the partition plan was opposed through press campaign. The total follower of such techniques led to the boycott of British goods and the people of India pledged to use only swadeshi or

Indian goods and to wear only Indian cloth. Imported garments were viewed with hate. At many places, public burnings of foreign cloth were organized. Shops selling foreign cloths were closed. The cotton textile industry is rightly described as the Swadeshi industry. The period witnessed the growth of swadeshi textile mills. Swadeshi factories came into existence everywhere.

According to Surendranath Banerji, the Swadeshi movement changed the entire texture of Indian social and domestic life. The songs composed by Rabindranath Tagore, Rajanikanta Sen and Syed Abu Mohd became the moving spirit for the nationalists. The movement soon spread to the rest of the country and the partition of Bengal had to be firmly inhaled on the first of April, 1912.

Rise of Indian Nationalism:

By 1900, although the Congress had emerged as an all-India political organisation, it did not have the support of most Indian Muslims.[55] Attacks by Hindu reformers against religious conversion, cow slaughter, and the preservation of Urdu in Arabic script deepened their concerns of minority status and denial of rights if the Congress alone were to represent the people of India. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan launched a movement for Muslim regeneration that culminated in the founding in 1875 of the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh (renamed Aligarh Muslim University in 1920). Its objective was to educate students by emphasising the compatibility of Islam with modern western knowledge. The diversity among India's Muslims, however, made it impossible to bring about uniform cultural and intellectual regeneration.

Nationalistic sentiments among Congress members led to a push to be represented in the bodies of government, as well as to have a say in the legislation and administration of India. Congressmen saw themselves as loyalists, but wanted an active role in governing their own country, albeit as part of the Empire. This trend was personified by Dadabhai Naoroji, who went as far as contesting, successfully, an election to the House of Commons of the United Kingdom, becoming its first Indian member.

Dadabhai Naoroji was the first Indian nationalist to embrace Swaraj as the destiny of the nation.[56] Bal Gangadhar Tilak deeply opposed a British education

system that ignored and defamed India's culture, history, and values. He resented the denial of freedom of expression for nationalists, and the lack of any voice or role for ordinary Indians in the affairs of their nation. For these reasons, he considered Swaraj as the natural and only solution. His popular sentence "Swaraj is my birthright, and I shall have it" became the source of inspiration for Indians.

In 1907, Congress was split into two factions: The radicals, led by Tilak, advocated civil agitation and direct revolution to overthrow the British Empire and the abandonment of all things British. The moderates, led by leaders like Dadabhai Naoroji and Gopal Krishna Gokhale, on the other hand, wanted reform within the framework of British rule. Tilak was backed by rising public leaders like Bipin Chandra Pal and Lala Lajpat Rai, who held the same point of view. Under them, India's three great states – Maharashtra, Bengal and Punjab shaped the demand of the people and India's nationalism. Gokhale criticised Tilak for encouraging acts of violence and disorder. But the Congress of 1906 did not have public membership, and thus Tilak and his supporters were forced to leave the party.

But with Tilak's arrest, all hopes for an Indian offensive were stalled. The Indian National Congress lost credibility with the people. A Muslim deputation met with the Viceroy, Minto (1905–10), seeking concessions from the impending constitutional reforms, including special considerations in government service and electorates. The British recognised some of the Muslim League's petitions by increasing the number of elective offices reserved for Muslims in the Indian Councils Act 1909. The Muslim League insisted on its separateness from the Hindu-dominated Congress, as the voice of a "nation within a nation".

The Ghadar Party was formed overseas in 1913 to fight for the Independence of India with members coming from the United States and Canada, as well as Shanghai, Hong Kong, and Singapore. Members of the party aimed for Hindu, Sikh, and Muslim unity against the British.

In colonial India, the All India Conference of Indian Christians (AICIC), which was founded in 1914, played a role in the Indian independence movement, advocating for swaraj and opposing the partition of India. The AICIC also was opposed to separate electorates for Christians, believing that the faithful "should

participate as common citizens in the one common, national political system". The All India Conference of Indian Christians and the All India Catholic Union formed a working committee with M. Rahnasamy of Andhra University serving as president and B.L. Rallia Ram of Lahore serving as general secretary. In its meeting on 16 and 17 April 1947, the joint committee prepared a 13-point memorandum that was sent to the Constituent Assembly of India, which asked for religious freedom for both organisations and individuals; this came to be reflected in the Constitution of India.

The temperance movement in India became aligned with Indian nationalism under the direction of Mahatma Gandhi, who saw alcohol as a foreign importation to the culture of the subcontinent.

- Dadabhai Naoroji, was one of the founding members of the Indian National Congress.
- Lala Lajpat Rai of Punjab, Bal Gangadhar Tilak of Bombay, and Bipin Chandra Pal of Bengal, the triumvirate were popularly known as Lal Bal Pal, changed the political discourse of the Indian independence movement.
- Surendranath Banerjee, founded the Indian National Association and founding members of the Indian National Congress.
- Gopal Krishna Gokhale, was a senior leader of the Indian National Congress and the founder of the Servants of India Society.

Partition of Bengal, 1905:

- Khudiram Bose was one of the youngest Indian revolutionaries tried and executed by the British.
- Prafulla Chaki was associated with the Jugantar. He carried out assassinations against British colonial officials in an attempt to secure Indian independence.
- Bhupendranath Datta was an Indian revolutionary who was privy to the Indo-German Conspiracy.

Lord Curzon:

In July 1905, Lord Curzon, the Viceroy and Governor-General (1899–1905), ordered the partition of the province of Bengal. The stated aim was to improve administration. However, this was seen as an attempt to quench nationalistic sentiment through divide and rule. The Bengali Hindu intelligentsia exerted considerable influence on local and national politics. The partition outraged Bengalis. Widespread agitation ensued in the streets and in the press, and the Congress advocated boycotting British products under the banner of swadeshi, or indigenous industries. A growing movement emerged, focussing on indigenous Indian industries, finance, and education, which saw the founding of National Council of Education, the birth of Indian financial institutions and banks, as well as an interest in Indian culture and achievements in science and literature. Hindus showed unity by tying Rakhi on each other's wrists and observing Arandhan (not cooking any food). During this time, Bengali Hindu nationalists like Sri Aurobindo, Bhupendranath Datta, and Bipin Chandra Pal began writing virulent newspaper articles challenging the legitimacy of British rule in India in publications such as Jugantar and Sandhya, and were charged with sedition.

The Partition also precipitated increasing activity from the then still Nascent militant nationalist revolutionary movement, which was particularly gaining strength in Bengal and Maharashtra from the last decade of the 1800s. In Bengal, Anushilan Samiti, led by brothers Aurobindo and Barin Ghosh organised a number of attacks of figureheads of the Raj, culminating in the attempt on the life of a British judge in Muzaffarpur. This precipitated the Alipore bomb case, whilst a number of revolutionaries were killed, or captured and put on trial. Revolutionaries like Khudiram Bose, Prafulla Chaki, Kanailal Dutt who were either killed or hanged became household names.

Jugantar:

Aurobindo Ghose was one of the founding member of Jugantar, as well as being involved with nationalist politics in the Indian National Congress and the nascent revolutionary movement in Bengal with the Anushilan Samiti.

Barindra Kumar Ghosh, was one of the founding members of Jugantar and younger brother of Sri Aurobindo.

Jatindranath Mukherjee (Bagha Jatin) in 1910; was the principal leader of the Jugantar Party that was the central association of revolutionary Indian independence fighters in Bengal.

Jugantar was a paramilitary organization. Led by Barindra Ghosh, with 21 revolutionaries, including Bagha Jatin, started to collect arms and explosives and manufactured bombs.

Some senior members of the group were sent abroad for political and military training. One of them, Hemchandra Kanungo obtained his training in Paris. After returning to Kolkata he set up a combined religious school and bomb factory at a garden house in Maniktala suburb of Calcutta. However, the attempted murder of district Judge Kingsford of Muzaffarpur by Khudiram Bose and Prafulla Chaki (30 April 1908) initiated a police investigation that led to the arrest of many of the revolutionaries.

Benoy Basu, Badal Gupta, and Dinesh Gupta were noted for launching an attack on the Secretariat Building - the Writers' Building in the Dalhousie square in Kolkata.

Bagha Jatin was one of the senior leaders in Jugantar. He was arrested, along with several other leaders, in connection with the Howrah-Sibpur Conspiracy case. They were tried for treason, the charge being that they had incited various regiments of the army against the ruler.

Benoy Basu, Badal Gupta and Dinesh Gupta, who are noted for launching an attack on the Secretariat Building - the Writers' Building in the Dalhousie square in Kolkata, were Jugantar members.

Alipore bomb conspiracy case:

Several leaders of the Jugantar party including Aurobindo Ghosh were arrested in connection with bomb-making activities in Kolkata and Hare Krishna Konar was one of the founding member of Communist Party of India (Marxist) and Communist Consolidation were arrested for connection with

Calcutta arms act case in 1932 and deported to Cellular Jail.[71] Several others were also deported to the Andaman Cellular Jail for doing Indian independence movement.

The trial room, Alipore Sessions Court, Calcutta, depiction from 1997.

Muraripukur garden house, in the Manicktolla suburbs of Calcutta. This served as the headquarters of Barindra Kumar Ghosh and his associates.

Hare Krishna Konar, was connected with Civil disobedience and Calcutta arms act case and was deported to Cellular Jail. There he founded Communist Consolidation.

A wing of the Cellular Jail, Port Blair; showing the central tower where many revolutionaries for Indian independence were held imprisoned.

Communist Consolidation:

Several leaders of Jugantar group were imprisoned in various jails, one of which was a prominent jail of British India, Cellular Jail. The Cellular jail was also referred to as Kalapani. In 1932 many freedom fighters from Bengal were imprisoned in cellular jail as a result of the Calcutta arms act case. The prisoners of cellular jail carried out their first hunger strike in 1933 due to inhumane treatment in jail. The prisoners encountered Marxist and Communist ideology in jail and in 1935 a Communist Consolidation party was formed by Hare Krishna Konar, Shiv Verma, Batukeshwar Dutt and other prisoners of Cellular jail who were attracted to Marxist ideology. This party also led the second hunger strike in Cellular Jail, which demanded the designation of these prisoners as political prisoners rather than a freedom fighters.

Delhi-Lahore conspiracy case:

1912 assassination attempt on Lord Hardinge.

The Delhi-Lahore Conspiracy, hatched in 1912, planned to assassinate the then Viceroy of India, Lord Hardinge, on the occasion of transferring the capital of British India from Calcutta to New Delhi. Involving revolutionary underground in Bengal and headed by Rash Behari Bose along with Sachin Sanyal, the conspiracy culminated on the attempted assassination on 23 December 1912, when

the ceremonial procession moved through the Chandni Chowk suburb of Delhi. The Viceroy escaped with his injuries, along with Lady Hardinge, although the Mahout was killed.

The investigations in the aftermath of the assassination attempt led to the Delhi Conspiracy trial. Basant Kumar Biswas was convicted of having thrown the bomb and executed, along with Amir Chand and Avadh Behari for their roles in the conspiracy.

Basanta Kumar Biswas threw a bomb at the Viceroy's Parade in what came to be known as the Delhi-Lahore Conspiracy.

Amarendranath Chatterjee was in charge of raising funds for the Jugantar movement, his activities largely covered revolutionary centres in Bihar, Odisha and the United Provinces.

Howrah gang case:

Most of the eminent Jugantar leaders including Bagha Jatin alias Jatindra Nath Mukherjee who were not arrested earlier, were arrested in 1910, in connection with the murder of Shamsul Alam. Thanks to Bagha Jatin's new policy of a decentralised federated action, most of the accused were released in 1911.

All-India Muslim League:

The All-India Muslim League was founded by the All India Muhammadan Educational Conference at Dacca (now Dhaka, Bangladesh), in 1906. Being a political party to secure the interests of the Muslim in British India, the Muslim League played a decisive role behind the creation of Pakistan in the Indian subcontinent.

In 1916, Muhammad Ali Jinnah joined the Indian National Congress, which was the largest Indian political organisation. Like most of the Congress at the time, Jinnah did not favour outright self-rule, considering British influences on education, law, culture, and industry as beneficial to India. Jinnah became a member of the sixty-member Imperial Legislative Council. The council had no real power or authority, and included a large number of unelected pro-Raj loyalists and Europeans. Nevertheless, Jinnah was instrumental in the passing of the Child

Marriages Restraint Act, the legitimisation of the Muslim waqf (religious endowments) and was appointed to the Sandhurst committee, which helped establish the Indian Military Academy at Dehradun. During the First World War, Jinnah joined other Indian moderates in supporting the British war effort.

First World War:

Indian Army gunners (probably 39th Battery) with 3.7-inch mountain howitzers, Jerusalem 1917.

Rash Behari Bose, was one of the key organisers of the Ghadar Mutiny and later the Indian National Army.

Punjabi Sikhs aboard the SS Komagata Maru in Vancouver's Burrard Inlet, 1914. Most of the passengers were not allowed to land in Canada and the ship was forced to return to India. The events surrounding the Komagata Maru incident served as a catalyst for the Ghadarite cause.

The First World War began with an unprecedented outpouring of support towards Britain from within the mainstream political leadership. Contrary to initial British fears of an Indian revolt, Indians contributed considerably to the British war effort by providing men and resources. About 1.3 million Indian soldiers and labourers served in Europe, Africa, and the Middle East, while both the Indian government and the princes sent large supplies of food, money, and ammunition. Nonetheless, Bengal and Punjab remained hotbeds of anti-colonial activities. Nationalism in Bengal, increasingly associated with the unrest in Punjab, was of significant ferocity to almost complete the paralysis of the regional administration. Meanwhile, failed conspiracies were triggered by revolutionaries lack of preparedness to organise a nationalist revolt.

None of the revolutionary conspiracies made a significant impact inside India. The prospect that subversive violence would have an effect on a popular war effort drew support from the Indian population for special measures against anti-colonial activities in the form of Defence of India Act 1915. There were no major mutinies occurring during wartime, yet conspiracies exacerbated profound fears of

insurrection among British officials, preparing them to use extreme force to frighten Indians into submission.

Hindu–German Conspiracy:

The 1915 Singapore Mutiny memorial tablet at the entrance of the Victoria Memorial Hall, Singapore.

The Hindu–German Conspiracy, was a series of plans between 1914 and 1917 by Indian nationalist groups to attempt Pan-Indian rebellion against the British Raj during World War I, formulated between the Indian revolutionary underground and exiled or self-exiled nationalists who formed, in the United States, the Ghadar Party, and in Germany, the Indian independence committee, in the decade preceding the Great War. The conspiracy was drawn up at the beginning of the war, with extensive support from the German Foreign Office, the German consulate in San Francisco, as well as some support from Ottoman Turkey and the Irish republican movement. The most prominent plan attempted to foment unrest and trigger a Pan-Indian mutiny in the British Indian Army from Punjab to Singapore. This plot was planned to be executed in February 1915 with the aim of overthrowing British rule over the Indian subcontinent. The February mutiny was ultimately thwarted when British intelligence infiltrated the Ghadarite movement and arrested key figures. Mutinies in smaller units and garrisons within India were also crushed.

