

DJH3A - HISTORY OF INDIA FROM 1858 TO 1964 A.D

Unit - I

Constitutional Developments in India after Mutiny of 1857- Queen Victoria's Proclamation of 1858-India Council Act of 1861, 1892 and Minto- Morley Reforms Act of 1909- Government of India Act of 1919 – Introduction of Dyarchy-Govt. of India Act of 1935 – Provincial-Indian Independence Act of 1947 – Transfer of power-Relation with Foreign powers-Afghanistan- Burma-Nepal

Unit - II

Princely States-Major Princely States a survey- British policies towards Princely States- Integration of the Indian States- Development of Education- Women's Movement – Dalit upsurge- Peasants and workers Movements – Communal and Separatist Movements- Indian Civil Servants – Development of Press in India.

Unit - III

Major Developments since 1858- Local self Government-Development of Trade and Commerce- Industry, Transport and Irrigation- Development of Science of Technology- Socio – Religious Reform Movement- Brahmo Samaj- Arya Samaj- Ramakrishna Mission – The Theosophical Society- Christian Missionary – Societies.

Unit - IV

Freedom Movement- Indian National Congress- Moderates and Extremists- Muslim League- M.K. Gandhi and M.A. Jinnah-The Gandhian Era- The Amirstar Massacre of 1919- Non- Co-operation movement- Nehru Report 1928- Simon Commission- Civil disobedience movement- Round table conference Communal Award – Poone a Part.

Unit - V

Final Phase- World War II and its impact- Quit India movement- Crips mission, Wavel plan and Cabinet mission- Partition and distribution of power - Reorganisation of Linguistic States - The Post - Independence Era - Five year plans and Economic Developments - Science and Technology-Growth of higher education - India's foreign policy.

Reference Books:

1. A.R. Desai -Social Background to India's nationalism
2. India's Struggle for Independence - Bipan Chandra.
3. Percival Spear - The Oxford History of India.
4. S.Batacharya - Economic Foundation of the British Raj.
5. Selchar Bandopadhyaya from Plasey to Paratition
6. Stanley Welpert - A New History of India (Oxford University Press)
7. Sumit Sankar- Modern India 157-1947 (Macmillan)

UNIT - I

Government of India Act 1858

The act of 1858 left untouched the government of India, but affected the administrative mechanism through which India was governed from England. The Act declared that hence forth "India shall be governed by and in the name of the Queen and vested in the queen all the territories and powers of the company. The main provisions of the acts were:

The secretary of state in council took the place of the Board of control and court of directors. The new secretary of state for India was to be assisted by a council of India which was consists of 15 members ,of whom 8 were to be appointed by the crown and 7 to be elected by the directors of the company.

The secretary of state was to preside over the meeting of the council and had power to overrule its decisions in case it differed. The function of the council was to advise the secretary of state but only on matters referred to it by him. It had to initiative. The secretary was empowered to make rules for the more convenient transaction of business, constitute committees and distribute departments of business among them. The secretary of state was to be a member of the British cabinet .His salary and allowances were made a charge on the revenues of India. The secretary of state was to annually place before parliament the Indian accounts and reports concerning the moral and material progress of India. The secretary of state for India was given the power of sending to and receiving secret messages from the viceroy of India and was not expected to communicate these to the India council.

The Governor –General was to be known as the viceroy, which means one holding post for or in the place of sovereign . He was to be assisted by a council of 15 members. The revenues of India were to be mostly spent for India alone. The crown was to appoint the Governor- General of India and the Governor of the presidencies. The military and naval forces were transferred to queen. The Act lay down that except for the purpose of rebelling invasion or any other sudden or urgent necessity, Indian revenues were not to be employed for military operation outside India without the consent of parliament. Above all, the secretary of state for India exercised control over the viceroy of India. Lord Canning was the first viceroy of India.

Thus, the government of India act of 1858 opened a new chapter in the History of India. The rule of the company ended, and now that of the crown in a direct manner commenced. According to marsh man, "The Company transferred to the crown on relinquishing its functions, an empire more magnificent than Rome. 'The main rules, under which India was governed in 1858, were already those of the British parliament. The British administrator including the Governor – General though nominally the servants of the court of directors knew that in reality they were answerable to the British cabinet with its Indian Minister, who was the president of the board of control and through them to the parliament. No doubt, the council was given some power on the Indian revenues and expenditure, but it had no authority on war and peace. The council had no initiative and

besides, certain matters could be kept secret from the council. The India office in London directly controlled permanent official in India and hence instead of criticising them identified itself with them and protected them. Therefore, these officials became the practical owners of India. In spite of various drawback, the Government of India act Occupies an important position in the history of India.

QUEEN VICTORIA'S PROCLAMATION OF 1858

The assumption by the crown of the Government of India was formally declared on November 1, 1858 at a Durbar held at Allahabad where Canning read the Queen's proclamation to the assembled princes and the people of India. The Queen proclamation "Such a document should breathe feeling of generosity, benevolence and religious toleration and out the privileges which the Indians will receive in being placed on the footing of equality with the subject of the British crown and the prosperity following in the train of civilisation." The proclamation given below was drafted by Lord Derby in accordance with the sentiments of the queen and worded to be worthy of the occasion to the people of India, the assumption by the Queen marked the dawn of a new era, the proclamation was cherished as the charter of their rights.

THE GREAT UPHEAVAL OF 1857

The proclamation broadly decided the relation of the British. Government with the princess of the Indian states and the people. The proclamation said, "We hereby announce to the native princess of India that all treaties and engagements made with them by or under the authority of the Honourable East India company are by us accepted, and will be scrupulously maintained, and we like for the like observance on their part." Then, "We desire no extension of our present territorial possession, and while we will permit no aggression upon our dominions or our rights to be attempted with impunity we shall sanction no encroachment on those of others." It further said, "We shall respect the rights, dignity and honour of our native princes as our own, and we desire that they as well as our own subjects, should enjoy that prosperity, and that social advancement which can be secured by internal peace and good government." The policy of doctrine of lapse was abolished. The policy of centralisation adopted in the character act of 1858 was reversed and the government recognised new principles of decentralisation and Indenisation.

For the people of India the Queen proclamation declared, "We hold our selves bound to the native of our Indian territories by the same obligation of duties which bind us to our other entire subject. It also promised non- interference in the religious affairs of the people, and non – discrimination as that none be any wise favoured, none molested by reason of their religious faith and observance." The proclamation also promised that hence forward efficient Indians would be appointed in various responsible government posts irrespective of caste and creed. The proclamation further declared that "We know and respect the feeling of attachment with which the natives of India regard the land inherited

by them from their ancestors and we desired to protect them in all rights connected there with subject to the quitable demands of the state and we will do that generally in framing and administering the law, the regard to be paid to the ancient rights, usages and customs of India”.

The Queen through her proclamation, granted amnesty to all the rebels except those who had actually assassinated the British subject in India during the mutiny.

The proclamation, with its promises went a long way in restoring order and pacifying the people. The feeling of relief it evoked was fully made use by canning to drive home the nation that a new era had in reality begun. To the people of India the proclamation brought a new heaven on earth. In fact, the proclamation was actually, as it was said, the Magna Carta of Indian liberties.

The Government brought about some modifications in the British Indian army after the revolt of 1857. The British now became extra cautious about the strength and number of the Indian spays. The number of British soldiers was considerably increased as to avoid the possibility of another such rising in future. The English soldiers, were now mainly kept in possession of the artillery and the Englishmen only were placed in the superior rank of the army. So the European element in the army was strengthened and the European officers became the permanent feature of the Indian army. The forces of the company were amalgamated in order to remove the old anomalies which had been existing between them so long. The company’s regiments were disbanded and now all the army men became directly the servants of the crown of England. The policy of balance and counter-poise was deliberately furthered in the Indian army”. Every effort was made to isolate the army from the people. Further, the mutiny caused he British to regard Indian aspirations with an eye that was more watchful and less benevolent than had previously been the case”. Previously the government took the initiative in introducing necessary social reforms, but now the government became cautious. Another, important result of the mutiny was the increase of suspicion of the British on the Indian citizens. It aggravated the differences between the Indian and the Europeans”. The British now became more revengeful upon the Indians after the revolt. According to Panikar, “The atrocities of white terror rankled long in Indian minds, and poisoned the relationship of the two races for decades to come”. As a result of the failure of this revolt distrust and differences cropped up between the Hindus and the Muslims as both began to look at one another as being responsible for the failure of the revolt. The revolt of 1857 caused terrible financial crisis, so various steps were taken to bring financial reforms. Custom duties were enhanced and income tax was imposed. Indian Police Act and Indian High Courts Act was passed in 1861. In order to establish their control over the Indians, the English encouraged the expansion of English education in India.

The revolt of 1857 was an epoch making event in the history of India. The outbreak of 1857 indeed was a watershed in British Indian history. In the words of Michel Edwards, “The mutiny represents a divide in the history of British India. In general terms it was the violent meeting of two dying systems.” The mutiny was the parting of the ways between two ages in the Indian history – the medieval and modern. It brought about a revolutionary

change in the national life of India. According to Sir L. Griffith, "Perhaps more fortunate occurrence than the mutiny of 1857 occurred in India- It swept the Indian sky clear of many clouds-it replaced an unprogressive, selfish and commercial system of administration by one liberal and enlightened". In fact, a new era began in Indian history.

The Indian Councils Act, 1861

In a way, the Indian Councils Act, 1861 marked an important step in the history of constitutional development of India. It marked the beginning of that policy of the British which has been called 'the policy of association' or 'the policy of benevolent despotism' because, for the first time, an attempt was made to include the Indians in the administration of the country. After the revolt of 1857, it was felt by the British that some measures were to be developed for establishing contact with the Indian public opinion. Besides, some other factors also necessitated the framing of this Act. The Act of 1858 had brought no changes in the administration of India. The provinces were not satisfied with the legislative powers assigned to them by the Act of 1853. The extended Executive Council of the Governor-General, which was meant only to advise him in matters of legislation, was acting as a petty parliament much against the wishes of its framers. Therefore, it was felt necessary to bring certain changes in the administration of India. It resulted in passing of the Act of 1861. The main provisions of the Act were as follows:

The strength of the Executive Council of the Governor-General was increased by the nomination of additional members for the purpose of legislation. The number of these members was to be minimum six and maximum twelve. At least half of them were to be non-officials. They were to be nominated by the Governor-General for two years. The Indians could also be nominated by him. These members were to advise the Governor-General in matters of legislation. The Governor-General could refuse to accept their advice. The Council had no control over the Executive of the Governor-General. It could not initiate bills concerning certain important matters like defence, religion etc, without the prior permission of the Governor-General.

(ii) A fifth member was added to the Executive Council of the Governor-General as the finance member. The Governor-General was empowered to frame rules for the convenient transaction of business by the Council. Lord Canning utilised this power for introducing portfolio-system in the Council. The Councillors were assigned responsibility of looking after different departments. They could take decisions concerning routine matters of their respective departments. Only important matters were to be put before the Council. It certainly helped in increasing the efficiency of the administration.

(iii) The Governor-General was empowered to frame Ordinances in cases of emergency which were to remain valid as law for six months unless cancelled by the Secretary of State-in-Council or by the Legislative Council at the Centre.

(iv) The provinces were given the right to frame laws concerning provincial affairs. For this purpose, the Executive Councils of the provinces were enlarged. The governors

were given the right to nominate minimum four and maximum eight members in their respective councils. Half of them were to be non-officials. The Indians were supposed to be nominated for this job. But the advice of the Council was not binding on the governor. After the assent of the governor, the assent of the Governor-General was also necessary for a Bill to become an Act. The Councils could not initiate legislation in certain important matters without the prior permission of the governor. The Councils had no control over their respective Executives.

(v) The Governor-General was empowered to create Legislative Councils in the provinces of North West (Uttar Pradesh) and Punjab. These were created in 1886 and 1897 respectively.

(vi) The Governor-General-in-Council was empowered to create new provinces, appoint lieutenant governors and demarcate the boundaries of the provinces.

The Act made a beginning of the legislatures in India both at the Centre and the provinces. Thus, it was a useful measure, But its utility ended there. The Act failed to serve the purpose for which it was created. Its primary purpose was to introduce measures of knowing the wishes of the Indians. The provision of nominating non-official members in legislature was made for the same purpose. But, the provision remained a failure because mostly princes or big landlords, who, in no way represented the Indian public opinion, were nominated as members. Coupland, therefore, has remarked: "These Councils were akin to the durbars which Indian rulers had traditionally held in order to sound their subject opinion". The Councils, in fact, were there simply to stamp the wishes of the Executive Councils. Thus, in a way, the Act was a reactionary step in comparison with the Act of 1853. Besides, the Legislative Councils, in fact, had no power either concerning legislation or controlling the Executives. The power to frame Ordinance to the Governor-General was an additional power to him. Therefore, the Act failed to serve any useful purpose. The only thing in its favour was that, by creating legislative Councils, it laid down the foundation of that system of administration which lasted till the end of the British rule in India.

The Indian Council Act, 1892

The Act of 1861 failed to satisfy even the liberal opinion in India. Even prior to the establishment of Indian National Congress, several associations were formed which expressed the desire that the Legislative Councils should be made effective bodies for framing the laws and controlling the Executive Councils. The Indian National Congress was established in 1885 and it demanded further reforms. Lord Dufferin, the Governor-General, himself suggested a scheme of reform, for this purpose. His successor, Lord Lansdowne, also favoured constitutional reforms with a view to satisfy the Indian Liberals. Another reason for passing the Act of 1892 was that the Indian government also desired it. It desired to increase the number of Indians in Legislative Councils which could provide it the pretext of extending its powers against the powers of the Home Government (Secretary of State in Council) which was behaving despotically towards it. The British traders and monopolists in

India were also of the opinion. They were confident of sending their representatives in legislative councils provided some sort of election device was introduced for choosing their members. All these factors pointed out the necessity of further reforms. The result was the Indian Councils Act of 1861. The main provisions of this Act were as follows:

- (i) The number of additional members in the Legislature at the Centre was increased. The minimum number was fixed as ten and the maximum twenty. Among them at least ten were to be non-officials.
- (ii) The number of additional members in provincial legislatures was also increased. There the minimum number was kept as eight and the maximum twenty. The number of non-official members among them was also increased. The number of total members varied from province to province. In Uttar Pradesh it was kept as fifteen while in Madras and Bombay it was twenty.
- (iii) The members of the Legislative Councils continued to be nominated by the Governor-General and the governors. But, provision was made in this Act to nominate them on the basis of recommendations by certain organised associations like 'Calcutta Chamber of Commerce', Zamindars' Association, University Senates, District Boards etc. For the Centre, the non-official members of the Provincial Legislature were also empowered to send their recommendations. Thus, the Act made provision for indirect election for the members of the Legislative Councils.
- (iv) The powers of the Legislative Councils were enhanced a little. These were allowed to discuss the annual budgets though they could not vote on them. The members had the right to ask questions from the Executive Councillors. But, a prior notice of six days was to be given in such cases. Besides, the members could not ask supplementary questions and the President of the Council could refuse permission for asking any question.

It has been expressed by some scholars that 'the Indian Councils Act of 1892' was an attempt at compromise between the official view of the Council as 'pocket legislatures' and the educated Indian view of them as 'embryo Parliament'. It was certainly a step ahead from the Act of 1861. The increase in the number of Indian members in the Legislative Councils, provision of their indirect election and enhancement of their powers were all in the direction of gradual establishment of Parliamentary government. Certain scholars have even remarked that 'the foundation of responsible government was really laid in 1892 and not in 1861'. Yet, the Act failed to satisfy the Indian public opinion. The provision of indirect elections served no purpose. The non-official members were in no position to influence the decisions of the government. The powers of the Councils both at the Centre and the provinces were much limited. Charles Aitchison remarked: "As a mere arena of exposit facto debate, Councils were little else than mischievous". Besides, while the partition of Bengal enraged the Indian public opinion, the rise of extremism within the All India Congress led Indians towards the path of struggle against the British. Therefore, the demand of further constitutional reforms came to the fore-front very soon.

MINTO – MORELY REFORM OF 1909

The Indian Councils Act of 1892 failed to meet the legitimate demands of the Congress and Tilak condemned the policy of the moderate leaders of the Congress in these words "Political rights will have to be fought for. The moderates think that these can be won by persuasion. We think that these can be won by pressure". Educated Indians were not given any share in the government services and administration. The infamous partition of Bengal which was considered to be a subtle attack on the growing solidarity of Bengal nationalism. The Bengal, is felt humiliated, insulted and resorted to a vigorous agitation to get the wrong undone. The cup of humiliation was filled to the brim when in 1907; The Transvaal Government passed the Asiatic Registration Act requiring Indians to be registered by means of finger prints. The defeat of Russia at the hands of a tiny Asian power-Japan-convincing the youths of the country that the Eastern powers were in no way inferior to the Western powers and that the British rule certainly not a divine gift. Besides, the growing Muslim consciousness also influenced the passing of the reforms of 1909 incorporating communal representation for the first time. In December the liberal party came to power in England and the India problem drew its attention. Lord John Morley was appointed secretary of state for India, and Lord Minto became the new Governor - General (viceroy). They felt that India could not be governed in the old spirit of military force, and that more constitutional reforms must be introduced to rally at least the moderate element within the ranks of the Congress. Minto felt that the Indian people must be given a large share in the governance of their country. Lord Minto had felt that permanence of the British administration in India depends upon a sound appreciation of the changing conditions which surround it. Both Morely and Minto recognized that the partition of Bengal was a grave blunder and had hardened anti-government feeling in the country. The new departure they thought was the introduction of changes in the composition and functions of the legislative bodies. Further, the situation of law and order deteriorated immensely, and both Morley and Minto concluded that if repression continued and reforms were denied the British rule might lose even the goodwill of those who desired it to continue. Both of them devised a scheme of reforms, and on the basis of this, another Indian Council Act was adopted by the Parliament in March 1909, and received royal assent on 25th May, 1919.

The new Act increased the strength of the Central as well as Provincial Legislative Councils. The number of additional members for legislative purposes in the Viceroy's executive council was raised from 16 to 60. While the number of additional members in provincial council was to be between thirty and fifty. This does not include the ex-official and non-official. At the centre, the official members were to be in majority. In the provincial legislature non-official majorities were conceded. This was done because of the understanding that the non-official members would represent such diverse interests and classes that it would be difficult for them to take a joint stand. In the central or imperial legislative council there were 37 officials (9 ex-officio + 28 additional official members). The Act became a landmark because of the manner in which non-official seats were distributed

and filled of these 32 non-official seats 5 were filled by nomination by the Government. The remaining 27 seats were distributed as follows- By non-official members of the Provincial Legislative Councils-13, by landholders of six provinces-6, by Muslims of five provinces-5, by Muslim landholders of U.P. or Bengal-01, Chambers of Commerce of Calcutta, Bombay-2. Similar provisions were made for forming Provincial Legislative Councils with variations depending on their peculiar conditions. The Muslims and landholders were given weightage not with reference to any advantages verified by actual practice but in anticipation of them. These seats were to be filled in by elections. For 13 open seats doubly indirect system of elections was introduced. The tax paying citizens in a town or village elected representatives for Provincial Legislative Council. Thus some 200 non-official members of Provincial Legislative Councils filled 13 unreserved seats. Further, Muslims were to be elected by separate electorate, that is to say, the electorate consisting of Muslim only. Muslims were also given weightage i.e. more seats were given to them than the number warranted by their proportion in the local population. In the election for Central Legislative Council held in 1909 Muslims were able to win 4 seats which were open to other too and so had in all 11 out of 30 non-official seats. The election regulation proved liberal enough to enable prominent political leaders period who believed in the method of constitutional agitation to enter the legislative bodies.

The Act did not make any alteration in the legislative powers of these Councils. It simply extended their functions. The Council was assigned only three functions, discussion of the budget, discussion of any matter of public interest and the asking of questions. The regulations that were subsequently framed by the Governor-General determined their scope and extent. The members were also allowed to ask supplementary questions, to move resolution on matters relating to loans to local bodies, additional grants and new taxes. The Act also extended to the members the right to discuss matters of public interest, adopt resolutions or divide the house on them. But the resolutions adopted by the House were not absolute and binding on the Government. The President of the House was authorized to drop any resolutions adopted by the House without stating any sound reason. The regulation in respect of the budget laid down that while the members were free to make comments and offer suggestions of any question of principle involved or on the budget as a whole they could not veto any item of expenditure proposed or tax levied. In fact, the budget was not to be put to vote and the finance members was free to accept or reject any view expressed and any suggestion made.

The Act of 1909 for the first time gave recognition to elective principle for the appointment of non-official members to the Councils. The Governor-General was empowered to make detail regulations for giving effect to the proposal of elective principle. Unfortunately, the electorate for returning the representatives were divided on the basis of class, community and interest. Further, the voting qualification also differed from province to province.

Criticism

No doubt, the size of membership and scope of activities of the Legislative Councils were increased, but their essential character remained the same. In order to secure safe enactment of important government bills in the Imperial Legislative Councils the majority of official members was retained. The votes upon Legislation resting with the Governors and the Governor-General left the situation practically where it was before the Act. The executive councillors remained in complete control of the administrative departments, and they could not be removed from their office.

The communal principle that was introduced caused more bitterness than leading to a solution. The introduction of communal principle sabotaged forever whatever chance of national consciousness was there. The solution proved to be the opening of the Pandora's box. The Act proved a failure because of the changing political climate of India—the rising crescendo of nationalism under the leadership of Gandhi, Tilak, Lajpat Rai and Bipin Chandra Pal, the Lucknow Pact, The Khilafat Movement, the massacre of Jallianwala Bagh, the home rule movement and many others.

According to the Act of 1909, the Muslims were given the right of plural voting and direct elections. The landlords too were given a preferential treatment. The Government of India wanted to crush the nationalists and destroy their oneness and solidarity. Even the moderates were dissatisfied. The actual working of the reform brought into limelight and evil consequences of communal representation in the Councils. S.N. Banerjee declared that the rules and regulations formed for the implementation of the reforms practically wrecked the reform scheme and asked, "is the bureaucracy having its revenge upon us for the part we have played in securing these concessions?"

The control exercised by the Centre over the provinces was very wide and extensive and so the proceedings of the Provincial Councils had always an air of unreality. Yet, it is of importance to note that although the Act did not make any provision for the appointment of Indians to the Provincial Executive Councils.

The poison of communal electorate injected by the Morley-Minto reforms was deplored. The Congress strongly criticized the humiliating distinction made between the Hindus and non-Hindus in the matter for electorate, the franchise etc. Nehru criticized the communal electorate.

The system of election was indirect. The people elected members of local bodies, the latter elected the members of an electoral college. The electoral college elected members of the provincial legislature and the members of the provincial legislature elected members of the imperial legislature. The result was that there was no connection between the people and the members sitting in the legislature. The members felt no responsibility towards the people. K.M. Munshi pointed out, "The British stabbed the rising democracy". He said further, "political changes known as Morley-Minto reforms were brought in as a sop to the moderates. Legislative Councils established under it were not intended to bring Parliamentary Government, as Viceroy Minto himself hastened to emphasise. —Zamindars and commercial classes were given disproportionate representation at the expense of the

politically minded classes, substituting those who cannot criticize for those who can going to the extent of creating special interests before such can even going to the extent of creating special interests before such interest were organized.”

The authorities in London wanted that the Imperial Legislative Council in its legislative as well as its executive character should continue to be so constituted as to ensure its constant and uninterrupted power to fulfil the constitutional obligations that it owes and must always owe, to his majesty’s government and to the Imperial Parliament speaking on the floor of the House of Lords Morley observed, “if it could be said that this chapter of reform led directly or indirectly to the establishment of a parliamentary system in India, I, for one, would have nothing at all to do with it”. In their actual working the reforms created much confusion while parliamentary forms were introduced. This led to thoughtless and irresponsible criticism of the Government. Indian leaders made legislatures as the platform for denouncing the government. According to Garratt and Thompson, “The Act made no theoretical change on the executive side though the legislature’s right of criticism was increased. The changes in the legislatures were cautions and tentative e- Morley had no intention of introducing any democratic system of control in India.” In the words of L. Curtis, “The vital defect of Morley-Minto principle was that it leaves the whole responsibility for Government on one set of men, while rapidly transferring power to another set of men.”

Despite its drawback the Act of 1909 was a definite advance on the preceding Act of 1892. To quote Ramsay **Macdonald**, “the Act did pave way for a parliamentary government although indirectly in the country. The act does constitute a step forward on a road leading to a stage at which the question of irresponsible government was bound to crop up.

THE MONTAGU-CHELMSFORD REFORMS 1919

As a response to the political pressure in India during the war years (1914-1918) and to buy support of Indians the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme was introduced by the British.

Infact, the reforms of 1909 did not satisfy any section of the people. Even a moderate like Gokhale got convinced of the hollowness of the reforms. The main object of the author of 1909 reforms was to win over the moderates, but that object was not realized. The discontentment of the people resulted in revolutionary activities. The act was so full of anti-democratic elements and fraught with much vicious consequences, that it drew criticism even from the moderates.

It was in an atmosphere of discontentment that the great war started in 1914. The British government affirmed that it was entering the war to make world safe for democracy. The Indians extended whole-hearted support to the war efforts of the government. At the end of the hostilities the Indians looked forward to a reward of their war-times services. But they were treated with the bullets and martial laws. On the other hand, the Indians wanted recognition of their ability to rule themselves. President Wilson of America had said that

the war being fought to make the world safe for democracy. A hope emerged that this would at least mean that India would be put on the road to self-government.

The Indian National Congress expressed its dissatisfaction at the unfairly preponderant share of representation given to the followers of one particular religion, the general distrust of the educated classes, the unsatisfactory composition of the non-official majorities in the provincial councils, rendering them ineffective and unreal. The Muslims were also getting restive. They had come to realize the importance of their position from their experience of separate electorates. The Muslim territories were being absorbed by Christian powers of Europe in the Balkans. The Muslims were annoyed over the acts of omission and commission of the British government in the case of Morocco. The entry of Turkey in the Great War, on the side of Germany further estranged the relations. This estrangement brought the Hindus and the Muslims closer. This resulted in the conclusion of the Lucknow Pact of 1916.

In 1917 Germany restarted the hostilities with ferocity, and England was confronted with a grave military situation. At about the same time alarming developments took place on the Indian political scene. In 1916 the extremists had rejoined the Congress party. Under the leadership of the Home Rule League of Tilak and Annie Besant the national movement was becoming stronger.

Realizing that India's cooperation and support was vital to British survival, the new secretary of State for India, Montagu issued a statement on British policy towards a India. "The policy of His Majesty's government –is that of increasing association of Indians in every branch of Indian administration and the gradual development of self-governing institution, with a view to the progressive realization of responsible government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. In pursuance of the declaration of 1917 Montagu visited India in November to discuss with the viceroy the first step towards the implementation of the promise contained in the declaration. On the basis of these deliberations the report on Indian constitutional reforms, which came to be known as Montagu-Chelmsford or simply the Montford report was published in 1918 which was passed by the British Parliament on 23rd December, 1919. The Act was described as an Act to make further provision with respect to the Government of India. It was divided into six parts and 47 articles. Part first dealt with local Governments, parts second with Government of India, part third with Secretary of State, part fourth with the Civil Services in India, Part fifth with Statutory Committee and part sixth covered other provisions.

Preamble to the Act

The preamble to the Act laid down a few significant points in respect of the Government of India. Those were – British India is to remain an integral part of the British empire. The declared policy of Parliament was to provide for the increasing association of Indians in every branch of Indian administration and to develop gradually the self-governing institution. Progress in giving effect to this policy could only be achieved by successive stages. Responsible government in British India is the objective of the declared policy of Parliament. The development in that direction was to commence from the provinces of

India and as such those provinces should be given in provincial matters, the largest measure of independence of the Government of India.

Changes in the Central Government

The chief executive authority remained vested in the governor-general who remained responsible to the British Parliament through the Secretary of State and not to the Indian legislature. The Constitution of Governor General's Executive Council was slightly modified while substantial changes were made in the composition of the Indian legislature. But it was made clear that the aim was not to increase its powers but merely to make it more representative and increase opportunities of influencing the Government.

To implement the policy of increasing association of Indians in every branch of administration- It was provided that, of the six members of the Executive Council of the Governor-General, three would be Indians. It should however be noted that these members were given portfolios of lesser significance like law, education, health etc., They were accountable to the Governor-General and through him to the Secretary of State and not to the legislature.

The Act set up a bicameral legislature at the centre in place of the Imperial Council consisting of one House. The two Houses were to be the Council of State and Central Legislative Assembly. The Council of State which was to be the upper house was to consist of 60 members, 27 of whom were to be nominated by the Governor-General and 33 were to be elected. The 27 nominated members were to consist of 17 officials and 10 elected members, 16 were to be elected by non-Muslims, 11 by the Muslims, 3 by the Europeans, 2 by non-communal elements and one by the Sikhs. Its president was to be nominated by the Viceroy.

The Legislative Assembly which was to constitute the lower House was to consist of 145 members, of whom 41 were to be nominated members, 26 were officials and 15 non-officials. Of the 104 elected members, 52 were to be returned by the general constituencies, 30 by Muslims, 2 by Sikhs, 7 by landholders, 9 by Europeans, 4 by Indian Commercial Community. The life of the assembly was to be three years but it could be extended by the Governor-General.

The Central legislature could legislate for the whole of British India, for the Indian subjects and servants of the Government. It could repeal or amend any law already existing in the country. The members were given the right to move resolutions. They had the right to move resolutions. They had the right to ask questions. The members enjoyed the rights and freedom of speech. In certain cases previous sanction of the Governor-General was required for the introduction of a bill. The power of the Governor-General was extended. In addition to the power of certification also i.e. he could secure the enactment of a bill whose passage in the form considered to be necessary was refused by the legislature. He could do so by certifying that the bill was essential for the safety, tranquillity or interests of British-India or any part thereof. With regard to the budget, it was laid down in the act that the government would submit proposals for appropriation in the shape of demands for grant in the legislative assembly. Certain items were subject to the vote of the assembly,

others were open for discussion, and some could not even be discussed, much less voted upon.

The Indian executive comprised the Governor-General and his Executive Council. The Governor-General continued to exercise "superintendence, direction and control of the Civil and Military Government of India". As head of the executive he distributed the portfolios among the executive councillors. But the more real and far-reaching powers of the Governor-General, were in the sphere of law-making and the passing of the budget.

Under the Montford Scheme partial responsible government was introduced in the provinces. Because of this, demarcation of power between the central and provincial governments became necessary. Hence two lists were drawn up. This division was created on the principle that matters concerning the whole of India or more than one province should be placed in the central list while those concerning the provinces should be placed in the provincial list. The central subjects included foreign and political relations, currency, communication etc. The subjects in the provincial list were local self Government, health, education, sanitation etc.

Thus the reforms as regards the Central Government did nothing more than enable the Governor-General to add a few "Yes Sirs" to his Executive Council, who were basking in the sun shines of his patronage had no more ambition than to swell their bank balances and to provide job for their relations. In vital matters as controlling the executive, formulating legislation, and directing the finances, the powers conferred were nil.

Changes in the Provincial Government

In 1917, Montague, the Secretary of State for India stated in the House of Commons, "The policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the 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 most significant changes made by the Act of 1919 were in the field of provincial administration under the system known as "Dyarchy". Dyarchy is a derivative of two Greek words "di" meaning twice and archie meaning rule, so it means dualism in Government. This dualism was designed to meet in some measure the popular demand for self-government. The subjects to be dealt with by the provincial governments were divided in to two parts, Reserved subjects and transferred subjects. Reserve subjects were administered by the Governor with the help of the Executive Council to be nominated by him and the transferred subjects were looked after by the ministers of the legislature. The reserved subjects were as under-administration of justice, police prisons, irrigation and canals, drainage and embankments, Land revenue administration, Famine relief etc. Transferred subjects included agriculture and fisheries, cooperative societies education, excise, local self government etc.

In all the provinces the executive was two fold, at the head of the each was the Governor with special powers and responsibilities. One was the Governor with his council administering the reserved subjects and the other was the Governor with his ministers administering the transferred subjects. There was no provision requiring the Governor to appoint as ministers only those who could command a majority in the legislature or only from the majority party and this was done because there was no intention that the ministers were to form themselves into a cabinet of the English type. Each of the ministers was individually responsible for the portfolio assigned to him. The Governor was neither bound to accept the advice of the councillors nor that of the ministers. His supremacy in provincial matters was left unlimited and unrestricted.

By the Act of 1919 the provincial legislature was consist of one House known as the Legislative Council. In this Council the majority of members were to be elected, the next being nominated by the Governor to give representation to special interests and classes. The strength of Council varied from province to province. These councils had powers of legislating on all provincial matters, with this restriction that no bill passed by the Council could become law without the assent of the Governor who could refuse to give that assent. In matters of finance, the powers of the Councils were equally circumscribed. The budget was to be submitted to them and the Councils.

The Government of India Act of 1935

The Round Table Conferences at London coincided with a vigorous campaign of civil disobedience campaign led by the congress and brutal repression by the British. In March 1933 after the Third Round Table conference the government of Great Britain issued a white paper on reforms. A joint committee of British Parliament studied the proposals embodied in the white paper and on the basis of its report the Government enacted the Government of India Act of 1935.

Imperial Interests British India being a vast and populous country, administrative efficiency required a large measure of decentralisation of powers. As diarchy proved unworkable the Simon commission felt that it should be replace by responsible Government over the entire provincial sphere. This required the devolution of authority from the centre to the provinces, but this could not be effected without sacrificing imperial interests . The British Government, therefore, evolved a system of federation in which it sought to safeguard imperial interests, to protect the princely rights and to provide for constitutional progress. The provincial autonomy was conceded but it was made subject to the overriding powers of the governor. Responsibilities, entrusted with the governor-general. These restrictions and limitations which were imposed for the protection of imperial interests were called as the safeguards.

These safeguards in their wider application included those that were intended to protect British as well as allied interests. Thus the British retained the control of the army, defence and finance. It was argued that India was not able to defend herself and it was in

the interest of India that Britain maintained forces for the defences of the country. What India was to do was to ensure financial support for which Britain was to retain control of the revenues? Also it was found essential to protect the interests of minorities. It was pointed out that in the absence of a party system on secular lines, there came into existence a system of conflict between two civilizations-one representing the Hindus and the other the Muslims. Further it was argued that there came into existence numerous minorities who lived in constant anxiety for their future. It appeared essential to protect their welfare. A bill of rights was considered, but it was not included in the new constitution, as it was feared that it would unduly restrict the powers of the legislatures. In addition it was asserted that there should exist an authority in India, armed with adequate powers, to prevent the ministers and legislatures from failing in their duty. In view of this consideration the provincial governor was given the authority linked with that of governor-general who was made responsible to Parliament and the Crown. In substance the British decided to safeguard their interests through an alliance with the reactionary forces, represented by communalism and feudalism against democratic nationalism. As the princes were opposed to democratic system and the Muslims were opposed to majority rule, the English felt that it would be possible to play them against the Congress and to perpetuate their authority in a federal set up.

The Muslims supported the provincial autonomy and the proposed federation. They felt that they could gain control of Bengal, the Punjab, Sind and North West Frontier Province, where they were in a majority. These provinces should have adequate authority so that they should be free from the control of a Hindu Controlled Centre. The princes of the states were convinced that they had every thing to gain but nothing to lose by joining the federation. Against the encroachments made by the paramount power and the threat of a struggle for responsible government, they decided to have a defined status in a federal set up. Without the necessity of paying any tribute they expected to gain a share in the functioning of the Central Government and to protect their interests against popular movements in alliance with the British.

The Federation

The Act provided for the formation of a federation. It was composed of governors' provinces and the princely states which might accede. While Burma was separated from British India, new provinces were added to the federation-North West Frontier Province, Sind and Orissa. The chief commissioners' provinces like Baluchistan, Delhi, Coorg and Andaman Nicobar were to be in the same relation to the Federal Government as they had hitherto been to the Government of India. The Centre as well as the provinces derived their authority directly from the Crown and exercised their powers on an equal basis without the interference of the other. In fact the Act created several autonomous provinces and united them in a federal union. The states were given the freedom to join the federation by means of an instrument of accession, agreed to by the ruler and accepted by the Crown. After entering the federation the state could not secede from the union.

The powers were enumerated and distributed. In the Federal List were included: military establishment, external affairs, ecclesiastical matters, currency and coinage, post and telegraph, public services, census, historical monuments, import and export, railway and shipping, insurance, banking and custom. In the Provincial List were: public order, justice, provincial services, public works, local government, public health, education, forests, mines, fisheries, industries and trade, land revenue, cinema and poor relief. Apart from these lists, a concurrent list was provided. In the case of residuary powers the governor – general was given the authority to allocate the Centre or to the province the right to legislate on any. The Federal Legislature could legislate on a provincial subject if the governor-general proclaimed a state of emergency on ground of security, when it was threatened by war or internal disturbance.

Dyarchy in Federal Government

The Act of 1935 introduced diarchy at the centre. The federal subjects were divided into two sections—the reserved subjects which included important areas like defence, finance and external affairs and the transferred subjects which included areas of internal importance. In the administration of reserved subjects the governor – general was to be assisted by not more than three councilors, while that of the transferred subjects he was to act on the advice of a council of ministers, not exceeding ten in number. However, he was free to act on his discretion in matters that fell within his special responsibilities like maintenance of peace, financial stability, minority interest and princely rights, for which he was made responsible to British Parliament.

The Federal Legislature consisted of the Council of State and Federal Assembly. The members of the Council of State were elected for a period of nine years, one third of them retiring every third year. The members of the Assembly were elected for a period of five years. Based upon population, historical position and commercial importance, seats in the Council were distributed among the provinces. Thus while Madras sent twenty members Sind five. Of the 260 members of the Council, 156 were from British India and 104 from Indian states. The Federal Assembly consisted of 375 members, of whom 250 were from British India and 125 from Indian states. The members were elected on the basis of communities, classes and interests. While the Muslims who formed twenty four percent of the population were given 82 seats, the Hindus who formed seventy percent of the population only 105 seats. The two chambers were given equal powers and in case of any difference of opinion, that could be resolved in a joint sitting.

The Act provided for the establishment of the Federal Court in 1937. It consisted of the Chief Justice and not more – than six other Judges. The Court dealt with cases arising out of disputes between governments and with disputes arising out of the interpretation of the provisions of the constitution. Also it heard appeals from provincial high courts and exercised advisory jurisdiction on any point of law, referred to it by the governor-general. However, the Federal Court was not supreme in its area, for appeals from its judgments could be taken to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Autonomy in Provinces

The governors appointed by the Crown exercised the executive authority in the province on the advice of a council of ministers. However, he was not required to accept the advice of the council of ministers, when he was to exercise his special responsibilities or to act under his discretion as provided in the Act. He appointed the ministers in consultation with the leader who was likely to command stable majority in the legislature. It was his special responsibility to prevent any serious menace to peace, to safeguard the legitimate interests of civil servants, to prevent commercial discrimination, to protect the rights of Indian states and to enforce the lawfully issued orders of the governor-general.

In the major provinces, Madras, Bombay, Bengal, the United Provinces, Bihar and Assam the provincial legislature was to consist of two chambers – the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly. The Council being a permanent body, only one third of the members were to retire once in three years. The members were to be elected from a narrow electorate consisting of zamindars and capitalists. The Assembly was to be elected on the basis of property and educational qualification; for a period of five years, though it could be dissolved earlier. The principal legislature was given the authority to legislate on matters pertaining to the provincial list. The powers of the Assembly are overwhelming when compared to those of the Council; for the latter could at the most revise or delay a bill passed by the lower house.

Dissatisfaction in India

Despite these reforms, there came no basic improvement in the political status of the country; for it was still a dependency of Great Britain. The Governor General and the provincial governors still could act at their discretion or at the direction of the Secretary of State on matters pertaining to their special responsibilities. The control exercised by the British Government over the Indian administration continued overwhelming, for defence, external affairs, public service, banking, railways, relations with Indian states outside federal authority and matters relating to special responsibilities remained in their charge. Secondly, the new constitution was extremely rigid. Described as a fixed plan of government, permanent and not by Central Legislature. Certain subjects like the accession of the states to the federation and transfer of reserved subjects to the Central Government could not be done by Parliament without the consent of each federated state, though on matters of minor importance it could make changes at the request of any of the legislatures of India. The elections to the legislatures were not made democratic, for the electorate was restricted to the properties class and was based on communal representation. Further the new constitution made no reference to the dominion status as the goal of India. The reservations, safeguards and special responsibilities seriously eroded the concept of responsible government. No wonder Rajaji considered it as worse than diarchy and Nehru condemned it as a new charter of slavery.

Working of the Reforms

Because of the opposition of the political parties in Great Britain and the reluctance of the Indian princes the federal part of the new constitution was not given effect to. As a result only the other part of the constitution, which related to autonomy in the provinces, was enforced. In 1937 when the election to the provincial legislatures was held, the Congress, determined to wreck the Constitution from within, decided to contest it. The Muslim League And the other parties like the Liberals too entered the field. The election demonstrated the sweeping influence of the Congress, for it captured 715 out of 836 elected seats against Muslim League's 51. It secured absolute majorities in Madras, Bombay, Orissa, Central Provinces, United Provinces and Bihar and emerged as the largest party, in Bengal, Assam and North West Frontier province. Together with the Muslim League, the Liberal Party and the Justice Party suffered reverses.

The spectacular victory in the elections generated in the Congress a controversy over office acceptance. One section of the Party led by Rajaji, Patel and Rajendra Prasad favoured office acceptance on ground that it would strengthen the party and help in the struggle for freedom. The other section led by Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose argued against it, for they feared that it would cool the zeal for the struggle. At the instance of Gandhi the Congress Working Committee authorized the leaders of provincial Congress in the provinces, where the party captured a majority, to accept office if they were satisfied that the governors would not use their special powers for interference. But the governors refused to give such an assurance and proceeded to form interim ministries. The controversy continued until Lord Linlithgow clarified that the governors would ordinarily be guided by the advice of their ministries. In July 1937 Congress seized this opportunity to form ministries of its own or in coalition with other parties. The refusal of the Congress to admit the League to its ministries in the provinces particularly U.P. where it commanded a majority greatly strained the Hindu-Muslim relations and completely alienated the League. M.A. Jinnah who was an ardent advocate of Hindu-Muslim unity at one time declared that the Muslims could never expect justice from the Congress administration. More than any other development this humiliation of the League led to the demand for partition of the country.

The Congress formed ministries in Madras, Bombay, Orissa, Central Provinces, U.P. and Bihar. In the North West Frontier Province and Assam it formed coalition ministries with other parties. The Congress Ministries remained in power for more than two years, while the other party ministries in Bengal, Sind and the Punjab for ten years. However, in 1939 as a protest against British India joining the World War II without ascertaining the consent of the people, the Congress relinquished power. There upon the governors assumed direct responsibility and continued to hold power until the election of 1946.

The Congress ministries maintained by and large smooth relations with the provincial governors. This was because of the restraint on either side. At the instance of the Congress Party the legislatures declared that the Constitution of 1935 did not represent the will of the people and demanded the framing of a new constitution by a constituent

assembly to be elected on the basis of adult franchise. The new ministries released political prisoners from jails and removed the restrictions on the movement of political workers. In U.P. and Bihar the governors refused their assent to these decisions; thereupon the ministries resigned. As a result of negotiations it was agreed that political prisoners could be released gradually after due examination of the charges. In Orissa when the Governor wanted to proceed on leave, the Governor General directed the Chief Secretary to act. But the Congress ministry refused to work under it is subordinate and threatened to resign. The crisis blew over as the Governor withdrew his application for leave. In U.P. the Muslim League whose offer for coalition which the Congress rejected, complained of Hindu tyranny against the Muslims. It charged the Congress attitude greatly remarked: "The Congress refusal to offer two ministerial posts to the Leaguers who offered to form coalition on this condition was unfortunate for it gave the League a new lease of life. It was from U.P. that the League was reorganised". Yet the Congress ministries several welfare measures. They removed the black listing of nationalist news papers and restored their deposits, which had been seized. The people felt free from the fear of police and their agents. The ministries sought to achieve some constructive work too, for they promoted education, started cottage industries, gave relief to the Harijans and the peasants, improved industrial wages and introduced prohibition in some areas. A parliamentary sub-committee, which came to be called the Congress High Command with Rajendra Prasad, Maulana Azad and Vallabhai Patel as members, reviewed and supervised the work of the Congress ministries.

Indian Independence Act 1947

In July 1947 British Parliament enacted the Indian Independence Act, that was drafted at New Delhi after ascertaining the views of the leaders of India. It went into effect from August 15, 1947.

The Act provided for two independent dominions-India and Pakistan. The new state of Pakistan was to consist of East Bengal, West Punjab, Sind, Baluchistan and Northwest Frontier, while India the rest of British India. Two boundary commissions each with four members, two nominated by the Congress and two by the League and both with Sir Cyril Radcliffe as Chairman was to demarcate the exact boundaries in Bengal and the Punjab. Mountbatten explained to the princes that when British paramountcy would cease, they were to accede either to India or Pakistan as warranted by geographical considerations.

Each Dominion was to have a Governor General, appointed by the King, to serve as constitutional head. Mountbatten wanted to be the common Governor General for both the countries but while Nehru invited him to continue, Jinnah did not. As a result while Mountbatten became the first Governor General of India, Jinnah that of Pakistan.

The Constituent Assemblies had the power to draft constitutions for the respective dominions. The Government of India Act of 1935 was to remain in force till the new constitutions came into effect. Each Dominion was too have a fully sovereign legislature with power to make laws and no law passed by British Parliament was applicable either to India or to Pakistan unless the respective legislature accepted it.

The office of the Secretary of State for India would cease to exist. Henceforth the Secretary of the Commonwealth Relations Department would take care of the relations with the two dominions. However, the persons appointed in the civil service would continue to serve under the terms as hitherto after independence.

After August 15, 1947 the British Government would possess no control over the two countries. The King of Great Britain would cease to be Emperor of India while his governor general would be only a constitutional head. The paramountcy of the Crown would lapse and the Indian states would be free either to join India or Pakistan or to remain independent.

In the mean time the division of assets and liabilities were taken up in right earnest. Radcliffe completed his work in five weeks and under his award the Sikhs for no fault of theirs lost their extensive fields and sacred shrines in West Punjab to the Muslims. As they sought to escape from Pakistan, their exodus ended in disaster, for they were trapped and slaughtered. Mountbatten wanted to keep the army united but at the insistence of Jinnah it was divided on a communal basis and the Muslim troops went over to Pakistan. Most of the Muslims in public services opted for Jinnah's administration. The records and finances too were regrouped and allotted to the concerned countries. In the midst of slaughter, destruction and other attendant agonies of partition every thing was set for the dawn of independence.

By midnight of August 14, 1947 jubilant crowds assembled in strength at Delhi. Among them were sobbing refugees, overtaken by an unexpected gloom. At the midnight hour Prime Minister Nehru declared : "Long years ago, we made a tryst with destiny, and now the time comes when we shall redeem our pledge, not wholly or in full measure, but very substantially. At the stroke of the midnight hour, when the world sleeps, India will wake to life and freedom". The tricolor, that fluttered atop the Red Fort, signaled the dawn of freedom. Yet it cannot be denied that it was much for the people in power and not for the people on the fields, for the ideology of the leaders portended evil to human rights.

INDIA'S RELATION WITH BURMA

The First Burmese War (1824-26)

The State of Burma in the north-east of India became a strong and extensive state under their leader Alomar (1752-60) and gradually, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, occupied Manipur, Assam etc. so that its territory touched the territory of the English in India. It led to the beginning of border disputes between the two.

But, more than that, the primary cause of conflict between the two were the Imperial designs of the English. The English coveted the jungle wealth of Burma and also expected to gain fresh markets. The English attempted to develop trade relations with Burma several times but failed. They deputed Captain Symes in 1795, Captain Cox in 1797, Captain Symes again in 1802 and Captain Canning in 1803, 1809 and 1811 repeatedly to Burma with a view to develop political relations. The Burma Durbar did not welcome them

and so attempts of the English proved futile. Having thus failed, the British picked up border disputes as sound pretext for war. The Burmese, on their part, behaved arrogantly. They were ignorant of the British power in India and acted foolishly in aggravating border disputes. The result was the first Burmese war.

The disputes between the two arose when Burma annexed Arakan. In 1794, the Burmese crossed into the British territory and demanded the return of the Arakanee fugitives. The English agreed to their demand. But, when Lord Hastings came to India as the governor-general, he reversed this policy. He refused to return the fugitives, which displeased the Burmese. The conquest of Assam by the Burmese resulted in more serious border disputes. In 1818, the Burmese governor at Ramri demanded cession of Ramoo, Chittagaon, Murshidabad and Dacca to Burma from the English Magistrate of Chittagon on the plea that these places originally were part of Arakan. Hastings seriously protested against it though preferred to avoid war because of his engagements within the territory of India.

Lord Amherst, however, felt free to deal with Burma. He was not prepared to tolerate the arrogance of the Burmese. The Burmese developed a false sense of their power after annexing Manipur, Arakan and Assam. Their commander-in-chief, Maha Bundela, felt that he would be able to defeat the English as easily as he had defeated the Assamese. 'He compared the Burmese with lions and the English with jackals' in one of his letters to his king. He also wrote to his king that he was in correspondence with a few Indian rulers who would support Burma against the English in case of a war. Even the common people of Burma were confident of the victory of their king against the English. Therefore, everybody in Burma was in favour of a war against the English. Crawford writes: "From the king to a beggar (the Burmese) were hot for a war". Thus, the Burmese also were responsible for war.

The English, on their part, had become equally anxious for a war against Burma. It could serve well their imperial designs. The pretext of the war was border disputes.

Some Englishmen who went for hunting the elephants were imprisoned by the Burmese. The Burmese demanded custom duty from a few English traders who were carrying their goods through the Nullah of Koor. The English, therefore, established their military posts at the Nullah of Tek Naaf and the island of Shahpuri. In January 1823, the Burmese asked the British to vacate the island of Shahpuri. It was refused. In September 1823, the Burmese attacked and captured Shahpuri. However, they left its possession after giving a warning to the English that if they would attempt to capture it again the Burmese would capture Murshidabad.

The relations between the English and the Burmese deteriorated further when the Burmese reinstated, Govind Chandra, were forced to leave his state. He first sought the help of the English to regain his throne. When he was refused assistance by the English, he sought the support of the Burmese and regained his throne with their help. Lord Amherst could not tolerate it. He felt that the acceptance of Burmese sovereignty by Govind Chandra posed a threat to the security of Bengal because the easiest approach to Bengal for

the Burmese was through Cachar. Lord Amherst dispatched an army to Cachar and took Govind Chandra under the British protection. Govind Chandra handed over even his internal administration to the British and also agreed to pay them rupees ten thousand annually. The Burmese felt offended by it and dispatched a force against Cachar which fought a battle against the English.

At that very time, the English and the Burmese again came into conflict with each other regarding the possession of the island of Shahpuri. The Burmese asked the British that the island be declared as neutral ground. The British however refused. In February, the Burmese attacked and captured the island though they left its **POSSESSION SOON AFTER**. Lord Amherst decided for war and declared it on February 1824.

The English attacked Burma from two sides. One army proceeded from the land route to the north-east. The other army, under Sir Archibald Campbell, attacked Rangoon from the sea side. The English faced heavy odds in the jungles of Burma. The beginning of the rainy season further enhanced their difficulties. The Burmese commander, Maha Bundela defeated the English easily captured Rangoon on 11 May 1824 which was deserted by the Burmese. However, the English could not move further because of the heavy rains and outbreak of epidemic. Maha Bundela was recalled by the king of Burma in the South. He however, was defeated by the English in a battle on 15 December 1824. The English conquered Assam in 1825 and Campbell moved forward from Rangoon. Maha Bundela checked his progress for about a month but, then, he was killed in a battle on 1 April 1825. Campbell occupied Prome, the capital of lower Burma. The Burmese started negotiations for peace when the English were only sixty miles away from Yandaboo, the capital. The treaty of Yandaboo was signed by the two parties on 24 February 1826. By its terms:

- (a) Burma left all its claims over Assam, Cachar and Jaintia.
- (b) It surrendered Arakan, Yeh, Tavoy, Mergni and Tannasserim to the English.
- (c) It accepted Manipur as an independent state and agreed to acknowledge Gambhir Singh as its ruler.
- (d) It agreed to pay a war indemnity of rupees one and a half crores to the English.
- (e) Both parties accepted each other as friends, agreed to depute and receive each other's ambassadors and also to enter into a commercial treaty. The English certainly got many advantages from this war. They gained extensive territories in the north-east. It, afterwards, gave them the facility to conquer Burma. But, the causes of the war and the way the war was planned by the English have been seriously criticized by the majority of the historians.

The war was not properly planned. Therefore, the English suffered both in men and material. If Sir Thomas Munro, the governor at Madras had failed to provide supplies at the proper time, the English losses would have been severe. Innes writes: "The war had been in many respects disastrous one. The expedition had been dispatched in almost entire ignorance of the circumstances of the country to which it was to proceed and without any

adequate preparation for securing supplies". As regards the Burmese, they, of course, fought valiantly but they were no match to the English in arms and organization of the army.

Regarding causes of the war, every unbiased historian has concluded that the English had no just cause for declaring the war. The claim of Burma over Dacca, Murshidabad etc. was not taken seriously by them. It was, rather, a matter of laughter. The Burmese had asked to declare the island of Shahpuri as a neutral ground which was quite reasonable. The English interference in Cachar was also unjustified because Govind Chandra had sought their help first and went to the side of the Burmese only when his request was refused by them. The Burmese were also justified in complaining that the Arkanese attacked their territories from the territory of the English and it, therefore, should be stopped. Even the Government of India in its letter of 25 December 1825 to the Directors of the Company accepted that the causes of the war were flimsy but as the war with Burma was expected any time, it was fought at the time which was felt most opportune.

Thus, the English imperialism was the primary cause of the war and it certainly gave them advantages.

The Second Burmese War (1852)

The relations of the English and the Burmese were not finally settled by the first Burmese war. Neither of the parties felt satisfied with what one had gained and the other had lost. It resulted, ultimately, in the second Burmese war.

The Burmese looked with suspicion and hatred towards the English. In fact, no Asiatic state liked the presence of the Europeans within their territory. That the feeling of suspicion towards the English was deep and genuine is clear from the letter which the ruler of China wrote to the ruler of Burma in 1836. He advised: "It is not proper to allow the English to remain in the city. They are accustomed to act like the papal tree". The ruler of Burma and his subjects shared this feeling. The new ruler Tharrawoddy (1837-45) refused to accept the treaty of Yandaboo. He said: "The English beat my brother, not me. The treaty of Yandaboo is not binding on me, for I did not make it. I will meet the Resident as a private individual, but as Resident never. When will they understand that I can receive only a royal ambassador from England/" He, therefore, neglected the Resident and the English withdrew their resident from the Burma Durbar, Gradually the rumours spread that the English merchants were ill-treated in Burma and the ruler of Burma was trying to get help from foreign powers like China, France and Siam.

Yet the primary cause of the second Burmese war was the imperial designs of the English which gave them political and economic advantages. The English justified their imperialism on humanitarian grounds and also on grounds of providing better rule to the natives. They claimed that they were more civilised and, therefore, their rule would have a civilizing influence on the natives and they would also be free from the tyrannical rule of their cruel rulers. Thus, political economic as well as cultural motives inspired the English to capture as much territory in eastern countries as could be possible. Burma was no exception and it resulted ultimately in complete annexation of Burma by them.

The immediate cause of the second Burmese war was however, trade disputes. The British complained that the Burmese government charged more trade tax than what was settled by the treaty of Yandaboo. They desecrated that the English government in India should defend their rights. They got the right man to look after their interests when Lord Dalhousie came to India as the governor-general because he was prepared to defend the honour and rights of Englishmen everywhere. The English traders at Rangoon informed the governor-general that "they had, for a long time, suffered from the tyranny and gross injustice of the Burmese authorities" and it was his responsibility to defend them. Dalhousie accepted that complaint as a sufficient reason to interfere in the affairs of Burma. He felt that it was the legitimate right of the Englishman to seek redress from their government and it was his duty to safeguard their interests. First, the English demanded rupees 9,948 from the Burma Durbar which, according to them, was illegally taken by the government from Sheppard and Lewis Company. And, as there was no English resident at the court, Dalhousie deputed the naval commander, Lambert, to proceed to Rangoon with all the ships at his command to recover that amount. Lambert charged the governor of Rangoon with tyrannical acts and wrote letters to the governor as well as to the king asking them to reply within five weeks. He received proper replies from both of them. The governor was changed by the king and the English were assured of proper inquiry into the whole affair. A deputation was sent by the English to meet the new governor which somehow failed to meet him.. The English took it as disrespect to themselves while the governor reported that he was sleeping when the deputation came to meet him. Lambert did not accept the explanation of the governor as genuine. He asked him to seek pardon and pay the compensation money. He afterwards increased the demand of money. Further, to provoke the Burmese for war, Lambert captured the royal ship, Yellow Ship, which was regarded as a sacred ship by the Burmese. The Burmese governor agreed to fulfil all the demands of the English and requested for the release of the royal ship. Lambert refused it and sought the advice of Dalhousie. Ultimately, the English demanded that the governor of Rangoon should be transferred, the king of Burma should apologise to the English and 1, 00,000 be paid to the English by the end of April 1852. The English waited for the reply of the king up to 1 April. When no reply was received an English army, under Godwin, was dispatched to Rangoon and the war was declared by the English.

The English occupied Rangoon, Bassein, Prome and Pegu. By October 1852, the entire lower Burma passed into the hands of the British. Dalhousie had no desire to pursue the war in upper Burma. He waited for some time for negotiations. But the Burma Durbar refused to accept any treaty. Therefore, Pegu, viz. lower Burma, was annexed to the British empire simply after a proclamation on 20 December 1852.

The annexation of Pegu was quite advantageous for the English. They got an extensive and fertile territory. It helped their trade interests. They got the sea-coast of Bay of Bengal which stretched from Chittagaon to Singapur. It blocked the passage to the sea, to the Burma government and also helped in defending their eastern empire.

All Indian historians have decried the second Burmese war and the annexation of Pegu by the British. They have described it as an imposed war to extend the Imperial interests of the English. Dalhousie did not attempt to probe the validity of the charges which were framed by the English traders against the Burmese government. The charges were placed before the English government in India only after 1851 when the traders were convinced of the imperial designs of Dalhousie. Besides, if the traders were dissatisfied with the policy of the Burmese government, why did they insist on trade on their own conditions? Why did they not decide to leave Burma? The English had no moral right to pressurise the Burmese government to act according to their interests. The demand of money and apology from the king, the appointment of the naval commander, Lambert to recover the compensation money, the capture of the Yellow Ship and the annexation of Pegu without a treaty are all indefensible on grounds of justice. The contention of the supporters of Dalhousie that it was all done to pressurize the king for a just treaty without a war is not tenable. The demands of Dalhousie were of a nature which no independent state could accept. The efforts of Dalhousie were not for peace but to provoke the Burmese for a war-right or wrong. He had prepared himself for it and simply desired to wage it at the proper time. He had noted in his diary that "he was resolved not to engage in a war with Ava with the hot season approaching but would commence operation with the opening of the cold season of 1852." Thus, though there is no concrete evidence to put his weight on the side that Dalhousie had planned the war to gain certain specific advantages. He wanted to get control over Burma with a view to negate the influence of America and France there. Therefore, he appointed Lambert for this task and supported him till last though,. At certain times, he did not agree with him. Besides, even if Lambert had not been appointed for this task, the war was inevitable because its primary cause was the imperialistic policy of Dalhousie and his desire to uphold the English honour in the East. On 24 April 1852, he wrote: "This is not a question of insult merely, but of injury. The simple question is whether before all Asia England would submit to Ava". Dalhousie had a poor opinion of the respect and intellect of all the rulers of the states in the East. When the President of the Court of Directors wrote to him that "he wrote a letter couched (written) in too severe terms", he replied: "The language of diplomacy employed in communication between civilized states is not applicable to the East and would exercise in influence on a potentate in India or Burma who only understands the language of a bully". Dalhousie believed in the dictum, 'My country right or wrong'. Even some English scholars criticized the actions of Dalhousie. Cobden, in his article, How wars got up in India, the Origin of the Burmese war, decried the Burmese war severely. Regarding the aim of Dalhousie in the second Burmese war, Arnold wrote: "It was because the Americans and the French, but principally the former, were busy in Eastern Seas and notably looking towards the delta of the Irawaddy that the hiatus between Arakan And Moulmein disquieted Dalhousie". Thus it is clear that the primary cause of the second Burmese war was the desire of Dalhousie to annex strategic and economically useful territory in Burma.

The Third Burmese War (1885-86)

The Burmese realized the futility of resisting the English after the second Burmese war and attempted to accommodate them as far as it was possible for them. The English, therefore, gradually increased their hold on Burma by subsequent treaties. In 1862, they got the right to trade with China through the territory of Burma. In 1867, by another treaty, Burma left their monopoly of trade on every other article except oil, wood and precious stones. The Burma court also accepted an English resident who was given the right to safeguard the interests of British resident who was given the right to safeguard the interests of British citizens in Burma. Gradually, the Burmese were forced to abolish certain trade duties and monopolies, accept a political representative at Bhamo and the right to travel through the river route between Yunnan and Rangoon. It all weakened Burma politically and economically. The English planned to construct a railway line from Rangoon to Prome which would have served not only their trade interests but would also have facilitated the movements of their army and its supplies. Yet, all these advantages failed to satisfy the greed of the English. Many English traders and administrators suggested complete annexation of Burma to their government in India prior to the third Burmese war.

The Burmese, on their part, of course, succumbed to the pressure of the English but were dissatisfied from what they were forced to leave to the British. The King of Burma also was not only suspicious towards the English but disliked them in his heart. Thus, while the British were always prepared to pick up quarrel with the Burmese, the Burmese also gave offence to the English. Though, defeated in two wars, the Burmese court and its king were not finally convinced of the invincibility of the English.

Therefore, causes of dispute arose between the English and the Burmese on matters of conflicting rights. The question of personal respect was also included in them. One of them being the question of shoe. According to the Burmese tradition, the English officers were also asked to put off their shoes before presenting themselves before the King. The English felt humiliated in observing this practice. In 1876, the governor-general categorically ordered his officers not to observe this practice. The King, on his part insisted on the observance of this practice and even expressed: "He would fight for shoe though he had not fought for Pegu". The English resident, therefore, stopped his visit to the court.

The King of Burma also attempted to develop relations with other European powers. He signed a trade treaty with France in 1873 but when it was added to the terms of the treaty that the French offers would train the Burmese soldiers, the English objected to it. The treaty, then, was annulled. Burma also signed a treaty with Italy. By it, Italy agreed to supply arms to Burma. But this term was excluded from it because the English protested against it. The King sent an ambassador to Persia And attempted to send one to Russia. His attempts to establish direct link with the Queen of England were also foiled by the Indian government. He also attempted to prepare cannons and muskets in his country. Thus, the king, Mindon attempted to strengthen himself against the British though he did not spoil; his relations with the English.

King Mindon died in 1878 and was succeeded by his son, Thibaw who was a Youngman of nearly twenty years of age. Lord Lytton demanded several facilities from him and all of them were granted except the abolition of the practice of putting off the shoes. In 1879, the English government was informed that the new king had got murdered nearly eight members of the royal family including women and children. The English resident protested against it strongly in one of his letters. But the king justified himself on the ground of state interest. A few other matters spoiled the relations of king Thibaw with the English. The English forced the king to abandon his monopoly over trade in certain articles in order to protect British trading interests. It further annoyed the king though he was not in a position to act against the English. Thibaw, like his father, attempted to strengthen himself with the help of foreign powers. In 1883 he sent a deputation to France. France, by that time, had extended its influence over Cochin-China and Tonkin near the border of Burma and it was believed that it was interested in bringing Burma as well under its sphere of influence. In January 1855, Burma signed a trade treaty with France. There was nothing in that treaty which the British could object to. Yet, they certainly did not like it. After some time, rumours spread that Burma had authorised the French to build up railway lines, explore diamond mines, open a Bank at Mandley and certain other trade concessions as well. These were no facts but the British were disturbed. So far they had the monopoly over the trade in Burma and, in no case, were they prepared to share it with the French. The English traders, therefore, put pressure on the English government to annex Burma to the British empire. The London Chamber of Commerce requested the Secretary of State for India "either to annex the whole of native Burma or to assume a protectorate over that country by the appointment of a sovereign under British control." The English government could not reject the demand of its trading community as it had sufficient control over the politics of the country. Thus by 1885 again circumstances were created which existed before the second Burmese war viz., the English became interested in getting a pretext to wage a war against Burma with a view to annex it completely. Lord Dufferin, the then governor-general of India was, in no way, prepared to accept the French influence over Burma and became convinced of the desirability of annexing Burma to the British Empire.

The English got an opportunity of declaring war against Burma when the Burmese refused to accept its boundary with Manipur demarcated by an English Commission. They threatened to remove the boundary pillars. The English ordered the king of Manipur to fight the Burmese in case they made any such attempt. It would have led to the opening of the hostilities between the Burmese refrained from any such action.

The third Burmese war, however, could not be postponed for long. It started because of a dispute between the Burmese government and an English Company called the Bombay-Burma Trading Corporation. This company was given a contract of the forests. The Burmese government charged it with evading tax to the tune of rupees ten lacs. The charge was proved. The government asked the company to pay rupees 23,59,066 in four instalments as penalty. The Company sought the protection of the English government in India. The English Commissioner asked the Burmese government to free the company from

this penalty and to refer the case to representative of the governor-general of India. The Burmese refused. The English, then, placed the following demands before the Burmese government:

- (a) Burma should accept an English representative to settle its dispute with the company and no step should be taken against it before the representative reaches Burma.
- (b) It should accept a permanent English representative at its court.
- (c) It would seek the advice of the governor-general concerning all its foreign relations.
- (d) It would provide the English all facilities to trade with China.

10 November was fixed as the last date for the acceptance of the first two demands of the English. The Burmese government sent its reply on 9 November. The demands of the English, however, were accepted only partially. Lord Duffrin, who had started the war preparations much earlier, ordered the English army to proceed towards Mandalay, King Thibaw also declared war against the English.

The war did not continue long. Mandalay was easily occupied by the English in November 1885. King Thibaw surrendered himself; Burma was annexed to the British Empire by a proclamation on 1 January 1885.

The annexation of Burma was the result of naked imperialistic designs of the British.