Other related events include the 1915 Singapore Mutiny, the Annie Larsen arms plot, the Jugantar–German plot, the German mission to Kabul, the mutiny of the Connaught Rangers in India, as well as, by some accounts, the Black Tom explosion in 1916. Parts of the conspiracy included efforts to subvert the British Indian Army in the Middle Eastern theatre of World War I.

The public executions of convicted sepoy mutineers of the 1915 Singapore Mutiny at Outram Road, Singapore.

The Ghadar Mutiny was a plan to initiate a pan-Indian mutiny in the British Indian Army in February 1915 to end the British Raj in India. The plot originated at the onset of World War I, between the Ghadar Party in the United States,

the Berlin Committee in Germany, the Indian revolutionary underground in British India and the German Foreign Office through the consulate in San Francisco. The incident derives its name from the North American Ghadar Party, whose members of the Punjabi Sikh community in Canada and the United States were among the most prominent participants in the plan. It was the most prominent amongst a number of plans of the much larger Hindu–German Mutiny, formulated between 1914 and 1917 to initiate a Pan-Indian rebellion against the British Raj during World War I. The mutiny was planned to start in the key state of Punjab, followed by mutinies in Bengal and rest of India. Indian units as far as Singapore were planned to participate in the rebellion. The plans were thwarted through a coordinated intelligence and police response. British intelligence infiltrated the Ghadarite movement in Canada and in India, and last-minute intelligence from a spy helping to crush the planned uprising in Punjab before it started. Key figures were arrested, mutinies in smaller units and garrisons within India were also crushed.

Intelligence about the threat of the mutiny led to a number of important war-time measures introduced in India, including the passages of Ingress into India Ordinance, 1914, the Foreigners act 1914, and the Defence of India Act 1915. The conspiracy was followed by the First Lahore Conspiracy Trial and Benares Conspiracy Trial which saw death sentences awarded to a number of Indian revolutionaries, and exile to a number of others. After the end of the war, fear of a second Ghadarite uprising led to the recommendations of the Rowlatt Acts and thence the Jallianwala Bagh massacre.

The first Christmas Day plot was a conspiracy made by the Indian revolutionary movement in 1909: during the year-ending holidays, the Governor of Bengal organised at his residence a ball in the presence of the Viceroy, the Commander-in-Chief and all the high-ranking officers and officials of the Capital (Calcutta). The 10th Jat Regiment was in charge of the security. Indoctrinated by Jatindranath Mukherjee, its soldiers decided to blow up the ballroom and take advantage of destroying the colonial Government. In keeping with his predecessor Otto (William Oskarovich) von Klemm, a friend of Lokamanya Tilak, on 6 February 1910, M. Arsenyev, the Russian Consul-General, wrote to St Petersburg

that it had been intended to "arouse in the country a general perturbation of minds and, thereby, afford the revolutionaries an opportunity to take the power in their hands." According to R. C. Majumdar, "The police had suspected nothing and it is hard to say what the outcome would have been had the soldiers not been betrayed by one of their comrades who informed the authorities about the impending coup".

The second Christmas Day plot was to initiate an insurrection in Bengal in British India during World War I with German arms and support. Scheduled for Christmas Day, 1915, the plan was conceived and led by the Jugantar group under the Bengali Indian revolutionary Jatindranath Mukherjee, to be coordinated with simultaneous uprising in the British colony of Burma and Kingdom of Siam under direction of the Ghadar Party, along with a German raid on the South Indian city of Madras and the British penal colony in Andaman Islands. The aim of the plot was to seize the Fort William, isolate Bengal and capture the capital city of Calcutta, which was then to be used as a staging ground for a pan-Indian revolution. The Christmas Day plot was one of the later plans for pan-Indian mutiny during the war that were coordinated between the Indian nationalist underground, the "Indian independence committee" set up by the Germans in Berlin, the Ghadar Party in North America, and the German Foreign office.[88] The plot was ultimately thwarted after British intelligence uncovered the plot through German and Indian double agents in Europe and Southeast Asia.

Niedermayer–Hentig Expedition:

Mahendra Pratap (centre), President of the Provisional Government of India, at the head of the Mission with the German and Turkish delegates in Kabul, 1915. Seated to his right is Werner Otto von Hentig.

The Niedermayer–Hentig Expedition was a diplomatic mission to Afghanistan sent by the Central Powers in 1915–1916. The purpose was to encourage Afghanistan to declare full independence from the British Empire, enter World War I on the side of the Central Powers, and attack British India. The expedition was part of the Hindu–German Conspiracy, a series of Indo-German efforts to provoke a nationalist revolution in India. Nominally headed by the exiled Indian prince Raja Mahendra Pratap, the expedition was a joint operation

of Germany and Turkey and was led by the German Army officers Oskar Niedermayer and Werner Otto von Hentig. Other participants included members of an Indian nationalist organisation called the Berlin Committee, including Maulavi Barkatullah and Chempakaraman Pillai, while the Turks were represented by Kazim Bey, a close confidante of Enver Pasha.

Britain saw the expedition as a serious threat. Britain and its ally, the Russian Empire, unsuccessfully attempted to intercept it in Persia during the summer of 1915. Britain waged a covert intelligence and diplomatic offensive, including personal interventions by the Viceroy Lord Hardinge and King George V, to maintain Afghan neutrality.

The mission failed in its main task of rallying Afghanistan, under Emir Habibullah Khan, to the German and Turkish war effort, but it influenced other major events. In Afghanistan, the expedition triggered reforms and drove political turmoil that culminated in the assassination of the Emir in 1919, which in turn precipitated the Third Afghan War. It influenced the Kalmyk Project of nascent Bolshevik Russia to propagate socialist revolution in Asia, with one goal being the overthrow of the British Raj. Other consequences included the formation of the Rowlatt Committee to investigate sedition in India as influenced by Germany and Bolshevism, and changes in the Raj's approach to the Indian independence movement immediately after World War I.

Nationalist response to war:

In the aftermath of the First World War, high casualty rates, soaring inflation compounded by heavy taxation, a widespread influenza pandemic and the disruption of trade during the war escalated human suffering in India.

The pre-war nationalist movement revived moderate and extremist groups within the Congress submerged their differences in order to stand together as a unified front. They argued that their enormous services to the British Empire during the war demanded a reward to demonstrate Indian capacity for self-rule. In 1916, Congress succeeded in forging the Lucknow Pact, a temporary alliance with the All India Muslim League over the issues of devolution and the future of Islam in the region

British reforms:

The British themselves adopted a "carrot and stick" approach in recognition of India's support during the war and in response to renewed nationalist demands. In August 1917, Edwin Montagu, Secretary of state for India, made an historic announcement in Parliament that the British policy was for: "increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire." The means of achieving the proposed measures were later enshrined in the Government of India Act, 1919, which introduced the principle of a dual-mode of administration, or diarchy, in which both elected Indian legislators and, appointed British officials shared power. The act also expanded the central and provincial legislatures and widened the franchise considerably. The diarchy set in motion certain real changes at the provincial level: a number of non-controversial or "transferred" portfolios, such as agriculture, local government, health, education, and public works, were handed over to Indians, while more sensitive matters such as finance, taxation, and maintaining law and order were retained by the provincial British administrators.

Gandhi arrives in India:

Gandhi in 1918, at the time of the Kheda Satyagraha and Champaran Satyagraha. (Sitting L to R) Rajendra Prasad and Anugrah Narayan Sinha during Mahatma Gandhi's 1917 Champaran Satyagraha. The Martyrs' Well of Jallianwala Bagh massacre, at Jallianwala Bagh. 120 bodies were recovered from this well as per inscription on it. Sidney Rowlatt, best remembered for his controversial presidency of the Rowlatt Committee, a sedition committee appointed in 1918 by the British Indian Government to evaluate the links between political terrorism in India, the actions indirectly led to the infamous Jallianwala Bagh massacre of 1919.

Gandhi had been a leader of the Indian nationalist movement in South Africa. He had also been a vocal opponent of basic discrimination and abusive labour treatment as well as suppressive police control such as the Rowlatt Acts. During these protests, Gandhi had perfected the concept of satyagraha. In January

1914 (well before the First World War began) Gandhi was successful. The legislation against Indians was repealed and all Indian political prisoners were released by General Jan Smuts.[92] Gandhi accomplished this through extensive use of non-violent protests, such as boycotting, protest marching, and fasting by him and his followers.

Gandhi returned to India on 9 January 1915, and initially entered the political fray not with calls for a nation-state, but in support of the unified commerce-oriented territory that the Congress Party had been asking for. Gandhi believed that the industrial development and educational development that the Europeans had brought were long required to alleviate many of India's chronic problems. Gopal Krishna Gokhale, a veteran Congressman and Indian leader, became Gandhi's mentor. Gandhi's ideas and strategies of non-violent civil disobedience initially appeared impractical to some Indians and their Congress leaders. In the Mahatma's own words, "civil disobedience is civil breach of immoral statutory enactments." It had to be carried out non-violently by withdrawing co-operation with the corrupt state. Gandhi had great respect for Lokmanya Tilak. His programmes were all inspired by Tilak's "Chatusutri" programme.

The positive impact of reform was seriously undermined in 1919 by the Rowlatt Act, named after the recommendations made the previous year to the Imperial Legislative Council by the Rowlatt Committee. The commission was set up to look into the war-time conspiracies by the nationalist organisations and recommend measures to deal with the problem in the post-war period. Rowlatt recommended the extension of the war-time powers of the Defence of India act into the post-war period. The war-time act had vested the Viceroy's government with extraordinary powers to quell sedition by silencing the press, detaining political activists without trial, and arresting any individuals suspected of sedition or treason without a warrant. It was increasingly reviled within India due to widespread and indiscriminate use. Many popular leaders, including Annie Besant and Ali brothers had been detained. The Rowlatt Act was, therefore, passed in the face of universal opposition among the (non-official) Indian members in the Viceroy's council. The extension of the act drew widespread critical opposition. A

nationwide cessation of work (hartal) was called, marking the beginning of widespread, although not nationwide, popular discontent.

The agitation unleashed by the acts led to demonstrations and British repressions, culminating on 13 April 1919, in the Jallianwala Bagh massacre (also known as the Amritsar Massacre) in Amritsar, Punjab. In response to agitation in Amritsar, Brigadier-General Reginald Dyer blocked the main, and only entrance, and ordered troops under his command to fire into an unarmed and unsuspecting crowd of some 15,000 men, women, and children. They had assembled peacefully at Jallianwala Bagh, a walled courtyard, but Dyer had wanted to execute the imposed ban on all meetings and proposed to teach all protestors a lesson the harsher way. A total of 1,651 rounds were fired, killing 379 people (as according to an official British commission; Indian officials' estimates ranged as high as 1,499 and wounding 1,137 in the massacre.) Dyer was forced to retire but was hailed as a hero by some in Britain, demonstrating to Indian nationalists that the Empire was beholden to public opinion in Britain, but not in India. The episode dissolved wartime hopes of home rule and goodwill and opened a rift that could not be bridged short of complete self-rule.

First non-co-operation movement:

From 1920 to 1922, Gandhi started the Non-Cooperation Movement. At the Kolkata session of the Congress in September 1920, Gandhi convinced other leaders of the need to start a non-co-operation movement in support of Khilafat as well as for dominion status. The first satyagraha movement urged the use of khadi and Indian material as alternatives to those shipped from Britain. It also urged people to boycott British educational institutions and law courts, resign from government employment, refuse to pay taxes, and forsake British titles and honors. Although this came too late to influence the framing of the new Government of India Act 1919, the movement enjoyed widespread popular support, and the resulting unparalleled magnitude of disorder presented a serious challenge to foreign rule. However, Gandhi called off the movement because he was scared after the Chauri Chaura incident, which saw the death of twenty-two policemen at the hands of an angry mob that India would descend into anarchy.

Membership in the party was opened to anyone prepared to pay a token fee, a hierarchy of committees was established, made responsible for discipline and control over a hitherto amorphous and diffuse movement. The party was transformed from an elite organisation to one of mass national appeal and participation.

Gandhi was sentenced in 1922 to six years in prison, but was released after serving two. On his release from prison, he set up the Sabarmati Ashram in Ahmedabad. On the banks of the river Sabarmati, he established the newspaper Young India, introducing a series of reforms aimed at the socially disadvantaged within Hindu society — the rural poor, and the untouchables. This era saw the emergence of a new generation of Indians from within the Congress Party, including Maulana Azad, C. Rajagopalachari, Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhbhai Patel, Subhas Chandra Bose and others- who would, later on, come to form the most prominent voices of the Indian self-rule movement, whether keeping with Gandhian Values, or, as in the case of Bose's Indian National Army, diverging from it.

The Indian political spectrum was further broadened in the mid-1920s by the emergence of both moderate and militant parties, such as the Swaraj Party, Hindu Mahasabha, Communist Party of India and the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh. Regional political organisations also continued to represent the interests of non-Brahmins in Madras, Mahars in Maharashtra, and Sikhs in Punjab. However, people like Mahakavi Subramanya Bharathi, Vanchinathan, and Neelakanda Brahmachari played a major role from Tamil Nadu in both self-rule struggle and fighting for equality for all castes and communities. Many women participated in the movement, including Kasturba Gandhi (Gandhi's wife), Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, Muthulaxmi Reddy, Aruna Asaf Ali, and many others.

Result of movements by Gandhi:

Salt march -1930

The mass movements sparked nationalist sentiment with the Indian populace and figures like Mahatma Gandhi united a nation behind his non-violence movement; philosophy and undoubtedly put crucial pressure on the British

occupation. The movements failed in their primary objective, achieving independence for India, as they were often called off before they naturally concluded due to laws and punishment. While in the later years of the Raj economic factors like the reversing trade fortunes between Britain and India and the cost of fielding the Indian armed forces abroad lumped on the British taxpayer by the 1935 Government of India act, had mounting implications for British administration, united resistance further drew light on the growing disparity of the British failures to achieve solidarity over India.

Quit India Movement:

On 14 July 1942 the Congress Working Committee (Indian National Congress, whose president Abul Kalam Azad supported Gandhi, passed a resolution demanding complete independence from the British government, and proposed massive civil disobedience if the British did not accede to the demands. On 8 August 1942 the Quit India Movement (Bharat Chhodo Andolan) began, a civil disobedience movement in India in response to Mahatma Gandhi's call for immediate self-rule by Indians and against sending Indians to World War II. Other major parties rejected the Quit India plan, and most cooperated closely with the British, as did the princely states, the civil service, and the police. The Muslim League supported the Raj and grew rapidly in membership, and in influence with the British.

The British swiftly responded to the Quit India Movement with mass arrests. Over 100,000 arrests were made, massive fines were levied, and demonstrators were subjected to public flogging. Hundreds of civilians were killed in violence many shot by the police army. Tens of thousands of leaders were also arrested and imprisoned until 1945. Ultimately, the British government realised that India was ungovernable in the long run, and the question for the postwar era became how to exit gracefully and peacefully.

Chauri Chaura Shahid Samarak, which is a memorial to the Chauri Chaura incident, when a large group of protesters, participating in the Non-cooperation movement, clashed with police, who opened fire. C. Rajagopalachari, was an Indian nationalist who participated in the agitations against the Rowlatt Act,

joining the Non-cooperation movement, the Vaikom Satyagraha, and the Civil disobedience movement. Jawaharlal Nehru in 1929 demanded "complete independence from Great Britain."

Vallabhbhai Patel was appointed as the 49th President of Indian National Congress, organising the party for elections in 1934 and 1937 while promoting the Quit India Movement.The flag adopted, during the Purna Swaraj movement, in 1931 and used by Provisional Government during the subsequent years of Second World War.

Congress leader and famous poet Hasrat Mohani and Communist Party of India leader Swami Kumaranand were the first activists to demand complete independence (Purna Swaraj) from the British in 1921 resolution from an All-India Congress Forum at the Ahmedabad Session of AICC. Maghfoor Ahmad Ajazi supported the 'Purna Swaraj' motion demanded by Hasrat Mohani.[102] Following the rejection of the Simon Commission's rejections, an all-party conference was held at Mumbai in May 1928 to instill a sense of camaraderie. The conference appointed a committee under Motilal Nehru to create a constitution for India. The Kolkata session of the Indian National Congress asked the British government to accord India dominion status by December 1929, or face a countrywide civil disobedience movement.

Amid rising discontent and increasingly violent regional movements, a call for complete sovereignty and an end to British rule found greater support from the people. At the Lahore session in December 1929, the Indian National Congress adopted the aim of complete self-rule. It authorized the Working Committee to launch a civil disobedience movement throughout the country. It was decided that 26 January 1930 should be observed all over India as the Purna Swaraj (complete self-rule) Day.

Gandhi–Irwin Pact:

The Gandhi–Irwin Pact was signed in March 1931, and the government agreed to release political prisoners. Gandhi managed to have over 90,000 political prisoners released under this pact. Though the death sentence for Bhagat Singh and his two comrades was not taken back by the British. For the next few years,

Congress and the government negotiated until the Government of India Act 1935 emerged. The Muslim League disputed the claim of the Congress to represent all people of India, while the Congress disputed the Muslim League's claim to voice the aspirations of all Muslims.

Civil Disobedience Movement:

The Civil Disobedience Movement launched a new chapter in the Indian independence movement. It did not succeed by itself, but it brought the Indian population together, under the Indian National Congress's leadership. The movement resulted in self rule being a talking point once again, and recruited more Indians to the idea. The movement allowed the Indian independence community to revive their inner confidence and strength against the British Government. In addition, the movement weakened the authority of the British and aided in the end of the British Empire in India. Overall, the civil disobedience Movement was an essential achievement in the history of Indian self-rule because it persuaded New Delhi of the role of the masses in self-determination.

The Government of India Act 1935, the voluminous and final constitutional effort at governing British India, articulated three major goals: establishing a loose federal structure, achieving provincial autonomy, and safeguarding minority interests through separate electorates. The federal provisions, intended to unite princely states and British India at the centre, were not implemented because of ambiguities in safeguarding the existing privileges of princes. In February 1937, however, provincial autonomy became a reality when elections were held; the Congress emerged as the dominant party with a clear majority in five provinces and held an upper hand in two, while the Muslim League performed poorly.

In 1939, the Viceroy Linlithgow declared India's entrance into the Second World War without consulting provincial governments. In protest, the Congress asked all of its elected representatives to resign from the government. Muhammad Ali Jinnah, the president of the All-India Muslim League, persuaded participants at the annual Muslim League session at Lahore in 1940 to adopt what later came to be known as the Lahore Resolution, demanding the division of India into two separate sovereign states, one Muslim, the other Hindu; sometimes referred to

as Two Nation Theory. Although the idea of Pakistan had been introduced as early as 1930, very few had responded to it.

In opposition to the Lahore Resolution, the All India Azad Muslim Conference gathered in Delhi in April 1940 to voice its support for a united India. Its members included several Islamic organisations in India, as well as 1400 nationalist Muslim delegates; the "attendance at the Nationalist meeting was about five times than the attendance at the League meeting."

The All-India Muslim League worked to try to silence those Muslims who stood against the partition of India, often using "intimidation and coercion". The murder of the All India Azad Muslim Conference leader Allah Bakhsh Soomro also made it easier for the All-India Muslim League to demand the creation of Pakistan.

There is no real connection between these two unrests, labour, and Congress opposition. But their very existence and coexistence, explains and fully justifies the attention, which Lord Irwin gave to the labour problems.

Apart from a few stray incidents, armed rebellions against the British rulers did not occur before the beginning of the 20th century. The Indian revolutionary underground began gathering momentum through the first decade of the 20th century, with groups arising in Bengal, Maharashtra, Odisha, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, and the Madras Presidency including what is now called South India. More groups were scattered around India. Particularly notable movements arose in Bengal, especially around the Partition of Bengal in 1905, and in Punjab after 1907. In the former case, it was the educated, intelligent and dedicated youth of the urban middle class Bhadralok community that came to form the "classic" Indian revolutionary, while the latter had an immense support base in the rural and military society of Punjab.

In Bengal, the Anushilan Samiti emerged from conglomerations of local youth groups and gyms (Akhra) in Bengal in 1902, forming two prominent and somewhat independent arms in East and West Bengal identified as Dhaka Anushilan Samiti in Dhaka (modern-day Bangladesh), and the Jugantar group (centred at Calcutta) respectively. Led by nationalists of the likes of Aurobindo

Ghosh and his brother Barindra Ghosh, the Samiti was influenced by philosophies as diverse as Hindu Shakta philosophy propounded by Bengali literature Bankim and Vivekananda, Italian Nationalism, and Pan-Asianism of Kakuzo Okakura. The Samiti was involved in a number of noted incidences of revolutionary terrorism against British interests and administration in India within the decade of its founding, including early attempts to assassinate Raj officials whilst led by Ghosh brothers. In the meantime, in Maharashtra and Punjab arose similarly militant nationalist feelings. The District Magistrate of Nasik, A.M.T. Jackson was shot dead by Anant Kanhere in December 1909, followed by the death of Robert D'Escourt Ashe at the hands of Vanchi Iyer.

Indian nationalism made headway through Indian societies as far as Paris and London. In London India House under the patronage of Shyamji Krishna Verma came under increasing scrutiny for championing and justifying violence in the cause of Indian nationalism, which found in Indian students in Britain and from Indian expatriates in Paris Indian Society avid followers. By 1907, through Indian nationalist Madame Bhikaji Rustom Cama's links to Russian revolutionary Nicholas Safranski, Indian groups including Bengal revolutionaries as well as India House under V.D. Savarkar were able to obtain manuals for manufacturing bombs. India House was also a source of arms and seditious literature that was rapidly distributed in India. In addition to The Indian Sociologist, pamphlets like Bande Mataram and Oh Martyrs! by Savarkar extolled revolutionary violence. Direct influences and incitement from India House were noted in several incidents of political violence, including assassinations, in India at the time. One of the two charges against Savarkar during his trial in Bombay was for abetting the murder of the District Magistrate of Nasik, A.M.T. Jackson, by Anant Kanhere in December 1909. The arms used were directly traced through an Italian courier to India House. Ex-India House residents M.P.T. Acharya and V.V.S. Aiyar were noted in the Rowlatt report to have aided and influenced political assassinations, including the murder of Robert D'Escourt Ashe. The Paris-Safranski link was strongly suggested by French police to be involved in a 1907 attempt in Bengal to derail the train carrying the Lieutenant-Governor Sir Andrew Fraser.

The activities of nationalists abroad is believed to have shaken the loyalty of a number of native regiments of the British Indian Army. The assassination of William Hutt Curzon Wyllie in the hands of Madanlal Dhingra was highly publicised and saw increasing surveillance and suppression of Indian nationalism. These were followed by the 1912 attempt on the life of Viceroy of India. Following this, the nucleus of networks formed in India House, the Anushilan Samiti, nationalists in Punjab, and the nationalism that arose among Indian expatriates and labourers in North America, a different movement began to emerge in the North American Ghadar Party, culminating in the Sedetious conspiracy of World War I led by Rash Behari Bose and Lala Hardayal.

However, the emergence of the Gandhian movement slowly began to absorb the different revolutionary groups. The Bengal Samiti moved away from its philosophy of violence in the 1920s, when a number of its members identified closely with the Congress and Gandhian non-violent movement. Revolutionary nationalist violence saw a resurgence after the collapse of Gandhian non-cooperation movement in 1922. In Bengal, this saw reorganisation of groups linked to the Samiti under the leadership of Surya Sen and Hem Chandra Kanungo. A spate of violence led up to the enactment of the Bengal Criminal Law Amendment in the early 1920s, which recalled the powers of incarceration and detention of the Defence of India Act. In north India, remnants of Punjab and Bengalee revolutionary organisations reorganised, notably under Sachindranath Sanyal, founding the Hindustan Republican Association with Chandrashekhar Azad in north India.

The HSRA had strong influences from leftist ideologies. Hindustan Socialist Republican Association (HSRA) was formed under the leadership of Chandrasekhar Azad. Kakori train robbery was done largely by the members of HSRA. A number of Congress leaders from Bengal, especially Subhash Chandra Bose, were accused by the British Government of having links with and allowing patronage to the revolutionary organisations during this time. The violence and radical philosophy revived in the 1930s, when revolutionaries of the Samiti and the HSRA were involved in the Chittagong armoury raid and the Kakori conspiracy and other attempts against the administration in British India and Raj

officials. Sachindra Nath Sanyal mentored revolutionaries in the Hindustan Socialist Republican Army (HSRA), including Bhagat Singh and Jatindra Nath Das, among others; including arms training and how to make bombs. Bhagat Singh and Batukeshwar Dutt threw a bomb inside the Central Legislative Assembly on 8 April 1929 protesting against the passage of the Public Safety Bill and the Trade Disputes Bill while raising slogans of "Inquilab Zindabad", though no one was killed or injured in the bomb incident. Bhagat Singh surrendered after the bombing incident and a trial was conducted. Sukhdev and Rajguru were also arrested by police during search operations after the bombing incident. Following the trial (Central Assembly Bomb Case), Bhagat Singh, Sukhdev and Rajguru were hanged in 1931. Allama Mashriqi founded Khaksar Tehreek in order to direct particularly the Muslims towards the self-rule movement. Some of its members left for the Indian National Congress then led by Subhas Chandra Bose, while others identified more closely with Communism. The Jugantar branch formally dissolved in 1938. On 13 March 1940, Udham Singh shot Michael O'Dwyer (the last political murder outside India), generally held responsible for the Amritsar Massacre, in London. However, the revolutionary movement gradually disseminated into the Gandhian movement. As the political scenario changed in the late 1930s — with the mainstream leaders considering several options offered by the British and with religious politics coming into play — revolutionary activities gradually declined. Many past revolutionaries joined mainstream politics by joining Congress and other parties, especially communist ones, while many of the activists were kept under hold in different jails across the country. Indians who were based in the UK, joined the India League and the Indian Workers Association, partaking in revolutionary activities in Britain.

Within a short time of its inception, these organisations became the focus of an extensive police and intelligence operations. Operations against Anushilan Samiti saw founding of the Special Branch of Calcutta Police. The intelligence operations against India House saw the founding of the Indian Political Intelligence Office which later grew to be the Intelligence Bureau in independent India. Heading the intelligence and missions against Ghadarite movement and India revolutionaries was the MI5(g) section, and at one point involved

the Pinkerton's detective agency. Notable officers who led the police and intelligence operations against Indian revolutionaries, or were involved in it, at various time included John Arnold Wallinger, Sir Robert Nathan, Sir Harold Stuart, Vernon Kell, Sir Charles Stevenson-Moore and Sir Charles Tegart, as well as W. Somerset Maugham. The threat posed by the activities of the Samiti in Bengal during World War I, along with the threat of a Ghadarite uprising in Punjab, saw the passage of Defence of India Act 1915. These measures saw the arrest, internment, transportations, and execution of a number of revolutionaries linked to the organisation, and was successful in crushing the East Bengal Branch. In the aftermath of the war, the Rowlatt committee recommended extending the Defence of India Act (as the Rowlatt act) to thwart any possible revival of the Samiti in Bengal and the Ghadarite movement in Punjab.

In the 1920s, Alluri Sitarama Raju led the ill-fated Rampa Rebellion of 1922–24, during which a band of tribal leaders and other sympathisers fought against the British Raj. Local people referred to him as "Manyam Veerudu" ("Hero of the Jungles"). After the passage of the 1882 Madras Forest Act, its restrictions on the free movement of tribal peoples in the forest prevented them from engaging in their traditional podu (Slash-and-burn) agricultural system, which involved shifting cultivation. Raju started a protest movement in the border areas of the Godavari Agency part of Madras Presidency (present-day Andhra Pradesh). Inspired by the patriotic zeal of revolutionaries in Bengal, Raju raided police stations in and around Chintapalle, Rampachodavaram, Dammanapalli, Krishna Devi Peta, Rajavommangi, Addateegala, Narsipatnam and Annavaram. Raju and his followers stole guns and ammunition and killed several British Indian Army officers, including Scott Coward near Dammanapalli. The British campaign lasted for nearly a year from December 1922. Raju was eventually trapped by the British in the forests of Chintapalli then tied to a tree and shot dead with a rifle.

Quit India Movement:

Mahatma Gandhi discusses the Quit India Movement with Nehru:

The Quit India Movement (Bharat Chhodo Andolan) or the August Movement was a civil disobedience movement in India which commenced on 8

August 1942 in response to Gandhi's call for immediate self-rule by Indians and against sending Indians to World War II. He asked all teachers to leave their schools, and other Indians to leave their respective jobs and take part in this movement. Due to Gandhi's political influence, his request was followed by a significant proportion of the population. In addition, Congress-led the Quit India Movement to demand the British to leave India and transfer the political power to a representative government.

During the movement, Gandhi and his followers continued to use non-violence against British rule. This movement was where Gandhi gave his famous message, "Do or Die!", and this message spread towards the Indian community. In addition, this movement was addressed directly to women as "disciplined soldiers of Indian freedom" and they had to keep the war for independence to go on (against British rule).