INDIA'S RELATIONS WITH AFGHANISTAN

The First Afghan War (1839-42)

Zaman Shah, the grandson of Ahmad Shah Abdali was deposed and blinded in 1800 by his brother Mahmud Mirza. That resulted in repeated wars of succession among the members of the royal family which weakened Afghanistan. Ultimately, the throne was captured by Dost Muhammed in 1826. He was a capable ruler and ruled Afghanistan for quite a long time. The first Afghan war was fought during the period of his rule.

Dost Muhammad was not entirely free from difficulties. Kandha and Herat were under the possession of his brothers, Ranjit Singh had captured Peshwar, Shah Shuja, the previous ruler of Afghanistan had found shelter with Ranjit Singh and was attempting to recover the throne of Afghanistan with the help of the English and the Sikhs and his border was insecure because of repeated revolts by rival Afghan chiefs. When Dost Muhammad was fighting against these difficulties, Afghanistan became a prey to the politics of Europe particularly because of the growing differences between Britain and Russia. Russia had gradually extended its territory towards Persia and Central Asia. It was said that it had moved nearly one thousand miles towards India and Persia between the period 1772-1836. Besides, it increased its influence on Persia particularly after the accession of Muhammad Shah on the throne in 1834. The English felt it dangerous for the security of their empire in India. The English representative at Persia remarked : "In the present state of relations between Persia and Russia, it can not be denied that the progress of the former in Afghanistan is tantamount to the advance of the latter." Lord Palmerston, who became the

foreign minister of Britain in 1830 was suspicious of the designs of Russia and was also determined to check its advance towards further east. He was in favour of a forward policy. He appointed Lord Auckland as governor-general of India in 1836 and deputed Dr. McNeil as ambassador to Persia. Lord Auckland, after joining his office in India, was advised by Palmerstone thus: "He must remain beware of the dangerous character of Russian action in Persia and try to raise a timely barrier against the encroachments of Russian influence". Auckland, however, could take no positive step against the growing influence of Russia. In May 1836, Dost Muhammad sought the assistance of the English to recover Peshawar from Ranjit Singh but Auckland refused. In September 1836, however, he attempted to befriend Afghanistan to find out the possibility of some settlement with the Amir. At that very time the Russians also deputed their representative, Captain Vitkevitch at the court of the Amir. Amir Dost Muhammad was first more inclined towards the English and welcomed Alexander Burnes. The English proposed that they would attempt to restrain Ranjit Singh from attacking Afghanistan and, in return, asked the Amir the promise not to keep political contacts with any foreign power. On his part, the Amir asked for positive help of the English to regain Peshawar from the Sikhs. Therefore, there could be no agreement between the two. The Amir then exhibited favourable inclination towards the Russian representative with a view to pressurise the English. In the meantime, Persia attacked Herat in 1837, of course, with the goodwill of Russia. Alexander Burnes realized his mission was a failure and left Afghanistan in April 1838.

The British then put diplomatic pressure both on Persia and Russia which brought fruitful results. Mr. McNeil had left Persia in desperation but he had advised Lord Auckland to despatch a naval fleet in the Persian Gulf. Auckland acted accordingly. The British government also strictly demanded Persia to raise the siege of Herat. Persia grew nervous and raised the siege on 9 September 1838. Britain put diplomatic pressure on Russia as well and it withdrew its representatives both from Persia and Afghanistan. It seemed that everything was settled for the time being. Of course, no settlement was possible with Dost Muhammad but there also remained no reason to wage a war against Afghanistan.

But, Auckland had decided otherwise. He became determined to oust Dost Muhammad and place the fugitive Shah Shuja on the throne of Afghanistan. He managed the tripartite treaty between the English, Ranjit Singh and Shah Shuja in June 1838. It was settled that:

- (a) Ranjit Singh would keep Peshawar and all that territory of Afghanistan which he possessed at that time.
- (b) Ranjit Singh would keep five thousand soldiers at Peshawar for the assistance of Shah Shuja and, in return, would receive rupees two lacs from time.
- (c) Shah Shuja and Ranjit Singh would have no claim over Sind.
- (d) Shah Shuja would not keep any relation with any foreign power without the consent of Ranjit Singh and the English.

Ranjit Singh and the English promised to put Shah Shuja on the throne of Afghanistan on the above conditions. The English initially were of the view that Shah Shuja

would be primarily responsible for the conquest of Afghanistan and Ranjit Singh would be his principal ally. But gradually it became clear that Shah Shuja was completely incompetent and Ranjit Singh was not prepared to assist him. Therefore, afterwards, the main burden of the war fell on the shoulders of the British.

The government of India explained the causes of the war in its proclamation of 1 October 1838. Several reasons were assigned for the declaration of the war viz. Dost Muhammad attacked friendly Ranjit Singh Dost Muhammad relied on the support of Persia and refused to accept the just demands of the British; the siege of Herat by the Persians was dangerous for security, etc., But all these allegations were false. Dost Muhammad had done nothing against the English or Ranjit Singh while the Persians had raised the siege of Herat. Therefore, there had remained no cause of war against Afghanistan. Auckland, in fact, was quite truthful in his proclamation of 8 November wherein he explained that the attack on Afghanistan was necessary with a view to turn out an unfriendly Amir and place a friendly person on the throne to protect the north-west frontier of the English empire in India. The British, therefore, attacked Afghanistan in 1839.

The Army which had to attack Afghanistan was called the "Army of the Indus". It assembled at Ferozpur in November 1838. As the commander-in-chief, Sir Henry Fane, was unfit so the command was handed over to Sir John Keane. Mr. Macnaghten was appointed as the principal adviser of Shah Shuja while Alexander Burnes was deputed as his assistant. Afghanistan was attacked from two sides one army preceded towards Kandhar and the other towards Kabul via Peshawar and Khyber Pass. Initially, the English succeeded. They occupied Kandhar in April and Ghazni in July 1839. Dost Muhammad fled away from Kabul in August and Shah Shuja entered Kabul on 7 August. Kaye, however, described that 'it was more like a funeral procession than the entry of a king into the capital of his restored dominions'. The Afghans certainly had not liked the presence of Shah Shuja in their midst with the assistance of British bayonets. Dost Muhammad surrendered himself to the English in November and was sent to Calcutta as a prisoner. It seemed that the expedition had succeeded completely.

But, it became clear very soon that Shah Shuja could not maintain himself on the throne without the assistance of the British. Therefore, six British regiments were left at Kabul. General Nott and Colonel Sale were also left in Afghanistan though the nominal command of the army was handed over to General Elphinstone, Rest of the English army returned to India. The Afghans, however, could not tolerate Shah Shuja and revolts started at several places. In 1841, the revolt started in Kabul as well. It seemed that the entire Afghan nation had decided to drive the English out of Afghanistan.

Various causes were responsible for this revolt. Shah Shuja was administering Afghanistan with the help of the foreigners, the English. The Afghans felt humiliated by it. The presence of the English army created inflation in Afghanistan. The burden of rising costs of even necessary articles affected adversely all Afghans whether rich or poor. The English were often tempted by the beauty of Afghan women and that induced the Afghans to fight against the English for the honour of their homes.

The Afghans revolted in Kabul on 2 November 1841. Alexander Burnes, his brother, Lt. Burnes and Broadfoot were killed by an unruly mob the same day. The English initially failed to understand the nature of the revolt and took no immediate and stern measures to suppress it. The revolt, therefore, spread far and wide and its leadership was taken over by Akbar Khan, son of Dost Muhammad. Akbar Khan besieged Kabul. Mr Macnaghten was forced to accept a treaty with the Afghans on 11 December. It was agreed that:

- (a) The English would leave Afghanistan as early as possible.
- (b) The English would leave all Afghan prisoners including Dost Muhammad.
- (c) Shah Shuja would be granted a pension. He could live in Afghanistan or could go to India with the English.
- (d) Four English officers would be surrendered to the Afghans as hostages.

The terms of the treaty were humiliating for the English but, at that time, they were left with no other alternative. The position of the English was worsening everyday and Elphinstone failed to control the situation. The treaty, however, remained useless. Mr Macnaghten attempted to divide the Afghans. The Afghans, therefore, lost faith in the English. Mr Macnaghten was murdered on 23 December, when he went to meet Akbar Khan to talk for a fresh treaty. Major Pottinger who took charge of the post of Macnaghten was not prepared for any agreement with the Afghans. But General Elphinstone was demoralized. He agreed for a fresh treaty on 1 January, 1842. By this treaty, the English agreed not only to the terms of the previous treaty but also a few more terms which were as follows:

- (a) The English would surrender all their cannons and gunpowder to the Afghans.
- (b) The entire treasury would be handed over to the Afghans.
- (c) The English would pay rupees fourteen lacs to the Afghans.

After signing this treaty the English army was permitted to leave Kabul for Jalalabad. The Afghans assured the English a safe passage. Thus, after losing all the prestige, arms and money, sixteen thousand people left Kabul. They were attacked by the Afghans at several places on the way. Mr Elphinstone, Mr Lawrence and Mr Pottinger were left as hostages to the Afghans. Except for one hundred twenty people who were sick and were handed over to Akbar Khan, rest of the English soldiers were murdered on the way. Datta and Sarkar write: "The retreat became a rout, the rout a massacre." Only one man, Dr Brydon reached Jalalabad on 13 January 1842 to give the news of this disaster. However, General Nott defended Kandhar and Colonel Sale protected Jalalabad. That alone saved the honour of the English in Afghanistan.

When the news of this disaster reached India, Auckland was deeply disturbed. He immediately sent reinforcement under Colonel Pollock. But, before Pollock reached Jalalabad. Auckland was recalled and Lord Ellenborough was sent to India as the governor-general. He assured his office on 28 February 1842. Like Auckland, Ellenborough also

desired to recall the English army only after the restoration of the British prestige in Afghanistan. But, when he received the news of reverses of General England at Hikalzai and that of Commander Palmer at Gazni, he ordered the English army to withdraw from Afghanistan. Colonel Pollock and General Nott, however, ignored his orders for some time. They decided to restore the English prestige first. Colonel Pollock joined General Scafe at Jalalabad. The Afghans were defeated near Kandhar. Mr Pollock then proceeded towards Kabul and en route defeated Akbar Khan near the pass of Khurd. The English occupied Kabul on 15 September 1842. General Nott also succeeded in capturing Gazni. Thus, the English restored their prestige in Afghanistan. The main market of Kabul was blown off by cannons. The British army, then, returned to India and carried with it the so-called gates of the temple of Somnath which Mahmud Ghazni had taken from India centuries back. The first Afghan war brought no advantage to the British.

The Second Afghan War (1878-80)

The differences between Britain and Russia gradually increased on the question of Turkey or the problem which has been called the Eastern Question in the history of Europe. They fought against each other in the Crimean War. The war checked the progress of Russia towards the Balkans and Turkey. Russia, in retaliation, moved towards Afghanistan and Central Asia. By 1868, it had conquered Tashkent, Bokhara etc. and formed a new province, Russian Tashkent. Sher Ali, the Amir of Afghanistan, felt worried because of the expansion of Russia near its border. He sought the support of the English in India but failed to get it. The English, at that time, were pursuing the policy of Masterly Inactivity. The policy of Lawrence, Mayo and Northbrook disheartened Sher Ali and he, then, attempted to gain the favour of Russia. He started correspondence with the Russian governor at Tashkent, Mr. Kaufmann and Russian representatives started visiting the court of the Amir. Britain asked Russia to stop correspondence with the Amir. Russia refused it. The English grew suspicious of the activities of the Amir. The change of government in Britain and the appointment of Lord Lytton as the governor-general of India changed the entire situation because it reversed the policy of the English towards Afghanistan.

Lord Lytton himself stated that he was sent to India with instructions to assign a fixed, permanent and clear treaty with the Amir and to inform him that the English were prepared to accept all those terms which he had proposed to the English in 1873, viz. to enhance his annual subsidy, accept Abdulla Jan as his successor and to provide him complete protection against any foreign aggression. Just after one month of his arrival in India, Lytton expressed his desire to the Amir to send a representative to Kabul with a view to negotiate a treaty on the above mentioned terms. Sher Ali declined the offer. He informed Lord Lytton that he had not agreed with Lord Mayo to accept a British representative at Kabul. The reasons given by him were as follows:

- (a) He could not guarantee the safety of the English representative at Kabul.
- (b) If he accepted the English representative then he would not be in a position to deny the same facility to Russia.

- (c) If agreement could not be reached between him and the English representative, then it would spoil further his relations with the English.

The Amir suggested that he would depute his own representative to meet the governor-general. Lord Lytton was not convinced by the arguments of the Amir. He, rather, felt humiliated. He warned the Amir and wrote that "he was isolating Afghanistan from the alliance and support of the British government". Not only Lord Lytton but Lord Salisbury, the Secretary of State of for India, was also determined to force the Amir to accept English ambassador at Kabul. Lytton said: "A tool in the hands of Russia, I will never allow him to become such a tool. It would be my duty to break before it could be used". English ambassador but also in increasing the influence of the English near the border of Afghanistan with a view to weaken it. He, therefore, occupied Quetta in 1877 by an agreement with the Khan of Kalat and attempted to bring other tribal chiefs near the border of Afghanistan under the influence of the English.

At that very time when the Amir refused to accept the English ambassador, certain European events also aggravated further the deteriorating relations between the English and the Amir. Russia had forced Turkey to sign the treaty of San Stefano which weakened Turkey further, Britain could not tolerate it and diplomatically forced Russia to put the matter before a European conference. The result was the Congress of Berlin in 1878. Russia felt aggrieved and dispatched its armies towards Afghanistan and Pamir with a view to pressurize Britain. The Amir was forced to accept the Russian ambassador, Mr. Stolietoff at Kabul and it was believed that he assured the Amir of Russian protection against foreign aggression. The acceptance of the Russian ambassador by the Amir enraged Lord Lytton. It was also believed that Lytton has developed a personal dislike toward Sher Ali.

Lord Lytton deputed Mr Chamberlain as his ambassador to Afghanistan and asked the Amir to accept him at Kabul. The Amir failed to reply to Lytton because his son a Abdulla Jaan had died the day he received the letter of Lytton or, probably, he was advised by the Russian ambassador to reply. But, Lytton did not wait. He asked Chamberlain to move ahead and informed the Amir that if his entry in Afghanistan was checked then the action would be treated as an act of the enemy. The Amir protested against it. HE also secretly informed he English that the Russian ambassador was about to leave Afghanistan and he would then accept the English ambassador after the festival of Id. Russia, in fact , recalled its ambassador after the treaty of Berlin. Yet, nothing deterred Lytton, Chamberlain was stopped by the Afghans at Ali Masjid. Lord Lytton sent a letter to the Amir on 2 November 1878. The Amir was asked to accept the English ambassador and beg pardon by 20 November. When no reply was received, Lord Lytton declared war against Afghanistan on 21 November 1878.

The English were solely responsible for the second Afghan war. The supporters of Lord Lytton argued that Sher Ali had thrown a challenge to the English by accepting the Russian ambassador at his court. Therefore, Lytton was left with no alternative except war to check the growing influence of Russia in Afghanistan. But their contention was unreasonable. The English themselves had created those conditions which forced the Amir

to receive the Russian ambassador at his court. Sher Ali had repeatedly requested the English for a treaty when Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo and Lord Northbrook acted as the governors-general in India. The English had refused to accept his proposals. It was only much later that he showed his favour to Russia. Yet, he had signed no treaty with it. The Amir refused to accept a permanent English ambassador at his court not because of the Russian influence but because he feared that the story of the first Afghan war could be repeated. The Afghans never liked the presence of an English ambassador in their country. That is why he had refused this offer of the English during the period of Lawrence, Mayo and Northbrook as well. Lord Lawrence justified the action of the Amir regarding it and said: "Have not the Afghans a right to resist our forcing a mission on them, bearing in mind to what such mission often leads and what Burnes's mission in 1837 did actually bring upon them?" The Russian records also bear this testimony that 'Sher Ali was neither Russian nor English, but an Afghan, desirous of preserving the independence of his country'. Besides this, Sher Ali was an independent ruler. He was perfectly free to befriend either the Russian or the English. The English had no moral or legal claim to force their friendship on him. Lord Lytton attempted to force the Amir for a treaty because he felt that the Afghans were weak and could be coerced to gain certain advantages. P.E. Roberts writes: "The old Lawrence policy was in truth based on a generous recognition of the rights of small and weak states; the school of Lytton and his followers relied upon a cynical doctrine of political expediency". Thus, the action of Lord Lytton was based on the fact that the English were stronger and the Amir should become a tool in their hands to check the Russian menace towards the East. It was imperialism pure and simple.

There is another question concerning this war. Who was more responsible for this war – Disraeli, Salisbury or Lytton? There is no doubt that all the three were in favour of a forward policy against Afghanistan and so all of them were responsible for the war. Yet, Lytton was certainly more responsible for it as compared to the other two. In 1877, Lord Salisbury had advised Lytton not to put much pressure on the Amir but, at that time, Disraeli supported a strong policy. He informed Salisbury that "we must completely and unflinchingly support Lytton, we chose him for this very kind of business". But, at another instance, Disraeli said: "He (Lord Lytton) was told to wait until we had received the answer from Russia to our remonstrance. I was very strong on this, having good reasons for my opinion. He disobeyed us. I was assured by Lord Salisbury that, under no circumstances, was the Khyber to be attempted. Nothing would have induced me to consent to such a step". Thus, it is clear that both Lord Disraeli and Lord Salisbury had advised Lord Lytton to observe restraint. They were trying to reach a settlement with Russia in Europe. But Lord Lytton failed to observe any caution. He asked the English ambassador to enter Afghanistan through the Khyber Pass deliberately though Salisbury had advised him against it. Lytton rightly understood that it would provoke the Afghans which would give him some pretext to declare war against Afghanistan. Therefore, Lord Lytton was more responsible for creating those conditions which resulted in the second Afghan War.

After the declaration of war, the English attacked Afghanistan from three sides. One army under Sir Samuel Browne, moved forward through the Khyber Pass, the other, under Major General Roberts proceeded through the Kurram valley; and, the third one, under General Steward attacked Afghanistan through the Bolan pass. The Afghans were easily defeated. Sher Ali fled to Russian Turkestan and his son Yakub Khan agreed for peace. The treaty of Gandamak was, therefore, signed on 26 May 1879. Its terms were as follows:

- a) The English accepted Yakub Khan as the Amir of Afghanistan.
- b) He surrendered to the English the passes of Khyber and Misni and the districts of Kurram, Pishin and Sibi.
- c) He accepted to manage his foreign policy with the advice of the English.
- d) He agreed to keep an English ambassador at Kabul.
- e) The English agreed to pay an annual subsidy of rupees six lacs to the Amir and to protect him from foreign aggression.

The Amir accepted Mr. Cavagnari as the English ambassador at Kabul and peace remained in Afghanistan.

The Third Afghan war

The danger of Russian attack on India was over when British and Russia entered into a treaty in 1907. The cause of the third Afghan war was, therefore, not related to the fear of Russians. It was a misadventure of the Amir Habibullah, instigated by Germany during the course of the first world war, the Amir attacked the frontier of India but with no result. In 1921. He agreed for peace with the English and friendly relations developed between the two.

India's Relations with Nepal

Nepal is situated to north of India in the mountain region of the Himalayas. The Gurkha Rajpstu succeeded in establishing a strong kingdom in Nepal by the English became a strong power in India. The English had, for long, attempted to develop commercial relations with Nepal but with no success. By the time Hastings arrived in India, the Gurkhas had captured all the hill-territory in north of India, extending from the river Tista in the east to the river Satluj in the West. They could not extend their territory towards further north because of a powerful empire in China. Therefore, they tried to penetrate towards the south. In 1801, they captured the district of Gorakhpur, well within the frontiers of India near the territory of the English. This resulted occasional boundary disputes between the Gurkhas and the English. Their boundaries being un demarcated, both of them claimed different parts of the Tarai region as their own . In fact, both the powers tried to capture as much disputed territory as they could. The inevitable result was a war between the two.

The war began in 1814 on a disputed claim over the districts of Butwal and Sheoraj. The two districts were occupied once by the Gurkhas during the period of Minto but were recovered by the English. In May 1814, the Gurkhas attacked three police stations in the district of Butwal. Hastings was provoked and declared war in October. The English attacked

Nepal from three sides. Colonel Ochterlony proceeded from the river Satlujn while Major-General Gillespie marched from Meerut to join him. Major –General Marley proceeded from Patna and John Wood proceeded towards Nepal from Gorakhpur. The English also attempted to win over to their side the Gurkha Generals Amar Singh Thapa and Bum Shah and also certain hill-chiefs. The Gurkhas resisted the English bravely. Marley and Wood were forced to retreat, Gillespie was killed while attempting to capture the fort of Kalanga and Major-General Martindell was defeated near the fort of Jaitak. But, the situation reversed in 1815. Colonel Nicholas and Colonel Gardener captured Almora and Kumaon in April 1815 and Colonel Ochterlony captured the fort of Malon from the hands of Amar Singh Thapa. The Gurkhas negotiated for peace after it and the treaty of Sagauli was signed on 28 November 1815. The king, however, refused to accept its terms and the war started again. Ochterlony proceeded further and defeated the Gurkhas at Makwanpur on 28 February 1816. The king then agreed to the terms of the treaty of Sagauli in March, 1816. By its terms:

- (a) The English got larger part of Tarai region including the districts of Garhwal and Kumaon.
- (b) The boundaries of the Gurkhas and the English were clearly demarcated and accepted by both the parties.
- (c) Nepal withdrew all its right from the state of Sikkim.
- (d) An English resident was kept at the court of Nepal in Kathmandu.

Hastings was seriously criticized because of this war which meant heavy expenditure for the Company and serious loss of lives of the soldiers. But, there is no doubt that the Company drew many advantages from it. The boundary between Nepal and the Company's territory was clearly demarcated and Nepal became a permanent friendly state of the Company.

UNIT - II

BRITISH POLICES TOWARDS PRINCELY STATES

With the gradual consolidation of the conquests, there developed a relationship between the government of India and the native states. These are divided into four types.

(1) The Ring Fence policy (1757 to 1813). In the period, the British were busy in their own self – defence. So they followed ‘Ring Fence Policy’. (i) Expansion of Empire was the main task. (ii) Treaty of Friendship. Those were signed with Marathas, Mysore states, Nawabs of Oudh etc. (2) the policy of sub ordinates Isolation (1813 to 1857.) Nature of the treaties decided relations in this period. (i) System of subsidiary alliances. By it the Marathas, Nizam, Mysore, accepted military supremacy of the British who weakened their military strength. (ii) Formal Treaties of protection. Some states like Bharatpur, Alwar, Kolhapur, etc., accepted British protection by formal treaties signed with the British. (iii) Restriction on more than 300 States. In return for permission to enjoy absolute power in internal matter, many states accepted varied restriction put on them such as monetary aid, giving part of their territory etc. (iv) Dalhousie’s annexation was climax leading to revolt of 1857. From Hastings to Dalhousie British paramount increased continuously. Dalhousie did it by ruthless methods, the Rebellion of 1857 took place and it resulted in the discontinuation of company’s rule in India for ever. (3) The policy of subordinates Union and of equal federation (1857 to 1947). As some states helped the British in 1857 sympathy had to be shown to them. (i) Queen’s proclamation promised Revival of adoption. New sands were issued to the states which theoretically accepted British paramount. Rulers could be changed if they misbehaved. (ii) 1858 to 1905 – A period of intervention on various grounds. (a) British power continued to grow in different ways. (b) Incompetence of a ruler became pretext. (c) Queen was declared Kaiser – i- Hind and Indian Princes had to salute her. (d) British Residents were appointed in the Courts of kings. (iii) Policy of Friendly Cooperation (1906 to 1920). (a) Since Minto’s times (1906) national awakening grew among Indians. (b) The British wanted the support of rulers of states against the new situation (iv) Formation of the Chamber of Princes and its Role. It was an advisory but the real aim was to ensure British paramount. Equal Federation.

Integration of Indian States

After the declaration regarding the partition of India some of the bigger states like Travancore, Hyderabad pleaded that they could not accept the original plan to which they had given their assent on the basis of a united India. They even thought that they were entitled to declare their independence in the changed situation. But the Congress Committee stated that they could not admit the right of any State to declare its independence. Sardar Patel took charge of the States department on 5th July 1947 to deal with matters arising between the Central Government and the Indian States. Following his advice as well as that of Lord Mountbatten, all the States with a few exception decided to

accede to the Indian union in accordance with an instrument of accession. The white paper on Indian States notes that “a bloodless revolution has been brought about, on the one hand, by the operation of democratic forces unleashed by freedom, and on the other, by the patriotic attitude of the rulers who have been quick to appreciate the change.

Writing on the integration of States, Percival Spear states “At times it was ruthless, but the whole process was made palatable and almost agreeable by the suave skill of the State department secretary V.P. Menon. He was the velvet glove on the mailed fist. He could explain the pleasures of extinction so convincingly that in the end apart from Kashmir, only the State of Hyderabad presented a real problem”. By 15th August, 1947 all the States geographically contiguous to India, excluding Junagarh had signed the instrument of accession. A standstill agreement was concluded with Hyderabad in November 1947. With regard to Kashmir, Lord Mountbatten visited the State personally and tried to persuade the Maharaja to accede either to India or Pakistan. The first to sign the instrument of accession was Sir Pratap Singh, the Gaikwar of Baroda. It is now time to know in greater detail about the integration of Junagadh, Hyderabad and Kashmir into the Indian Union.

Junagadh

Junagadh was the most important State in the Kathiawar States. It had access to the coast from the port, veraval, it had 80% Hindus in its population, and some part of its territory were situated in the States of Bhavnagar and Nawavnagar which had already acceded to India. Within its territories there were famous Hindu and Jain Shrines. Its ruler was a Muslim Nawab. With the lapse of paramountcy, the Nawab of Junagadh despite the wishes of the people declared the accession of his State to Pakistan. The State people launched a Satyagraha and the Nawab unable to resist fled to Pakistan in October 1947. In November 1947 on the express desire of the people of the State the Government of the Indian dominion took over its administration. In the early part of 1948 a plebiscite was held which decided that the State should join the Indian dominion and thus Junagadh became a part of the union of Saurashtra (Gujarat) whose rajapramukh was then the Jam Shib of Nawavnagar.

Hyderabad

Lord Mountbatten made clear to the Nizam of Hyderabad that his State could not join as a dominion in the British commonwealth of nations. The Nizam vacillated because the Muslim minority happened to be powerful. On the other hand, the majority of the inhabitants of Hyderabad are Hindus. The State Congress had long continued its struggle for civil liberties in spite of the repressive measures of the Nizam. Although Hyderabad executed a standstill agreement for a year in November, 1947, it started importing arms and ammunitions. A reign of terror was established in Hyderabad under Kasim Rizvi and his rajakars. The rajakar organization was the private army of Kasim Rizvi who indulged in high flown threats of a blood bath throughout India if Hyderabad’s independence was in any way

assailed. He declared that he would over power the Indian Government and plant the flag of Hyderabad on the walls of the Red fort at Delhi. Hyderabad became the Mecca of India into whose territories thousands of Muslims migrated to swell the Nizam's armies and to oppress the Hindus. The reluctance of the government of India to use force was construed into weakness and the Rajkars began to raid Indian Territories, on which the Government of India strengthened the border districts. Side by side an economic blockade of the state was ordered. The effects of the blockade hastened the ruin of the administration which completely collapsed. Confusion reigned supreme. The Government of India demanded the immediate disbandment of the rajakars and facilitates the return of Indian troops to Secunderabad. The Nizam remained obdurate. So in 1948, the Indian army entered the state and within a week captured Hyderabad. Finally, Hyderabad acceded to the Indian union on 26th January, 1950.

Kashmir

In the 18th century Kashmir came under the cruel rule of the Afgans. In 1819 Ranjit Singh conquered the country and installed the **Dogra Rajput Chief, Gulab** Singh as the ruler of Jammu. It was he who conquered the neighboring State Ladakh and Balistan. After the first Sikh war, Kashmir was ceded as part of indemnity to the British, who in turn installed Gulab Singh as its ruler. At the time of partition, **Hari Singh**, a Hindu by faith was the ruler of the State and the majority of the inhabitants were Muslims. The people under the leadership of **Sheikh Abdullah** of the National conference had for some time been struggling for their liberties, when the lapse of paramountcy was declared. The Maharaja was encouraged to take up independent attitude and refused to accede to either of the Dominions and just before August, 1947 he announced his status of independence. The "K" of Pakistan had stood for Kashmir and Jinnah was annoyed at the English strategy which had compelled him to accept Pakistan without Kashmir. He planned to absorb it by force when diplomacy failed. The Kashmir valley was invade by the tribesman backed by the Pakistan forces. The raiders immediately on their arrival established a reign of terror. Jinnah's plan was that the with the help of the Muslim population who would serve as the fifth column, the State would be overrun and eventually absorbed into Pakistan. The Maharaja, unable to resist the raiders signified his immediate accession to the Indian dominion and asked for help. On 26th October, the Kashmir Maharaja signed the instrument of accession. Immediately forces of the Indian dominion were flown to Srinagar and Jinnah's military coup foiled. But an undeclared war between India and Pakistan continued. The Pakistan Government refused to recognize the accession continued. The Pakistan Government refused to recognize the accession of Kashmir into India. All attempts to settle the Kashmir dispute by mutual agreement having failed, the Indian Government referred it to the U.N.O. The fighting however came to an end on January 1, 1949 due to cease fire. Subsequently, the State of Jammu and Kashmir was allowed to frame its own Constitution through an elected constituent assembly. The Maharaja agreed to become a constitutional head and

was termed as Sadar-i-Riyasat. A democratic government was set up and the state given its due representation in the Union Parliament.

The Princely States that have been incorporated in the Indian union totaled 554. The rulers were given the title of Rajpramukh and the personal problem of the rulers was solved by giving the rulers personal privileges and granting privy purse free of tax. In this manner, the integration of the States was worked out in a very smooth manner.

Development of Education

Introduction of English as Medium of Instruction

In 1813, by the Charter Act, the British Parliament provided for an annual expenditure of rupees one lakh for educating the Indians. Yet, for years to come, the money could not be spent. One reason of the failure of utilizing this money was the controversy between the Orient lists and the Anglicizes. While the Orient lists desired that the money should be spent on the study of Indian languages and learning like Persian and Sanskrit, the Anglicists insisted that it should be spent on English language and learning. The controversy was settled when William Bentinck came to India as the Governor General. Lord Macaulay's Minutes in 1835 favoured the introduction of English language as a medium of instruction and the English system of education in India. William Bentinck accepted Macaulay's viewpoint and it was decided that all funds for the purpose of education were to be spent on the promotion of European literature and science through the medium of English language (for details, see Chapter 9). Besides this, the strong support of Macaulay and the desire of William Bentinck to introduce English language and western education in India, three important factors helped in making this decision. Firstly, the Liberals, Humanitarians and the Evangelists predominated the British attitudes at that time. The Evangelist aimed at getting large converts in India by introducing Western learning and the Liberals and Humanitarians felt that it would be an act of humanity. Both groups had parental attitudes towards Indians and both desired the introduction of English language and Western education in India to serve their own ends. Secondly, many Indians themselves also desired it. They rightly believed that it would provide them good opportunities of employment in government jobs. Raja Rammohan Roy became their chief spokesman. Thirdly, the British had become politically secure in India by that time. They neither expected any serious challenge to their power by the Indians nor did Oriental learning, customs and traditions command any respect in their eyes. Therefore, the Anglicizes got the upper hand and the so called 'Macaulay system' of education was introduced in India.

The system which Macaulay introduced simply aimed at educating the upper classes of India. The government did not intend to spend money on the education of the masses. The education of minority was sufficient for their purpose of getting Indians into lower services of the government. Besides this, Macaulay believed in the 'theory of filtration', viz, the knowledge of Western education would reach the masses gradually through the English educated Indians. Therefore, the government made no efforts to develop vernacular

languages and their literature. It was only in North-western Provinces (modern Uttar Pradesh) that MR. James Thomson, Lieutenant - Governor during the period 1843 – 1853, attempted to educate the Indians in vernacular languages. There, the English education was limited to High Schools and colleges while in lower grade schools all subjects were taught through the medium of vernacular languages. The motive of this effort was to train the Indians for employment in the newly set up Revenue and Public Works Department where the Englishmen could not be provided gainful employment.

Sir Charles Wood's Dispatch on Education, 1854

The next important step concerning English education in India was taken by Sir Charles Wood, the President of the Board of Control, in 1854. His Dispatch on education has been described as the Magna Carta of English education in India. The main recommendations of Charles Wood were as follows:

- (a) The primary motive of the government was to provide Western education through the medium of English but the education of the vernacular languages also needed attention because only through them the Western education could infiltrate among the masses.
- (b) Primary schools should be opened in villages and High Schools and affiliated colleges should be started at the district level in the cities.
- (c) Voluntary associations should be encouraged to establish schools and colleges and the government should grant them financial assistance.
- (d) An education department under a director should be established in each province to supervise and standardize education.
- (e) Affiliated Universities, on the model of the London University should be opened at Calcutta, Madras and Bombay.
- (f) Vocational teachers' training and technical schools and colleges should be established.
- (g) The Education of the females should be pushed up.

Lord Dalhousie, the then Governor – General, attempted to implement the suggestions of Charles Wood. The Department of Public Instructions was organized at the centre in 1855, Education departments were established in provinces, Inspectors of Schools were appointed, an agricultural institute at Pusa in Calcutta and an Engineering institute at Roorkee in Uttar Pradesh were started and affiliated Universities were established at Calcutta, Madras and Bombay. The process started by Dalhousie continued afterwards and gradually the indigenous system of education was completely replaced by the Western system.

The Hunter Commission, 1882 – 83

The British so far had placed emphasis on the college and university education. The Secretary of State for India, by a regulation in 1859, had made provision of grants – in – aid by the government to colleges and Universities alone. Therefore, the Primary and High School education remained neglected. In 1870, the responsibility of education was transferred to provinces which had limited economic resources. That also handicapped the

Primary and High School education. Therefore, Lord Ripon felt the necessity of inquiring into the working of Primary and High School education and appointed an Education Commission under Mr. W.W. Hunter in 1882 to review the progress of education in these fields since Wood's Dispatch of 1854. The Commission submitted its report in 1883. Some of its primary recommendations were as follows:

- (a) Primary education should be given priority. The government need not wait for voluntary, help in this field. It should hand over the management of primary education to District and Municipal Boards which were to be provided one-third of its expenditure on it by the government as grants in- aid.
- (b) Two types of High Schools should be established - the one, for providing literacy education leading up to the entrance examination of the University and the other preparing students for vocational education.
- (c) The government, as far as could be possible, should withdraw itself from the school and college education and every effort should be made to encourage private enterprise in these fields by a system of liberal grants-in-aid.
- (d) Female education which was most inadequate outside the Presidency towns should be emphasized.

The government accepted most of the recommendations of the commission and education developed with a marked speed after it. But more than the government a number of Indian philanthropic and religious associations participated in its growth. It resulted not only in the development of western education but also in oriental studies. Some teaching - cum - examining universities were also established in the coming years, i.e., the Punjab University in 1882 and the Allahabad University in 1887. But, the primary education still remained neglected. Besides, the female education also remained negligible. According to public census in 1901, only fifteen per cent among children went to the primary schools and only seven females among one thousand could read and write.

The Indian Universities Act, 1904

Lord Curzon was in favour of centralization and bureaucratization not only in administration but also in education. The national movement too had gained some momentum by that time. He felt that the standard of college and university education had gone down and the educational institutions had become factories for the production of political revolutionaries. He, therefore, desired to bring the Universities under the control of the government. In 1901 he called a conference at Simla. Educational officers of high ranks and representatives of the Universities were summoned. The Conference adopted one hundred fifty resolutions concerning education. Many of its resolutions were criticized by the Indians and the Press. He, therefore, appointed an Education Commission under the Chairmanship of Sir Thomas Raleigh in 1902. There were only two Indian members in it. The one was Syed Hussain Bilgrami and the other was Gurudas Banerjee. The Commission submitted its report the same year but with a note of dissent by Mr. Banerjee. In

1904, Curzon passed the Indian Universities Act on the basis of the recommendations of this Commission. The Act brought out the following important changes:

- (1) The number of the members of the Senates of the Universities was reduced. It was fixed between fifty to one hundred. The number of nominated members in Senates was increased and provincial education officers were given representation on them. The number of elected members in them was fixed as twenty for the Universities it was fixed as fifteen. The period of membership of the Senate was also reduced to five years. The government was empowered to veto the decisions of the Senate.
- (2) The Universities were required to pay more attention to the promotion of study and research.
- (3) The government was empowered to define the territorial limits of a university or decide the affiliation of colleges to universities.
- (4) Private colleges were also brought under the strict control of the government by laying down strict conditions of affiliation and periodical inspections.

The Act, however, brought no changes in the structure of education. Curzon simply desired to bring the colleges and the universities under the control of the government and that he achieved by this Act. It was decried by all national leaders of India. The Sadler Commission of 1817 also commented that the Act made 'the Indian universities among the most completely governmental universities in the world'. However, Curzon did one useful act. He sanctioned rupees five lakhs per annum for five years for bringing out improvements in higher education. The practice of government's grant remained a permanent feature of the educational policy of the government since then.

The Resolution of 21 February 1913

The Indian national leaders were pressing the government of India to assume the responsibility of providing compulsory primary education in India. The government cleared its policy by a resolution on 21 February 1913. It did not assume the responsibility of compulsory primary education. Instead, it accepted its adherence to a policy for the removal of illiteracy in India, It urged the provincial governments to take early measures towards this direction. It also emphasized the need to encourage private voluntary efforts in this direction. It emphasized on improvement of the High School education and stressed the need of taking the responsibility of teaching by the Universities.

The Sadler University Commission, 1917 – 19

A commission was appointed under the Chairmanship of Dr. M.E. Sadler in 1917. It included two Indians, Sir Asutosh Mukerjee and Dr. Ziauddin Ahmed. Its primary concern was to report on the problems of Calcutta University but it reviewed the entire field of education from the school to the University stage. Some of its important recommendations were as follows:

- (a) A twelve – year school course should be introduced. A student should be admitted to a university only after passing the Intermediate examination. The Intermediate schools were to remain free from the control of the Universities. Separate Boards to be established for the purpose of High School and Intermediate Education.
- (b) The degree course should be three years duration.
- (c) The affiliated universities should be replaced, as far as possible, by teaching universities.
- (d) It stressed the need of extending the facilities for female education, teachers' training and education of science and technology.
- (e) The Calcutta University be handed over under the control of the government to Bengal.

Most of the recommendations of the Commission were accepted by the Government of India. It helped in the development of University education in India. Seven new universities were established in India during the period 1916 – 1921, namely Mysore, Patna, Dacca, Lucknow, Banaras, Aligarh and Osmania.

The Hartog Committee, 1929

By the Act of 1919, education was transferred to the provinces and the central government discontinued its grant for the purpose of education. The provincial government could do nothing much concerning the education, yet the number of schools and colleges continued multiplying because of private initiative. It led to deterioration of educational standards. Therefore a committee headed by Sir Philip Hartog was appointed in 1929 by Indian Statutory Commission to report on the progress of education achieved by them. The main findings of this committee were as follows

- (a) Primary education needed more attention though it was not necessary to make it compulsory.
- (b) Only deserving students should be allowed to go in for High School and Intermediate education. Average students should be diverted to vocational courses just after the Middle stage, i.e. after VIII class.
- (c) The Universities should improve their standard of education and for that it was necessary that admissions to the university should be restricted.

By the Act of 1935, provincial autonomy was introduced in the provinces and popular ministries started functioning in 1937. The Congress formed its government in seven provinces. Mahatma Gandhi proposed a scheme of education which is popularly known as Wardha Scheme of Basic Education. The Zakir Hussain Committee worked out the details of this scheme and suggested a seven years course of education which involved manual productive works as well. But the scheme could not be introduced because the ministries resigned in 1939 due to the outbreak of the Second World War.

Sargeant Plan of Education

In 1944, the Central Advisory Board of education drew up a scheme. As Sir John Sargeant was the educational adviser of the Government of India at that time, it is known as the Sargeant Plan. It envisaged the establishment of Junior and senior basic schools and compulsory education for children between six to eleven years of age. Over senior basic schools were High Schools which were to be of two categories – academic and technical or vocational which were to provide education for six years. The Plan suggested the abolition of Intermediate schools. But it recommended that one year was to be added to school education and one year to the degree courses in the universities. The plan suggested reconstruction of education in the next forty years. The period, however, was reduced to sixteen years by the Kher Committee.

Radhakrishnan Committee, 1948 – 49

After Independence, the governments of India appointed a Commission under the chairmanship of Dr. Radhakrishnan to report and suggest improvement concerning the university education. The important recommendations of the commission were as follows:

- (a) The pre-university course of education should be of twelve years.
- (b) The working days in the University should not be less than one hundred eighty days in a year exclusive of examination days.
- (c) The objectives of the education were defined as three viz. General, Liberal and Occupational. Emphasis was laid on general and occupational education.
- (d) A University degree should not be considered essential for the administrative services.
- (e) Yearly examination should be introduced at the degree level.
- (f) A University education should be placed on the 'Concurrent List' standard of education should be raised and it should be uniform in all universities.
- (g) The pay scales of the University teachers should be raised.
- (h) A University Grants Commission should be established to look after the university education.

The University Grants Commission was established in 1953 which now sanctions all types of grants to different universities and, thus, indirectly supervises university education in all respects.

PEASANTS' AND WORKERS MOVEMENTS

The majority of the Indian people are peasants. It has always been so. Prior to the British rule, the villages in India gradually enjoyed a self-sufficient economy. The peasants depended for their livelihood not only on agriculture and animal husbandry but subsidized their income through village handicrafts. Of course, the peasants and the agricultural labour constituted the lowest income group of the society but their condition was not pitiable except when there were famines and epidemics. During the British rule in India, their condition becomes deplorable. The revenue measures, the trade and tariff policy and

gradual destruction of village handicrafts during the British rule, on the one hand, and increased pressure on land, on the other, deprived them of their subsidiary income. The economic policies of the British affected adversely all people of India but the worst sufferers were the peasants and the farm-labour. The government remained completely neglectful towards the welfare of the peasants, it exploited them to the maximum and permitted the landlords, the village banias and the government officials also to exploit them in a way each of them, in turn, could exploit them. The peasants suffered it all. Their poverty, ignorance, faith in fatalism, attachment to their lands, etc. obstructed in getting them organized and seeking justice for themselves. We, therefore, find no organized movement of the peasants in India till the first quarter of the twentieth century. Yet, prior to it, we find several sporadic attempts of the peasants at different places to seek justice for them. All of them were local risings, were not organized and lacked a coherent ideal or purpose before them. Many of them were violent outbursts of peasants against the oppression of local landlords or banias from whom the government had failed to safeguard them.

Among these risings the earliest ones were those of tribal people in their respective areas. These revolts, strictly speaking, can not be regarded as the revolts of the peasants but, one primary cause of their revolts was, certainly, the acquisition of their lands by the British. The Khasis in Assam, the Kukis in Manipur – Tripura, the Kols in Chota Nagpur and the Khoks in Orissa occasionally rose violently against the British because they did not like their encroachment on their tribal lands and interference in their community life. None of them succeeded.

The first revolt which can be regarded as peasants' revolt was those of the Santhals in 1855 – 56. The land near the hills of Rajmahal in Bihar was cultivated by the Santhals. The landlords and money lenders from the cities around took advantage of their ignorance and began grabbing their lands, they exploited their women also. This created bitter resentment among them leading to their armed uprising in 1855. The revolt was suppressed by the government after some months in 1856 by force. Yet, it was not without any result. The government declared the Parganas inhabited by them as Santhal Parganas so that their lands and indemnity could be safeguarded from external encroachments.

A locally but better organized uprising took place among the labour and peasants engaged in agriculture of indigo in Bengal. Many retired British officials had engaged themselves in indigo plantation in Bengal and Bihar. They either cultivated land themselves with the help of Indian laborers or had entered into contracts with local cultivators. This gradually reduced the labourers as well as the cultivators to the position of bonded labour or slaves. Their interests were safeguarded by the 'Indigo-Planters Association' while the unorganized labourers and cultivators were left to their fate. The condition of the cultivators and the labourers engaged in indigo plantation had become so bad that they often refused to work. That always resulted in more misery to them. The planters used to burn their fields and houses, beat and even kill them and dishonor their women. The newspaper, Hindoo Patriot brought to light the misery of the cultivators several times. Dinabandhu Mitra wrote a drama, Nil-darpan, in Bengali with a view to draw the attention of the people and the

government towards the misery of the indigo-cultivators. But nothing happened. Of course, the sufferings of the cultivators evoked sympathy among all classes of Indians but there was no organized protest for nearly half a century. However, Hindoo Patriot and later on, Amrita Bazar Patrika published the cruelties of the indigo planters. Ram Gopal Ghose, a social worker, travelled through the areas of indigo plantation and described the plight of the indigo cultivators in a book. The cause of the cultivators was, finally, taken up by two brothers, Bishnu Charan Biswas and Digambar Biswas. Both were working in plantation as diwans but they resigned their jobs. They asked the cultivators of their own village not to plant indigo at any cost and the cultivators agreed. Gradually cultivators of several other villages also took a vow not to cultivate indigo. They were severely oppressed by the planters. Yet the movement of 'non-cultivation of indigo' gained momentum and spread to several districts during 1858 – 60. A conference of the representatives of 92 villages of Nadia district was also held at Jayaramput at the instance of Sisir Kumar Ghose, the founder editor of Amrit Bazar Patrika. Finally, a Commission was appointed by the Government at the representation of the planters and the cultivators. The Commission suggested certain remedial measures in August 1860 but that did not satisfy the cultivators and they continued to refuse work on plantations. It resulted in the elimination of indigo plantation in Bengal.

In 1870, the peasants in several districts of Bengal refused to pay revenue and when their lands were grabbed they opposed it by violent means. Their uprising, however, was suppressed. But it resulted in the passing of the Bengal Tenancy Act in 1885 which provided some security to tenant-cultivators.

In 1875, the peasants revolted in the district of Poona, which event has been called the 'Deccan Riots'. The peasants revolted primarily against the oppression of local money lenders who were grabbing their lands systematically. The uprising started from a village in Poona district when the village people turned out a local moneylender from the village and captured his property. Gradually, the uprising covered 33 villages and the peasants looted the property of Marwari Sahukars. The uprising turned violent when the Sahukars took protection of the police. It could be suppressed only when the army was called to control it. However, it resulted in passing of 'The Deccan Agriculturists Relief Act' which removed some of the most serious grievances of the peasants.

The peasants fought against the revenue laws and injustice done to them by local moneylenders in Punjab during the period 1896 to 1900 and, finally, succeeded in getting passed 'The Punjab Land Alienation Act' in 1902-3 which decided that the money lenders could not purchase or get confiscated the land of the peasants in return of the loan advanced to them.

Thus, several uprisings of the peasants took place in several parts of India and some of them even succeeded in removing the worst grievances of the peasants, prior to the entry of M.K. Gandhi in the field and the gradual involvement of the peasants in the national movement.

Gandhi and the Satyagraha at Champaran and Khera

The indigo-cultivation was done by the British planters in Champaran area in Bihar as well and the cultivators there were also victims of same misery as their counterparts in Bengal. The Cultivators there also protested against their oppression by the Indigo-planters. In 1917 – 18, they sought the assistance of Mahatma Gandhi. Gandhi went there, stayed among them against the orders of the government, asked the peasants not to cultivate the land and led a peaceful movement. Finally, the government formed a committee to look into the grievances of the peasants and, on the basis of its report, removed certain gross injustices done to the cultivators by the planters.

In 1919, the peasants of Khera in Maharashtra refused to pay the revenue. They claimed that their crop was destroyed due to lack of rains and, therefore, they should be exempted from paying revenue. The government did not agree with their demand. Gandhi went there and offered peaceful Satyagraha. The government, finally, exempted the peasants from paying the revenue.

Participation of Peasants in the National Movement

The success of Gandhi in removing the grievances of the peasants at Champaran and Khera attracted the peasants towards the 'All India Congress'. They were convinced that the best solution to their problems was the independence of India and they whole-heartedly cooperated with the Congress in its struggle for independence. The Congress included abolition of zamindari and minimum wages for farm-labourers among its aims. Therefore, from 1919 onwards, all peasants' movements became part of the national movement for independence.

Peasants' Movements outside the Congress

Certain movements were carried on by the peasants even outside the fold of the Congress. They fought for their rights at several places like Guntur, Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh. The Mopla rebellion in 1922 was also the result of the struggle of Muslim peasants against their landlords.

The Indian Communists also led some violent movements of the peasants. Among them were the peasants' revolts in Bengal between 1942 – 47, the revolt in Terengganu in 1946 – 51 and the movement of the farm labourers' for minimum wages at Varli in Maharashtra. They encountered limited success.

The Organizations of Peasants. During the course of participation of peasants in the National movements, some spirited individuals realized that the interests of the peasants could not be safeguarded properly by the Congress. Mr. N.G. Ranga even criticized the movement led by Gandhi in Champaran because it failed to resolve the basic problems of the peasants such as reduction of revenue, problem of their debts etc. Therefore, the necessity was felt by several individuals and the peasants of organizing separate organizations of the peasants. In 1923, the peasants organized several groups of their own. In 1926 – 27, peasants organizations were formed in Panjab, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and

Bengal. In 1928, Ryot Sabha was organized by the peasants in Andhra at the provincial level. The same year, the peasants' representatives of Uttar Pradesh and Bihar put up their demands before the 'All Party Conference' held under the Chairmanship of Pandit Moti Lal Nehru. The Congress, in general, supported the demands of the peasants. It resulted in framing of certain laws by the government such as 'The Debt Relief Act, 1934' in Uttar Pradesh, 'Regulation of Accounts Act, 1934' in Punjab and 'Moneylenders Act 1933' and 'Relief of Indebtedness, 1935' in Bengal. These Acts provided only minor relief to the peasants as none of them touched their basic problems.

In 1935, the All India Kisan Congress was organized. It provided an all-India platform to the peasants to voice their grievances. However, it failed to achieve to get anything substantial for the welfare of peasants from the government and even from the Congress ministries formed in several provinces in 1937.

Thus, prior to independence, neither the violent movements nor the organized peaceful movements of the peasants succeeded much in getting justice to them. After Independence, some steps have been taken by the government to remove gross injustices done to the peasants, yet they are far from satisfactory. Much remains to be done yet and it is possible only when peasants become conscious of their rights and create leadership from amongst themselves.

LABOUR MOVEMENTS

Industrialization of India took place at a very slow pace prior to Independence and, therefore, Indian labour as a group came into existence very slowly. Generally landless peasants and the labourers engaged in home-made handicrafts shifted to cities as industrial labour. They were uneducated, unskilled and in good supply. Therefore, they became easy victims of exploitation by the industrialists. For long, the Indian labour, therefore, suffered from insecurity of service, long duration of working hours, low wages, exploitation of their women and children etc. The government, certainly, framed some laws to remove their extreme sufferings such as 'Indian Ports Act, 1931', 'Workmen's Compensation Act, 1934', 'Factories Act, 1934', 'Mines Act, 1935' and Payment of Wages Act, 1936'. But these laws failed to serve much useful purpose because these could not be enforced. The Indian labour was not organized and the industrialists could manage to avoid the enforcement of these laws. After some time, the Indian labour got indirect help to their cause from an unexpected quarter. The Indian labour was cheap. Therefore, the Indian industrialist took advantage of that and stood in competition against the British industrialists particularly in manufacturing cotton cloth. The British cloth manufacturers found its solution in reduction of working hours and enhancement of wages of the Indian labour, The Indian government decided to support the cause of British manufacturers and framed certain laws for the purpose. The Factory Act of 1881 disallowed employment of children less than seven years of age in the factories and fixed nine hours of work per day for children from seven to twelve years of age. The Factory Act of 1891 fixed seven hours of work per day of children between 9 to 14 years of age and eleven hours of work per day for women employed in

factories, Besides, it permitted one day holiday in a week for every labour. The Factory Act of 1911 fixed twelve hours of work per day for men working in factories. But, again these laws failed to serve any useful purpose for the labour because no proper machinery was created to enforce these laws.

The first united protest of the Indian labourers was displayed by a hartal of labourers engaged in cloth mills at Bombay in 1908. But the hartal was organized in protest against the imposition of six years imprisonment to Bal Gangadhar Tilak by the court. It had no concern with any problem of the labourers. By then, the Indian labourers had not organized themselves to struggles in defence of their cause. The first World War somewhat helped in changing this situation. It accelerated the process of industrialization in India because imports from Britain were hindered while war efforts needed production of several articles, Speedy industrialization increased the number of labourers. At the same time, the increased cost of article of daily use enhanced the misery of the labourers. That stirred the labourers towards organized efforts. They also participated in the national movement for independence which gave them self-confidence. Therefore, the labour movement took a vague shape in 1918. Between 1918 to 1920, the labourers took recourse to hartals for getting removed their grievances against the industrialists in several towns like Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Kanpur, and Sholapur. During the course of their struggle against the industrialists, they felt the necessity of having their own organized bodies. It led to the formation of several labour unions at local levels. Finally, their efforts resulted in the formation of an all India organization, viz, the 'All India Trade Union'. Leadership to this union was provided by N.M. Joshi, Lala Lajpat Rai and Joseph Baptista. National leaders like V.V. Giri and C.R. Das also participated in its activities though, for the next ten years, N.M.Joshi remained its undisputed leader.

In 1922, the ideologies of socialism and communism began to emerge on the Indian scene. In the 'All India Congress' itself emerged a Socialist group led by Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru and Subash Chandra Bose. But this Socialist group gave priority to national independence and, therefore, did not make efforts to form separate and distinct labour organizations to fight for the rights of the labourers exclusively. The problems of the Indian labour, therefore, remained neglected. It resulted in the popularity of the socialist' and communist ideas among the labour –class. Gradually, some organizations were formed consisting exclusively of the labour –class for protecting their rights. The Socialists and the Communists, finally, succeeded in capturing leadership of the "All India Trade Union'. The liberal labour leaders like N.M.Joshi, therefore, withdrew themselves from this organization and, in 1929, formed a separate organization called the 'Indian Trade Union Federation'. In 1931, another split took place in the 'All India Trade Union' and it was divided into two parts. But both wings were united in 1935 and, in 1938, the 'Indian trade Union Federation' also joined it which strengthened the labour movement India. The 'All India trade Union' now fixed higher goals for itself. It now aimed to secure better economic and social status for labourers, freedom to organize them into unions, legitimate right to hartal, freedom of

expression, nationalization of the means of production and, finally, establishment of a socialist state in India.

From 1927, the labour organizations accentuated their struggle against employers to secure the rights of the labourers. The labour unions participated in the struggle for independence as well but maintained their separate entity. The labourers boycotted the Simon Commission and whole-heartedly participated in the 'Civil Disobedience Movement'. Between 1928 – 30, the labour unions took recourse to hartals at several places as in the case of a hartal by labourers engaged in the cotton mills at Bombay.

In 1924, the 'Communist Party of India' was formed. It claimed to be a revolutionary organization of the labourers and tried to gain control over labour unions. The government grew suspicious towards the activities of the Communists. It passed the 'Trade Disputes Act' and limited the right of the labourers to observe hartal. The 'Public Safety Act' was also passed almost at the same time which permitted the deportation of undesirable persons from the country. The leaders of the Communist Party were involved in some cases called the 'Peshawar Conspiracy case', the 'Kanpur Conspiracy Case' and the "Meerut Conspiracy case' and most of them were sentenced to imprisonment for several years.

In 1937, Congress ministries were formed in several provinces in India. The Indian labour expected to gain certain favours from them But their hopes were soon belied. When the labourers in Bombay observed hartal to get their grievances removed, they were fired upon by the police. Besides, the 'Bombay Trade Disputes Act' was passed which strengthened the hands of the industrialists against the labour. Similarly the hartal observed by the labourers engaged in leather and cotton industries at Kanpur in 1946, the hartal of the labourers in Kolar –mines in the same year and hartals observed by labourers at Calcutta and Kanpur in 1947 were suppressed with the use of force by the government.

Thus, before Indian independence, the Indian labourers succeeded in forming independent unions of their own, became conscious of their legitimate right and struggled to achieve them through hartals, processions, protest meetings etc. Yet, they failed to achieve anything substantial. The industrialists proved themselves much stronger. Besides, they generally succeeded in getting the support of the government. The Indian labour movement, thus, did not prove strong and one major cause of its weakness was that the farm labourers remained unorganized and were not made a party to the labour movements which remained restricted only to certain industrial towns.

Indian Civil Servants

After the great movement of 1857, Queen Victoria tried to pacify the Indians and the Queen made the following proclamation; "It is our further will that, so far as may be our subjects of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to office in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity duly to discharge". A committee was appointed by the secretary of state in 1860 for India to give effect to the pledge given in 1858. The committee recommended that simultaneous

examinations should be held both in England and in India to remove the injustice from which the Indians suffered, but no action was taken on its recommendation,.

Indian Civil service Act 1861

The Indian Civil Service Act of 1861 was passed in order to legalise certain appointments made by the East India Company. Higher posts were reserved for covenanted civil service. The recruitment to them was to be done in London every year by open competition, Terms and conditions including the lowering of maximum age from 22 years in 1860 to 19 years in 1878 became so galling that it became well-nigh impossible for Indian students to compete. It was extremely difficult for Indians to pass his examination. The Journey to England was not only expensive, but in the case of the Hindus, was frowned upon by the more orthodox leaders of the community. To compete with English boys in an examination conducted through the medium of English in an English University was indeed a formidable task. The only posts opened to Indians were those not contained in the scheduled annexed to the Act of 1861 and these were of a very inferior status. The secretary of state for India discouraged Indians from competing as will be evident from the rejection of Lawrence's proposal to award 9 scholarships of the value of £200(pound)a year each tenable for three years, for Indian students to go to England for study and competition for the civil or other services of India.

With the coming of Gladstone (The British Prime Minister) to power in 1868, the government felt it necessary to provide additional facilities for the employment of the natives of India of proved merit and ability in the civil service. According to the Act of 1870 empowered the Governor – General to appoint Indians to the Civil Service in accordance with rules to be framed by the government of India, but without the necessity of passing the examination in England. The meager concession made by the Act of 1870 was sought to be frustrated by the government of India, which little relished it, and delayed in the framing of rules till 1873, in spite of repeated reminders from the secretary of state and when at last the rules were made they were clearly opposed to the spirit and intentions of the Act. The government of Lord Northbrook framed new rules in 1875 in accordance with which one or two appointments were made to the judicial service; otherwise they remained a dead letter. In 1878 the government of Lytton proposed in a dispatch to the secretary of state, to close the covenanted civil service altogether to Indians and to create a close native service to satisfy the provisions of the Act of 1870. But Lytton's proposals were rejected. In 1879 rules were framed in accordance with which a certain number of Indians of good family and status were to be appointed each year by the Governor – General in council on the recommendation of the provincial governments. Their number was not to exceed 1/6 of the appointments made by the Secretary of state in that year, at the same time the door of open competition was still made narrower by reducing the maximum age to 19. Disaffection prevailed as soon as the Indian National Congress was established in 1885, recruitment to Indian Civil Service attracted its foremost attention. The Congress demanded simultaneous examination both in India and England for recruitment to the covenanted civil service.

Atchison Commission

In 1886 Lord Dufferin appointed a public service commission to investigate the problem with Sir Charles Atchison, the Lt. Governor of Punjab as its chairman. The commission was to devise a scheme which may be hoped to possess the necessary elements of finality and to do full justice to the claims of natives of India to higher and more extensive employment in the public service. The commission did not favour holding of simultaneous examination in India and England. It favoured the abolition of the statutory service. It recommended division of administrative staff into three branches, Imperial service was to remain a preserve of the Indian Civil Servants recruited in England. All superior jobs were to be held by them. Provincial and subordinate civil service were confined to candidates domiciled in India. A certain number of listed posts were to be given to provincial service cadre. But as a matter of policy the local governments for one reason or the other, aimed at keeping down the number of Indians in the services. Reservation of key posts for Europeans was the prevalent view. The maximum age of I.C.S. (Indian Civil Service) was raised to 23. Most of the Indians found themselves excluded either by the difficulties created by the rules or by the racial bar, for example the police examination was open only to British subjects of European descent and appointments to forest and P.W.D. could only be made from among graduates of Cooper's Hill Colleges or Royal Engineers. The recommendations of the Commission found little favour with educated Indians. The all India services opened new avenues for Europeans. The white bureaucracy gained in strength day by day. The system remained in being till the end of British rule. It improved the standard of British rule. It improved the standard of service but failed to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the Indians for employment in large numbers in higher offices of state.

Resolution of 1893

With the election of Dadabhai Naoroji as a member of the House of Commons, the centre of propaganda for simultaneous examination to I.C.S. shifted to England. In order to focus attention on the question, he placed bill in the House of Commons to provide for it. But the resolution was not binding upon the government, so no action was taken on the resolution. Though Dadabhai's efforts were nullified, but the country accepted his contribution and honoured him by making him the president of the Lahore Session of the Indian National Congress in 1893.

Islington Commission

The position of the Civil Services in India was examined by the Royal Commission on public services in 1912. The Chairman of the Commission was Lord Islington. The report of the Commission was published in 1917. By that time the 1917 declaration by Montagu regarding utilization of self-government had changed the situation. Progressive increase of Indians in services was a foregone conclusion.

Recommendations of 1918 Report

The Commission did not favour the institution of simultaneous examination in India for the I.C.S., a demand on which public opinion was unanimous. To meet the Indian aspiration a definite number or proportion in each service was fixed for the Indians. In the case of I.C.S. 75% of the posts were to be recruited in England by open competitive examination for which Indians were theoretically eligible, but in order to prevent them from competing the maximum age was lowered from 24 to 19. The Montford report took a more liberal view than the Islington Commission on the question of Indian in the Indian Civil Service. They proposed that 33 percent of the superior posts should be recruited for annually until the situation was revised by a commission. All racial distinctions in the matter of appointments should be abolished. Besides, for all the public services for which there is recruitment in England open to Europeans and Indians alike, there must be a system of appointment in India. For about four years, the principle laid down in the Montford report was followed in the matter of recruiting Indians. But the members of the superior services became rather perturbed at the growing indignation of the services. According to the Montford report, the Secretary of State in Council introduced a scheme under which all India officers selected for appointment before 1st January 1920, and not permanently employed under the Government of India, were allowed to retire before the completion of the normal period of service, on a pension proportionate to the length of their service. But the Indians were unhappy that the rate of Indianisation of services was not adequate. Further adequate number of Englishmen and Europeans was not coming forward for the All India Services. A Royal Commission of Superior Civil Services in India was appointed in 1923. And the Commission is known as Lee Commission as Lord Lee was its Chairman.

Lee Commission 1923

The Lee Commission submitted its report in 1924 and most of its recommendations were accepted and put into force by the government. Its recommendations were-

Recruitment to I.C.S., the I.P.S., the I.F.S. and the Irrigation Branch of the service of Engineers was to continue through the secretary of state for India. Recruitment to Indian Education Service, Indian Veterinary Service, the Indian Medical Services was closed on All India basis. Increased rate of Indianisation was to be implemented. Ten percent of superior posts were to be filled by promotion from the provincial services. Various proportions for recruitment as regards the central service in political department, imperial customs, superior telegraph and wireless branch, state railways were proposed. Recruitment to provincial services was handed over to the provincial governments. Increase in the pay and emoluments of the members of the civil services were proposed. Appointment of the Public Service Commission was recommended. The pensions of the members of the Indian Civil Services who attained ranks were considerably increased. The public service commission composed of five whole time members was appointed in 1925.

Government of India Act 1935

The last phase in the growth of the service was the Government of India Act of 1935. It clarified the rights of the civil and military services in India. The Secretary of state continued to make appointments for the Indian Civil Service, the Indian Police Service. It also made provision for the institution of Federal Public Service Commission and as a corollary provincial commissions. During the working of this 1935 Act, the popular ministers were able to manage with the civil servants. The salaries, emoluments and the pension of the civil services. Were not to be subject to the vote of the legislature. Civil servants were indemnified against civil and criminal proceedings in good faith in the execution of their duty and the certificate of the Governor – General on the question of good faith was conclusive. Without the permission of the Governor – General or Governors in his discretion no civil or criminal proceedings could be instituted. The Federal public service commission and the provincial commission were required to conduct examinations to various services within their respective sphere. Further, no civil servants could be dismissed by an authority inferior to the appointing authority. According to Michel Edward, “The expansion of Europeans society in the towns confined the official to his office, his home and the club. The civil service sense of superiority withdrew its members into a special ark of its own, riding with aggressive impartiality and difference on the troubled seas of India”. The men who manned the civil service centre in the 19th century were stern moralists full of the earnestness of the mid Victorian age. Whether right or wrong, they believed in their mission of leading India towards English ways of thought and feeling. After independence the services that have been organized are still being carried on the old lines even through they are all for Indians.

Development of Press in India

Licensing Act, 1857

Due to the revolt in 1857, the Government again imposed the condition of getting licence from the Government before starting any publication. The Government was also given the right to revoke the licence of any press or prohibit the publication of any book, newspaper or journal. The Act, however, remained in force only for a year.

Registration Act, 1867

The Metcalfe’s Act of 1835 was replaced by the press and Registration of Books Act of 1867. It did not curb the liberty of the press but required that every printer had to give his name, publisher’s name and the name of the place where the material was printed. Every publisher had to submit to the local government a copy of every book published by him within a month of its publication

In 1870, liberty of press was curtailed to some extent by adding a sedition section in the Indian Penal Code.

Vernacular Press Act, 1878

The Vernacular Press was seriously critical of the racial arrogance of the British and also criticized certain measures introduced by Lord Lytton. Lytton, therefore, passed the Vernacular Press Act to curtail its liberty. The magistrates were authorized to ask any publisher of a newspaper to give assurance of not publishing anything which might threaten the peace among the people and the security of the government. He could also ask from the publisher to deposit a fixed amount as surety of his Assurance. The decision of the magistrate was final in every case. He could forfeit the security of the publisher or even seize his possessions in the Press.

The Act applied not to the English Press but only to the Vernacular Press which was regarded the worst feature of the Act and was called the Gagging Act by the Indians.

The Vernacular Press Act was, however, revoked by Lord Ripon in 1882. But during the viceroyalty of Curzon, certain provisions were again incorporated in the Indian Penal Code to curb the liberty of the Press.

The Newspapers Act, 1908

Certain measures of Lord Curzon created widespread dissatisfaction among the Indians and led to some acts of violence by the revolutionaries. Therefore, the Government passed this measure to repress the press. The act empowered the magistrates to confiscate the press and its concerning property which published any material leading to violence in any form. The newspaper could, however, appeal to the High Court within fifteen days of the forfeiture of the press. Under this Act, the Government confiscated seven presses.