Procession in Bangalore during the Quit India Movement:

At the outbreak of war, the Congress Party had during the Wardha meeting of the working-committee in September 1939, passed a resolution conditionally supporting the fight against fascism, but were rebuffed when they asked for self-rule in return. In March 1942, faced with an increasingly dissatisfied sub-continent only reluctantly participating in the war, and deteriorations in the war situation in Europe and South East Asia, and with growing dissatisfactions among Indian troops- especially in Europe- and among the civilian population in the sub-continent, the British government sent a delegation to India under Stafford Cripps, in what came to be known as the Cripps' Mission. The purpose of the mission was to negotiate with the Indian National Congress a deal to obtain total co-operation during the war, in return of progressive devolution and distribution of power from the crown and the Viceroy to elected Indian legislature. However, the talks failed, having failed to address the key demand of a timeframe towards self-government, and of the definition of the powers to be relinquished, essentially portraying an offer of limited dominion-status that was wholly unacceptable to the Indian movement. To force the British Raj to meet its demands and to obtain definitive

word on total self-rule, the Congress took the decision to launch the Quit India Movement.

The aim of the movement was to force the British Government to the negotiating table by holding the Allied war effort hostage. The call for determined but passive resistance that signified the certitude that Gandhi foresaw for the movement is best described by his call to Do or Die, issued on 8 August at the Gowalia Tank Maidan in Bombay, since renamed August Kranti Maidan (August Revolution Ground). However, almost the entire Congress leadership, and not merely at the national level, was put into confinement less than 24 hours after Gandhi's speech, and the greater number of the Congress were to spend the rest of the war in jail.

On 8 August 1942, the Quit India resolution was passed at the Mumbai session of the All India Congress Committee (AICC). The draft proposed that if the British did not accede to the demands, a massive Civil Disobedience would be launched. However, it was an extremely controversial decision. At Gowalia Tank, Mumbai, Gandhi urged Indians to follow non-violent civil disobedience. Gandhi told the masses to act as citizens of a sovereign nation and not to follow the orders of the British. The British, already alarmed by the advance of the Japanese army to the India–Burma border, responded the next day by imprisoning Gandhi at the Aga Khan Palace in Pune. The Congress Party's Working Committee, or national leadership was arrested all together and imprisoned at the Ahmednagar Fort. They also banned the party altogether. All the major leaders of the INC were arrested and detained. As the masses were leaderless the protest took a violent turn. Large-scale protests and demonstrations were held all over the country. Workers remained absent en masse and strikes were called. The movement also saw widespread acts of sabotage, Indian under-ground organisation carried out bomb attacks on allied supply convoys, government buildings were set on fire, electricity lines were disconnected and transport and communication lines were severed. The disruptions were under control in a few weeks and had little impact on the war effort. The movement soon became a leaderless act of defiance, with a number of acts that deviated from Gandhi's principle of non-violence. In large parts of the country, the local underground organisations took over the movement.

All the other major parties rejected the Quit India plan, and most cooperated closely with the British, as did the princely states, the civil service, and the police. The Muslim League supported the Raj and grew rapidly in membership, and in influence with the British.There was opposition to the Quit India Movement from several political quarters who were fighting for Indian self-rule. Hindu nationalist parties like the Hindu Mahasabha openly opposed the call and boycotted the Quit India Movement. Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, the president of the Hindu Mahasabha at that time, even went to the extent of writing a letter titled "Stick to your Posts", in which he instructed Hindu Sabhaites who happened to be "members of municipalities, local bodies, legislatures or those serving in the army...to stick to their posts" across the country, and not to join the Quit India Movement at any cost.

The other Hindu nationalist organisation, and Mahasabha affiliate Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) had a tradition of keeping aloof from the anti-British Indian self-rule movement since its founding by K.B. Hedgewar in 1925. In 1942, the RSS, under M.S. Golwalkar completely abstained from joining in the Quit India Movement as well. The Bombay government (British) appreciated the RSS as such, by noting that,The Sangh has scrupulously kept itself within the law, and in particular, has refrained from taking part in the disturbances that broke out in August 1942.

The British Government stated that the RSS was not at all supporting any civil disobedience against them, and as such their other political activities(even if objectionable) can be overlooked.[131] Further, the British Government also asserted that at Sangh meetings organised during the times of anti-British movements started and fought by the Indian National Congress, Speakers urged the Sangh members to keep aloof from the congress movement and these instructions were generally observed.

As such, the British government did not crackdown on the RSS and Hindu Mahasabha at all. The RSS head (sarsanghchalak) during that time, M.S. Golwalkar later openly admitted to the fact that the RSS did not participate in the Quit India Movement. However, such an attitude during the Indian independence

movement also led to the Sangh being viewed with distrust and anger, both by the general Indian public, as well as certain members of the organisation itself. In Golwalkar's own words, In 1942 also, there was a strong sentiment in the hearts of many. At that time too, the routine work of the Sangh continued. Sangh decided not to do anything directly. 'Sangh is the organisation of inactive people, their talks have no substance' was the opinion uttered not only by outsiders but also our own swayamsevaks.

A number of violent incidents against British officials also took place during the Quit India movement around the country. The British arrested tens of thousands of leaders, keeping them imprisoned until 1945. Ultimately, the British government realised that India was ungovernable in the long run, and the question for the postwar era became how to exit gracefully and peacefully.

Sulhas Chandra bose:

India's entry into the war was strongly opposed by Subhas Chandra Bose. Bose had been elected President of the Congress in 1938 and 1939 but later resigned owing to differences of opinion with Gandhi, however he remained emotionally attached to Congress for the remainder of his life. After his resignation he formed his own wing separated from the mainstream Congress leadership known as Forward bloc which was a loci focus for ex-congress leaders holding socialist views.[134] Bose then founded the All India Forward Bloc. In 1940 the British authorities in Calcutta placed Bose under house arrest. However, he escaped and made his way through Afghanistan to Nazi Germany to seek Hitler and Mussolini's help for raising an army to fight the British. The Free India Legion comprising Erwin Rommel's Indian POWs was formed. After a dramatic decline in Germany's military fortunes, a German land invasion of India became untenable. Hitler advised Bose to go to Japan where a submarine was arranged to transport Bose, who was ferried to Japanese Southeast Asia, where he formed the Azad Hind Government. The Provisional Free Indian Government in exile reorganised the Indian National Army composed of Indian POWs and volunteer Indian expatriates in South-East Asia, with the help of the Japanese. Its aim was to

reach India as a fighting force that would build on public resentment to inspire revolt among Indian soldiers of the Raj.

The INA was to see action against the Allies, including the British Indian Army, in the forests of Arakan, Burma, and in Assam, laying siege to Imphal and Kohima with the Japanese 15th Army. During the war, the Andaman and Nicobar islands were captured by the Japanese and handed over by them to the INA.

While a number of Japanese officers, even those like Fujiwara, who were devoted to the Indian cause, observed Bose as a military incompetent as well as an unrealistic and stubborn man who sees only his own needs and problems and could not observe the larger picture of the war as the Japanese had to.

The INA failed owing to disrupted logistics, poor supplies from the Japanese, and lack of training.[136] The Azad Hind Fauj surrendered unconditionally to the British in Singapore in 1945. In the consensus of scholarly opinion, Subhas Chandra Bose's death occurred from third-degree burns on 18 August 1945 after his overloaded Japanese plane crashed in Japanese-ruled Formosa (now Taiwan).

Trials against members of the INA began in late 1945, and included the infamous joint court-martial of key figures Shah Nawaz Khan and Prem Sahgal.

The Royal Indian Navy Mutiny was a failed insurrection which encompassed a total strike and subsequent mutiny by Indian sailors of the Royal Indian Navy on board ship and shore establishments at Bombay (Mumbai) harbour on 18 February 1946. From the initial flashpoint in Bombay, the mutiny spread and found support throughout British India, from Karachi to Calcutta and ultimately came to involve 78 ships, 20 shore establishments and 20,000 sailors.

The agitations, mass strikes, demonstrations and consequently support for the mutineers, therefore continued several days even after the mutiny had been called off. Along with this, the assessment may be made that it described in crystal clear terms to the government that the British Indian Armed forces could no longer be universally relied upon for support in crisis, and even more it was more likely

itself to be the source of the sparks that would ignite trouble in a country fast slipping out of the scenario of political settlement.

The mutiny ended with the surrender of revolting the sailors to British officials. Congress and the Muslim League had convinced Indian sailors to surrender. They condemned the mutiny due to the political and military risks of unrest.

ImpactWorld War II:

World War II was one of the most significant factors in accelerating Indian independence, and the independence of many British and non-British colonies. In the period 1945–1965, decolonization led to more than three dozen countries getting freedom from their colonial powers. Many factors contributed to the downfall of the British Empire.

When Britain reached out to the US asking for help in the war, the US offered help contingent on Britain decolonizing post-WWII, and that agreement was codified in the Atlantic Charter. The decolonization of Britain (post-war) also meant that the US and other countries could possibly have access to markets to sell goods that were previously under the British Empire - which were not accessible to them then To bring about these changes, the establishment of the UN following WWII codified sovereignty for nations, and encouraged free trade. The war also forced the British to come to an agreement with Indian leaders to grant them independence if they helped with war efforts since India had one of the largest armies. Also, following WWII, it was untenable for Britain to raise capital on its own to keep its colonies. They needed to rely on America and did so via the Marshall Plan to rebuild their country.

Sovereighnty and Partition of India:

On 3 June 1947, Viscount Louis Mountbatten, the last British Governor-General of India, announced the partitioning of British India into India and Pakistan. With the speedy passage of the Indian Independence Act 1947, at 11:57 on 14 August 1947 Pakistan was declared a separate nation. Then at 12:02 A.M., on 15 August 1947 India became a sovereign and democratic nation.

Eventually, 15 August became Independence Day for India marking the end of British India. Also on 15 August, both Pakistan and India had the right to remain in or remove themselves from the British Commonwealth. But in 1949, India took the decision to remain in the commonwealth.

Violent clashes between Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims followed. Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and deputy prime minister Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel had invited Mountbatten to continue as Governor General of India during the period of transition. He was replaced in June 1948 by Chakravarti Rajagopalachari. In May 1947, Nehru declared that any princely state which refused to join the Constituent Assembly would be treated as an enemy state. Patel took on the responsibility for bringing princely states into the Union of India, steering efforts by his "iron fist in a velvet glove" policies. There was the use of military force to integrate Junagadh, Hyderabad State (Operation Polo) and Kashmir (Instrument of Accession) to India.

The Constituent Assembly, headed by the prominent lawyer, reformer and Dalit leader, B.R. Ambedkar was tasked heading the creation of the constitution of independent India, and the constitution was drafted by B. N. Rau. The Constituent Assembly completed the work of drafting the constitution on 26 November 1949; on 26 January 1950, the Republic of India was officially proclaimed. The Constituent Assembly elected Rajendra Prasad was the first President of India, taking over from Governor General Rajgopalachari. Subsequently, the French ceded Chandernagore in 1951, and Pondichéry and its remaining Indian colonies by 1954. Indian troops annexed Goa and Portugal's other Indian enclaves in 1961, and Sikkim voted to join the Indian Union in 1975 after the Indian victory over China in Nathu La and Cho La.

UNIT IV

SOCIO REFORM MOVEMENTS

Background of Reform movements

The Indian society in the first half of the 19th century was caste-ridden, decadent and rigid. The conquest of India by the British during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, exposed some serious weaknesses and drawbacks of Indian social institutions When the British came to India, they introduced the English language as well as certain modern ideas. These ideas were those of liberty, social and economic equality, fraternity, democracy and justice which had a tremendous impact on Indian society. As a consequence, several individuals and movements sought to bring about changes in social and religious practices with a view to reforming and revitalizing society.

These efforts, collectively known as the Renaissance, were complex social phenomena. It is important to note that this phenomenon occurred when India was under the colonial domination of the British. There were some enlightened Indians like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Ishwar Chand Vidyasagar, Dayanand Saraswati and many others who were willing to fight and bring reforms to society so that it could face the challenges of the West.

Types of Reform Movements

Basically, there were two kinds of reform movements in the 19th century in India.

1. Reformist

These movements responded with the time and scientific temper of the modern era.

2. Revivalist

These movements started reviving ancient Indian traditions and thoughts and believed that western thinking ruined Indian culture and ethos.

Reformist Movements

Some of the reformist movements of the 18th and 19th centuries are discussed below:

Brahmo Samaj

Founded in 1828 in Calcutta by pioneer social reformer Raja Ram Mohan Roy (1772- 1833), the movement fought against idol worship, polytheism, caste oppression, unnecessary rituals and other social evils like Sati, polygamy, purdah systern, child marriage, etc Society also strove for women's rights like widow remarriage and education of women. It also fought, attacked prevailing superstitions among Hindus.

Aligarh Movement

Sayyid Ahmed Khan founded Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College in Aligarh in 1875. Later, it became Aligarh Muslim University. It offered modern education to Muslims.

Prarthana Samaj

- In 1863, Keshub Chandra Sen helped found the Prarthana Samaj in Bombay.
- The Prarthana Samaj preached monotheism and denounced priestly domination and caste distinctions.
- Its activities also spread to South India, through the efforts of the Telugu reformer, Veeresalingam.
- Chandavarkar, basically a philosopher, was a great leader of the Prarthana

Revivalist Movements

Some of the revivalist movements are discussed below.

Arya Samaj

- The social and religious reform in North India was spearheaded by Swami Dayanand Saraswati (1824-1883) who founded the Arya Samaj in 1875.

- This society strove against idolatry, polytheism, rituals, priesthood, animal sacrifice, child marriage and the caste system. It also encourages the dissemination of western scientific knowledge.
- They worked for the improvement in the condition of women, advocated social equality and denounced untouchability and caste rigidities. Read more about Swami Dayananda Saraswati, from the linked article.

Deoband Movement

It was a revivalist movement. In 1866, Muhammad Qasim Wanotavi and Rashid Ahamad Gangohi founded a school in Deoband (Uttar Pradesh, Saharanpur District). Deoband movement focused on uplifting the Muslim community through religious education.

The video given below is in line with the CSL flabus for the 19th Century Social and Religous Reform Movements. This has been curated by experts for guiding IAS.

Ramakrishna Mission

This mission was founded by Swami Vivekananda in 1897 in Belur near Calcutta to promote the teachings of Vivekananda's Guru Ramakrishna Paramahansa. It opposed the caste system and untouchability. It focused on the universality of all religions and propagated Vedanta.

Satyashodhak Samaj

This society was founded by Jyotirao Govindrao Phule on 24 September 1873 in present- day Maharashtra. It campaigned against idolatry and the caste system. It advocated rational thinking and rejected the priesthood Jyotirao Phule is said to have used the term "Dalit for the oppressed castes.

Young Bengal Movement

This movement was started by Henry Louis Vivian Derozio in Calcutta in the 1820s Derozio was an Anglo-Indian college teacher in Calcutta, and he

encouraged radical thinking among his students. He criticised the prevailing religious practices of orthodox Hinduism. He also inspired free-thinking and propagated the spirit of liberty, equality and freedom.