Indian Press Act, 1910

After two years of the passing of the Newspaper Act, the government decided to frighten the press by more severe measures. It, therefore, passed the Press Act of 1910. By it, the local governments were empowered to ask any Press to deposit security-money which could be forfeited and its registration cancelled if it printed any objectionable material. The aggrieved press, however, could place its case before a special Tribunal of the High Court within two months. Every newspaper was asked to submit two copies of its every issue to the government. Under this Act, the government confiscated securities amounting to about rupees five lakhs during the first five years. The government continued its repressive policy against the press during the course of the First World War.

In 1921, a press committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, the then Law member of the Viceroy's Council to review the working of the press laws. It recommended abolition of the Press Act of 1908 and 1910 and these were repealed.

Indian Press Act, 1931

In 1930, the government revived the provisions of the Press Act of 1910. It was felt necessary with a view to suppress the Civil Disobedience Movement launched by Mahatma Gandhi. But it was not found sufficient. Therefore, in 1931, the government passed another

Act by which the provincial governments were given wide powers to suppress the press. It empowered them to punish any person who engaged in publishing any material which directly or indirectly, could lead to violence. In 1932, the provisions of this Act were further elaborated in the form of the Criminal Amendment Act of 1932. During the course of the Second World War, the government assumed further powers concerning the press. It imposed pre-censor-ship and amended the Press Emergent Act of 1931 and Official Secrets Act in favour of the officials.

In 1947, the government appointed a Press Enquiry Committee to review press laws. It suggested amendments in all press laws with a view to make the press free from government control. The government liberalized the press laws in view of the recommendations of the Committee.

The Press Act of 1951

The communal riots, however, forced the government to revive the powers of the government concerning the press. The Press Act of 1951 gave wide powers to the government to demand security from the press, to forfeit it, seize the press, destroy the objectionable material etc. The aggrieved party, however, was allowed to appeal for a trial by jury. The Act was opposed by the All India News papers Editors' Conference and Indian Federation of Working Journalists. The government yielded to their demand and appointed a Press Commission under the Chairmanship of Sir Justice G.S.Rajadhuaksha in 1952. It submitted its report in 1954. The government then passed several Acts with a view to the restoration of the freedom of press though of course with certain restrictions.

UNIT – III

Development of Trade, Commerce, Industry, Transport and Irrigation

India has been mainly a country of agriculturists. Even this does not mean that industry and commerce were under total neglect as a result of which she lagged behind in this field. On the contrary since ancient times, India claimed a place of pride in industries of Asia and her trading relations with the people of other continents is a proven fact of history. The prosperity of Industry and commerce also continued during Mughal period. That prosperity was one of the factors responsible to attract the European traders amongst whom the British succeeded in driving out the rival competitors.

- (i) England needed Raw Material from India. With the process of industrialization in England that started in the 18th and was at the height in the first quarter of the 19th century, she needed a supply of raw materials to feed her industries. England also felt the need of extensive markets for the sale of finished goods on a large scale. The conquest of Indian territories and their consolidation, therefore, helped the growth of English trade and commerce. That is why the British rule till 1857 followed a policy of economic exploitation particularly by transporting Indian raw materials to the homeland.
- (ii) Evil effects on Indian Trade. The chief effect of this policy was indifference to the growth of Indian industries. The indigenous products could not stand in competition with the finished goods of factories when they were imported in India. The ruin of Indian industries and commerce was, therefore, a welcome feature at the initial stages. Only when the fatal implications were realized, the British had to take steps in the progressive directions. The fame of Indian cotton, the grandeur of Dacca muslin, sugar, salt, perfumes, articles of copper, brass, ornaments of gold, silver, jewellery and artistic works of sculpture, sandalwood, ivory were few of the many industries of India which had secured a world, wide reputation. But towards the end of the 18th century, all the prosperity of trade showed signs of decline and by 1850 it was completely ruined.
- (iii) Development after 1870. Critical financial position of the Company government at the time of Rebellion of 1857 had proved the necessity for development of industry and commerce by the new government under the Crown. Peasant economy had to be supplemented by industrial one, food crops to be replaced by cash crops and old cottage industries were to be replaced by power driven factories. If 'free-trade wind' was blowing in England, Industrial development had to be secured by governmental action. Main problem of development was the supply of capital. Till the time of revolt of 1857, the British investors did not wish to invest in Indian industries because the risks involved were too great'. Indian capital was scarce due to the exploitation and it needed confidence as well as the habit of investment.
- (iv) Improved Means of Transport. With the opening of Suez Canal in 1869, the prospects of trade and commerce with India became bright. The first need for development was felt in the sphere of means of transport like railways, roads, canals, and ship building. Their need was also keenly felt at the time of famines when the relief measures could not reach the

interior affected by famines. Without the development of railways, the prospect of industrial progress were bleak and modernization process also could not be expected to succeed.

Railways are considered to be a great legacy of the British rule in India. It is in 1845 that the first sanction was secured for their construction. Within a span of 1853 to 1856, simultaneous constructions were started in Bombay, Calcutta and Madras presidencies. Of course, the possibility of their use to link up the strategically important places for military purposes cannot be ruled out. Though Dalhousie laid down general principles of management, finance and construction of railways, the government did not enjoy power to raise loans for productive purposes. So the initial development was done through private companies in England. Five percent of rate of interest had to be assured, to induce the private companies to undertake the work of railway construction. After 1870, British government took up the construction work itself. Even then bold plans of rapid construction could not be materialized. The result was three types of gauges, narrow, meter and broad, which had to be accepted depending on the need and the resources. The system that existed before the take over of the construction work to itself, is known as old 'guarantee system'. Under it as the companies that agreed to work out the projects were assured of interest, they did not economize. Their loss was made by the Indian Exchequer. Indirectly this was an additional financial burden on the Indian people for the sake of profit of foreign companies.

- (v) Railways improved. To improve upon the difficulties during 1869 to 1880, the policy of State Construction was envisaged. Railway lines were extended in North Punjab, North Bengal, Indus Valley and Rajasthan territories. Still the progress being slow and financial difficulties being on the increase, because of famines and Afghan War, the 'guarantee system' was revived at a lower rate of interest. Thereafter even the native states like Hyderabad were allowed to build and operate the railways. But in spite of all experiments, the schemes did not become paying till 1900. "Fruits of the annual profits were reaped thereafter".

In 1905 the Railway Board was set up. Mackay Committee of 1908 drafted a scheme of railway extension. But the outbreak of World War I made it impossible to execute the recommendations. After World War I was over, Acworth Committee's Report recommended reorganization. In the meanwhile, the railway companies continued to exploit the country to the tune of one crore of rupees per annum which was a heavy drain on Indian revenues. This was the period when the nationalist movement had stabilized. So there was a nation – wide agitation as a result of which the take –over process of the various railways began in 1925 and was completed by 1942.

Alongside with the defects of unplanned development, wastages of resources, there is also a bright side of the picture. The development of railways also helped to hasten "The transmission to mechanical industry" in India. Its economic effects were far reaching because it transferred the nature of famine problem and made the Famine Code 'a working proposition' because it provided work for the unemployed workers. Railway budget was separately prepared from 1925 onwards. By 1940 more than 43,000 miles were covered

under the railway construction. Railways were a mixed blessing for socio-cultural development along with the economic development of the country. Distant places of India being brought nearer, they helped 'to foster the spirit of unity'. They helped removal of social prejudices, religious orthodoxy and on constructive side they also helped in the growth of fine arts. They also helped in bringing India 'within the orbit of world economy'. They were an essential preliminary to an industrialized India. In fact it can be said of them, and not in an economic content only. "no railways, no modern India".

- (vi) Taste for English Goods. After 1900 the railways almost revolutionized the trade. The economic habits and tastes of Indians develop on western lines. Indian markets were overflooded with English – made goods. Import in India consisted of many articles like leather goods, decorative articles, wrist-watches, stationery, earthen-wares, glass-wares, cycles, cars, toilets and medicines. India industries developed on scientific basis because of merchants who realized the importance of industrialization.
- (vii) Textile Industries. Among the new industries, cotton mill industry was first to develop. As early as 1818 cotton mill was set up in Calcutta. By 1853 Bombay had become the centre of textile industries. In the beginning they suffered because of company's high-handed methods, and due to the protectionist policy in respect of Lancashire and Manchester cloth. In 1887 Tata opened New Empress Mill at Nagpur. Cotton Mill also flourished at Sholapur, Ahmadabad and Madras, From 1905 onwards Swedish movement gave a further impetus to Indian cotton. By 1914 India was fourth among cotton producing countries in the world.
- (viii) Jute Industry. Jute industry also had an old tradition. It was originally handicraft industry of Bengal. In 1838, its value as export commodity was first realized. When Europe was busy in fighting the Crimean War in 1854, it became a turning point of prosperity to Indian industry whose supply was till then made from Russian quarters. With the increased demand and scientific production, India enjoyed a virtual monopoly of jute production'. If cotton made Bombay an industrial city, jute made Calcutta an industrial city.
- (ix) Coal Industry. Coal industry also made a rapid progress. Its use as a source of power was realized in connection with the growth of railways. If no modern industry could without railway, "no railway could be without coal". It was because of Bentinck's encouragement that in 1843 Bengal Coal Company was formed. With the growth of railways, the demand for coal continuously increased as they consumed one-third of the total production of coal. This made India self-supporting in coal production.
- (x) Iron and steel industries. Traders now turned their attention to heavy industries. Iron and steel industry, therefore, developed. The credit of its development goes to Jamshed Tata whose efforts bore fruit when his sons founded in 1907 Tata Iron and steel Company in Bihar. Its production began in 1911 and it became the "largest single steel works in the world" built up on Indian capital. Mining industries also developed between 1850 and 1880. The gradual growth of them led to corresponding growth of other industries like petroleum. Engineering workshops, manganese, mica and salt.

Among other industries which developed during the British rule were chemical industries, soda, vegetable oils. Other industries of repute were the rice mills, the flour mills, manufacture of silk and woollens, cement, matches and paper. Plantation industries made a tremendous progress. Formerly it was China who supplied tea to Europe. Now in the late 18th century once tea plants were found in Assam, Bengal and South India, their export earned heavy profits. In the initial stages it is the foreign companies which exploited the Indian labour. Gradually, however, the Indian traders entered their field. Coffee plantation in Mysore also resulted in the growth of coffee trade.

- (xi) Post war Development (1918 – 1947) Whatever monopoly the British rule enjoyed in industry and commerce, she could not maintain it after the beginning of the 20th century. In Indian market, the other countries like Germany, Japan, America became competitors. But the outbreak of first World War reduced imports in India and gave impetus to the Indian industries. The world-wide economic depression of 1932 to 1934 also hit the Indian industries and commerce. The outbreak of Second World War again gave a fresh stimulus to her industries.

The establishment of a separate Imperial Department of Commerce in 1905, of Munitions Board in 1917 shows how the British rulers realized the urgency of development of Indian industries and commerce. Hence after 1919, 'industries became' a 'transferred subject'. Department of industries was created in each province to coordinate the work of industrial development. A Fiscal Commission was appointed in 1921 when a policy of protection was recommended for Indian industries. The Tariff Board of 1923 assured protection to many industries. The appointment of Indian Trade Commission by the Government at places where the British Crown has signed commercial treaties indirectly helped the growth of Indian industries. Thus by the time India secured her independence in 1947, she had established commercial contacts with the western countries.

Development of Science and Technology

During 1947- 1964, rapid development of science and technology took place independent India. That was mainly because of the support given to that activity by India's Prime Minister, Jawharlal Nehru, who had education in the scientific subjects and who had understood the role which science plays in making the life of man modern, happy and progressive in the world.

1. **Science in India 1947 – 1964.** The Directive Principles of State policy embodied in the constitution of India require the State to direct its policy in such a manner as to make effective provision for securing the right to work for its citizens. The Government of independent India under Nehru took steps in that direction. By introducing the Five Year Plans it tried to increase employment in India During 1947 – 64. The Government under Nehru wanted to eliminate poverty also from the life of the people of India.

As the Government under Nehru had realized that the increase in employment and the elimination of poverty can be achieved by the application of improved methods and

techniques which were to be evolved with the help of science and technology, it decided by its Scientific policy Resolution of 1958 to “foster promote and sustain by all appropriate means, the cultivation of science and scientific research in all its aspects - pure, applied, and educational”. Prime Minister Nehru, who wished to effect rapid development of science and technology in India, then took prompt steps to implement that resolution.

i) Reinvigoration of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, which was established in 1942 had not done much work before independence. But when Nehru became its President after Indian independence, that organization took steps to expand scientific research by setting up National Laboratories and Institutes in India.

- a) National Laboratories and Institutes. The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research had set up 28 national laboratories and institutes at various centres in India by 1964. They covered the most vital fields of science and technology, such as physics, Chemistry, Fuel, metallurgy, Roads, Food, Building, Drugs, Glass and Ceramic, Electro-chemistry, leather, Bio-Chemistry, Mechanical Engineering, public Health, Construction and Operation of Aircraft, Botany, petroleum Refining and Processing of Natural Gas, Petro-Chemical etc. The scientific research work carried out in the National Laboratories and Institutes proved to be great help to the Indian industries.
- b) Sponsored Research. Through a liberal system of grant-in-aid scientists in other technical institutes, industrial laboratories and universities were enabled by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research to pursue fundamental and applied research and develop their own special fields. In 1964, there were more than 495 such schemes which were in progress. While yielding practical results, those schemes provided opportunities of training for young research workers and developed centers of independent research work in India. The Council also awarded Junior fellowships to the talented young scientists in order to further their research activity.
- c) Cooperative Research Associations. The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research assisted the Cooperative Research Associations in the different industrial fields by giving them monetary help of different kinds, technical advice, procurement of expertise and materials, etc. That had increased the activity of scientific research in India.
- d) Liaison. The Liaison units were set up by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research in some of the laboratories to maintain contact with the industry, industrial and trade associations, government departments and other users of research. An Industrial Liaison and Extension Service Unit was maintained at New Delhi to make use of the available scientific knowledge for the economic betterment of rural and semi-urban communities. That helped the growing activity of scientific research in India
- e) Vigyan Mandirs. Forty-eight centres known as “Vijyan Mandirs” were set up by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research at sites covered by Community Development projects. Those centres disseminated scientific knowledge among the rural population and through it

educated them in the potentialities of the methods of science as applied to their day-to-day life. The Council also undertook the activity of producing popular editions of scientific literature in the Indian languages in order to popularize knowledge of science among the people.

- f) Atomic Energy and Outer Space Research. (a) Atomic energy Research. One of the important spheres in which India had made progress in the Nehru Era was atomic research. It was due to the encouragement which Nehru had given to that research that India became one of the Leaders in that field.

The Atomic Energy Commission which was established in 1948 was responsible for planning and implementing the programme for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Its chairman was Dr. Homi J. Bhabha.

That programme aimed at the encouragement of the uses of atomic energy in agriculture, biology, industry and medicine, mainly through the production and application of radioisotopes; and at the development of atomic energy of a source of electric power. That programme was under the charge of the Department of Atomic Energy, whose secretary was Dr. Homi J. Bhabha, the renowned Indian scientist.

(b) Outer Space Research. An Indian National Committee on Space Research (INCOSPAR) was constituted to aid and advise in the formulation and execution of policies on the peaceful uses of outer space. A sounding rocket launching facility was to be set up in Kerala in cooperation with the National Aeronautical and Space administration of the U.S.A. A satellite ground communication facility for participation in the programme to develop a system of communications via satellites was also to be set up. Due to that India made a beginning in the Outer Space Research in the Nehru Era.

(iii) Other Department Research Activities. In the Nehru Era, research activities were undertaken in the subjects of their concern by the Hydraulic Research Stations, the Botanical Survey of India, the Zoological Survey of India, the Geological Survey of India, the Department of Anthropology, the Indian Meteorological Department, the Forest Research Institute, the All India Radio, the Railway Board, the Roads Organization, the Indian Standards Institutes, etc.

(iv) Other Institutions, A number of research organizations financed by private endowments and Governmental assistance like the Bose Institute, Calcutta, Birbal Sahani Institute for Palaeo-Botany, Lucknow, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmadabad, etc., undertook useful and productive research activities in the subjects of their undertakings and thereby helped Indian to effect progress in scientific matters in the Nehru Era.

(v) Medical Research. The Indian Council of Medical Research (established in 1912) was engaged in the promotion and coordination of medical research in India. As a result of its schemes and grants –in aid, different medical institutions carried out research in the

methods of malaria eradication, preparation of bacterial vaccines, sterile solutions, tuberculosis, cancer, influenza etc., in the Nehru Era. As a result of that research, when steps were taken to control different diseases, the health of the Indian people improved.

(vi) Agricultural Research. The Indian Council of Agricultural Research (established in 1920) aided, promoted and coordinated agricultural and animal husbandry education and research in India in the Nehru Era. In order to make its work more effective the Government of India developed it into one of the biggest institutions of its kind in Asia. That organization as well as other research institutes concerned with agriculture carried out useful research on veterinary diseases and their cure, quality of milk and in commodities like cotton, jute, coconut, sugarcane, tobacco, oilseed, fish and fish products, etc. As a result of that research agriculture and animal husbandry improved in India during 1947 – 64.

Socio Religious Reform Movement

Raja Rammohan Roy

Born in a well-to-do orthodox Brahmin family, Rammohan Roy (1779 – 1883) emerged as the earliest spokesman of the India intellectual movement. He was one of the marvelous makers of Modern India. He was the father of the socio-religious reform movement of the 19th century, Rammohan was a multi-faceted personality. First and foremost, he was a humanist. He fought for the emancipation of man. He struggled against ignorance, intolerance, superstition and cultural decadence. He worked for social accommodation and cultural assimilation. Rammohan's crusade against Sati (1818 – 1829) is well known. He inveighed against the inequalities of the caste system. He was one of the earliest champions of the freedom of the press. He advocated the separation of judicial function from administrative functions of the Magistrates serving in India. He was a magnificent champion of personal freedom and national emancipation. Rammohan Roy was indeed the first to deliver the message of political freedom to India.

Raja Rammohan Roy is rightly regarded as "India's Columbus in the discovery of a new continent of truth".¹ Influenced by the exalted moral teachings of the New Testament and the Koranic concept of Tauhid or Unity of God, Roy repudiated the outmoded polytheistic pantheon of the Hindus and upheld the spiritual monism of the Upanishads. He also "brought from the ancient store-house of Hindu thought new weapons to meet the challenge posed by the eighteenth century and early nineteenth century Europe".² Idol – worship was anathema to Rammohan Roy. He was bitterly hostile to sectarianism, superstition and of scuriantism. He advocated a catholic approach to religious truths. As a student of comparative religion Rammohan visualized the necessity for a Universal Religion. He worked out a scheme of fundamental spiritual synthesis.

Brahmo Samaj

The Brahmo Samaj was founded by Raja Rammohan Ray on 20th August, 1828 and was formally inaugurated on 23rd January, 1830. It was also known as the **Brahma Sabha** or the **one God Society**. He started it "on a more or less rationalist and social reform basis".

The members of the Brahmo Samaj were known as the Brahmos. The Samaj soon attracted increasing number members and sympathizers from educated middle class. It was laid down that the Samaj could be used by any one for the worship of one Eternal being without name, designation or title. No picture or image was allowed. It served as the meeting ground of all sects for the worship of One True God, The obvious object of Rammohan Roy was to revive monotheism in India. But he found it an uphill task. The orthodox Hindu Community opposed him tooth and nail. It even organized a rival organization called Dharma Sabha. "The agitation gradually spread into the interior and the entire Hindu society was convulsed in a manner to which there was no parallel within living memory.

Devendranath Tagore

The Brahmo Samaj became weak and moribund after demise of Rammohan Roy in 1833. It was, however, revived and revitalized by Devendranath Tagore (1817 – 1905), the eldest son of Dwarkanath Tagore. In 1859 he merged the Tattvabodhini Sabha founded by him in 1838 with the Brahmo Samaj. He rejected idolatry, the infallibility of the Vedas and its creedal ceremonialism and theology. Under his benign patronage the Brahmo Samaj was converted into distinct spiritual fraternity and an instrument of social reform. He attracted many enlightened Hindus to its fold. The Brahmo Samaj served as a missionary organization and its manifold activities were extended to mofussil areas. But his cautious approach to social reform provoked his disciple Keshab Chandra Sen, who split the Samaj.

Keshab Chandra Sen

The Brahmo samaj suffered a major split when its younger section headed by Keshab Chandra Sen (1838 – 1884) broke away from the Samaj. Sen was a religious eclectic and a monotheist. He maintained that Brahmoism was catholic and not to be equated with Hinduism. He declared that renunciation of caste was essential to Brahmoism as that of idolatry. He was influenced more by the ethics of Christianity. In fact he gave his Brahmo Samaj of India a new Christian outlook. His Samaj worked vigorously for the social and moral regeneration of India. It actively involved in the emancipation of women and spreading of education, cheap literature, temperance and charity.

Sen blamed the crafty and unscrupulous priesthood for perpetrating ignorance and superstition among the masses. He denounced caste restrictions, promoted the cause of higher education of women and applied the process of critical reason to all departments of life. He considered slavery either to men or to books as a grave sin. Sen was openly hailed as a deliverer of his people by no less a person than Lord Lawrence, the Viceroy himself. At Sen's request the Government of India passed the Native marriage Act popularly known as the Civil Marriage Act, 1872. The Brahmo Samaj of India grew into a dynamic force, It carried a step further the ideal of freedom not only in respect of religious issues but also in social spheres and personal contact". The Brahmo Samaj under Keshab Chandra Sen, had proclaimed a new gospel of personal freedom and social equality, which reacted very

powerfully upon this infant national consciousness and the new political life and aspirations of young Bengal”.

Sen’s message and mission was not confined to Bengal only. For, he was the first to inaugurate an all-India movement of religious and social reforms. He undertook a missionary tour to Bombay and Madras in 1864 and North West Provinces in 1868 as result of which Parthana Samaj was established in Bombay and Veda Samaj in Madras. His all India tour fostered the idea of national unity by bringing together on a common platform diverse peoples of India in different regions. His was “the first all-India movement which was a precursor of a similar movement undertaken a few years later by another Bengali, Surendranath Banerji”. Sen was indeed the first great all – India figure symbolizing the unity of Indian culture, His death in January 1884 was” one of the earliest occasions for the manifestation of truly national sentiment in the country. The residents of all parts of India, irrespective of Caste or creed, united with one voice in the expression of sorrow at his loss and pride in him as member of one common nation.

Legacy

The Brahamo Samaj bequeathed a rich legacy to India. Its nationalism, universalism concept of religions of humanity, and its ideal of synthesis of the East and the West prepared the intellectual foundations for future national movement. It inspired many scholars, patriots and leaders. Both Bipin Chandra Pal and C.R.Das had received their intellectual stimulation from the Brahmo Samaj. Anand Mohan Bos, who later became the president of the Indian National Congress in 1898, was a Brahmo, Jagdish Chandra Bose. Pratab Chandra Mazumdar, Braendranath Seal, Sarlabi Chandhurani Ramanand Chatterji, Krishan Kumar Mitra, Rabinadranath tagore, and Lord S.P. Snha were inspired by the teachings of the Brahmo Sabha. Swami Vivekananda used to attend the meetings of the Sabha. Thanks to the ceaseless efforts of the Brahmo Sabha India imbued the nationalistic spirit, freedom of individual conscience and a great deal of its moral, ethical and spiritual precepts. By emphasizing individual and social freedom the Brahmo Samaj evolved the sense and value of political freedom thereby contributed to the growth of Indian nationalism.

Prarthana Samaj

The Samaj

The Prarthana samaj came into being through the inspiration of the Brahmo Samaj. The missionary tour of Keshab Chandra Sen (1864) provided necessary impetus for the founding of the sabha at Bombay on 31st March 1867. Atmaram Panduranga was its first president, The second visit of Sen to Bombay in 1868 helped to strengthen the Sabha . Mahadev GOvoind Ranade and Ramkrishn Gopal Bhandarkar soon Joined the Prarthana Sabha and gave it a definite form and Character, the Sabha adopted ‘Satyameva Jayate’ (truth alone Triumphs) as its motto.

Theistic Worship

Theistic worship and social reform were the twin objectives of the Prarthana Samaj. It believed in the Unity of God. It accepted one God without a form. It protested against the existing corruption of Hindu religion. It opposed the various religious rites and propitiation of Gods by sacrifices. It refused to acknowledge the infallibility of any sacred scriptures. Incarnations and miracles were discountenanced. Mediators and redeemers had no place in the Prarthana Samaj. It denounced idolatry. The Concepts in incarnation of God and transmigration of soul were discarded. It was a protest movement against the archaic and superstitious Hinduism. In short, the Prarthana Samaj was based on the principle that “all men and women are equally children of God and in his sight no distinction obtains between man and man”.

Social Reform

In the words of M.G.Ranade, the chief exponent of the Prarthana Samaj, “Religion was as inseparable from social reform as love to man is inseparable from love of God”. Inspired by this ideal the Samaj embarked on a determined fight against the social and moral evils that had crept into the Indian society. It run a network of primary and secondary schools, night schools, orphanages, Mahila Samaj and depressed Classes Mission Society of India. The abolition of child marriage, remarriage of widows, inter-caste dining and inter-caste marriage were the other social reforms undertaken by the Prarthana Samaj.

All – India Perspective

The leaders of the Prarthana Samaj worked on an all-India perspective. M.G. Ranade was the first to conceive a plan for an all-India reform movement. He was one of the founding fathers of the Indian National Congress. The Indians National Social Conference was his creation. In fact, there was no movement of national reconstruction with which Ranade was not actively associated. “Ranade not only kindled the thought but also gave a programme and plan of action for the elevation of the Indian People. “ Bhandarkar, Narayan Chanavarkar and G.K. Gokhale were the leaders of the Prarthana Samaj who helped, in no small measure, Indian political emancipation.

Legacy

The Prarthana Samaj successfully carried the reformist message of the Brahma Samaj in Western India. It played a salutary role in the Socio-religious regeneration of India. It championed the cause of social justice, religious reform, spread of education, emancipation of women, and cultural and humanitarian nationalism. The Prarthana Samaj produced some of the outstanding patriots of modern India whose efforts helped a great deal in creating the national consciousness and the eventual political emancipation of India.

Arya Samaj

Swami Dayananda Saraswathi

Born in an orthodox Gujarati Brahmin family, known in early life as Mula Sandara, Swami Dayananda Saraswathi (1824 – 1883) was a Vedic Scholar, a dialectician, religious revivalist and a social reformer. He was widely travelled seeker of knowledge and wisdom. He was unaffected by Western thought or culture. 'Go Back to Vedas' was his slogan. "This slogan really meant an elimination of developments of the Aryan faith since the Vedas", Swami Dayananda Saraswathi was convinced that the Vedas were the repository of all knowledge – religious, secular and scientific. He was an ardent advocate of Vedic Varanashrama Dharma. He condemned the criteria of birth as the determinant of one's caste. He was a reformer in social matters. He argued had no sanction in the Vedas. He opposed child marriage and supported widow remarriage. Swami Dayananda Saraswathi was an aggressive champion of militant Hindu nationalism. He called India as Aryavarta. He insisted on the moral purification of the nation. He always stressed the cultivation of fearlessness as a moral virtue, When fearlessness took political shape it became a force which stood against the oppression of British despotism.

The Samaj

The Arya Samaj was first founded at Bombay in 1875 and then at Lahore. It had unmistakable faith in the infallibility of the Vedas and the transmigration of souls. The members of the Samaj were obliged to study the Vedas. It defended everything Hindu. The social ideals of the Arya Samaj were based on the concept of Fatherhood of God and Brotherhood of Man. Its social reform creed laid emphasis on the equality of the sexes, absolute justice between men and men, equal opportunities and love and charity towards all. The Arya Samaj was a crusading and reforming movement. It was reaction to the influence of Islam and Christianity.

Social Reform

The Arya Samaj was well known for its social service and reform activities. It gave new orientation to the traditional Indian practice of Charity. Charity was confined to poorer and more backward sections of the society. It declared a crusade against child marriage. It is significant that Harbilas Sarda, an Arya Samajist, was the author of the Child Marriage Restraint Act, 1929, popularly called the "Sarda Act" fixing the maximum marriageable ages of boys and girls at 18 and 14 years respectively. A vigorous campaign was carried on by the Samaj for widow remarriage. It started a string of educational institutions of girls. The work of the Arya Samaj in the field of upliftment of the depressed classes was really revolutionary.

Shuddhi

The work of Shuddhi was one of the distinct though controversial, contributions of the Arya Samaj. It meant the reconversion of those Hindus also who had been converted to

other religions. Through sustained campaigning the Arya Samaj was able to reconvert millions into the fold of Hinduism. The Arya Samaj boldly threw open its doors to the reconverts in the teeth of opposition from both reactionary Hindus and the Muslims. The So-called untouchables were administered the 'Gayatri Mantra' and invested with the sacred thread and thereby made equal to others. The Arya Samaj "introduced proselytization into Hinduism and thus tended to come into conflict with other proselytizing religions".

Legacy

Swami Dayananda Saraswathi's plan and programme of social reform and rehabilitation served as precursor of national political progress in modern India. He may be regarded as the spiritual father of the Punjab nationalism, "Swami Dayananda will be known in History not only as a religious reformer but also as one of the Fathers of the great Indian Renaissance..." Dayananda, though indirectly, prepared the foundations of an independent political life in India. Similarly, the Arya Samaj founded by him, imparted an indelible impetus to the movement of social and national consciousness. It created a new militant spirit among the Hindus. Mahatma Hansraj, Swami Sharadhananda, Lala Rajpt Rai, Munshi Ram and Rama Deva were well known Arya Samajists who strengthened the spirit of political nationalism. The Aryas demanded radical change in the constitution of the Indian National Congress. In the Punjab the congress was taken over and controlled to by the Aryas and shaped the movement according to their mode of thinking. At one time it was considered by the government as a politically revolutionary movement, but the large number of Government servants in it made it thoroughly respectable".

Ramakrishna Mission Movement

Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa

A contemporary of Swami Dayananda, Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa (1836 – 1886) was practising spiritual sadhanas in Bengal in his pursuit of God in the form of Kali. After a dozen years of intense practice he realized that Krishna, Allah and Jesus were but different manifestations of the same God. He thus underlined the essential unity of all religions, He considered the different religious creeds as different paths to reach God. At a time when religion had divided people into irreconcilable incongruities Ramakrishna brought to bear catholicity of outlook and approach to it. He did not decry Christianity. He demonstrated that even worship of images was compatible with the highest spiritual development. He was no scholar but he attracted scholars towards him. Ramakrishna was as human as he was mystical. In fact he realized divinity in humanity. He emphasized the service of mankind as a means to salvation. Though essentially a God-mad man Ramakrishna never forgot the poor and the downtrodden. He longed to "give up twenty thousand such bodies to help one man". He implored Swami Vivekananda, his disciple, not to be a traditional sanyasi seeking personal salvation but to be a seeker of Siva of in Jiva, God in man. "Difficult to understand in the context of modern life, and yet fitting into India's many coloured pattern, he was

accepted and revered by many of her people as a man with a touch of the divine faith in him”.

Swami Vivekananda

Narendranath Dattal better known as Swami Vivekananda (1863 – 1902) was an anti – thesis to his master Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa. And yet this English educated youth magnetized by his master. After the passing away of Ramakrishna in August 1886, Swami Vivekananda took charge of his disciples. Then he travelled throughout the country. He took the spiritual world by storm by his address at the Parliament of Religious at Chicago in 1893. He was hailed as the “Cyclonic Hindu”, and “Hindu Napoleon”. Swami Vivekananda’s thunderous speeches reverberated from Kanyakumari to Holi Himalayas. He wore himself out in the process of preaching his manly message and died at the age of thirty – nine.

“ No more weeping but stand on your feet and be men. It is a man-making religion that we want. It is man-making theories we want. It is man-making education all round that we want. And here is the test of truth-anything that makes you weak physically, intellectually and spiritually, reject as poison: there is no life in it, it cannot be true”. This was the clarion call of Swami Vivekananda to Indian. His weighty words came as a timely tonic to the depressed and demoralized Hindu mind Vivekananda’s speeches and writings have contributed a great deal to the strengthening of the moral foundations of Indian nationalism. At a time when the nation was seized with apathy, inertia and despair, he thundered the gospel of strength and fearlessness. At a time when the Indian intelligentsia was aping the Westerners, he boldly proclaimed that the West had to learn much from India. “It will not be possible to understand the genesis of the Indian nationalist movement and the change in the tone of the political literature between 1904 and 1907 with out having in our mind the gospel and writing of Vivekananda”.

Swami Vivekananda reposed faith in the youth for the regeneration of India His message to youth is three-fold; 1) they should love their country and feel proud of her achievement; 2) understand fully cause and forces that led to the downfall of this glorious nation; 3) should strive with missionary zeal for the upliftment of the country. He advocated emancipation of women he was greatly concerned about the upliftment of the masses. Swami Vivekananda had no patience to the ‘religion in the kitchen’ and ‘God in cooking pots’. According to him religion was the manifestation of divinity already in man. He condemned occultism and mysticism. He had the guts to declare: “I would rather see every one of you rank atheists than superstitions folks, for the atheist is alive and you can make something out of him” In short, Swami Vivekananda was the patriot – prophet and spiritual – nationalist of modern India.

Ramakrishna Math and Mission

The Ramakrishna Order, an informal monastic organization, was formed by Swami Vivekananda, shortly after the passing away of Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa (1886). In 1887 an association was founded by Vivekananda under name of the Ramakrishna Math and

Ramakrishna Mission. The Math was a spiritual centre intended to impart spiritual education and training to sanyasins. The Mission engaged itself in several social services activities, Branches of the Ramakrishna Math and mission were opened in India and abroad. Monks and sanyasins of the Ramakrishna Order, instead of retreating to forest and caves for realization, involved themselves in promoting the welfare of the masses. "This new attitude gave a new turn to the concept of monasticism and monastic life, which was one of the main contributions of Swami Vivekananda and Ramakrishna Mission to modern Indian life".

Legacy

The Ramakrishna Mission Movement was a movement of spiritual and national significance for India. Opposing all sectarianism, Ramakrishna emphasized that all religious roads lead to the same God. Vivekananda brought a new vigour to the dormant qualities of the people and roused the patriotic spirit of Indians. He invested the idea of service to his country men. The Ramakrishna Mission undertook relief works in connection with famines, floods fires and epidemics and engaged in educational, health and other service activities. After the advent of the Ramakrishna Order, serving the 'Daridra Naryanan' became the ideal of all social workers. Gandhi, Nehru, Bose and several other freedom fighters were deeply indebted to Swami Vivekananda, the patriot saint of modern India. Even today the Ramakrishna Math and Mission is a living movement with a glorious future before it.

Theosophical Society

Founders

The Theosophical Society was originally founded in New York by Madame H.P. Blavatsky, a Russian and Colonel H.S. Olcott, an American, to promote psychic phenomena and spiritualism. They came to India in 1879. With the help of Swami Dayananda Saraswati, they transferred the Head Quarters of the Theosophical Society to Adayar, Madras. Madame Blavatsky believed that the Hindus were "spiritually immensely higher" than the Europeans. She even stated that the former were spiritually a millennium ahead of the latter. She identified herself with Hinduism, Colonel Olcott believed in the ancient greatness of India. He appealed to the patriotic loyalty of Indians to uphold the religion of their forefathers. Both of them evinced enormous interest in the regeneration of India.

Objects

The Main objects of the theosophical society were 1) to form a Universal Brotherhood of Man; 2) to protect the study of ancient Aryan religions, literature, philosophy and sciences and 3) to investigate the laws of nature and develop the divine power latent in man. By subtle philosophical theories of graded elevation of man, the theosophical society defended the current practices of Hinduism. It reconciled the ideal of Universal Brotherhood with the caste system. Similarly, it compromised the fundamental

unity of the Supreme being with the worship of numerous gods and goddesses. It also defended image worship.

Anni Besant

Mrs. Annie Besant, an Irish lady, came to India in 1893. She joined the Theosophical Society and infused new vigour and life into it and worked for four decades till her death at Adyar in 1933. She wore Hindu dress, adopted the Hindu way of life and worked tirelessly for the upliftment of the Indian people. She was known for her highly trained intellectual powers and extraordinary gift and of eloquence. She translated the Bhagavad Gita in English. She became a pillar of Hindu Revivalism. She, however, condemned early marriage and forced widowhood, she was associated with the founding of the Central Hindu College at Banaras in 1898. Annie Besant was an Irish Lady with the Hindu Heart. Her defence of Hinduism was through going. "Make no mistake", she said, "Without Hinduism India has no future. Hinduism is the soil into which India's roots are struck, and torn out of that she will inevitably wither, as a tree, torn out from its place". She also played a conspicuous role in the organization of the Industrial Exhibition, in the awakening of the Indian National Congress, in organizing the Home Rule League, in elevating the depressed classes and in propagating Swadeshism. She made no mean contribution in the awakening of Indian nationalism.

Legacy

Madame Blavatsky, besides promoting the objectives of the Theosophical society, fully supported the Indian National Congress. A.O. Hume, a prominent colleague of Madame Blavatsky, was instrumental in starting the Congress. Both Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott created among Indians a new pride in their own ancient legacy. At a time when the English educated Indian reformers were rejecting traditional Hinduism as irrational and evil, Annie Besant accepted Hinduism as valid and relevant and earned new respect for it. She helped Indians to shed their inferiority complex and in rousing them to sense of their national greatness.

UNIT – IV
Freedom Movement
Indian National Congress

Origin and Inception. A new era in the political life of India began with the foundation of the Indian National Congress in 1885. The Congress was the result of the several factors described above and it was but the visible embodiment of the national awakening in the 19th century.

The credit of organizing the Indian National Congress undoubtedly goes to a large extent to Allan Octavian Hume, a retired member of the Indian Civil Service. Hume had been closely following the trend of events since the Governor-Generalship to Lord Lytton, and had been anxiously watching the clouds that were darkening the Indian horizon. Hume was convinced of the imminent danger of a terrible outbreak among the Indian and he became convinced that the cure for the general unrest lay only in the foundation of a genuine nationalist movement. He discussed the situation with Lord Dufferin, the Governor-General, and with Sir William Wedderburn of the ICS, both of whom were equally concerned with the political unrest in India. With encouragement from the Governor – General, Hume addressed on 1st March, 1883, an open letter to the graduates of the Calcutta University. It was an appeal to the educated Indians to aid in the upliftment of India. He called upon 1st fifty men to organise themselves into an association which would promote the mental, moral, social, and political regeneration of the people of India.

The appeal was not made in vain, for the men required as founders to initiate the movement were forthcoming from all parts of India, and towards the close of 1884, the Indian National Union was formed. In March 1885, the Union decided to hold a meeting of representatives from all parts of India in December. Thus the first meeting took place on 28th December 1885 in Bombay, and the Indian National Congress was formed. Originally the Congress has been founded as an instrument to safeguard the British rule in India. Hume had candidly expressed this idea himself when he had referred to the Congress as a “safety – valve” for the escape of the forces generated in a gradually awakening India. But there is no doubt that once Hume set the ball rolling, it gathered momentum beyond expectation and that it was the chief instrument in the achievement of independence for India in 1947.

2. Nature, Aims and Objects of the Congress. The first session of the Congress was attended only by seventy –two delegates, but they were fairly representative of the different regions of India, In the course of time (hitherto the Congress was to hold an annual session usually in December in some of the other important towns of India), the number of delegates increased. By 1888 the number had crossed the one thousand levels, and two decades later the Congress was beginning to draw the attention of the masses.

One feature of the congress worth –nothing is that from the very beginning the Congress opened its doors to all Indians claiming no and its aims further reveals that the Congress was essentially a cosmopolitan organization. Almost all the leading personages in

the country joined the Congress and at one time or another served as its President. The First President of the Congress was Womesh-chandra Bannerjea and he was followed by other leaders like Dadabhai Naoroji, Badruddin Tyabji, Pherozeshah Mehta. Surendra nath Bannerjea, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Motilal Nehru, Pandit Nehru etc. Even such Englishmen, David Yule and William Wedderburn, served as the President of the Congress sessions. Thus, during the years of the struggle for freedom, the Congress claimed to represent all the Indian classes and their interest.

The early objectives of the Indian National Congress were outlined by Womeshchandra Bannerjea in 1888 under the following heads: (a) The promotion of friendship and co-operation amongst all the workers for the country's cause in all parts of India. (b) The determination of the lines upon which it is desirable for Indian politicians to labour in the public interest. (c) The examination and solution of the more important social questions of the day. (d) The eradication of all possible race, creed or provincial prejudices and the fuller development and consolidation of national unity.

Throughout the first two decades of its early career, the Congress concerned itself mainly with the criticism of the policies of the British Government and with demands for reforms. It drew the attention of the Government to various existing evils and asked for redress. It formulated its views in the shape of resolutions which were forwarded to Government for its consideration. Its demands included the following measures: (i) The expansion and the reform of the imperial and local Legislative Councils in order to enhance the development of self-government. (ii) The admission of Indians into the public service on a large scale. (iii) The introduction of the Indian Civil Service examinations both in England as well as in India simultaneously, and the raising of the upper age-limit of the candidates (iv) The separation of the judicial and executive branches of the Government. (v) The abolition of the India Council. (vi) The spread of education in India and the training of Indians to make them fit for higher positions in the administration. (vii) The development of indigenous industries and the stemming of the exploitation of the Indian economy. (viii) The revision and reduction of the land revenue. Besides these demands, the Congress also concerned itself with famine relief, forest laws, commerce and industry, social evils, the depressed classes, the position of women, national education and various other themes.

Above all, the main object of the Congress was to quicken the national consciousness of the people and to further the growth of the Nationalist Movement in India. This it was able to achieve from the very beginning. The resolutions passed by it were widely circulated and discussed by local political associations. The vernacular newspapers welcomed the organization as the most powerful organ of Indian political opinion and put forward various suggestions for its activities in their columns. Thus the foundation of the Congress marked the real beginning of the national era in India.

Moderates and Extremists

By 1905 there emerged within the Congress Party two distinct sections the Moderates and the Extremists. The Moderates followed a policy of persuasion in their dealings with the British while the Extremists believed in agitation for the attainment of swaraji. Two Maharashtra patriots led the two wings, Gokhale of the Moderates and Tilak of the Extremists. The conflict between the two sections in their approach and objective led to a split in the Congress at its session at Surat in 1907. Because of this situation the British administration found it possible to win over the Moderates through constitutional concessions and to suppress the Extremists through repressive measures.

Rise of Extremism

Rise of extremism represented a national reaction against the policy of procrastination, followed by the moderate leadership and its failure to gain positive results. To the people with a radical philosophy and revolutionary thinking the policy of prayers and petitions appeared quite obnoxious. They rightly condemned this approach of the Moderates as of mendicancy. Instead of depending upon the mercy of the alien masters, they decided to appeal to the people for concerted action for the attainment of Swaraj.

Despite their policy of persuasion, the Moderates could wrest from the British no reform of any constitutional consequence. On the other hand political degradation and economic degeneration continued unabated. Much was expected when the Indian Councils Act of 1892 was proposed but it administered a rude shock to nationalist sentiments. For, the Act did not concede, to the people the right of electing the own representatives to the Councils or any definite share in administration. Lord, Curzon, the Viceroy, who believed in the concept of white superiority, considered the Indians unfit to rule themselves. As a result the sons of the soil continued to be kept out of higher positions in the administration. At the same time the neglect of manufactures inside India, preferences given to European industries and drain of economic resources continued to render the lot of the people miserable.

The British administration showed a calculated disregard to relief measures in times of calamities. A disastrous famine visited the Bombay Presidency in 1896. In its wake there came epidemic and starvation. Yet the relief measures were not only slow but inadequate. Though millions of people perished, the officials appeared quite indifferent. Rand, the Plague Commissioner at Poona was more interested in the jubilee celebrations of Queen Victoria rather than in affording succor to the victims of misfortune. No wonder, he was shot dead.

Despite these, the British mounted an administrative offensive against the Indians. Lord Curzon enacted a series of measures of controversial nature, aimed at suppressing popular aspirations. While the Indian Universities Act brought the universities under strict bureaucratic control, the Official Secrets Act greatly curbed the freedom of Publication. To add to the insult he proceeded to announce the partition of Bengal in 1905. In the past

under British rule it formed a large province and the Bengalis as a linguistic group made their influence felt on imperial politics. Calcutta, as the centre of political and intellectual activity, served as a base of nationalism. Lord Curzon divided Bengal into East Bengal and West Bengal –East Bengal to include Assam and other eastern areas and west Bengal to include Bihar, Orissa and other territories. Though this was intended as a measure for better administration, it was also calculated to drive a wedge between the Hindus of the West and Muslims of the East and weaken the influence of Bengali centre of nationalist activity. This policy of divide and rule offended Bengali sentiments.

Added to these the ill treatment of the Indians in the British colonies spread wave of resentment. The colonial authorities not only denied due wages to the workers but also subjected them to hard labour and racial discrimination. The Tamils suffered in Ceylon and the other Indian settles in South Africa. It was in this dark hour that Asiatic Japan gained a spectacular victory over European Russia in the Russo. Japanese war of 1905. It shattered the contention of invulnerability of western might and represented a clear manifestation regeneration of the East, The Extremists attributed this victory to the patriotism of the Japanese. Greatly encouraged the delegates 21st session of the Congress held at Varanasi on 1905 denounced the ill treatment of their country men in South Africa and admired the valour of the Japanese.

In the mean time the work that was extensively carried on by a galaxy of nationalists, particularly Vivekananda, Aurobindo, Tilak, Annie Besant and Subramanya Bharati kindled an aggressive nationalism. Vivekananda called upon the people to awake, arise and discover their strength in their immortal soul. Sri Aurobindo ghosh insisted upon a bold line of action and purification by blood and fire instead of seeking relief through prayer and petition. Tilak called upon the people to seek inspiration from India's glorious past and to work for a greater future. Annie Besant announced the superiority of Indian thought over European culture. Subramanya Bharati spread the message of freedom through the patriotic songs that he composed. Among the writers of the times R.C. Dutt, Naoroji and Wacha depicted how the British impoverished the country through systematic exploitation. The glaring contrast brought out between India of the past and India of their times shook the confidence that many in the Congress reposed on the British sense of Justice. As a result of these developments many of the nationalists turned into Extremists. Otherwise called new nationalism, Extremism grew into a formidable force in the Congress Party.

Between the two sections there came a series of differences while the Moderates represented the conservative wing of the Congress, the Extremists the radical. Admirers of western tradition, the former entertained the view that the British rule contributed to the social welfare of the population. The latter being admirers of Vedic literature, asserted that the British rule caused incalculable misery to the people. What the Moderates demanded were concessions like greater representation on the councils and more job opportunities for the Indians. What the Extremists demanded was the attainment of swaraj. To achieve their goal the Moderates relied on reasoned arguments, effective representation and appeals to the British sense of justice. No self sacrifice was needed. As the Indians were not fit for self

government, they were to be trained for co-operation with the British. The extremists on the other hand relied on agitation methods-boycott of British goods, swadeshi and self sacrifice. They rejected the version that the Indians were not fit for self government and turned to the people for inspiration and strength.

Gok hale Tilak

The provocations presented by imperialism and the intellectual awakening that came among the people had their powerful impact upon the working of the Congress Party. The Moderates, who formed the majority in the Congress, pursued their traditional policy but the Extremists decided to follow a different policy. It was felt that through a boycott of British goods, promotion of Swadeshi and a constitutional struggle, it would be possible to drive out the British. They were as ardent patriots as the Moderates were but unlike the latter, they were prepared to suffer and to make sacrifices. However, two factors came in the way of their progress-they were the philosophy of procrastination which guided the congress and the dissension among the nationalists.

Among the leaders of the Moderates the most outstanding was Gopalakrishna Gokhale (1865 – 1915), whole others included Dababhai Naogoji, Pherozechah Mehta and Surendranath Banerjee. Born in 1866, he came under the influence of the western traditions and the principles of moderation, upheld by his guru justice Ranade. He started his career as Professor of History and Economics at Fergusson College, Poona, and retired as Principal of the same College, Form the early days of his public career he took an active interest in Indian politics. He served as member of the Bombay Legislative Council and of the Central Legislature. In 1905 he was elected president of the Indian National Congress. It was a period when there emerged two wings in the party the moderate section and the extremist section. In the controversy between the two he gave leadership to the Moderates and opposed the methods, advocated by the Extremists.

A man of great intellectual power, he turned into a social reformer and an ardent nationalist. He opposed the ill treatment of the untouchables by the caste Hindus. As an advocate of the cause of the Indians in South Africa, he sought equal justice for them. Despite the British policy of oppression and exploitation, he refused to favour any break with the Empire. On the other hand he adored the benefits conferred by the British upon the country. As the other Moderates did, he demanded reform of the constitution and decided to reach this goal through a slow process of co-operation with the British. A man of the times, he argued that the People were to qualify themselves for sharing any responsibility, for what was essential was to strengthen the ties between the peoples of Great Britain and Indian Empire. He explained: "Our old public life was based on frank and loyal acceptance of British rule due to a recognition of the fact that it alone could secure to the country the peace and order, which were necessary for slowly evolving a nation out of the heterogeneous elements of which India was composed and for ensuring to it a steady advance in different directions". In fact his views and his programme were marked by caution and moderation.

Bal Gangadhar Tilak (1856 – 1920) was the undisputed leader of the Extremists. Among others of his camp were Lajpat Rai, Bipin Chandra Pal and Aurobindo. Born in a Maharashtra Brahmin family as Gokhale was, he studied law and emerged as a social reformer and a staunch nationalist. As editor of the news paper Kesari used its columns not only to criticize the administration of the British and the policy of the Moderates but also to propagate his views and methods. Early from his career, he devoted himself to the spread of nationalism. With this end in view he organized social clubs and anti-cow killing societies and promoted Ganapati festival and Shivaji cult. It was his ambition to inspire the youth of the country and transform them into militant nationalists. However, this had its reaction, for the Muslims interpreted these practices differently and resorted to communal politics, much to the advantage of the British.

As nationalist he believed in the greatness of India, denounced British imperialism and advocated independence for the country. While the Moderates demanded liberalization of the constitution, he condemned as nothing but a penal code. As armed uprising was impossible without arms he suggested the promotion of Swadeshi manufactures and boycott of British goods. For his writings and speeches in Condemnation of imperialism, he suffered persecution and imprisonment. Yet it was his great contribution that, he gave the slogan “Swaraj is my birth right”, infused into the people a spirit of defiance and transformed the Indian National Congress to a great extent from a party of admirers of imperialism into that of advocates of revolution. The great work that he did for the country found expression in the promotion of local industries and rise militant nationalism.

Swadeshi and Boycott

In the midst of the agitation against the partition of Bengal the extremists rose to prominence. The people of Bengal observed October 16, 1905, when the partition went into force, as a day of mourning. There were demonstrations and hartals. Secret societies too joined this popular movement. Among them the important was the Anusilan Samiti or the Society of progress. The news papers Bande Mataram and Yugantar in Bengal extended their support to the revolutionary upsurge. As an effective weapon of agitation the people resorted to, as the Chinese did, to swadeshi and boycott. They promoted the manufacture and sale of indigenous goods and boycotted the British goods. The Extremists spearheaded the movement, for they gave the leadership through their youth clubs, sports societies and swadeshi stalls. Mass festivals held in honour of Kali and Ganesa and the Shivaji cult that was imported from Maharashtra added vigour to the struggle.

Before long the agitation spread to the different regions of India. Swadeshi and boycott became the slogans of the struggle, for meetings were held, pamphlets were issued and swadeshi stalls were opened. Bande Mataram or Hail Motherland, taken from a novel written by Bankim Chandra was adopted as the song of the nationalists. The swadeshi spirit contributed to the rise and growth of Indian industries In Bengal the Tata Industries

received favour with the people. At Tutukudi V.O.Chidambaram Pillai launched the Swadeshi Steam Navigation Company. The cottage industries received a new life and the locally manufactured goods gained a ready acceptance in the place of the imported goods. The Swadeshi and boycott were so effective that by 1908 textile imports fell by more than twenty five per cent while the local industries experienced a boom.

As the secret organizations moved into the arena of struggle, the agitation tuned into a terrorist movement. The British arrested the leaders and launched repression, still the extremists could not be deterred from militance. At Tirunelveli, Tutukudi, Madras, Bombay and Calcutta the workers in the mills and railways struck work. At several places the peasants and students joined the agitation. In 1907 due to the influence of Arya Samaj serious disturbances broke out in Punjab. The nationalists sought the support of the sepoys, but did not succeed. In 1908 the agitating workers of Tirunelveli, joined by a large mob, attacked the public buildings, but were dispersed by the troops. Following the murder of two white women in Bihar, the police discovered a Calcutta based conspiracy for the liberation of the country through the strength of the youth. The nationalist, led by Barindra, collected arms and sought the support of the Indian troops for an armed struggle, but their effort proved abortive. At Maniachi near Tirunelveli in 1911 Vanchi Iyer shot Collector Ashe dead. Several news papers particularly the Hindu denounced it as a dastardly act but the enquiry into the incident indicated that it was the outcome of a widespread conspiracy against British imperialism.

The Surat Split

The agitation that was marked by Swadeshi and boycott sharpened the contradiction between the Moderates and the Extremists. Despite their basic differences the two wings in the Congress carried on for long: however their conflict came to the surface during the Swadeshi Movement. Both the groups condemned the partition of Bengal yet while the Extremists took active part in the agitation, the Moderates extended only a limited support. In Bengal as the young people boycotted schools and Colleges, B.C.Pal came out in support of the agitation but Surendranath Banerji opposed it. What added to the differences were the respective inspirations that they received from the victory of the respective inspirations that they received from the victory of Japan in the war against Russia and the electoral victory of the Liberals over the Tories in England. The Extremists interpreted the victory of Japan as an expression of the greatness of Eastern culture and glory of Asiatic nationalism. The Moderates took the victory of the liberals as a manifestation of British liberalism and declared that it would serve as a prelude to the introduction of liberal reforms in India.

As no compromise appeared possible the Extremist sought to capture the control of the Congress from the Moderates. In 1906 at the session at Calcutta they proposed Tilak as their candidate for the presidency but were defeated by the Moderates. Yet, this session as demanded by the Extremists adopted resolutions favouring swaraj, swadeshi, boycott and national education. Many of the Moderates were afraid that these resolutions would give an excuse to the British to deny constitutional concessions and adopt repressive measures. It

was widely felt that the Extremists were so irresponsible that they would lead the country to uncertainty and danger. As a result, the extremists feared that the Congress would drop the resolutions at the first opportunity. In consequence when the Congress met at Surat in 1907 the two camps came into direct conflict. Tilak attacked the Moderates for abandoning the campaign for swaraj, while some of the Moderates condemned the extremists as irresponsible agitators. Now the two sides came into clash in which sticks, lathis and chapels were freely used. The meeting ended in confusion. The next day the two sides held separate sessions. This marked the split. As a result the nationalist movement was much weakened, for the rival sections continued their struggle through press statements, circulars and pamphlets. The British took advantage of the situation to strengthen imperialism. They suppressed the extremists through repressive measures but conciliated the Moderates through constitutional reforms. At the Madras Session in 1908, as feared by the Extremists, the Congress dropped the resolution on boycott and welcomed the proposals of John Morely for reforms.

Coercion and Concession

In 1905 the Liberals captured power at the general election in Great Britain and formed the government. John Morely, who was noted for his liberal views, was appointed Secretary of state and Lord Minto succeeded Lord Curzon as Viceroy. The new administration followed a policy of repression as well as concession.

Accordingly, between 1907 and 1911 the British enacted a series of repressive legislations. Among them the most stringent were the Seditious Meetings Act, the Explosive Substances Act and the Indian Press Act. In addition there came circulars and ordinances aimed at concerning the nationalist. Armed with these measures the administration curtailed the right of speech and criticism, banned processions and meetings, barred the students from taking part in politics and threw the nationalists into prisons. It suppressed the new papers Yugantar and Bande Mataram, confiscated properties of the nationalist and sent police forces on raids, Lathi charges and police firings became the order of the day. Lajpat Rai was deported without trial, Aurobindo was sent to jail and Tilak was sentenced for imprisonment for six years. As a result the extremist movement lost its vigour and the Congress its vitality. In 1914 Tilak was released from Mandalay jail. The nationalists demanded the re-admission of the Extremists but Pherozeshah Mehta and his followers opposed the move. However, the situation turned favourable with the death of Mehta and Gokhale in 1915. Because of the initiative taken by Annie Besant, Tilak and his followers rejoined the Congress at its session at Lucknow in 1919.

In 1909 the British enacted the Indian Councils Act, otherwise called the Morely-Minto Reforms. This constitutional change that was under consideration for two years was intended to conciliate the Moderates. It provided for an increase in the size of the legislative councils, non-official majority in the provincial councils, election of few members of the councils and right to the councils to discuss matters of public and general importance

and to pass resolutions for the consideration of the Government. In a bid to weaken the influence of the nationalists and to win over the Muslims the Act introduced separate electorate for the Muslims.

As mentioned in the Montague Chelmsford Report, the Morely- Minto reforms proved inadequate, as there came no general advance in local bodies and no large admission of Indians into the public service. Though the principles of elections was recognized, only non –official members and not elected members formed majority in the provincial Councils. As these non-official members included nominated members too, the British could have their way in the councils, In the Imperials council the English retained an official majority, while Morely declared that these reforms were not intended to introduce a system of parliamentary government in India, Lord Minto too asserted that representative government of the western type was unsuited to India. In fact the Act made no concession to the demanded for swadraj, as interpreted by the Extremists or the Moderates.

Yet the Congress party that was dominated by the Moderates welcomed the reforms. Gokhale maintained that the people were to remain loyal to the British, rule, as no alternative to it for a long time to come. However, his appeal had no effect upon the revolutionary movement and the Extremists denounced his stand. In a bid to counter the nationalist propaganda he founded the Servants of India Society. The members of this society were required to accept the bonds with the British Empire as a necessity and self government within the Empire as their goal. The repressive measures, the constitutional reforms and the attitude of the Moderates, the Muslims and the princes created a situation favourable for continued imperialist sway.

MUSLIMS LEAGUE

The Muslims in general kept aloof form the loyalty-professing National Congress for long. The British administration was not acceptable to them. For it relegated the Muslims form their status as a ruling class to the background and suppressed them during the rebellion of 1857. The Congress was equally unacceptable to them, for the Hindus dominated it and their leaders criticized the Muslims aptitude. The general back ward ness of the Muslims of the Muslims in education and a feeling that they formed a minority also came in them way of their participation in the nationalist movement. However, in course of time they came out of their bewilderment and decided to create a party of their own.

It was the British policy of divide and rule that contributed to the consolidation of communalism in politics. Eager to play one community against another for safeguarding their interests, the British organized their military system on connunal lines. Thus there were Marava Battalions, Sikh Regiments and Gurukha Regiments in the Indian army. Also the British preferred the Hindis for appointment in the administrative set up, for they wanted to weaken the hold of the Muslims as political factor. The situation changed with the advent of the nationalist’s movement. The leaders, mostly Hindus turned critical of British imperialism and it appeared that the Muslims would joint the movement. Therefore

they cleverly decided to play upon the communal distinctions and to exploit the traditional hostility to their advantage.

Accordingly in 1888 the Reform Committee appointed by the British suggested representation of various interest on the legislative council on the basis of classes. Kimberley demanded representation for minority groups on the councils. Syed Ahmad Khan, an influential leader, declared that the Muslims formed a separate community and that their progress depended upon their co-operation with the British in opposition to the Hindus. In the elections to the legislative councils, set up under the Act of 1892, the Muslims failed to secure adequate representation. The British utilized this opportunity to assert that it was because of Hindu conspiracy and that as the Muslims formed a minority, they were at a disadvantage in any election. Instigated by their agents and a representation. Aga Khan led the deputation and met Lord Minto at Simla in 1906. In a memorandum signed by several of the Muslim leaders they demanded (1) a position commensurate with their numerical strength, their political importance and the value of their contribution to the defence of the British empire in any kind of representation. (2) the right to send their representatives to representative institutions through separate communal electorates (3) establishment of the Muslims University to serve as the centre of their religious and intellectual life, and (4) due representation for the Muslims in the local boards, university bodies, courts, public services and legislative councils.

It was felt that no central organization was necessary, for the Muslims could place their faith upon the British. The English agents too advised against the idea of forming a party, as they feared that it would lead to agitation against the empire. Yet several leaders felt that a central organization was essential not only to counter Hindu propaganda but also to protect the interest of their community and of Dacca the idea was accepted and in 1906 the Muslim league was created. It aimed at promoting Muslim loyalty to the British, protecting the political rights of the Muslims and preventing the rise of any feeling of hostility among the Muslims against other communities without prejudice to the other aims of the League. The establishment of the Muslim League not only ensured the Muslim support to the British but also sharpened communal antagonism.

THE GANDHIAN ERA

It was widely expected that the announcement of constitutional reforms in 1917 and the enactment of the Government of India Act in 1919 would usher in a period of political freedom and responsible government. But this did not happen. The British on the other hand proceeded to arm themselves with coercive laws and to repress nationalist aspirations. This policy, that was ruthlessly enforced, led to arrest, shooting and blood shed at several places. The Muslims in the meantime drew near to the several places. The Muslims in the meantime drew near to the Congress because of Khilafat Question. M.K. Gandhi, who was shooting into prominence during this period by virtue of his technique

resistance called Satyagraha, utilized the opportunity to bring the different interests under a common banner and to launch what was called the Non- Co – operation Movement.

The economic distress of the people gave a vigour to the struggle against imperialism. Though the war period was marked by normal harvests, there was considerable delay in the coming of monsoon rains in 1918 but then came a heavy down pour. As vast areas went affected by floods, essential articles like, cloth and oil went scarce and seasonal scarcity. In 1919 the monsoon failed again and there came more of suffering marked by more of scarcity, more of high prices and above all a severe epidemic.

Punjab Tragedy and Turkish Issue

The repressive measures inflicted upon a people who were suffering due to wartime pressures and natural calamities gave rise to revolutionary activity in the country. Determined to liberate the land through an armed uprising, the revolutionaries' smuggled in arms from the countries opposed to Great Britain. The Government now enacted the Defence of India Act and assumed powers to arrest persons suspected to be involved in revolutionary activity, to set up tribunals and to punish the victims with transportation for life or death. As the war was about to end, the Government decided to retain some of the powers acquired during this period. Accordingly it appointed a Committee under Justice Rowlatt to enquire into the revolutionary movement and to suggest the needed legislation to curb it. The committee proposed stringent measures to secure the conviction and punishment of the nationalist offender's and to check the spread of revolutionary crime. It also suggested the trial of such a crime by three judges without juries and to grant emergency powers to the provincial administration to intern the suspects. On the basis of its report the Government prepared two bills and introduced them in the Central Legislature in 1919. The bills, as they were calculated to curb the rights of the people, roused bitter opposition through out the country. Yet they were passed feared that the British were up to establish a system of tyranny and oppression at a time when they rendered meritorious services to the British for victory in the war.

Immediately after the bills were passed, the leaders including M.K. Gandhi, called upon the people to observe hartal in protest. In Delhi the shop keepers closed their shops and the mob clashed with the troops leading to the death of several patriots. The disturbances spread to Ahmadabad, Bombay, Calcutta, Lahore and Amritsar. As the Europeans were assaulted and communications were disrupted, martial law was enforced in several districts of the Punjab.

In protest against the deportation of leaders, the inhabitants of Amritsar took out a procession, but were fired upon. As the infuriated crowd, with the dead volunteers retreated, they set fire to buildings and fell upon the Europeans. On 13th April a mob about 20,000 strong, assembled at Jallianwallah Bagh, Amritsar, for a public meeting. At the crucial moment General Dyer in command of 150 troops arrived and without warning opened a severe and continuous firing. The victims were caught in a trap and were killed. According to

official version, which is normally goes shorts of truth about 400 people died and 1200 wounded. Subsequently Dyer asserted that he committed the massacre to produce a sufficient moral effect through out the country, the British appointed the Hunter Committee to enquire into the massacre. But to the dismay of the people the killer general was acquitted with a retirement order from service. The English men and women in India and abroad heaped honours and encomium upon this assassin. As a result the nationalists as well as the moderates were left greatly disillusioned.

By this time the Turkish Question turned the Muslims against the British. Though Turkey fought on the side of Germany, the Muslims expected that she would no be deprived of her home lands. But as the war ended, Greece moved into Thrace while Britain and France occupied her imperial possessions. Te Muslims held the Khalif, the Sultan of Turkey, in high esteem but he was deprived of his territories as well as powers. The Allied Powers justified their attitude on ground that the Khalif fought against them and the Arabs resented his authority. The Muslims of India on the other hand considered the humiliation of the Khalif as a great betrayal to the cause of Islam and launched the Khilafat Agitation. The Punjab wrong and the Turkish question brought the agitated Hindus and the excited Muslims closer against the British. This enabled Gandhi to organize the Non-Co- operation Movement.

Emergence of Gandhi

M.K. Gandhi, born in a wealthy family at Porbandar in Gujarat, studied law in England. He began his career as a lawyer in the Bombay High Court and visited South Africa for conducting a law suit in Natal. As lawyer at the Supreme Court of South Africa, he look up the cause of the Indian settlers and opposed the law that required the Asiatic to register their names. As a result he suffered imprisonment for two terms. Again he fought successfully for the removal of an obnoxious and discriminates tax, that was imposed on the Indian labour in the coal mines of Nata and against the attempt to deny vote to the people of Asiatic origin. This struggle gave him an opportunity to experiment with passive resistance, called satyagraha, which meant holding fast to truth. This concept that was based on India's cultural heritage involved non-violent method of non-co-operation and civil disobedience, marked by meditation, fasting, silence and moral resistance.

Gandhi returned to India with the reputation of a popular leader. He proceeded to champion the cause of the tenants of Bihar against the indigo planters and of the tax payers of Karia in Bombay against the Government. Yet he believed in the rights and duties of the citizens of the British empire and accordingly called upon the educated people to extend their co-operation to the Government for gaining home rule. During World War 1 he supported the war effort and himself served as a recruiting agent, for he felt that if the British Empire collapsed, it would be disastrous to India. In the same spirit he favoured the Montford Reforms and called upon the Congress to accept them in a spirit of co-operation. In fact while fighting against the injustices in the political system, he wanted to do so with the good wil of the British.