Development of Education In India

In First Five Year Plan 7.9% of total plan outlay was allocated for education. In Second and Third Plan, the allocations were 5.8% and 6.9% of the total plan outlay. In Ninth Plan only 3.5% of the total outlay was allocated for education. To streamline the education, the Govt. implemented the recommendations of Kothari Commission under 'National Policy on Education' in 1968. The main recommendations were

- universal primary education.
- Introduction of new pattern of education,
- three language formula,
- introduction of regional language in higher education,
- development of agricultural and industrial education and
- adult education.

To combat the changing socio-economic needs of the country, Govt. of India announced a new National Policy on Education in 1986. Main features :-

- Universalisation of primary education,
- vocationalisation of secondary education and
- specialisation of higher education were the main features of this policy.

National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) at National level and State Council of Educational Research and Training (SCERT) at State level were established to maintain the standard of education.

University Grants Commission (UGC) was instituted to determine the standard of higher education

Expansion of General Education:

During the period of planning there has been expansion of general education.

	1950-51
Percentage literacy	19.3%
Enrollment ratio of children (6-11 year age group)	43%
Primary schools	2.1 Lakh
Universities	27

Primary education – been free and compulsory.

Midday meal has been started in schools since 1995 to check drop-out rate.

Development of Technical Education:

Besides general education, technical education plays important role in human capital formation. The Govt. has established several Industrial Training Institutes, Polytechnics, Engineering colleges and Medical and Dental colleges, Management institutes etc.

These are given below:

(a) Indian Institute of Technology:

For education and research in engineering and technology of international standard, seven institutes have been established at Mumbai, Delhi, Kanpur, Chennai, Khargpur, Roorkee and Gauhati, Technical education is imparted here both for graduation and post-graduation and doctorate level.

(b) National Institute of Technology (NIT):

These institutes impart education in engineering and technology. These were called Regional College of Engineering (REC). These are 17 in number throughout the country. There are other institutes in the country to teach engineering and technical education.

(c) Indian Institute of Management:

These institutes impart education in business management and administration. These institutes are located at Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Kolkata, Lucknow, Indore and Kozhikode.

(d) Medical education:

There were only 28 medical colleges in the country in 1950-51. There were 165 medical and 40 dental colleges in the country in 1998-99.

(e) Agricultural education:

Agricultural Universities have been started in almost all States to improve production and productivity of agriculture. These universities impart education and research in agriculture, horticulture, animal husbandry and veterinary sciences etc.

Women education:

In India, literary among women was quite low. It was 52% according to 2001 census. While the literacy among men was 75.8%.

Women education was given top priority in National Policy on Education. Many State Governments have exempted the tuition fee of girl's up to university level. Separate schools and colleges have been established to raise level of literacy among women.

Vocational education:

National Policy of Education, 1986, aims at vocationalisation of secondary education. Central Govt. has been giving grants to State Governments to implement the programme since 1988. Agriculture, Pisciculture, diary, poultry, typing, electronics, mechanical and carpentry etc. had been included in higher secondary curriculum.

Growth of higher education:

In 1951, there were 27 universities. Their number increased to 254 in 2001.

Non-formal education:

This scheme was launched on an experimental basis from the Sixth plan and on regular basis from Seventh plan. The aim was to achieve universal elementary education to all children in the age group of 6-14 years. The scheme was meant for those children who cannot attend schools regularly and for full time due to poverty and pre-occupation with other works.

The Central Govt. is providing assistance to State Govt. and voluntary organisation to implement the scheme. Non-formal education centres have been set up in remote rural areas, hilly and tribal areas and in slums. These impart education to children of 6-14 age group.

Encouragement to Indian Language and Culture:

After the adoption of National Policy of Education 1968, regional language became the medium of instruction in higher education. Syllabus on science and technology, dictionaries, books, and Question Papers are translated into regional languages. Indian history and culture have been included in school and college curriculum.

Adult education:

Adult education refers to the education for the illiterate people belonging to the age group of 15-35 years.

The National Board of Adult Education was established in the First Five Year Plan. The village level workers were assigned the job of providing adult education. The progress remained not too good.

The National Adult Education Programme was started in 1978. The programme is considered as a part of primary education. National Literary Mission was also started in 1988 to eradicate adult illiteracy particularly in rural areas.

Improvement of Science education:

Central Govt. started a scheme for the improvement of science education in schools in 1988. Financial assistance is given to provide science kits, up gradation of science laboratories, development of teaching material, and training of science and mathematics teachers. A Central Institute of Educational Technology (CIET) was set up in NCERT to purchase equipment for State Institutes of Educational Technology.

Education for all:

According to 93rd Amendment, education for all has been made compulsory. The elementary education is a fundamental right of all children in the age group of 6-14 years. It is also free. To fulfill this obligation Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) has been launched.

The above discussion makes it clear that a lot of development in education has been made in India after Independence. There is wide growth in general education and higher education. Efforts have been made to spread education among all sections and all regions of the country. Still our education system is ridden with problems.

Schemes for Elementary Education

1. Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
2. Mid Day Meal
3. Mahila Samakhya
4. Strengthening for providing quality education in Madrassas (SPQEM)

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) is implemented as India's main Programme for universalizing elementary education. Its overall goals include universal access and retention, bridging of gender and social category gaps in education and enhancement of learning levels of children.

Mid-Day Meal Scheme

Launched in 1995 as centrally sponsored scheme as the National Programme of Nutritional Support to Primary Education (NP-NSPE). Its objective was to enhance enrolment, retention and attendance and simultaneously improving nutritional levels among children,

Schemes for Secondary Education

Secondary Education is the most significant stage in the educational hierarchy as it prepares the students for higher education and the world of work. The policy at present is to make secondary education of good quality available, accessible and affordable to all young persons in the age group of 14-18. At present, the following schemes targeted at secondary stage (i.e. class IX to XII) are being implemented in the form of Centrally Sponsored Schemes:

1. Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan
2. Girls Hostel Scheme
3. National Scheme of Incentives to Girls for Secondary Education
4. Inclusive Education for Disabled at Secondary Stage
5. Scheme of Vocational Education
6. National Merit-cum-Means Scholarship Scheme
7. Scheme for construction and running of Girls' Hostel for students of secondary and higher secondary schools
8. Scholarship schemes for Minority students
9. National Scholarships

The National Council for Educational Research and Training (NCERT) promotes educational development both in quantitative and qualitative terms and makes special efforts to remove disparities and equalize educational opportunities for all students.

NCERT acknowledges and appreciates educational brilliance in students through the National Talent Search Scheme. It also seeks to applaud artistic distinction through the Chacha Nehru Scholarships – for artistic and innovative

excellence. The National Bal Bhawan has instituted a system of honouring talented children in different age groups in the year 1995 through the Bal Shree scheme.

Schemes for Higher Education

Higher Education is the shared responsibility of both the Centre and the States. The coordination and determination of standards in institutions is the constitutional obligation of the Central Government. The Central Government provides grants to UGC and establishes Central Universities in the country. Meritorious students, from families with or without necessary means, need an incentive or encouragement to keep on working hard in their studies and go to the next level of education in their academic career. This is where the scholarships and education loans play a crucial role.

Growth of Local Self-Government in India

Self-governing village communities have always existed in India since the earliest of times. Slowly over a period of time, these village bodies were converted to form Panchayats. Panchayats or Panchayati Raj is one of India's oldest local self-government systems. The word 'Panchayat' means an assembly (ayat) or five (panch) people who rule (raj).

Elected local self-government bodies came into existence after 1882, when Lord Rippon, the father of local self-government, took the initiative to create these bodies. At that time, these were known as local boards.

After the Government of India Act in 1919, village panchayats were firmly established in several provinces. While Rippon is widely known as the father of local self-government, Mahatma Gandhi is also a key player in decentralising political and economic power at the grassroots levels. Gandhi supported the strengthening of village panchayats and ensured the involvement of local self-governments in all developmental initiatives.

With the passing of the 73rd and 74th Constitutional amendments, it became mandatory for every state to have rural and urban local self-governments in place

and the mechanisms to fund these bodies. It also became compulsory that these bodies carry out elections every five years.

With the creation of this local governance, rural and urban local bodies were given the constitutional status that ensured uniformity in their functioning and structure across India.

At present, there are over 250,000 local self-government bodies across the country, with over 3.1 million elected representatives. Out of this, 1.3 million representatives are women.

Local Self-Government System

In rural areas, there are three governing bodies. At the top is the Zila Parishad, or district council. The Zila Parishad is made up of panchayat samitis or block councils. Panchayat Samitis are composed of gram panchayats or village councils. Every village in India has a gram sabha which includes anyone above the age of 18 years in the village. The gram sabha members have the right to elect the panchayat members directly.

In the urban areas, there are three local self-governing bodies:

Municipal corporations (Mahanagar Palikas) in areas that have a population of over a million Municipalities or Municipal Councils (Nagar Palikas) for areas with less than one million population.

Nagar Panchayats or Town Councils for areas in the middle of transitioning from rural to urban. In large municipal areas, they may further be divided into wards. In the case of panchayats, the Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) structure remains the same across India. Only India's tribal and scheduled areas are exempted from this system of governance. A village must have a population of at least 500 people to have a Gram Panchayat. The panchayat members are elected directly by the villagers, also for a term of five years.

Functions of Local Self-Government

The primary objective of these local bodies is to promote local economic development, social justice, and infrastructure development. The various functions of the local government include:

- To build basic infrastructure like transport, roads, power lines, schools, hospitals, etc
- To construct and maintain community assets
- To promote the development of agriculture by proper management of irrigation and water schemes, land improvement, and soil conservation
- To promote education
- To enhance health facilities and promote awareness about health
- To promote small-scale industries of the village
- To develop social forestry, dairy, poultry, and animal husbandry

The local government bodies are also responsible for implementing a wide variety of schemes that the state government comes up with to develop rural and urban areas.

In order to help local bodies understand how best to govern, the India Institute of Local Self Government was established in 1926. The institute acts as the perfect guide to all the urban local bodies and spreads awareness about urban education, capacity building, and governance. All India Institute of Local Self Government helps the local government bodies upgrade their skills and knowledge for carrying out effective administration. They also ensure the proper implementation of various development programmes. The Indian Constitution divides our governing system into three tiers, with local self-government taking care of the grassroots level. The local self-government falls under the state government's jurisdiction and is further divided into Zila Parishads, Panchayat Samitis, Mahanagar Palikas, Nagar Palikas, and Panchayats. India has a strong local self-government system and has ensured democracy at even the remotest corners.

Impact of British Rule in India

The Impact of British Rule in India is quite noticeable. There is no denying that British rule had a significant social, economic, and cultural impact on India. The British arrived in India in 1608. Gradually, they began to invade the nation and rule it according to their laws, which affected the economy across India. The Indian economy experienced a rapid transformation due to British economic policy. Between 1600 and 1757, British merchants made most of their profits by exporting goods from India. Social and Economic strategies for the Indians were cleverly created by the British administration. India was constantly dependent on them because of these policies.

Impact of British Rule in India

India has always been a wealthy nation, despite its rural economy. From the first century until the start of British colonialism, India's GDP fluctuated between 25% and 35%; however, by the time the British left India in 1947, it had decreased to 2%. The Impact of British Rule in India has been exactly as stated here, and there were massive economic, political, and social changes the British rule brought to India.

The British, who came to India as traders and then gained power as rulers & administrators, immediately impacted the nation's social, political, and economic systems. However, their impact on India's social and cultural life was gradual.

Economic Impact of British Rule in India

It was primarily for trade that the British travelled to India. The Industrial Revolution was a problem for Britain at the time. For this reason, they needed a large number of raw materials for the factories, most of which came from India. They also required a suitable market to sell their final goods. As a result, India's transformation into the hub of British commerce was the most serious economic impact of British rule in India.

- India became an economic colony for industrial England.

- The industrialization of England harmed India's handloom weaving industry, which ultimately failed.
- Both the domestic and international markets for Indian crafts were lost.
- Farmers experienced suffering due to the following land revenue experiments:
    - Lord Cornwallis's System of Permanent Settlement
    - Mahalwari & Ryotwari Systems
- The impact of commercial agriculture on labourers was severe, leading to a rise in the number of landless workers.
- This led to a new class of money-lenders who relied on the farmers who were compelled to borrow the money from them.

Social Impact of British Rule in India

India saw several social and cultural reforms due to British rule.

- The British introduced concepts like liberty, freedom, equality, and human rights in the middle of social problems like child marriages, sati, and infanticides.
- Numerous legal measures were established to better the status of women in society.
- The British were eager to inculcate the English language into Indian culture.
- The regional languages were ignored.
- Using the Charter Act 1813, enacted by the British Parliament, Rs. 1 lakh was authorized to promote western sciences across India.

Positive Impact of British Rule in India

The British introduced new employment opportunities, which were especially helpful to those from the lower castes. They had a higher probability of achieving social mobility upward because of these possibilities. Other aspects of the positive impact of British rule in India are as follows:

- Indian industrialization's top pioneers were members of the middle class that grew to prominence during British rule in the post-independence period.

- Infrastructural projects undertaken by the British government include the building of schools, hospitals, and railways. The indigenous Indians were not given a better quality of life; everything was done to make it easier for them to be exploited. All things considered, these infrastructures laid the foundation for India to grow into a sizable economic giant.
- The economy of the Indian subcontinent underwent a significant transformation with the advent of new technology like sailing ships, telegraphs, and railroads. The Bengal Sati Regulation Act passed on December 4, 1829, put an end to societal issues like Sati and some extent, damaged the caste system. The British also made significant cultural advancements.

Negative Impact of British Rule in India

Along with a few positive changes the British rule brought in India, there are innumerable negative impacts of the British rule in India, which are explained in detail in this section.

- Indian industry was damaged when Britain seized control because they were obliged to acquire things from the British Kingdom rather than produce their own. The resulting chaos caused the local woodwork, metal, and clothing businesses to collapse. It effectively turned India into a pawn in the hands of Britain's economic schemes, making moving away from it impossible.
- Famines were caused by British mismanagement because the country's large population was not adequately fed during the British Empire's control; rather, cash crops were prioritized above food crops. Food was brought from other provinces of the empire to feed the population. Between 1850 to 1899 alone, 24 famines claimed millions of lives due to this strategy and the inequitable distribution of food.
- The British realized they could never rule a vast area like India without dividing powerful kingdoms into manageable, easily conquerable pieces. Additionally, the British Empire made it a practice to compensate religious leaders for speaking out against one another, slowly corroding relations

across other faiths. This approach has had a direct impact on the adversarial relationship between India & Pakistan.

- Britain stole trillions from the Indian economy due to the East India Company's unethical business practices. Such actions even led to the destruction of Indian industry and made sure that London received the profits from the Indian economy.

Impact of British Rule in India

It would appear that India's society improved during British rule. But upon closer inspection, it became clear that these advantages were at best fortuitous and at worst self-serving. Only to effectively exploit the Indian economy were economic reforms implemented. Without the necessity for British involvement, even sociological changes would have shown themselves. The negative impact of British rule in India ultimately outweighs the advantages.

Aspirants to the Civil Services should have a solid understanding of the impact of British rule in India. Both the Civil Services (Prelims) and (Mains) Examinations may include questions on this topic. Studying the following important points will certainly help and further improve your knowledge about the Impact of British Rule in India notes.

- Many social and cultural changes, including the introduction of concepts like liberty and freedom, were brought to India by the British.
- The caste system was destroyed due to changes brought forth by Indian reformers & mass leaders, as well as British regulations.
- The British policy of "Divide & Rule" was maintained despite the reforms, which resulted in ongoing turmoil and mistrust because of caste, religious, and intellectual divides.
- The Indian economy collapsed due to unfair tax techniques and declining of the Indian industries.

UNIT-5

INDIAN NATIONAL LEADER

Dadabhai Naoroji:

Dadabhai Naoroji was an Indian social political leader and one of the founders of the Indian National Congress. A leading nationalist author and spokesman, he was the first Indian to be elected to membership in the British Parliament. Born in Mumbai in 1825 in a Gujarati-speaking Parsi family, Naoroji was educated at Elphinstone Institute School before pursuing a career as an intellectual and campaigner for Indian causes. At a time when the East India Company was ruling British India, Naoroji was laying the foundation of India's contemporary freedom struggle, establishing India's first political association, the Bombay Association, in 1852. In 1855 he was appointed Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy at Elphinstone College in Mumbai. The first Indian to be given an academic appointment, he was called 'The Promise of India' by another professor at the institution. Shortly after he travelled to London to join the first Indian business firm of the mercantile Cama family, opening a Liverpool location for Cama & Co, the first Indian company to be established in Britain. However, within three years he had resigned on ethical grounds and by 1859 had established his own cotton trading company, Dadabhai Naoroji & Co. Alongside this he was also made Professor of Gujarati at University College London (1856-65).

In 1867 he went on to help establish the East India Association which aimed to combat prevailing views of the Asians as inferior and put the Indian point of view before the British public. The organisation eventually merged with the Indian National Association in 1885, becoming the Indian National Congress – the main nationalist party that campaigned for Indian independence from British rule, later the party of Gandhi and still a prominent party in Indian politics today. Meanwhile, in 1874, having returned to India, Naoroji had started his public life as the Dewan (minister) to the Maharaja of Barado and later was a member of the of the Legislative Council of Mumbai.

During Naoroji's lifetime, the Indian population accounted for over four fifths of the British Empire, but its 250 million people were unrepresented in British Parliament. Continuing his political involvement, Naoroji relocated to Britain once again and stood several times for election to the House of Commons, facing considerable racism each time. His 1886 bid as Liberal Party candidate for the strongly Conservative Holborn seat in London was unsuccessful and following his defeat, Lord Salisbury, the Prime Minister, remarked that an English constituency was not ready to elect a 'black man'. The statement gave Naoroji notoriety and popular satirical magazine Punch referred to it in a cartoon depicting Naoroji as Othello and Salisbury as the 'Doge of Westminster'.

Known as the 'Grand Old Man of India', Naoroji became a well-known public figure, gaining the support of Florence Nightingale and suffrage campaigners. In 1892 he was eventually elected as the Liberal candidate for the strongly working-class marginal seat of Central Finsbury in the Clerkenwell (now part of the London Borough of Islington) and joined Gladstone's government.

'If we twenty croce of Indians were entitled to send only one member to the British parliament, there is no doubt that we would have elected Dadabhai Naoroji unanimously to grace that post.' - Bal Gangadhar Tilak

Naoroji was the first Asian to be a British MP, notwithstanding Anglo-Indian MP David Ochterlony Dyce Sombre, who was elected as a Radical-Liberal to the seat of Sudbury in Suffolk in 1841 but disenfranchised for corruption in 1842 (Parliament overturned the result citing 'gross, systematic and extensive bribery' during the election campaign, and he and the other Member for the Sudbury division lost their seats). As he was not a Christian, Naoroji refused to take the oath of office on the Bible, but was allowed to take the oath in the name of God on his copy of the Khordeh Avesta (the Zoroastrian religious text).

During his time in the House of Commons Naoroji devoted his time towards improving the situation in India and campaigned for Indian independence. However he also supported votes for women, pensions for the elderly, Irish home role and the abolition of the House of Lords. He was assisted in duties as an MP by

Muhammed Ali Jinnah, the future Muslim nationalist and founder of Pakistan. Although Naoroji lost his seat in the General Election of 1895 when the Conservatives won back power, he continued to campaign to the end of his life, being elected president of the Indian National Congress for a third time in 1906. A staunch moderate within the congress, he was a mentor to Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Gopal Krishna Gokhale and Mohandas Karamchand (Mahatma) Gandhi.

Gopal Krishna Gokhale (1866 –1915):

Born on 9 May, 1866, in Maharashtra, Gopal Krishna Gokhale was an Indian liberal political leader and a social reformer during the Indian Independence Movement.

Being one of the first generations of Indians to receive a university education, Gokhale graduated from Elphinstone College in 1884. In addition to learning English, he was exposed to Western political thought and became a great admirer of theorists such as John Stuart Mill and Edmund Burke. He had a great influence of the social works of Justice Mahadev Govind Ranade on his life. He was named as the Protege Son' i.e. Manas Putra of Justice Mahadev Govind Ranade.

Apart from beinga senior leader of the Indian National Congress, he was the founder of the Servants of India Society. Through the Society as well as the Congress and other legislative bodies he served in, Gokhale campaigned for Indian self-rule and for social reforms.

Gokhale was famously a mentor to Mahatma Gandhi in the latter's formative years. As a young barrister, Gandhi returned from his struggles against the Empire in South Africa and received personal guidance from Gokhale, including a knowledge and understanding of India and the issues confronting common Indians.

Gokhale's deposition before the Welby Commission on the financial condition of India won him accolades. His speeches on the budget in the Central

Legislative Council were unique, with thorough statistical analysis. He played a leading role in bringing about Morley-Minto Reforms in India. He was a scholar and a statesman, arguably the greatest Indian liberal.

Gokhale died on 19 February, 1915, leaving a void in life of those who greatly admired him.

Bal Gangadhar Tilak:

Bal Gangadhar Tilak (pronunciation (help·info); born Keshav Gangadhar Tilak (pronunciation: ; 23 July 1856 – 1 August 1920), endeared as Lokmanya (IAST: Lokmanya), was an Indian nationalist, teacher, and an independence activist. He was one third of the Lal Bal Pal triumvirate. Tilak was the first leader of the Indian independence movement. The British colonial authorities called him "The father of the Indian unrest". He was also conferred with the title of "Lokmanya", which means "accepted by the people as their leader". Mahatma Gandhi called him "The Maker of Modern India".

Tilak was one of the first and strongest advocates of Swaraj ('self-rule') and a strong radical in Indian consciousness. He is known for his quote in Marathi: "Swaraj is my birthright and I shall have it!". He formed a close alliance with many Indian National Congress leaders including Bipin Chandra Pal, Lala Lajpat Rai, Aurobindo Ghose, V. O. Chidambaram Pillai and Muhammad Ali Jinnah.

Early Life:

Keshav Gangadhar Tilak was born on 23 July 1856 in an Marathi Hindu Chitpavan Brahmin family in Ratnagiri, the headquarters of the Ratnagiri district of present-day Maharashtra (then Bombay Presidency). His ancestral village was Chikhali. His father, Gangadhar Tilak was a school teacher and a Sanskrit scholar who died when Tilak was sixteen. In 1871, Tilak was married to Tapibai (Née Bal) when he was sixteen, a few months before his father's death. After marriage, her name was changed to Satyabhamabai. He obtained his Bachelor of Arts in first class in Mathematics from Deccan College of Pune in 1877. He left his M.A. course of study midway to join the L.L.B course instead,

and in 1879 he obtained his L.L.B degree from Government Law College. After graduating, Tilak started teaching mathematics at a private school in Pune. Later, due to ideological differences with the colleagues in the new school, he withdrew and became a journalist. Tilak actively participated in public affairs. He stated: "Religion and practical life are not different. The real spirit is to make the country your family instead of working only for your own. The step beyond is to serve humanity and the next.

Inspired by Vishnushastri Chiplunkar, he co-founded the New English school for secondary education in 1880 with a few of his college friends, including Gopal Ganesh Agarkar, Mahadev Ballal Namjoshi and Vishnushastri Chiplunkar. Their goal was to improve the quality of education for India's youth. The success of the school led them to set up the Deccan Education Society in 1884 to create a new system of education that taught young Indians nationalist ideas through an emphasis on Indian culture. The Society established the Fergusson College in 1885 for post-secondary studies. Tilak taught mathematics at Fergusson College. In 1890, Tilak left the Deccan Education Society for more openly political work. He began a mass movement towards independence by an emphasis on a religious and cultural revival.

Political Career:

Tilak had a long political career agitating for Indian autonomy from British colonial rule. Before Gandhi, he was the most widely known Indian political leader. Unlike his fellow Maharashtrian contemporary, Gokhale, Tilak was considered a radical Nationalist but a Social conservative. He was imprisoned on a number of occasions that included a long stint at Mandalay. At one stage in his political life he was called "the father of Indian unrest" by British author Sir Valentine Chirol.

Indian National Congress:

Tilak joined the Indian National Congress in 1890.[14] He opposed its moderate attitude, especially towards the fight for self-government. He was one of the most-eminent radicals at the time.[15] In fact, it was the Swadeshi movement of

1905–1907 that resulted in the split within the Indian National Congress into the Moderates and the Extremists.

During late 1896, a bubonic plague spread from Bombay to Pune, and by January 1897, it reached epidemic proportions. The British Indian Army was brought in to deal with the emergency and strict measures were employed to curb the plague, including the allowance of forced entry into private houses, the examination of the house's occupants, evacuation to hospitals and quarantine camps, removing and destroying personal possessions, and preventing patients from entering or leaving the city. By the end of May, the epidemic was under control. The measures used to curb the pandemic caused widespread resentment among the Indian public. Tilak took up this issue by publishing inflammatory articles in his paper Kesari (Kesari was written in Marathi, and "Maratha" was written in English), quoting the Hindu scripture, the Bhagavad Gita, to say that no blame could be attached to anyone who killed an oppressor without any thought of reward. Following this, on 22 June 1897, Commissioner Rand and another British officer, Lt. Ayerst were shot and killed by the Chapekar brothers and their other associates. According to Barbara and Thomas R. Metcalf, Tilak "almost surely concealed the identities of the perpetrators". Tilak was charged with incitement to murder and sentenced to 18 months imprisonment. When he emerged from prison in present-day Mumbai, he was revered as a martyr and a national hero. He adopted a new slogan coined by his associate Kaka Baptista: "Swaraj (self-rule) is my birthright and I shall have it."

Following the Partition of Bengal, which was a strategy set out by Lord Curzon to weaken the nationalist movement, Tilak encouraged the Swadeshi movement and the Boycott movement. The movement consisted of the boycott of foreign goods and also the social boycott of any Indian who used foreign goods. The Swadeshi movement consisted of the usage of natively produced goods. Once foreign goods were boycotted, there was a gap which had to be filled by the production of those goods in India itself. Tilak said that the Swadeshi and Boycott movements are two sides of the same coin.

Tilak opposed the moderate views of Gopal Krishna Gokhale, and was supported by fellow Indian nationalists Bipin Chandra Pal in Bengal and Lala Lajpat Rai in Punjab. They were referred to as the "Lal-Bal-Pal triumvirate". In 1907, the annual session of the Congress Party was held at Surat, Gujarat. Trouble broke out over the selection of the new president of the Congress between the moderate and the radical sections of the party. The party split into the radicals faction, led by Tilak, Pal and Lajpat Rai, and the moderate faction. Nationalists like Aurobindo Ghose, V. O. Chidambaram Pillai were Tilak supporters.

When asked in Calcutta whether he envisioned a Maratha-type of government for independent India, Tilak answered that the Maratha-dominated governments of 17th and 18th centuries were outmoded in the 20th century, and he wanted a genuine federal system for Free India where everyone was an equal partner. He added that only such a form of government would be able to safeguard India's freedom. He was the first Congress leader to suggest that Hindi written in the Devanagari script be accepted as the sole national language of India.

Sedition Charges:

During his lifetime among other political cases, Tilak had been tried for sedition charges in three times by British India Government—in 1897, 1909, and 1916. In 1897, Tilak was sentenced to 18 months in prison for preaching disaffection against the Raj. In 1909, he was again charged with sedition and intensifying racial animosity between Indians and the British. The Bombay lawyer Muhammad Ali Jinnah appeared in Tilak's defence but he was sentenced to six years in prison in Burma in a controversial judgement.] In 1916 when for the third time Tilak was charged for sedition over his lectures on self-rule, Jinnah again was his lawyer and this time led him to acquittal in the case.

Imprisonment in Mandalay:

On 30 April 1908, two Bengali youths, Prafulla Chaki and Khudiram Bose, threw a bomb on a carriage at Muzzafarpur, to kill the Chief Presidency Magistrate Douglas Kingsford of Calcutta fame, but erroneously killed two women traveling in it. While Chaki committed suicide when caught, Bose was hanged. Tilak, in his paper Kesari, defended the revolutionaries and called for immediate Swaraj or self-

rule. The Government swiftly charged him with sedition. At the conclusion of the trial, a special jury convicted him by 7:2 majority. The judge, Dinshaw D. Davar gave him a six years jail sentence to be served in Mandalay, Burma and a fine of ₹1,000 (US$13). On being asked by the judge whether he had anything to say, Tilak said:

All that I wish to say is that, in spite of the verdict of the jury, I still maintain that I am innocent. There are higher powers that rule the destinies of men and nations; and I think, it may be the will of Providence that the cause I represent may be benefited more by my suffering than by my pen and tongue.

Muhammad Ali Jinnah was his lawyer in the case.[29] Justice Davar's judgement came under stern criticism in press and was seen against impartiality of British justice system. Justice Davar himself previously had appeared for Tilak in his first sedition case in 1897. In passing sentence, the judge indulged in some scathing strictures against Tilak's conduct. He threw off the judicial restraint which, to some extent, was observable in his charge to the jury. He condemned the articles as "seething with sedition", as preaching violence, speaking of murders with approval. "You hail the advent of the bomb in India as if something had come to India for its good. I say, such journalism is a curse to the country". Tilak was sent to Mandalay from 1908 to 1914.[31] While imprisoned, he continued to read and write, further developing his ideas on the Indian nationalist movement. While in the prison he wrote the Gita Rahasya.[32] Many copies of which were sold, and the money was donated for the Indian Independence movement.