However, the subsequent developments turned Gandhi into a rebel. The British enacted the Rowlatt Act and imposed severe restrictions upon the right of the people. The Punjab wrongs. Particularly the public floggings. Lathi charges, crawling orders and shootings startled his conscience. Though innocent people were shot dead, the culprits in the service of the Government were given rewards and permitted to draw their salaries and pensions from the Indian revenues. As a result he condemned the British rule as satanic, for he was convinced that the reforms represented no change of heart on the side of the British, except as a method for the extension of India's servitude. Now he proceeded to bring the National Congress and the Khilafat Conference into a united front for launching the Non-Co-operation Movement.

In 1920 in an atmosphere of resentment and despair the National Congress met in a special session at Calcutta, with Lajpat Rai as President. A resolution that was moved by M.K. Gandhi demanded the grant of swaraj and suggested no-co-operation with the British for attaining it. The Congress ratified this resolution at Nagpur in the same year. The Non-Co-operation Movement envisaged a two fold programme constructive as well as non-co-operative. The constructive programme sought a social awakening through the encouragement of the use of swadeshi goods, prohibition of the consumption of intoxicants, removal of untouchability, promotion of communal harmony and the establishment of national schools. The non-co-operation movement on the other hand sought political change-the attainment of responsible government through disobedience of unjust legislations. Refusal of taxes, resignation from offices and boycott of legislatures, courts and schools. In the context of the times the principle appeared so revolutionary that it touched the imagination of many.

However, several leaders opposed the move. Annie Besant considered it undesirable, for she feared that it would destroy law and order. M.A. Jinnah declared that the Gandhian method would create conflicts in the society and would lead the country to disaster. V.S. Srinivasa Satri and P.S. Sivasamy Aiyar felt that the no-co-operation was mythical and hence suggested co-operation with the British in the working of reforms and for the gradual attainment of swaraj. S. Satyamurti too questioned the wisdom of boycott of the councils. C.R.Das who fought against the boycott of councils at the Calcutta session asserted; "What you have earned through toil and struggle for the last thirty five years, you should not give up by entirely shutting yourself out". In fact while Rajendra Prasad, Vallabhai Patel, Rajaji and Prakasam stood by Gandhi on the issue of boycott of councils, C.R. Das, Motilal Nehru and S. Satymurti favoured council entry. Gandhi won over C. R. Das at the Nagpur session but in 1923 C.R. Das and his followers organized the Swaraj Party within the Congress, favouring council entry. Jinnah, Bipin Chandra Pal and Annie Besant on the other hand left the Congress Party.

The Congress launched the Non-Co-operation Movement immediately after the Nagpur Session, The news paper, Tamil Nadu published from Salem Wrote: "We have commenced a war in History. Hence every man and woman above the age of 18 should march to the forefront of the battle". The people responded to the call with considerable

enthusiasm. They hoisted national flags, installed photographs of national leaders at public places and organized demonstrations. The boycott programme progressed with much success. In response to the appeals made by the Congress Party and the Khilafat Conference most of the people boycotted the elections that were held under the Act of 1919. However, the Liberals and the Justice Party contested the elections and entered the councils. The lawyers boycotted the law courts, while the students left the schools. Some people renounced the titles and honours that they collected from the British. Also some of the people resigned their offices to join the movement. At several places foreign goods were burned and the auction of liquor shop was prevented; causing loss of revenue to the British. Hartals, strikes, procession, demonstration and meetings created a disturbed situation over vast areas the Duke of Connaught reached India to inaugurate the new reforms but he people greeted him every where with black flags and hartals. The Prince of Wales arrived in 1922 but the Congress observed a hartal on the day of his arrival. The attitude of the Congress angered the British.

But, the Congress programme appeared ineffective. Though the Congress Party and the Khilafat Conference boycotted the elections, the Liberal Party and the Justice party extended their co-operation to the British. Though some lawyers and students boycotted courts and classes respectively. Others did not join. Hartals and demonstrations caused embarrassment to the government but they did not paralyze the administration. The constructive programme too did not progress smoothly. In view of these the Congress at its session at Ahmadabad in 1921 decided to intensify the movement and directed Gandhi to carry it on in the manner that he considered appropriate. Accordingly he gave an ultimatum to Lord Reading, the Viceroy, to withdraw all repressive laws under threat of non-payment of taxes.

Collapse of the Movement

However, there came no intensified struggle. The contradictions in the Congress Khilafat Movement, repressive measures of the administration, the violence that attended the agitation and the general indifference of the masses rendered the continuation of the struggle a risky adventure.

The opposition to the non-co –operation programme came from moderates as well as radicals. The Moderates or Liberals as they came to be known, declared the reforms of 1919 as a great advance towards attainment of self government and accordingly extended their co-operation in the working of reforms. Among the leaders who opposed the Gandhian technique were Jinnah, Besant, Pal and Rabindranath Tagore. The revolutionaries on the other hand felt that the policy of non-violence implied non-retaliation and it would render the nationalists ineffective against the British irritants. The Muslims in the meantime turned lukewarm towards the movement, Kemal Pasha of Turkey abolished the Khilafat and as a result they found it no more necessary to fight for a cause that was already lost through internal action.

The British sought to suppress the movement by repression, What irritated them most were the demonstrations organized against the Duke of Connaught and the hartal observed on the arrival of the Prince of Wales. In consequence lathi charges arrests, shooting and imprisonment were extensively resorted to. Though Gandhi was left free, the prominent leaders and about 20,000 Congress volunteers languished in prisons by end of the year 1921. The freedom fighters were kept handcuffed in the hot sun, housed with scavengers and lepers and served with dirty water and poor food. Early in 1922 the Nagasaki reported; "The signs of the present times are bad enough, Repressive measures are progressing fast like the hot morning sun".

The Non-Co – operation was intended as a non violent struggle but before long it non –violent character. The Khilafat and Non-Co-operation propaganda led to clashes. In Malabar the Hindu Nayers and the Muslim Moplas entertained a tradition of hostility. The Nayers were land lords, orthodox Hindus and allied to the ruling houses. The Moplas were mostly tenants, fanatical Muslims and allied to the trading houses. Greatly excited by the appeals made by the Khilafat leaders and the speeches made by the Ali Brothers Muhammad Ali and Shaukat Ali, the Moplas collected arms and prepared for the establishment of the kingdom of Islam. Following an attempt made by the police to capture a few Moplas, who were found in possession of deadly arms there began a wide spread uprising. They proclaimed Ali Muzaliar as their ruler and gained control of Ernad and Valluvanad. After killing a number of Europeans, they fell upon the Hindus on suspicion that the latter worked against their interests. In Ernad, Valluvanad Ponnai and Calicut they committed outrages on men, women and children. The reports suggested that a large number of people including young boys and pregnant women were cut to pieces and left on roadsides and jungles, Innocent children were murdered before their parents , women were carried away and men were flayed or burnt alive, Wells and tanks were filled with dead and half dead people. Houses were looted, temples were desecrated and Hindus were forcibly converted to Islam. As the troops stationed in Malabar found it impossible to cope with the situation, the British deployed forces from outside. In a battle fought at Pandikad the Gurkhas lost sixty killed, while the Moplas lost 250 killed. Throughout the operations about 3,000 Moplas were killed but their leader put the figure at 10,000. For want of ventilation in a train compartment a batch of seventy prisoners died of suffocation. By end of 1921 the Moplas were suppressed. The Congress leaders refused to believe the horrors committed by the Moplas and Gandhi even sought to play down the issue. But as the refugees swelled in number and as they narrated the tales of woe, the relations between the Hindus and the Muslims came to be greatly strained.

At Chauri Charura in U.P. The Congress volunteers picketed the shops dealing with liquor and foreign cloth. As they were beaten up, a mob assembled and pelted stones on the police. This led to firing but when the police exhausted their ammunition, the enraged mob set fire to the police camp with some twenty two police men inside on February 5, 1922; Gandhi now convened a meeting of the Congress Working Committee and suspended the Non-Co-operation Movement. While some leaders welcomed this decision, others

condemned it as disappointing. Rajaji, Motilal Nehru, the Ali Brother and Lajpat Rai were dissatisfied with the suspension of the agitation. The British administration arrested Gandhi and sentenced him for imprisonment for six years, without exciting any nationalists opposition. The Movement collapsed and the Congress withdrew into its constructive programme.

Certain factors contributed to the failure of the movement. Eager to forge a Hindu-Muslim unity, the Congress co-operated with the Khilafat Conference. While the goal of the Congress was national that of the Conference was religious, creating contradiction in the programme. The people were not enthusiastic either in India or even in the Turkish Empire to support the discredited Khalif, who gained notoriety in the oppression of the Muslims and atrocities on the Christians. When the movement was suspended by the Congress, the Muslims blamed the Hindus for not extending their full support. The Malabar riots worsened the situation. In the wake of the movement there came communal disharmony and riots, which neutralized the effectiveness of the struggle. Secondly, the principle of ahimsa proved unworkable. The country was not prepared for a disciplined behavior and the people as elsewhere were not prepared to face lathis and bullets as dumb animals. Thirdly, the Congress boycotted the council entry but it gave an opportunity to the traitors and opportunists to assume the reins of power and to co-operate with the British. The combination of imperialism and opportunism worked against national interests. Finally, when much was expected the Congress Working Committee decided on a sudden suspension of the movement. Gandhi resorted to this extreme step to save the movement but its effect proved disappointing to the nationalists.

Yet the positive gains made by the nationalism cannot be denied. The Congress Party which spearheaded the movement transformed into united and strong organization. It has a dynamic leader in Gandhi, a desired goal in swaraj and a direct action programme in passive resistance. The Swarajists did not agree with council boycott but they worked within the Congress ranks. Secondly, it contributed to self reliance. Because of the swadeshi movement there came to be established a number of national schools and local industries. This in turn weakened the influence of European trade. Further, the Non-co - operation Movement strengthened the spirit of nationalism. This mass campaign involved people all over the country even in distant tracts and remote villages. The Nationalist newspapers despite the restrictions imposed by the British, reported the development and kept the inhabitants informed. The people on the other hand became familiar with hartals, strikes and demonstrations on the one hand and lathis, bullets and jails on the other. Through bitter experiences and suffering, they developed spirit of defiance and sacrifice in the interest of the nation.

**Nehru Report, Sun ion Commission Civil Disobedience Movement
And
Round Table Conference**

With the collapse of the Non-Co-operation Movement imperialism reasserted itself. The British relied on repression, sent the leaders to Jails, exploited Hindu – Muslim differences and allied themselves with the opportunists. Communalism, that remained dormant in several areas during the agitation, again raised its head. The movement called Shuddi and Sangathan, organized by the Hindus, and that of Tablig and Tanzeem formed by the Muslims in defence of their respective religions, led to clashes and deaths. In opposition to each other the Muslim league and the Hindu Mahasabha extended the areas of their operation. Despite these contradictions the press through its writings and the nationalists through their meetings kept alive the spirit of nationalism.

Pro changers and No changers

At the special session of the Congress at Calcutta in 1920 the party decided to boycott the councils and the elections as part of its non-co-operation programme. C.R. Das opposed this move, but at the regular session, that was held at Nagpur in the same year he joined hands with Gandhi and secured the ratification of the Boycott programme. However, the failure of the Non-co- operation Movement led several leaders doubt the efficacy of council boycott C.R. Das, President of the congress in 1922, at the session that was held at Gaya demanded a change in the policy of council boycott but the party adopted a resolution moved by Rajaji opposing any changes in the policy of council boycott. Those who favoured a change in the policy of council boycott came to be known as Pro-changers and those who opposed this change were called no – changers C.R. Das led the Pro-changers, while Rajaji the No – changers.

C.R. Das and his pro-changers felt that the council boycott was a failure for the Liberals, the Justicites and the like minded parties took advantage of this attitude of the Congress and entered the councils to support the British. Therefore, he was convinced that a change in this policy would enable the congress not only to extend its activity to the councils but also to offer non-co-operation form within. On this ground C.R. Das resigned his presidency of the Congress and supported by Motilal Nehru organized the Swaraj Party as a group within the Congress in 1923. The Congress in a special session at Delhi in the same year permitted the Swarajists to take part in the general elections but refused to assume any official responsibility for the policy of the Swarajists.

Work of the Swarajists

As leaders of the new party, C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru, explained the Swarajist programme. According to them their party sought to capture the councils with a view to mending if not ending them, to prevent the liberals and other opportunists from entering

the councils , to check the autocracy of the Government through a policy of non-co – operation within the councils and to compel the British to revise the Constitution through a policy of obstructing the working of diarchy. At their first conference, that was held at Allahabad in 1923, they decided on the immediate attainment of dominion status for India as their goal.

The Swarajist programme excited much hope among the nationalists but in practice it proved not very successfully. In the election of 1923 it secured a clear majority in the Central province and emerged as the largest group in Bengal. In other provinces too they captured a large number of seats. As the Swarajists secured forty eight out of 105 elected seats in the Central Legislature, they formed a coalition with the independents led by M. A. Jinnah on a policy of uniform, continuous and persistent obstruction. This enabled them to prevent the Government from having its way in the Central Legislature.

In 1924 the Swarajists secured the following resolution passed by the Central Legislature – “that step should be taken to have the Act of 1919 revised with a view to establish full responsible Government in India, and for that purpose to summon at an early date, a representative Round Table Conference to recommend with due regard to the protection of the rights and interest of important minorities, a scheme for the constitution of India – “ It was expected that the Labour Party which came to power with Macdonald as Prime Minister, would accept this resolution. But as this did not happen, the Swarajists followed a persistent policy of obstruction. Accordingly, they voted against the finance bills in the Central Assembly and refused to form the ministries in Central Province and Bengal, where they commanded a majority in the provincial assemblies. Also they criticized the administration. Demanded release of political prisoners, staged walk outs and boycotted official functions. Unable to overcome their oppositions the British had to suspend the working of diarchy in Central Provinces and Bengal and to rely on special responsibility of governors for running the administration. In response to a resolution passed by the central Legislature, the Government appointed an enquiry committee under the Alexander Muddiman to report on the working of diarchy. The Muddiman Committee however, submitted a report in favour of the continued working of diarchy.

The decline of the Swaraj Party was as sudden as its rise. In an atmosphere of frustration created by the suspension of the Non-Co –operation Movement it held out a hope to the country and captured a large number of seats in the legislatures. Yet before long its programme lost its glamour and failed in practice. In 1924 Viceroy Reading released Gandhi from Jail. Party because of his illness and party because of popular demand. C.R. Das and Motilal Nehru met Gandhi at Juhu near Bombay and sought his support to the Programme of Council entry. But Gandhi declared that he considered council entry as opposed to the principle of non-co-operation. In 1926 C.R. Das Passed away and in his death the Swarajists lost their unifying force. The party contested the election of 1926 but the result was not encouraging. Many of the leaders left and the party disintegrated.

The decline of the Swarajists was because of the want of adequate support of the Congress, its failure to paralyse the working of government and the want of unity in their ranks. M.K. Gandhi had no faith in the efficacy of their programme. After he was jailed, Rajaji ably led the opposition against their programme within the Congress. Unable to pursue its policy as an independent organization and unable to gain the support of the Congress to its programme, the Swaraj Party could not emerge as an effective. To begin with the programme had a limited appeal. This was because the suspension of the Non-cooperation appeared derogatory to the nationalists. Through experience the people learned that the Swarajist programme too was negative and ineffective. In addition, most of the leaders who joined the party, had no conviction in their professed ideals. Finding that electoral victory brought no material reward, many of them left the party to take up offices or to extend co-operation to the administration. Two of them, Lajpat Rai and Madan Mohan Malaviya, founded the Nationalist Party and contributed to the defeat of the swarajists in the election of 1926. Yet it should be admitted that the party rendered certain services to nationalism. It held aloft the banner of resistance to British rule during a period when the Congress withdrew into the cell of constructive programme. Also through the programme of council entry it tried to reach the masses and to give an opportunity to the nationalists to train themselves in parliamentary methods. In South India R.K. Shanmugam Chetty Party and Varadarajulu Naidu, two prominent leaders of the Justice party went over to the Congress at the invitation of C.R. Das. This process helped in the disintegration of the Justice Party and transformation of the Congress party in South India from a Brahmin association into a Dravidian organization.

Issue of Dominion Status

As different times the Central Assembly considered resolutions on the establishment of responsible government. A resolution moved by Rai Bahadur Majumdar in 1921 demanded the establishment of responsible government except in military, foreign and political departments by 1924 and home rule by 1922. Another resolution tabled by T. Rangachariar in 1924 initiated a constitutional debate, an amendment move by Motilal Nehru to this resolution called for an early revision of the Act of 1919 to establish full responsible government. It was carried by a large majority, all elected members voting in support. In the light of this decision the Government appointed the Reforms Enquiry Committee presided over by Alexander Muddiman. While the majority, consisting of Europeans and officials suggested only minor changes to remedy the defects, the minority consisting of Liberals and moderates suggested major changes so as to provide for stability in the government and the willing co-operation of the people.

However, it was only in 1927, as provided by the Act of 1919 that Viceroy Irwin announced the appointment of Indian Statutory Commission, with John Simon as President, to enquire into the working of the Reforms of 1919 and to report as to whether and to what extent it was desirable to establish the principle of responsible government. Enraged

at the all white composition of the commission, the political parties condemned it as derogatory to the dignity of India and refused their co-operation. At its session held at Madras in 1927 the Congress decided to boycott the Commission and to organize mass demonstrations.

On February 3, 1929 the Commission landed at Bombay. The people greeted it with black flags with the word, 'boycott' inscribed on them. In protest the shop keepers closed their shops, lawyers boycotted the courts and the students left the classes. The Central Legislature adopted a resolution moved by Lajpat Rai that the scheme of the Commission was unacceptable to it. To counter the protest movement the Government organized welcome parties and set up anti-national elements to greet the commission. As Ten Nadu reported, the government persuaded leaders with no followers, preachers with no audience and self seekers with no self respect to present welcome address to the Commission. Not content with this, the administration raided the houses of the nationalists, arrested the leaders and lathi charged the volunteers. Agitation and repression followed the Commission, where ever it went.

Despite the opposition it faced, the Commission made a thorough study of the constitutional problem and spent more than two years to prepare its report. It attributed the failure of diarchy to the inherent weakness of the system and to communal conflict. In its report the Commission recommended the retention of the India Council to advise the Secretary of state, the reconstitution of the Central Legislature on federal principle and the transfer of all provincial subjects to popular ministers with certain safeguards. The Commission also proposed that instead of providing for the review of the constitutional progress, the new constitution should be made so flexible as to admit changes.

As it was expected, the Simon Report fell short of the expectations of the nationalists. Even the Labour Government that succeeded the Tory Government in Great Britain showed not much of enthusiasm for the Report. This was because the British, according to the Report, were to retain the substance of authority. It did not provide either for dominion status or for responsible government. Defence and army were to remain under British control. The princes and the Muslims retained with them a privileged status as usual. Though provincial autonomy was recommended. The Governor –General as well as the provincial governor continued to possess overriding authority. Yet many of the recommendations made in the Report found their way in the Government of India Act of 1935.

In 1927 the Indian National Congress met at Madras. It set complete independence as the goal of India. The next year in response to a challenge wielded by the Commission to produce an agreed constitution, an All Parties Conference was held at Delhi. A sub committee presided by Motilal Nehru and appointed by this conference produced a draft constitution in what was called Nehru Report. It set the attainment of dominion status as the immediate goal of India and called upon the British to establish full responsible government on lines of self governing dominions. The Report envisaged a federal set up, with autonomy for the provinces, division of the subjects into central and provincial lists and

retention of residuary powers with centre. India was to be a secular state with guarantees for minority interests and reservation of seats in joint electorates for minority communities instead of communal electorates.

The All Parties Conference that met at Lucknow accepted the Nehru Report but subsequently there came differences. The nationalists Muslims favoured it but Jinnah demanded weight age representation for the Muslims in legislatures and cabinets. In his Fourteen Points, which were approved by the Muslims League Jinnah demanded that: India should be a federal state with residuary powers for the provinces, the communities were to be free to have separate electorates, the Muslims should have one third of the total representation in the Central Legislature and cabinets, they should have adequate share in the services subject to efficiency, there should be no territorial change as to affect Muslim majority in Bengal, the Punjab and North West Frontier Province, adequate state help should be given for the promotion of Muslim culture and no change in the Constitution should be made by Central Assembly except with the concurrence of the units constituting the federation. Both the Nehru Report and the Jinnah's Points wanted the separation of Sind from Bombay and an equal status for the North West Frontier Province with the other provinces. Within the Congress the younger section led by Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose raised opposition to the Nehru Report. Nothing short of complete independence would satisfy them. The newspaper Congress Sitanagaram deplored the defeatist attitude of the Nehru Committee for it wrote: "While the Madras Congress had clearly stated that complete national independence was the ideal of India, it is deplorable that the Nehru Committee should have prepared its scheme having for its basis the ideal of dominion status".

The Congress was divided over the issue of dominion status and complete independence. Therefore, at the instance of Gandhi a compromise was worked out. Accordingly, Congress was to demand dominion status for India and if that were not accepted within two years it was to set its goal as complete independence. By this time the Labour Party came to power in England. With Ramsay Macdonald as Prime Minister. At the instance of the new ministry Viceroy Irwin made a proclamation in 1929 setting dominion status as the goal of India's constitutional progress. There upon Gandhi and other leaders met the Viceroy at Delhi to seek a clarification whether a constitution on basis of dominion status would be framed by a proposed round table conference. But the Viceroy gave no definite assurance.

Civil Disobedience

The country again moved towards a crisis. The leaders were agitated as the Viceroy refused to give a definite assurance on the attainment of responsible government. The Labour ministry appeared sympathetic to the cause of India, but it had neither the will nor the ability to introduce reforms in view of the opposition of the Tories. The leaders sought the release of political prisoners but Lord Irwin not only did not yield but also continued repression in his attempt to keep the agitation under control. An economic depression that

came by this time added to the suffering of the people. In this situation there was a the fear that the movement for freedom would go out of the control of the Congress and pass into a violent struggle under the leadership of the communist Party. Saunders, a police officer at Lahore was murdered, at Delhi a bomb was thrown at the Central Legislature and an attempt was made to blow up the Viceroy's train. At Lahore a bomb factory was a detected an it appeared that a violent revolution was in the making. These circumstances demanded that the Congress should face the situation with resolution.

In 1929 the Congress held its session at Lahore with Jawaharlal Nehru as President. It adopted a resolution on purnaswaraj or complete independence and called upon the people to devote themselves to the attainment of freedom. The Congress observed the 26th of January as 'Independence Day' Jawaharlal Nehru hoisted the tricolor flag of independence at Lahore on the bank of the Ravi. A resolution moved by Gandhi, called upon the Government to reduce land tax, abolish salt tax and enforce proment, the Congress working Committee launched the Civil Disobedience Movement for the attainment of British authority by means of power, generated by political agitation and constructive work.

Gandhi decided to launch the movement with the violation of the salt law. The government increased the tax on salt, causing hardship to the poor. Accompanied by seventy nine trained volunteers he left his Sabarmati Ashram on March 12, 1930 to the sea shore at Dandi to pick up salt. The party covered the distance of 200 miles in twenty four days. On April 6 he picked up salt lying on the beach. This marked the signal to the mass movement. At different places the patriots violated the slat law, picketed liquor shops, destroyed foreign cloth, abstained form schools and offices and refused payment of taxes. Action councils and boycott committees constituted by the provincial committees of the congress Party directed the movement in different provinces. In the far South Rajaji led the first batch of volunteers form Tiruchirapalli to Vedaranyam. Volunteers from Burma, Ceylon, Madras and Bombay joined this group. As they broke salt laws and collected salt, they were arrested and thrown into jails. At Udayavanam near Madras T. Prakasam set up his camp, but the police raided it and arrested the volunteers. In a clash with the crowd the police shot as per official report, three persons dead. Yet throughout the country men, women and children joined the movement on a massive scale. The Pathans, led by Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, took part in the movement but most of the Muslims kept away, for Jinnah declared that Gandhi aimed at the enslavement of the Muslims to Hindu Mahasabha and not the independence of the country.

By June 1930 the Civil Disobedience became widespread. At several places the administration, was brought to a stand still. Textile mills and liquor shops were closed at numerous places. However, the British administration employed their Indian police and military for the suppression of the struggle. More than 60,000 volunteers were arrested and thrown into jail. The arrested patriots were subjected to all forms of inhuman barbarity. The wounded men were dragged and thrown into hedges or slat water. Pins and thorns were driven into sensitive parts and people were stripped naked and beaten even after they became unconscious. When these atrocities. Confiscation of properties and destruction of

homes proved ineffective the unarmed crowds were fired upon. At Dharsana, where the volunteers raided the salt works, they were subjected to brutal treatment. There were firings and deaths at Sholapur, Peshawar and Madras. Yet the British and their Indians failed to crush the movement.

Round Table Conferences

In May 1930 the British Government published the Simon Report but for want of understanding and sympathy India greeted it with universal opposition. Yet in accordance with Irwin's declaration the Government convened a Round Table Conference at London. Presided over by Ramsay Macdonald and attended by sixty three persons from India and sixteen from Britain it remained in session from November, 12, 1930 to January 19, 1931. The Congress did not attend, as its leaders were in jail and as it received no assurance that it would frame a constitution based on dominion status. The Viceroy nominated the delegates from India but they did not represent the people.

Despite its irregular composition, the Round Table Conference had some achievements to its credit. The delegates accepted the suggestion of Macdonald for a federal set up consisting of provinces and princely states in a bicameral legislature. Tej Bahadur Sapru, Maharaja of Bikaner, Nawab of Bhopal, Muhammad Shafi and Jinnah were among the leaders who supported the proposal. The other decisions were the establishment of a diarchy at the centre and full responsible government for the provinces. However, the Governor – General was to have special powers and the Governors were to have special responsibilities. The Muslims demanded separate representation and Ambedkar advocated reservation of seats for the Harijans, but the Hindi leaders insisted upon joint electorates. However, no settlement was arriving at on these points.

Lord Irwin in an attempt to conciliate the Congress lifted the ban on the party and released the prisoners including Gandhi in February 1931. On March 5 through the efforts of Sapru and Jayakar the Gandhi-Irwin Pact was signed. Accordingly, Gandhi suspended the Civil Disobedience and agreed to join the Round Table Conference, Irwin agreed to withdraw cases against political prisoners and release them, except those charged with violence, from prisons, permit people living on sea shores to collect salt without being taxed, to permit peaceful picketing of shops dealing with liquor, foreign goods and opium and to restore the possession of properties, confiscated because of agitation, But immediately after the pact was signed, Viceroy Willington who succeeded Lord Irwin, executed Bhagat Singh, Rajaguru and Sukhadev, who were convicted in the Lahore Conspiracy case. Therefore several leaders condemned the pact because of Gandhi's failure to secure the unconditional release of all political prisoners, though many welcomed the pact as a great gain and the Congress ratified it at its session at Karachi.

In 1931 the Labour ministry went out of power and national government mostly Tory came to power in Great Britain Samuel Hoare, a Conservative, became secretary of State. Lord Willington, the Governor – General under the new ministry showed no regard for the Gandhi –Irwin Pact and let loose a policy of repression. Yet Gandhi came to an understanding with the Governor – General and decided to attend the Second Round Table

Conference was called to seek an amicable settlement of the Indian constitutional question but the new ministry was not inclined for it. While Gandhi represented the national interests, most of the other delegates represented the sectional interests. The conference began on September 7, 1931. The British explored the communal differences for the advancement of their cause, for they employed the Muslims and the princes to counter the Congress demands Gandhi demands the grant of responsible government for India and pleaded for finding a solution to the communal problem. But he failed because of the stubborn attitude of the British and because of the insistence of the Muslims and the Sikhs for privileges and weight age. As a result he returned to India disappointed and exhausted.

Return to the struggle

The developments during the Second Round Table Conference cast an air of gloom among the nationalists. The Labour Party went out of power and the Conservatives assume authority in Britain. Secretary Samuel Hoare and Viceroy Willington were determined to suppress the popular movement. In violation of the Gandhi –Irwin Pact the British enforced a reign of terror in several parts of the country, In Bengal repression by the police excited opposition and the administration of Chittagong imposed a form of martial law. In the North West Frontier the Red Shirt movement was declared illegal and the leaders including Gaffar Khan were sent to prison. In U.P. a no tax campaign organized by the by the peasants was suppressed. At the Round Table Conference too Gandhi found his experience most disappointing. Though he represented the Congress, his views received not much of consideration. Both the Muslims and the Harijans refused to identify their aspirations to the nationalist cause.

Gandhi and the Congress working Committee offered their co-operation to the Government in finding a settlement to the problems under threat of the resumption of the movement. But the British responded with a midnight arrest of Gandhi and other leaders. They banned the Congress and the auxiliary associations like the students Association and the Youth League. The police raided the Congress offices, arrested the nationalists and their sympathizers. They seized funds and documents and confiscated properties. The meetings were banned and the press was denied permission to report this development. Restrictive regulations and ordinances were promulgated with a view to cover almost every field of public activity. These measures were so drastic that the people were subjected to frequent lathi charges arrest, imprisonment and shooting. Finding no other way the country again drifted into another Civil Disobedience Movement.

During the early months of the year 1932 the Congress carried on the resistance with unabated vigour. Determined to fight a treacherous enemy, the patriots sought the support of the public servants, the workers, peasants and the students. The Police decided to stand by the enemy but the students drifted into the movement. Meetings, demonstrations, satyagraha, hartal picketing, staging of dramas and singing of patriotic songs formed the different manifestations of the nationalist struggle. Among the themes of the dramas were the victory of the charka, use of Khaddar and martyrdom of the patriots like Bhagat Singh.

As the volunteers sang patriotic songs, they sang with the thakhlis. Flag salutations and 'independence' day celebrations too became common.

Viceroy Willington decided to crush the Congress in six week's time. With this end in view he resorted to arrest, torture and imprisonment on an intensive as well as extensive scale. Mrs. J.M. Sen Gupta, who presided over a session of the Congress at Calcutta in 1933 asserted that about 1,26,000 people were thrown into prisons in fifteen months. The satyagrahis were kept hand cuffed and beaten on road sides and in custody. The police forces lathi charged the crowds broke meetings and frequently resorted to firings. Among the patriots who perished during this period was Tirupur Kumaran.

The British also adopted measures to divide and weaken the movement. They encouraged loyalist gatherings, celebrated Emperor's birth day and supported anti nationalist newspapers. In August 1932 Prime Minister Ramsay Macdonald announced his Communal Award, as the different communities failed to agree to a formula to settle the communal issue at the Second Round Table Conference. It recognized the Harijans as a minority and allocated seats in the provincial legislatures on a communal basis to the Muslims, Sikhs and Christians. The Muslims in Hindu majority provinces were given more than proportionate representation while the same was denied to the Hindus in Muslim majority provinces. Thus the Award was not only undemocratic but also intended to promote the conflict between the Hindus and the Muslims as well as between caste Hindus and other Hindus.

As a protest Gandhi commenced a fast unto death on September 22, 1932. Thereupon Rajendra Prasad and Malaviya held discussions with the Harijan leaders, Ambedkar and M.C. Rajah, and signed the Poona Pact on September 26th. Gandhi now broke the fast. The British Government as well as the Hindu Mahasabha approved the Pact. Under its terms the Harijans were allotted 148 reserved seats against 71 in Macdonald's Award. They were given about twenty percent of the seats in Central Legislature, assured of adequate representation in local bodies and public services and promised financial support to promote literacy. This settlement helped in the restoration of confidence among the communities whom the caste Hindus considered as untouchables.

Much against their will yet intended to regain the sympathy of the moderates; the British convened the Third Round Table Conference on November 17, 1932. While Congress was denied representation, only a few 'safe' delegates were invited. The questions relating to safeguards for imperial interests in India, the terms under which the Indian states could join the federal set up and the distribution of residuary powers were discussed. The delegates from British India sought to include a bill of rights for the people on the agenda but it was vetoed. The British announced the creation of the new provinces of Sind and Orissa and allotment of one third of the seats in the Federal Assembly to the Muslims. In the light of the proceedings of the Round Table Conferences the British Government published a White paper in March 1933.

Early in 1933 it was clear that the Movement was heading towards a certain collapse. The leaders were in jails and the nationalists were demoralized. Gandhi on release from Yervada Jail on May 8, 1933 announced the suspension of the struggle. He sought a settlement with the Viceroy, failing which the Congress permitted the individual satyagraha too was withdrawn and hence the All India Congress Committee was allowed to hold its session in peace. The devoted service rendered by the Indians in the police and armed establishments of the British dissensions among the religious and communal groups and losing confidence of the people in the efficacy of Gandhian technique to cope with determined repression accounted for the failure of the Movement.

COMMUNAL AWARD AND POONA PACT

As the Civil Disobedience Movement was in progress the British Prime Minister Ramsay Mac Donald announced his Communal Award on 17th August 1932. The scope of the Award was confined to the arrangements to be made for the representation of British Indian communities in the Provincial Legislatures> Representation in the Central Legislature was deferred for the time being. Under the terms of the communal award 1) The Muslims, Europeans and Sikhs would have separated communal electorates; 2) all qualified voters who were not voters in the reserved constituencies were entitled to vote in a general constituency; 3) Seven seats were to be reserved for the Marathas in certain plural member constituencies in Bombay; 4) separate electorates were to be given to the Depressed Classes; 5) the Anglo- Indians were to be elected on communal lines; and 6) special seats allotted to Commerce and Industry, Mining and Plantation were to be filled through Chambers of Commerce and other Associations. Provision was also made for landholders constituencies.