Life after Mandalay:

Tilak developed diabetes during his sentence in Mandalay prison. This and the general ordeal of prison life had mellowed him at his release on 16 June 1914. When World War I started in August of that year, Tilak cabled the King-Emperor George V of his support and turned his oratory to find new recruits for war efforts. He welcomed The Indian Councils Act, popularly known as Minto-Morley Reforms, which had been passed by British Parliament in May 1909, terming it as "a marked increase of confidence between the Rulers and the Ruled". It was his conviction that acts of violence actually diminished, rather than

hastening, the pace of political reforms. He was eager for reconciliation with Congress and had abandoned his demand for direct action and settled for agitations "strictly by constitutional means" – a line that had long been advocated by his rival Gokhale.] Tilak reunited with his fellow nationalists and rejoined the Indian National Congress during the Lucknow pact 1916.

Tilak tried to convince Mohandas Gandhi to leave the idea of Total non-violence ("Total Ahimsa") and try to get self-rule ("Swarajya") by all means. Though Gandhi did not entirely concur with Tilak on the means to achieve self-rule and was steadfast in his advocacy of satyagraha, he appreciated Tilak's services to the country and his courage of conviction. After Tilak lost a civil suit against Valentine Chirol and incurred pecuniary loss, Gandhi even called upon Indians to contribute to the Tilak Purse Fund started with the objective of defraying the expenses incurred by Tilak.

All India Home Rule League:

Tilak helped found the All India Home Rule League in 1916–18, with G. S. Khaparde and Annie Besant. After years of trying to reunite the moderate and radical factions, he gave up and focused on the Home Rule League, which sought self-rule. Tilak travelled from village to village for support from farmers and locals to join the movement towards self-rule.[31] Tilak was impressed by the Russian Revolution, and expressed his admiration for Vladimir Lenin.[37] The league had 1400 members in April 1916, and by 1917 membership had grown to approximately 32,000. Tilak started his Home Rule League in Maharashtra, Central Provinces, and Karnataka and Berar region. Besant's League was active in the rest of India.

Religio-Political Views:

Tilak sought to unite the Indian population for mass political action throughout his life. For this to happen, he believed there needed to be a comprehensive justification for anti-British pro-Hindu activism. For this end, he sought justification in the supposed original principles of the Ramayana and the Bhagavad Gita. He named this call to activism karma-yoga or the yoga of action. In his interpretation, the Bhagavad Gita reveals this principle in the

conversation between Krishna and Arjuna when Krishna exhorts Arjuna to fight his enemies (which in this case included many members of his family) because it is his duty. In Tilak's opinion, the Bhagavad Gita provided a strong justification of activism. However, this conflicted with the mainstream exegesis of the text at the time which was dominated by renunciate views and the idea of acts purely for God. This was represented by the two mainstream views at the time by Ramanuja and Adi Shankara. To find support for this philosophy, Tilak wrote his own interpretations of the relevant passages of the Gita and backed his views using Jnanadeva's commentary on the Gita, Ramanuja's critical commentary and his own translation of the Gita. His main battle was against the renunciate views of the time which conflicted with worldly activism. To fight this, he went to great lengths to reinterpret words such as karma, dharma and yoga, as well as the concept of renunciation itself. Because he founded his rationalization on Hindu religious symbols and lines, he alienated many non-Hindus such as the Muslims who began to ally with the British for support.

Social views against women:

Tilak was strongly opposed to liberal trends emerging in Pune such as women's rights and social reforms against untouchability. Tilak vehemently opposed the establishment of the first Native girls High school (now called Huzurpaga) in Pune in 1885 and its curriculum using his newspapers, the Mahratta and Kesari. Tilak was also opposed to intercaste marriage, particularly the match where an upper caste woman married a lower caste man. In the case of Deshasthas, Chitpawans and Karhades, he encouraged these three Maharashtrian Brahmin groups to give up "caste exclusiveness" and intermarry. Tilak officially opposed the age of consent bill which raised the age of marriage from ten to twelve for girls, however he was willing to sign a circular that increased age of marriage for girls to sixteen and twenty for boys.

Child bride Rukhmabai was married at the age of eleven but refused to go and live with her husband. The husband sued for restitution of conjugal rights, initially lost but appealed the decision. On 4 March 1887, Justice Farran, using interpretations of Hindu laws, ordered Rukhmabai to "go live with her husband or

face six months of imprisonment". Tilak approved of this decision of the court and said that the court was following Hindu Dharmaśāstras. Rukhmabai responded that she would rather face imprisonment than obey the verdict. Her marriage was later dissolved by Queen Victoria. Later, she went on to receive her Doctor of Medicine degree from the London School of Medicine for Women.

In 1890, when an eleven-year-old Phulamani Bai died while having sexual intercourse with her much older husband, the Parsi social reformer Behramji Malabari supported the Age of Consent Act, 1891 to raise the age of a girl's eligibility for marriage. Tilak opposed the Bill and said that the Parsis as well as the English had no jurisdiction over the (Hindu) religious matters. He blamed the girl for having "defective female organs" and questioned how the husband could be "persecuted diabolically for doing a harmless act". He called the girl one of those "dangerous freaks of nature".Tilak did not have a progressive view when it came to gender relations. He did not believe that Hindu women should get a modern education. Rather, he had a more conservative view, believing that women were meant to be homemakers who had to subordinate themselves to the needs of their husbands and children.[11] Tilak refused to sign a petition for the abolition of untouchability in 1918, two years before his death, although he had spoken against it earlier in a meeting.

Esteem for Swami Vivekananda:

Tilak and Swami Vivekananda had great mutual respect and esteem for each other. They met accidentally while travelling by train in 1892 and Tilak had Vivekananda as a guest in his house. A person who was present there(Basukaka), heard that it was agreed between Vivekananda and Tilak that Tilak would work towards nationalism in the "political" arena, while Vivekananda would work for nationalism in the "religious" arena. When Vivekananda died at a young age, Tilak expressed great sorrow and paid tributes to him in the Kesari. Tilak said about Vivekananda:

"No Hindu, who, has the interests of Hinduism at his heart, could help feeling grieved over Vivekananda's samadhi. Vivekananda, in short, had taken the work of keeping the banner of Advaita philosophy forever flying among all the

nations of the world and made them realize the true greatness of Hindu religion and of the Hindu people. He had hoped that he would crown his achievement with the fulfillment of this task by virtue of his learning, eloquence, enthusiasm and sincerity, just as he had laid a secure foundation for it; but with Swami's samadhi, these hopes have gone. Thousands of years ago, another saint, Shankaracharya, who, showed to the world the glory and greatness of Hinduism. At the fag of the 19th century, the second Shankaracharya is Vivekananda, who, showed to the world the glory of Hinduism. His work has yet to be completed. We have lost our glory, our independence, everything.

Conflicts with Shahu over caste issues:

Shahu, the ruler of the princely state of Kolhapur, had several conflicts with Tilak as the latter agreed with the Brahmins decision of Puranic rituals for the Marathas that were intended for Shudras. Tilak even suggested that the Marathas should be "content" with the Shudra status assigned to them by the Brahmins. Tilak's newspapers, as well as the press in Kolhapur, criticized Shahu for his caste prejudice and his unreasoned hostility towards Brahmins. These included serious allegations such as sexual assaults by Shahu against four Brahmin women. An English woman named Lady Minto was petitioned to help them. The agent of Shahu had blamed these allegations on the "troublesome brahmins". Tilak and another Brahmin suffered from the confiscation of estates by Shahu, the first during a quarrel between Shahu and the Shankaracharya of Sankareshwar and later in another issue.

Tilak started two weeklies, Kesari ("The Lion") in Marathi and Mahratta in English (sometimes referred as 'Maratha' in Academic Study Books) in 1880–1881 with Gopal Ganesh Agarkar as the first editor. By this he was recognized as 'awakener of India', as Kesari later became a daily and continues publication to this day. In 1894, Tilak transformed the household worshipping of Ganesha into a grand public event (Sarvajanik Ganeshotsav). The celebrations consisted of several days of processions, music, and food. They were organized by the means of subscriptions by neighbourhood, caste, or occupation. Students often would celebrate Hindu and national glory and address political issues; including

patronage of Swadeshi goods.] In 1895, Tilak founded the Shri Shivaji Fund Committee for the celebration of "Shiv Jayanti", the birth anniversary of Shivaji, the founder of the Maratha Empire. The project also had the objective of funding the reconstruction of the tomb (Samadhi) of Shivaji at Raigad Fort. For this second objective, Tilak established the Shri Shivaji Raigad Smarak Mandal along with Senapati Khanderao Dabhade II of Talegaon Dabhade, who became the founder President of the Mandal.

The events like the Ganapati festival and Shiv Jayanti were used by Tilak to build a national spirit beyond the circle of the educated elite in opposition to colonial rule. But it also exacerbated Hindu-Muslim differences. The festival organizers would urge Hindus to protect cows and boycott the Muharram celebrations organized by Shi'a Muslims, in which Hindus had formerly often participated. Thus, although the celebrations were meant to be a way to oppose colonial rule, they also contributed to religious tensions. Contemporary Marathi Hindu nationalist parties like the Shiv Sena took up his reverence for Shivaji. However, Indian Historian, Uma Chakravarti cites Professor Gordon Johnson and states "It is significant that even at the time when Tilak was making political use of Shivaji the question of conceding Kshatriya status to him as Maratha was resisted by the conservative Brahmins including Tilak. While Shivaji was a Brave man, all his bravery, it was argued, did not give him the right to a status that very nearly approached that of a Brahmin. Further, the fact that Shivaji worshiped the Brahmanas in no way altered social relations, 'since it was as a Shudra he did it – as a Shudra the servant, if not the slave, of the Brahmin'".

The Deccan Education Society that Tilak founded with others in the 1880s still runs Institutions in Pune like the Fergusson College. The Swadeshi movement started by Tilak at the beginning of the 20th century became part of the Independence movement until that goal was achieved in 1947. One can even say Swadeshi remained part of Indian Government policy until the 1990s when the Congress Government liberalised the economy. Tilak said, "I regard India as my Motherland and my Goddess, the people in India are my kith and kin, and loyal

and steadfast work for their political and social emancipation is my highest religion and duty".

Dadabhai Naoroji:

Dadabhai Naoroji served India as the first politician and also engaged in commercial activities like fabric selling. He was also a pioneer in the Indian education system, working to dispel misconceptions about Monotheistic among the people of Bombay. Between 1892 to 1895, Naoroji served as an MP in the UK's House of Commons, making him the first Asian to hold the position of MP in the British Parliament.

Lala Lajpat Rai:

Born on 28 January 1865 in Punjab, Lala Lajpat Rai was one of the famous leaders of India who is also known by the name Punjab Kesari. Mohandas (Mahatma) Gandhi's Non-Cooperation Movement was started under his leadership during a special session of Congress. Under the command of Lala Lajpat Rai, the Swadeshi movement was initiated whose main objective was to avoid foreign products and make use of those created in India. Sadly, Lala Lajpat Rai was injured by a British constable on October 30, 1928, as he was opposing the Simon Commission's arrival by yelling "Simon Go Back" and left the world on 17th November 1928.

Annie Besant:

Annie Wood was born on 1 October 1847 in London into an upper-middle-class family. She was the daughter of William Burton Persse Wood (1816-1852) and Emily Roche Morris (died 1874). The Woods originated from Devon and her great-uncle was the Whig politician Sir Matthew Wood, 1st Baronet from whom derives the Page Wood baronets. Her father was an Englishman who lived in Dublin and attained a medical degree, having attended Trinity College Dublin. Her mother was an Irish Catholic, from a family of more modest means. Besant would go on to make much of her Irish ancestry and supported the cause of Irish self-rule

throughout her adult life. Annie's father died when she was five years old, leaving the family almost penniless. Her mother supported the family by running a boarding house for boys at Harrow School. However, she was unable to support Annie and persuaded her friend Ellen Marryat to care for her. Marryat made sure that she had a good education. Annie was given a strong sense of duty to society and an equally strong sense of what independent women could achieve.As a young woman, she was also able to travel widely in Europe. Annie was an Anglican but would later abandon the faith.

In 1867, at age twenty, she married 26-year-old clergyman Frank Besant (1840-1917), younger brother of Walter Besant. He was an evangelical Anglican who seemed to share many of her concerns. On the eve of her marriage, she had become more politicised through a visit to friends in Manchester, who brought her into contact with both English radicals and members of the Irish Republican Fenian Brotherhood, as well as with the conditions of the urban poor.

Soon Frank became vicar of Sibsey in Lincolnshire. Annie moved to Sibsey with her husband, and within a few years they had two children, Arthur and Mabel; however, the marriage was a disaster. As Annie wrote in her Autobiography, "we were an ill-matched pair".

The first conflict came over money and Annie's independence. Annie wrote short stories, books for children, and articles. As married women did not have the legal right to own property. Frank was able to collect all the money she earned. Politics further divided the couple. Annie began to support farmworkers who were fighting to unionise and to win better conditions. Frank was a Tory and sided with the landlords and farmers. The tension came to a head when Annie refused to attend Communion. In 1873 she left him and returned to London. They were legally separated and Annie took her daughter with her.

Besant began to question her own faith. She turned to leading churchmen for advice, going to see Edward Bouverie Pusey, one of the leaders of the Oxford Movement within the Church of England. When she asked him to recommend

books that would answer her questions, he told her she had read too many already. Besant returned to Frank to make a last unsuccessful effort to repair the marriage. She finally left for London.

V. O. Chidambaram Pillai:

V. O. Chidambaram Pillai was born in a Vellalar family in Ottapidaram, Tirunelveli District to Olaganathan Pillai and Paramayee Ammal. When Chidambaram was six years old, he learned Tamil from teacher Veeraperumal Annavi. He heard stories about Shiva from his grandmother and stories from the Ramayana from his grandfather. He heard stories from Mahabharatha told by Allikulam Subramanya Pillai. In his childhood, he learned horse riding, silambattam, archery, sword fighting and played kabaddi, swimming, stilt walking, wrestling and chess.

He learned English from a Taluk officer named Krishnan lyyengar in the evenings. When lyyengar was transferred, Chidambaram Pillai's father built a school for him and appointed Aramvalarthanatha Pillai from Ettayapuram as the English teacher. The school was run by a priest at Pudhiamuthur. At fourteen, Chidambaram Pillai went to Thoothukudi to continue his studies. He studied at CEOA High School and Caldwell High School and in Thoothukudi at the Hindu College High School, Tirunelveli.

Chidambaram Pillai worked as Taluk office clerk for some time before his father sent him to Tiruchirappalli to study law. He passed his pleadership exam in 1894, returning to Ottapidaram to become a pleader in 1895.

In Madras, Chidambaram Pillai met Swami Ramakrishnananda, a saint who belonged to Swami Vivekananda Ashram (monastery), who advised him to serve the nation. Here he met the Tamil poet Bharathiyaar who shared his political ideology. The two men became close friends.

Jarvaharlal-Nehru (1952-1966):

From 1951 until his death in 1964, Jawaharlal Nehru was the paramount leader of the party. Congress gained power in landslide victories in the general elections of 1951-52, 1957, and 1962. During his tenure, Nehru implemented policies based on import substitution industrialisation, and advocated a mixed economy where the government-controlled public sector co-existed with the private sector. He believed the establishment of basic and heavy industries was fundamental to the development and modernisation of the Indian economy. The Nehru government directed investment primarily into key public sector industries steel, iron, coal, and power-promoting their development with subsidies and protectionist policies. Nehru embraced secularism, socialistic economic practices based on state-driven industrialisation, and a non-aligned and non-confrontational foreign policy that became typical of the modern Congress Party. The policy of non-alignment during the Cold War meant Nehru received financial and technical support from both the Eastern and Western Bloes to build India's industrial base from nothing.

During his period in office, there were four known assassination attempts on Nehru. The first attempt on his life was during partition in 1947 while he was visiting the North-West Frontier Province in a car. The second was by a knife-wielding rickshaw-puller in Maharashtra in 1955. A third attempt happened in Bombay in 1956. The fourth was a failed bombing attempt on railway tracks in Maharashtra in 1961. Despite threats to his life, Nehru despised having excess security personnel around him and did not like his movements to disrupt traffic. K. Kamaraj became the president of the All India Congress Committee in 1963 during the last year of Nehru's life. Prior to that, he had been the chief minister of Madras state for nine years. Kamaraj had also been a member of "the syndicate", a group of right wing leaders within Congress. In 1963 the Congress lost popularity following the defeat in the Indo-Chinese war of 1962. To revitalise the party, Kamaraj proposed the Kamaraj Plan to Nehru that encouraged six Congress chief ministers (including himself) and six senior cabinet ministers to resign to take up party work.

In 1964, Nehru died because of an aortic dissection, raising questions about the party's future. Following the death of Nehru, Gulzarilal Nanda was appointed as the interim Prime Minister on 27 May 1964, pending the election of a new parliamentary leader of the Congress party who would then become Prime Minister. During the leadership contest to succeed Nehru, the preference was between Morarji Desai and Lal Bahadur Shashtri. Eventually, Shashtri was selected as the next parliamentary leader thus the Prime Minister. Kamaraj was widely credited as the "kingmaker" in for ensuring the victory of Lal Bahadur Shastri over Morarji Desai.

As prime minister, Shastri retained most of members of Nehru's Council of Ministers; T. T Krishnamachari was retained as Finance Minister of India, as was Defence Minister Yashwantrao Chavan. Shastri appointed Swaran Singh to succeed him as External Affairs Minister Shastri appointed Indira Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru's daughter and former party president, Minister of Information and Broadcasting. Gulzarilal Nanda continued as the Minister of Home Affairs. As Prime Minister, Shastri continued Nehru's policy of non-alignment, but built closer relations with the Soviet Union. In the aftermath of the Sino-Indian War of 1962, and the formation of military ties between China and Pakistan, Shastri's government expanded the defence budget of India's armed forces. He also promoted the White Revolution a national campaign to increase the production and supply of milk by creating the National Dairy Development Board. The Madras anti-Hindi agitation of 1965 occurred during Shastri's tenure.

Shastri became a national hero following victory in the Indo-Pakistani War of 1965. His slogan, "Jai Jawan Jai Kisan" ("Hail the soldier, Hail the farmer"), became very popular during the war. On 11 January 1966, a day after signing the Tashkent Declaration, Shastri died in Tashkent, reportedly of a heart attack; but the circumstances of his death remain mysterious. After Shastri's death, Congress elected Indira Gandhi as leader over Morarji Desai. Once again, K. Kamaraj was instrumental in achieving this result. The differences among the top leadership of the Congress regarding the future of the party during resulted in the formation of

several breakaway parties such as Orissa Jana Congress, Bangla Congress, Utkal Congress, and, Bharativa Kranti Dal.

K. Kamaraj:

Kumaraswami Kamaraj (15 July 1903– 2 October 1975), popularly known as Kamarajar was an Indian independence activist and politician who served as the Chief Minister of Madras State (Tamil Nadu) from 13 April 1954 to 2 October 1963. He was the founder and the president of the Indian National Congress (Organisation), widely acknowledged as the "Kingmaker" in Indian politics during the 1960s. He also served as the president of the Indian National Congress for two terms i.e. four years between 1964–1967 and was responsible for the elevation of Lal Bahadur Shastri to the position of Prime Minister of India after Nehru's death and Indira Gandhi after Shastri's death. He was the Member of Parliament, Lok Sabha during 1952–1954 and 1969–1975. He was known for his simplicity and integrity. He played a major role in developing the infrastructure of the Madras state and worked to improve the quality of life of the needy and the disadvantaged.

As the president of the INC, he was instrumental in steering the party after the death of Jawaharlal Nehru. As the chief minister of Madras, he was responsible for bringing free education to the disadvantaged and introduced the free Midday Meal Scheme while he himself did not complete schooling. He was awarded with India's highest civilian honour, the Bharat Ratna, posthumously in 1976. US Vice-president Hubert Humphrey, referred to Kamaraj as "one of the greatest political leaders in all the countries of the free world" in January 1966.

Early Life:

Kamaraj was born on 15 July 1903 in Virudhunagar, Tamil Nadu, to Kumaraswami Nadar and Sivakami Ammal. His name was originally Kamatchi, later changed to Kamarajar. His father Kumaraswami Nadar was a merchant. Kamaraj had a younger sister named Nagammal. Kamaraj was first enrolled in a traditional school in 1907 and in 1908 he was admitted to Yenadhi Narayana Vidhya Salai. In 1909 Kamaraj was admitted in Virudupatti High School.

Kamaraj's father died when he was six years old, his mother was forced to support the family. In 1914 Kamaraj dropped out of school to support his mother.

Politics:

As a young boy, Kamaraj worked in his uncle's provision shop and during that time he began to attend public meetings and processions about the Indian Home Rule movement. Kamaraj developed an interest in prevailing political conditions by reading newspapers daily. The Jallianwala Bagh massacre was the decisive turning point in his life - he decided to fight for national freedom and to bring an end to foreign rule. In 1920, when he was 18, he became active in politics. He joined Congress as a full-time political workerIn 1921 Kamaraj organised public meetings at Virudhunagar for Congress leaders. He was eager to meet Gandhi, and when Gandhi visited Madurai on 21 September 1921, Kamaraj attended the public meeting and met Gandhi for the first time. He visited villages carrying Congress propaganda.

In 1922 Congress boycotted the visit of the Prince of Wales as part of the Non-Cooperation Movement. He came to Madras and took part in the event. In 1923–25 Kamaraj participated in the Nagpur Flag Satyagraha. In 1927, Kamaraj started the Sword Satyagraha in Madras and was chosen to lead the Neil Statue Satyagraha, but this was given up later in view of the Simon Commission boycott.

Kamaraj went to jail for two years in June 1930 for participating in the "Salt Satyagraha". led by Rajagopalachari at Vedaranyam; he was released before he served the two-year sentence as a result of 1931 Gandhi–Irwin Pact.In 1932, Section 144 was imposed in Madras prohibiting the holding of meetings and organisation of processions against the arrest of Gandhi in Bombay. In Virdhunagar, under Kamaraj's leadership, processions and demonstrations happened every day. Kamaraj was arrested again in January 1932 and sentenced to one year's imprisonment. In 1933 Kamaraj was falsely charged in the Virudhunagar bomb case. Varadarajulu Naidu and George Joseph argued on Kamaraj's behalf and proved the charges to be baseless. At the age of 34, Kamaraj entered the Assembly winning the Sattur seat in the 1937 election.

Kamaraj conducted a vigorous campaign throughout the state asked people not to contribute to war funds when Arthur Hope, the Madras Governor, was collecting contributions to fund for the Second World War. In December 1940 he was arrested again at Guntur, under the Defence of India rules for speeches that opposed contributions to the war fund, and sent to Vellore Central Prison while he was on his way to Wardha to get Gandhi's approval for a list of Satyagrahis.

While in jail, he was elected as Municipal Councillor of Virudhunagar. He was released nine months later in November 1941 and resigned from this post as he thought he had greater responsibility for the nation. His principle was "One should not accept any post to which one could not do full justice".

In 1942, Kamaraj attended the All-India Congress Committee in Bombay and returned to spread propaganda material for the Quit India Movement. The police issued orders to all the leaders who attended this Bombay session. Kamaraj did not want to be arrested before he took the message to all district and local leaders. finishing his work and sent a message to the local police that he was ready to be arrested. He was arrested in August 1942. He was under detention for three years and was released in June 1945. This was his last prison term. Kamaraj was imprisoned six times by the British for his pro-Independence activities, that added up to more than 3,000 days in jail.

During the anti-cow slaughter agitation in 1966, Kamaraj's house near the parliament was burnt down by Hindutva groups. The agitation was incited by Bharatiya Jana Sangh, the political arm of the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS). They also surrounded his house with an intent to attack him.] Kamaraj had a narrow escape.

Chief Minister:

On 13 April 1954, Kamaraj became the Chief Minister of Madras Province. To everyone's surprise, Kamaraj nominated C. Subramaniam , who had contested his leadership, to the newly formed cabinet.

As Chief Minister, Kamaraj removed the family vocation based Modified Scheme of Elementary education 1953 introduced by Rajaji. He reopened 6000 schools closed in the previous government by C. Rajagopalachari citing financial reasons and reopened 12,000 more schools. The State made immense strides in education and trade. New schools were opened, so that poor rural students had to walk no more than three kilometres to their nearest school. Better facilities were added to existing ones. No village remained without a primary school and no panchayat without a high school. Kamaraj strove to eradicate illiteracy by introducing free and compulsory education up to the eleventh standard. He introduced the Midday Meal Scheme to provide at least one meal per day to the lakhs of poor school children. He introduced free school uniforms to weed out caste, creed and class distinctions among young minds.

During the colonial era, the local education rate was at 7%; after Kamaraj's reforms, it reached 37%. Apart from increasing the number of schools, steps were taken to improve standards of education. To improve standards, the number of working days was increased from 180 to 200; unnecessary holidays were reduced; and syllabi were prepared to give opportunity to various abilities. Kamaraj and Bishnuram Medhi (Governor) took efforts to establish IIT Madras in 1959.

Major irrigation schemes were planned in Kamaraj's period. Dams and irrigation canals were built across higher Bhavani, Mani Muthar, Aarani, Vaigai, Amaravathi, Sathanur, Krishnagiri, Pullambadi, Parambik ulam and Neyyaru among others. The Lower Bhavani Dam in Erode district brought 207,000 acres (840 km^2) of land under cultivation. 45,000 acres (180 km^2) of land benefited from canals constructed from the Mettur Dam. The Vaigai and Sathanur systems facilitated cultivation across thousands of acres of lands in Madurai and North Arcot districts respectively. Rs 30 crores were planned to be spent for Parambikulam River scheme, and 150 lakhs of acres of lands were brought under cultivation; one third of this (i.e. 56 lakhs of acres of land) received a permanent irrigation facility. In 1957–61 1,628 tanks were de-silted under the Small Irrigation Scheme, and 2,000 wells were dug with outlets. Long-term loans with 25% subsidy were given to farmers. In addition farmers who had dry lands were given oil engines and electric pump sets on an instalment basis.

Industries with huge investments in crores of Rupees were started in his period: Neyveli Lignite Corporation, BHEL at Trichy, Manali Refinery, Hindustan raw photo film factory at Ooty, surgical instruments factory at Chennai, and a railway coach factory at Chennai were established. Industries such as paper, sugar, chemicals and cement took off during the period.

Kamaraj Plan

Kamaraj remained Chief Minister for three consecutive terms, winning elections in 1957 and 1962. Kamaraj noticed that the Congress party was slowly losing its vigour. On Gandhi Jayanti day 2 October 1963, he resigned from the post of the Chief Minister. He proposed that all senior Congress leaders should resign from their posts and devote all their energy to the re-vitalization of the Congress.

In 1963 he suggested to Nehru that senior Congress leaders should leave ministerial posts to take up organisational work. This suggestion came to be known as the Kamaraj Plan, which was designed primarily to dispel from the minds of Congressmen the lure of power, creating in its place a dedicated attachment to the objectives and policies of the organisation. Six Union Ministers and six Chief Ministers including Lal Bahadur Shastri, Jagjivan Ram, Morarji Desai, Biju Patnaik and S.K. Patil followed suit and resigned from their posts. Impressed by Kamaraj's achievements and acumen, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru felt that his services were needed more at the national level. In a swift move he brought Kamaraj to Delhi as the President of the Indian National Congress. Nehru realised that in addition to wide learning and vision, Kamaraj possessed enormous common sense and pragmatism. Kamaraj was elected the President of Indian National Congress on 9 October 1963.

National Politics:

After Nehru's death in 1964, Kamaraj successfully navigated the party through turbulent times. As the president of INC, he refused to become the next Prime Minister himself and was instrumental in bringing to power two Prime Ministers, Lal Bahadur Shastri in 1964 and Nehru's daughter Indira Gandhi 1966. For this role, he was widely acclaimed as the "kingmaker" during the 1960s.

When the Congress split in 1969, Kamaraj became the leader of the Indian National Congress (Organisation) (INC(O)) in Tamil Nadu. The party fared poorly in the 1971 elections amid allegations of fraud by the opposition parties. He remained the leader of INC(O) until his death in 1975.

Nagercoil by-election victory:

The death of A. Nesamony in 1968 led to the by-election in Nagercoil Lok Sabha constituency. Realising the popularity of Kamaraj in this constituency and the potential danger posed by Kamaraj's election after the Indian National Congress party's debacle in 1967 election, C. Rajagopalachari wrote in *Swarajya*, the magazine of the Swatantra Party, about the need to defeat him and appealed to C. N. Annadurai to support M. Mathias, the Swatantra Party candidate. Annadurai deputed M. Karunanidhi, the then Minister for Public Works, to Nagercoil to work in support of Mathias. Despite the efforts, Kamaraj won decisively with a 1,28,201-vote margin on 8 January 1969.

Personal Life:

During his tenure as Chief Minister, when the municipality of Virudhunagar provided a direct water connection to his house in his hometown, Kamarajar ordered it to be disconnected immediately as he did not want any special privileges. He refused to use the Z-level security that was provided to him as the CM of Tamil Nadu and instead travelled with just one police patrol vehicle. He did not marry, did not own any property and was never tempted by power. When he died, he left behind ₹130, 2 pairs of sandals, 4 shirts, 4 dhotis and a few books.

Kamaraj died at his home, on Gandhi Jayanti day (2 October 1975), which also was the 12th anniversary of his resignation. He was aged 72 and died in his sleep due to a heart attack

Reference Books:

1. B.K. Keswani, History of Modern India, (1800-1984), Himalaya Publishing House, Delhi, 1996.

2. S.C. Ray Choudri, History of Modern India, Surjeet Publication, Delhi, 1989.

3. S.N. Sen, History of Freedom Movement in India (1857-1947), Wiley Eastern Ltd., Calcutta, 1989.

4. Hukam Chand, History of Modern India, Anmol Publications, Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2005.

5. V.D. Mahajan, History of Modern India, S. Chand and Co, NewDelhi, 1972