The Communal award accorded Government recognition to the minority communities. It was mischievous, malicious, motivated and meaningless. It was mischievous because it undermined Communal Unity and national and occupation. It was motivated because constituencies were reserved for Indian Christians and woman who never demanded separate representation. It was meaningless because the Sikhs and Europeans were given disproportionate representation. The Award was most unfair to Bengal. It sacrificed Bengal to the Muslims and Europeans leaving no autonomy to the sons of the soil. "It was a grossly unfair to the Hindus, most so the Hindus of Bengal and the Punjab were they from minorities" If implemented, the Award would only widen the gap between the various minority communities and the rest of the population. In short, the Communal Award carried the vicious seeds of separatism.

Poona Pact

The announcement of Communal Award caused consternation through out the country Gandhi declared for the Yervada jail that he would resist the Award with his life. He considered the Award as an avoidable imposition. On 18th August 1932 Gandhi wrote to

Ramsay Mac Donald about his decision to fast unto death. He received a leisurely reply on 12th September imputing inimical intention in respect of Depressed Classes. Gandhi commenced his fast on 20th September. His fast had a telling effect on the country. On the initiative of Malavia a conference of the Hindu leaders was convened in Poona. After prolonged parleys between Malavia, Sapru, Rajendra Prasad, Amritlal Thakkar, C. Rajagopalachari, Birla, Sardar Patel, Sarojini Naidu, Hridayanath Kunzru, Ambedkar., M.C. Raja and others an agreement known as the Poona Pact was arrived at. The Pact approved by Gandhi, the Depressed Classes and the British Government, was simultaneously announced in London and in Delhi on 26th September 1932. Gandhi broke his fast at 5.15 p.m. on the same day.

According to the Poona Pact 1) there were to be no separate electorates for the Depressed Classes; 2) They were to contest in the general electorates along with other Hindus; 3) they were to have a specific number of reserved seats in the general electorate; 4) they were to elect by themselves four candidates for each reserved seat and the general electorates choice would be confined to one of these four, 5) the Depressed Classes Primary elections were to last for five years; and 6) adequate representation was to be given to them in local bodies and public Services.

The Poona package was a commendable compromise under the circumstance. It was widely welcomed in the country. It saved Gandhi from his fateful fast. The caste Hindus heeded his call to uplift the Depressed Classes. The untouchables or the Depressed Classes came to be called Harijans. Hundreds of temples all over country were thrown open to the Harijans. Harijan Seva Sangh came into being, Untouchability abolition work was undertaken with vigour and enthusiasm. Inter –caste gathering and dinners became popular. Gandhi published a weekly called 'Harijan'.

However, the Poona Pact was criticized on the following grounds; 1) conceded the Harijan 148 seats whereas the communal Award gave them only 71; 2) it did not put an end to separate electorates; 3) using the moral weapon of fast towards an issue which was not of immediate importance to the achievements of independence was questionable; 4) the remedy was worse than the disease because it would erode the political power of the Hindus; 5) it was an unequal compromise made in order to appease the Harijan; and 6) Bengal and Punjab, where the Hindus were a minority, were the worst affected since they were to give up more seats in favour of the Harijans,

UNIT – V

QUIT INDIA MOVEMENT

The outbreak of the Second World War in September 1939 created an embarrassing situation for India. Great Britain announced India's entry into the war, neither with the consent of the Central Legislature nor with the approval of the political parties. Irrked at this attitude of arrogance, the National Congress declared: "the issue of war and peace for India must be decided by the Indian people and they cannot permit their resources to be exploited for imperialist ends". It called upon Great Britain to declare her war aims, to tell of the new world order that she wanted to erect and to accept India's demand for complete independence. But there came no satisfactory response, for Viceroy Linlithgow merely stated that at the end of the war the Government would be prepared to modify the Act of 1935 in the light of Indian wishes, Bitter at the kind of reward that the country received at the end of First World War and humiliated at the imposition of a second war on India, the Congress refused any support to the war effort. In protest the Congress ministries resigned and went out of power. Perhaps a mere protest would have served the purpose but considering the overall situation in the country, this negative attitude proved highly impolitic. For, when the British stood in need of complete authority to mobilize resources for the conduct of the war, the Congress played into their hands, As the Congress relinquished power the provincial governors assumed the entire administration, organized the National war Front, and raised the resources in support of war effort. For fear of giving the impression of betrayal, the Congress could raise no effective opposition. Secondly, the League found its opportunity in the Congress failure to convince that it was the really of Britain in time of peril and not the Congress.

Individual Satyagraha

To begin with, the war situation in Western Europe went against the Allied Powers. Germany occupied Poland and France and posed a direct threat to Great Britain. Greatly concerned at the apparent ascendancy of Nazism over democracy, Gandhi declared that India would not seek her independence out of Britain's ruin. The Congress working Committee now offered its co-operation if Britain agreed to set up a national government during the war and recognize India's right to independence after the war. Churchill, the Prime Minister and Amery, the Secretary of State, who came to power by now had no intention to concede to the Congress demands. Yet considering the emerging situation, the Viceroy held discussions with different leaders and made what was called the August offer of 1940. It stated: British Government held as its objective to grant dominion status to India, after the war it would constitute a body of representatives of national life to work out a constitution, it would form a war advisory council consisting of representatives of political parties and admit some representatives to the Governor General's Council and that it would

not transfer responsibility to any party whose authority was not acceptable to any other major group in India.

The August Declaration of Viceroy Linlithgow did not concede to the Congress demands either in regard to the establishment of a national government or control of all departments including defence or promise of complete independence at the end of war. What was worse it made transfer of responsibility to the Congress conditional to the assent of the Muslim League and other groups. Naturally the Congress rejected the offer. The League on the other hand held discussions with the Government with a view to securing advantages. But the Viceroy did not agree to appoint representatives of the league as advisors to governors in the Muslims majority provinces. Thereupon it too rejected the offer. The Viceroy now offered to give greater powers to the people of India in the administration but the Congress did not relent.

Influenced by different considerations, the Congress led by Gandhi drew into a dilemma of its own creation. While Subhas Chandra Bose, as the American Colonists did, found in Britain's troubles the country's opportunity, Gandhi refused to take advantage of Britain's difficulties. Therefore he committed the Congress to no offensive against imperialism. At the same time he found the Government unprepared to accept the demands made by the Congress or to yield any concession. Added to this, severe repression awaited it if the Congress launched any offensive, for the League and the prices took their stand in the camp of the enemy. In this critical hour of indecision Gandhi evolved what was called individual satyagraha-for he did not want to hinder war effort and at the same time he wanted to protest against the British taking of India into the war.

The Congress launched the individual satyagraha in October 1940. Vinoba led the movement and he was followed by Jawaharlal Nehru. For the conduct of the satyagraha the Congress formed committees, issued pamphlets and raised slogans. The satyagrahis from the Tamil districts went to Delhi to join the demonstrations. However, the administration dealt with the situation through lathis charges and arrests. More than 14,000 people courted arrest, Yet the movement was a failure, for it ended causing some irritation to the British but not any embarrassment. The Viceroy in the mean time expanded his executive Council by appointing five Indian in addition to the three existing members out of total of thirteen. Still he retained control of important departments like defence and finance. As no serious trouble was anticipated the Government released all imprisoned satyagrahis in December 1941.

In December 1941 Japan launched a military offensive against the Allied Powers. She overran Shanghai and proceeded to occupy Singapore, Malaya, Indo-China and Indonesia in quick succession. As the threat of Japanese invasion loomed large on the eastern horizon, the Congress leaders developed a sudden sympathy for the enemy. While Gandhi conveyed his sympathy to Great Britain, Jawaharlal Nehru came out with unconditional support. Rajaji, who developed an illusion that because of Japanese threat the British would create a situation favourable for his return to power other than the British. No wonder in January 1942 the Congress withdrew the agitation. Their philosophy was such that the leaders

exhibited their inability to carry the struggle to its logical end. The official report on the situation after the withdrawal of the movement stated: the Congress meetings continued to be held as usual but the topics that were discussed were not the issues relating to the struggle for freedom but the experiences of the political prisoners, constructive work and the defenseless state of the country.

The Cripps Mission

The British House of Commons held a three day debate in 1940 on the war situation. The nationalists of India eagerly waited for a word of hope from Prime Minister Churchill but the latter maintained an absolute silence on the Indian situation. The dominions like Canada and Australia received representation on the War Cabinet at London and Pacific Board at Washington, but the populous country of India which furnished much of the man power and economic resources for the conduct of war received nothing in return. Greatly irked at this calculated indifference, the nationalist press felt that the English cared nothing for the public opinion in India.

However, the development in the war front and pressures from other powers forced the British Government to change this attitude of indifference. The war in South East Asia went against the Allied Powers. In the great battle of Singapore the Japanese defeated the British army. After this victory they launched attack on the Dutch East Indies and made rapid advance in Burma. The fall of Rangoon and the collapse of the Dutch defence in had a depressing effect upon the imperialists in India. In March 1942 the Japanese air forces attacked Colombo, Kakinada and Vizagapatam. It appeared that an invasion of India was imminent.

It was during this period that Subhas Chandra Bose led his Indian National Army against the British forces beyond the eastern frontier of India. Born in 1897 in Bengal, he proved himself an outstanding scholar with an aptitude for military career. He won the coveted ICS but left it to devote himself to the cause of national liberation. As a young Congressman he carried the nationalist movement to the ranks of the students, peasants and workers. Before long he emerged as an admirer of CR. Das, an opponent to Gandhi's vague programme of winning Swaraj and a national leader among the youth. In 1925 he succeeded C.R. Das as the Mayor of Calcutta. While Gandhi and Motilal Nehru were content with Swaraj within the Empire, Subhas Chandra Bose together with Jawaharlal Nehru organized a Socialist Independence League in 1928 and set complete independence as the goal of India. He condemned the Gandhi-Irwin Pact as a capitulation to the British, as a result of which the gulf between Bose and Gandhi widened.

In 1938 at the presidential election to the Congress there came a trial of strength, Bose defeated Gandhi's nominee, Pattabhi-Sitaramayya. However, Gandhi's refusal to accept the result of a democratic election and denial of co-operation by his followers forced Bose to resign office. Thereupon he left the party and founded the Forward Block with a determination to launch a revolutionary struggle for independence.

In 1940 the British administration banned the Forward Block but Bose escaped arrest and reached Kabul then Moscow and Berlin where he organized the Free Indian Legion. Encouraged by Hitler, he made broad-casts to India calling upon the people to rise in rebellion. As a result there came terrorist activity, marked by explosion and assassinations. From Germany he made a long voyage to reach Singapore, which had fallen to the Japanese. Bose who came to be popularly called Netaji, meaning leader, created the India National Army consisting mostly of the troops whom the Japanese captured as prisoners of war from the British.

In October 1943 he announced the establishment of a provisional Government of Free India with headquarters in the Andamans, held by Japan. This was followed by the declaration of war on Great Britain and U.S.A. Moving his camp to Burma, he led his forces in March 1944 to Manipur. The attempt to capture Imphal failed. The British forces occupied Burma from Japan and compelled the National Army to surrender. Netaji made his escape but died in a plane crash in Taiwan. As a result, a determined attempt that was made to liberate the country through an armed struggle failed.

During the critical period when the Japanese's forces and Netaji's troops were threatening north eastern India, President F.D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill signed the Atlantic Charter in 1941. It affirmed the right of all peoples to choose the form of government but Churchill asserted that it did not apply to India. However, Roosevelt of U.S.A. and Chiang Kai-Shek of China prevailed upon Churchill to initiate measures for taking India into confidence, so that the resources of this country could be fully mobilized for combating the Japanese advance. In fact a combination of circumstances created by the Japanese threat, Netaji's military activity, and pressure from Allied Powers and need to mobilize more of Indian resources led to the announcement of the Cripps Mission.

On 23 March 1942 Stafford Cripps landed at Delhi. He met the officials and then proceeded to discuss with the leaders the following proposals: 1) That the British Government had as its object the creation of Indian union with the status of a dominion in no way subordinate to any foreign power in its internal and external affairs. 2) That the British Government soon after the end of the war would set up a constituent assembly elected by the provincial legislatures and with provision for representation by Indian states of frame a new constitution for India. 3) That provinces would have the freedom to accept the new constitution or to frame their own constitutions and to join the union or to enjoy the same status as the Indian union. 4) That the Indian states were to revise treaty arrangements in the context of the new situation, whether or not they accede to the Indian union. 5) That the British Government would negotiate a treaty with the Constitution making body to cover the different issues arising out of the complete transfer of responsibility to Indian leadership and for the protection of radical and religious minorities.

In these proposals Cripps accepted the demands of the Congress for the acceptance of dominion status for India and for the creation of a constituent assembly for framing a constitution. However, they set no definite date for the grant of dominion status and they provided for no popular representation of Indian states on the constituent assembly. Also

they did not provide for the establishment of a national government during the war period or for the transfer of defence to the control of India. Worse still, the proposals were not calculated to set up a free united India. The provinces could send their representatives and the rajahs could send their nominees for making a constitution but they were not required to accept such a constitution. Therefore the Congress feared that the British wanted to play a game, for they could use the representatives of the princes and the communal parties against it for preventing the framing of a constitution. Even when one was framed, the Muslim majority provinces and the princely states would keep out of the union, leaving India divided. On these grounds the Congress rejected the proposals. To the Muslim League it appeared that the proposals made no definite provision for the creation of Pakistan or for a separate constituent assembly for the Muslims. It also felt that the Hindus would secure a majority in the proposed constituent assembly and that the Indian states were not compulsorily required to send their representatives to the assembly. On these grounds the League too rejected the proposals.

The causes of the failure of the Cripps Mission centered on the British attitude as well as Congress stand. At the most from the British point of view it represented a war time expediency. Great Britain ventured into this mission as she wanted to satisfy the public opinion in the camp of Allied Powers. As the mission served this purpose, she found it possible to throw the blame upon India and to pretend that she complied with world public opinion. Laski rightly observed: the real thought in British Government was less the achievement of Indian freedom than of a coup de main in the propagandist art among its allies. Secondly, the British neutralized what they agreed to give with what they proposed to deny. Though the right to frame a dominion constitution was conceded, the process was rendered difficult by setting the Congress against the princes and the League on the one hand and the centre against the provinces on the other. As no date was set for the transfer of power, it played up the Indian suspicions against British motives. Thirdly, the national movement failed to exercise adequate pressure upon the British for conceding to demands. In India the national interests came into conflict with the feudal and communal interests. Within the Congress some wanted to take advantage of the war situation but Gandhi, Nehru and others decided to give no trouble to the British. In spite of these internal contradictions the party was not prepared to accept the proposals except on its own terms. No wonder the Cripps mission failed, much to the jubilation of the imperialists and chagrin of the nationalists.

Quit India Movement

The failure of the Cripps Mission widened the gulf between the Congress and the Government. While the political leaders of Great Britain including Cripps blamed the Congress for the failure of the mission, the nationalists of India felt that what the British aimed at was not to seek a settlement but to gain the purpose of propaganda. In this atmosphere of disappointment, there came mounting discontent because of the scarcity of

essential goods, high prices of articles, exodus of people from coastal towns and ill treatment of the refugees who poured into India from the eastern countries. The Indian leaders felt that the arrogant officials treated the innocent refugees as unwelcome elements. As Gandhi wrote the admitted inequality of treatment of Indian and European evacuees and the manifestly overbearing behaviour of troops are adding to the distrust of British intentions and declarations. The Growing threat of Japanese invasion led a two fold effect on India. On the one hand the spectacular victories gained by Japan exposed the weakness of the British Empire, which was traditionally considered as unassailable. In the event of Japanese march into India the British planned the destruction of ports and other installations in cities like Calcutta. The Nationalist concluded that what provoked the Japanese was the presence of the British in India and the only remedy was to ask them to leave the country to its fate. Added to these, the people were getting demoralized in view of the repeated failures of the Congress leadership in taking advantage of opportune moments for wresting freedom. It appeared that unless it decided to strike, it would lose control of the movement to Netaji and his National Army. Gandhi now changed his stand on support to war effort and favored direct action.

The Congress Working Committee met at Allahabad and adopted the Quit India Resolution in May-July 1942. With certain changes at its session at Bombay the All India Congress Committee approved this resolution It read: "That the immediate ending of the British rule in India is an urgent necessity both for the sake of India and for the success of the United Nations... The Committee, therefore, resolves to sanction for the vindication of India's inalienable right to freedom and independence, the starting of a mass struggle on non-Violent lines on the widest possible scale..."

This resolution was of great consequence in reviving the tempo of the struggle, but as on previous occasions Congress missed the opportunity presented by the international situation. As there came an improvement in battle position, Great Britain refused to be perturbed. A series of spectacular victories removed the threat of Japanese invasion of India too. For, the Allied Powers defeated the Japanese navy in the Battle of Coral Sea, the Chinese army the Japanese forces entangled in China and the British forces landed in Madagascar, The enemy found their strength so unassailable that they proceeded to deal with the situation firmly. The Government declared that it would never tolerate a rebellion during the war, whether it was violent or non-violent. As soon as the All India Congress Committee passed the resolution, it proceeded with the arrest of all prominent leaders of the party. Also it banned the Congress, confiscated the party funds and seized the party offices. This gave the signal to the outbreak of what came to be called as the upheaval of 1942.

Before his arrest Gandhi declared: "we shall either free India or die in the attempt" but at the same time he wanted the struggle to be strictly non-violent. As in the two nation theory of Jinnah Gandhi asserted: I am convinced that the time has come for the British and the Indians to be reconciled to complete separation from each other. There is no common interest left to unite such distant and different nations. In the absence of a clear directive

form the arrested leaders the remaining leaders adopted a programme of struggle hartats, picketing of offices, violation of salt laws, non –payment of taxes and strikes by workers. However, the movement, though non-violent in theory, did not always remain so in practice, for when meetings were broken up and processions were dispersed, there came clashes and firing. In this critical period the Muslims League refused to join the struggle while the Communist Party of India because of its loyalty to Moscow was fighting on the side of Great Britain, supported the enemy.

The arrest of Gandhi on August 9, 1942, marked the beginning of disturbances throughout the country. There came strikes by the workers and demonstrations by the volunteers. The worst affected were the textile mills, which supplied textile products to the army. At several places telegraph lines were cut, railways were damaged and public offices were burnt. The volunteers picketed the post offices, railway stations and set fire to court buildings.

The struggle was fairly widespread in all provinces. The mob came into clash with the police and the army at Rajapalayam, Karaikudi, Devakottai and Madras. In a firing at Madurai on August 10, 1942 P.M. Doraiswamy Nadar was killed. At Madras the toddy shops were destroyed and the Buckingham and Carnatic Mills was closed. The agitators raised barricades and disrupted communications in almost all the southern districts. As the military air port at Sulur in Coimbatore was destroyed, the men of the nearby villages were taken into custody and tortured for a week. The agitated nationalists attacked the military camp near Coimbatore, setting fire to tanks and sheds. The army opened fire, leading to about thirty casualties. At Tiruvadani the people took control of the police station and set free the prisoners. In retaliation the police ravaged the villages and set them on fire.

In Bombay the agitation was not only widespread but also intense. As the crowds assembled in Bombay and demonstrated against arrests, police opened fire killing more than eight people. The people who attacked the railway stations and public offices were fired upon with heavy casualties. At Poona the agitators set fire to an ammunition godwon and at Satara they set up a parallel government under the leadership of Nana Patil. The police indulged in atrocities, for there were arrests, torture, molestation and deaths in police lock-ups. In Gujarat too there were demonstrations and repressions. There were firings at Dakor, Bhadran and Nadiad.

In North India several places took active role in the movement. As the troubles spread from the towns to the country side crowds attacked police stations. Disrupted rail communications, took possession of armories and treasuries and liberated several villages from British rule. But the Government rushed in army units and police forces and let loose repression against the people. As a result many were killed and villages were razed to the ground. Ballia, Azamgarh Ghazipur, Banares, Jaunpur, had Gorakhpur were the principal centre, which suffered heavily due ot the atrocities, committed by the enemy. In Madhya Pradesh the people of Nagpur and Chimer occupied public buildings and hoisted national flag. As police men were killed by the mob, the army took possession of houses, shot the agitators dead and outraged women. At Patna the students hoisted national flag on the

Secretariat but they were fired upon and four were killed. The mob raided the police stations at Muzaffarpur, Lal Ganj and Hajipur in Bihar. The patriots set up national governments at Bhagalpur and Sultanpur. Siaram Singh and Jaglal Chaudhury gave the leadership to the struggle. Jayaprakash Narayan established a centre on the borders of Nepal and organized guerilla bands to fight against the enemy. To wreck vengeance the British committed the worst outrages. People were tortured to death, houses were destroyed, students were lathi charged and collective fines were imposed.

In eastern India Calcutta and Dacca in Bengal, Now gong in Assam and Balasore in Orissa took the lead in the struggle. The agitators set up secret radio station at Calcutta to broadcast revolutionary views At Tamlluk a crowd, 20,000 strong, attacked the police station but lost many in the firing. A national army was organized and parallel governments were established in several areas. In retaliation the military units raided the villages, shot many people dead and demolished the houses. In Assam the people erected barricades on the roads and derailed two trains carrying the troops to the trouble spots. In the police firings about thirty people lost their lives. The inhabitants of Talcher in Orissa formed a national militia but as the result of air and machine gun attacks it was suppressed.

The Movement of 1942 was by and large a violent struggle against the British Raj. Every where the people, though mostly unarmed or inadequately equipped, resorted to the destruction of industrial units, disruption of communications and attack on police stations. The British condemned these disorderly crowds as mobs of traitors; shot them dead indiscriminately and proceeded with the wanton destruction of houses. As a result more than a thousand people lost their lives and more that three thousand received serious injuries even as per the official account. This violent movement incidentally represented a failure of the Gandhian technique of non violent struggle. While the congress spearheaded this movement the other parties, particularly the Muslim League and the Communists either remained indifferent to the struggle or extended their support to the enemy. While the Muslim League in fact deplored the Congress decision to launch an open rebellion, most of the people stood as idle spectators. There was no unity among the Indians, for it was the same people whether they were in the administration or the police or the army who wielded the sword of repression against their country men on behalf of the aliens. Added to these the struggle was the most ill timed. The Congress missed the opportune moments presented by the Japanese threat and launched the struggle when the situation turned favourable to the enemy. Prisoners of their theory, they refused to seek the support of the Japanese and they tried an insuperable task against a ruthless enemy singles handed. No wonder the movement failed within two months of the struggle. India had to wait for years to see a change in the political situation of Great Britain so that she could attain her independence in an atmosphere of more of agony and humiliation.

WAVELL PLAN

After the breakdown of the Desai – Liaquat talks, Lord Wavell, the viceroy, went to England to discuss the future of India with the British Cabinet. On his return to India Wavell made a broadcast on the political proposals on 14th June 1945. The Wavell plan proposed

1. To invite Indian leaders to meet the Viceroy with a view to form a new Executive Council more representative of organized political opinion;
2. The proposed Council would represent the main communities;
3. It would include equal proportions of Caste Hindus and Muslims;
4. It would work under the existing constitution;
5. It would be an entirely Indian Council, except for the viceroy and the Commander – in Chief, who would retain his position as War Member;
6. The portfolio of External Affairs would be placed in charge of an Indian Member of Council ;and
7. A British High commissioner would be appointed in India, as in the Dominions, to represent great Britain’s commercial and such other interests in India.

The Viceroy said that the new Executive Council represented a definite advance on the road to self –Government. He also assured that orders had been issued for the immediate release of the CWC who were still in detention; A similar statement was made by the Secretary of State for Indian in the British Parliament. It may be noted that in the Wavell Plan a novel twist was given to the concept of parity.

Cabinet Mission

Background

Japan surrendered on 15th August 1945. With her surrender the Second World War came to a successful close. There was a change of Government in Britain. Clement Attlee became the Labour Prime Minister of England. The new Government announced holding of General Elections in India and they were to take place by the beginning of 1946. The INA trial held in Red Fort, Delhi, in November 1945 sparked off widespread anti-Government agitation throughout the country. The release of the accused electrified the entire nation. The Congress exhorted the people to strengthen its hands in its struggle for freedom and exploited their enthusiasm to win the ensuing election. The elections on 1945 – 46 clearly demonstrated the relative position of the Congress and the league. The Hindus identified themselves with the Congress and the Muslims with the League. This had sharpened the conflict and widened the gulf between the Congress and the league.

The massive revolt of the Royal Navy ratings in Bombay on 19th February 1946, the civilian support to it and its repercussion in other centre’s as Ambalam Karachi, Madras, Calcutta and Rangoon coupled with police risings in Delhi, Bihar, Jabalpur and several other places deeply assessment of the Indian political situation made by the British Parliamentary

Delegation which visited India on 5th January 1946 the British Government decided to send the Cabinet Mission to India.

The Mission

The Cabinet Mission consisting of Lord Pethick- Lawrence, the Secretary of state for India; Sir Stafford Cripps, the Persistent of the Board of Trade and A.V. Alexander, the First Lord of Admiralty came to India on 23rd March 1946. Its object was to speed up the transfer of responsibility to Indian lands to govern themselves. After holding interviews with the representatives of various political parties and important individuals, the Mission published its recommendations on 16th May.

The Plan

The Cabinet Mission Plan offered the following proposals:

1. There should be a Union of India comprising both British India and the Princely States. It would deal with the Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications;
2. The Union should have an Executive and Legislature. They would be constituted from the representatives of British India and Princely States;
3. Major communal issue must be decided by the representatives of the two major communities present and voting as well as majority of all the members presenting and voting;
4. All subjects other than the Union subjects and residuary powers should vest in the Provinces:
5. The Princely States will retain all subjects and powers other than those ceded to the Union.
6. Provinces would be free to form Groups with Executives and Legislatures. Each Group could determine the provincial subjects to be taken in common;
7. Any province could, by a majority vote of its Legislative Assembly, call for a reconsideration of the terms of the condition. But this could be done after an initial period of ten years and at ten yearly intervals thereafter;
8. In the proposed Constituent Assembly, one representative was to represent roughly one million people. The proportion between the representatives of various communities was to be one the basis of their population. The process of settling provincial constitution for the provinces was laid down;
9. Until the new constitution was framed, the administration should be run by an Interim Government; and
10. A treaty had to be negotiated between the Constituent Assembly and Great Britain to cover matters arising out of the transfer of power.

Advantages of the Plan

The advantages of the Cabinet Mission Plan outweighed its disadvantages. True, the plan suffered serious limitations. For instance the plan package should either be accepted or rejected in to. In provided for a weak centre. The Princely States were given some

incremental powers either to join the Union or remain outside it. The grouping of provinces was not made on a rational basis. In the name of national unity the plan conceded the core of Pakistan. The powers of the Constituent Assembly were severely restricted. Similarly, the provisions relating to the provinces were vague lending themselves to different interpretations, And yet the Cabinet Mission Plan was definite improvement over the Cripps' Proposals, Its distinct merit was its recommendation for an undivided united India. It restricted the scope of communal representation. The basis of the Constituent assembly was broad based and democratized. Interim Government was completely Indianised. The plan offered a reasonable basis of settlement for all the parties. The Muslims got the right to preserve their own culture and tradition. The Sikhs were assured of the unity of their homeland the Punjab. The Plan sought to preserve the essential unity of India. The Cabinet Mission proudly claimed that the proposed system "secure the advantage of a Pakistan without incurring the danger inherent in the division of India" In fine, the plan conceded the demand of complete independence. It also gave the people of India the right to frame their own constitution.

Reaction to the Plan

The Cabinet Mission plan evoked mixed reaction The Congress sought clarification on

1. The grouping of Provinces;
2. The sovereign character of the Constituent Assembly; and
3. The basis and character of the Interim Government.

The clarification offered by the Cabinet Mission in regard to the Constituent Assembly and Interim Government was found satisfactory, but the interpretation given on the Grouping of Provinces was considered inadequate. The Congress could, therefore, neither unreservedly accept the plan nor unceremoniously reject it. Finally, the Congress had agreed to work out the plan. At first the Muslim League was entirely opposed to the plan for it did not recognize its demand for a sovereign state of Pakistan. But later it unanimously accepted it. "The acceptance of the Cabinet Mission plan by both Congress and Muslim League was a glorious event in the history of the freedom movement in India". The Indian Princes were in favour of accepting the plan. The Sikhs at first opposed the plan but later supported it. Gandhi called the Cabinet Mission plan a "promissory" and gave credit to the Mission for their efforts to secure an agreement between the Congress and the Muslim League.

Formation of Interim Government

The Cabinet Mission left of England on 29th June 1946. The Congress agreed to participate in the Constituent Assembly. In the elections to the Constituent Assembly held in July the Congress secured a landslide victory. It captured 199 out of 210 general seats. In a House of 296 members, the Congress enjoyed the support of 212 members. Whereas the league could muster a paltry 73 members. Jinnah read the writing on the wall and became alert. When the Congress declined to join the Interim Coalition Government, Jinnah tried

hard to form the Government but failed. At a press Conference held on 10th July Nehru made the following two implicit and undiplomatic statements

1. That the Congress would enter the Constituent Assembly completely unfettered by agreements and
2. That the Congress could change or modify the Cabinet Mission plan as it thought best. Jinnah exploited Nehru's the Cabinet statements to his advantage and refused to join the Interim Coalition Government. The Congress now changed its stand and agreed to join the Interim Government. On 12th August 1946, Lord Wavell, the Viceroy of India, invited Nehru to form the Interim Government. Nehru favourably responded to the Viceroy's Invitation. The Muslim Leagues refused to join the Coalition Government.

REORGANIZATION OF LEGALISTIC STATE

Five Year Plan

It was realized since long by the Indian leaders that the British rulers had made their country poor by neglecting the proper utilization of its natural resources and by not developing the skill and talent of the Indians. Some of them therefore started thinking seriously about the economic problems of India in order to offer suggestions to the British government which was taking different measures for the economy of India. Their object was to prepare the Indian mind for a better course of economic life.

The introduction of economic planning in Russia and the Five Year Plans which Russia had carried out since 1928 for transforming it into a second major power in the world made the Indian leaders think about introducing economic planning in India in order to improve Indian economy. Amongst those leaders was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru due to whose efforts the Indian National Congress set up the National Planning Committee in 1938 in order to compile valuable material and prepare a comprehensive report for the introduction of economic planning in India. When the Indian experts of that committee were carrying out that work, the Bombay Plan drawn by eight leading Indian industrialists for causing the economic development of India was published in 1944. By the time India achieved independence, the India economists and thinkers had produced meaningful literature which suggested several other approaches to planned economic development in India. By that a ground for undertaking economic planning was set up in India when it became independent countries.

1. Establishment of the Planning Commission (1950) and Preparation of the Five year plans. As the Indian mind had become ready to undertake economic planning, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, who had understood the importance of the application of science and technology in transforming the course of human life, set up the Planning Commission in March, 1950, by a Resolution of the Government of India.

a) Work of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission was required “(i) to make an assessment of the material, capital and human resources of the country including technical personnel and to investigate the possibilities of augmenting them, wherever deficient; (ii) to formulate a plan for the most effective and balanced utilization of the country’s resources; and (iii) to determine the priorities and define the stages in which the plan should be carried out and propose the allocation of resources for the due completion of each stage”.

b) Objectives for the Plans. The planning Commission was required to formulate the five Year Plans within the framework of the Directive Principles of States Policy stated in the Indian Constitution. The purpose of those Plans was “to ensure to the people of India adequate means of livelihood, the right to work, to education, and minimum standards of living”.

c) Establishment of the National Development Council. In the federal set-up India, economic and social planning is in the Concurrent List of the Indian Constitution. As a result, for that the centre and the States have to work in co-operation with each other. Unless there was to be mutual consultation between them, it was not visualized that the schemes of the Plans would be executed properly and smoothly. Therefore, for their mutual consultation, the Government of India set up the National Development Council. It has in it the Ministers of the Central Cabinet, Chief Ministers of the States and the Members of the Planning Commission. The Prime Minister was the Chairman of that Council. As a result of the discussion which took place from time to time on the plan proposals in the National Development Council, the system of economic planning became democratic in nature.

With the help of the objectives and the machinery stated above, the Planning Commission prepared: (i) the First Five Year Plan for the Years 1951-52 to 1955 -56; (ii) the Second Five Year Plan for the years 1956 -57 to 1960 -61; and (iii) the Third Five Year Plan for the years 1961 -62 to 1965-66, in the Nehru Era in order to carry out planned economic development and in order to transform on modern lines the mediaeval pattern of life in India .

2. The First Five Year Plan (1951 – 52 to 1955 -56) and its Achievement. The central objectives of planning was defined by the Planning Commission of India as initiating “a process of the development which will raise living standards and open out to the people new opportunities for a richer and more varied life”. Economic Planning was viewed by the Planning Commission as “an integral part of a wider process aiming not nearly at the development of resources in a narrow technical sense, but at the development of human faculties and the building up of an institutional framework adequate to the needs and aspiration of the people”.

The First Five Year Plan was framed by the Planning Commission after facing the problem of making a choice, of striking a balance between a number of competing objectives like: (i) reduction of inequalities and maximizing production; (ii) production of the consumer goods and build up enduring assets and capital goods, etc.

The First Five Year Plan endeavored to initiate the process of development that was to form the basis of the much larger efforts in the time to come. That Plan took into account the necessity of completing the schemes of development initiated by the Central and the State Government prior to the commencement of the Plan. It also took into account the need to correct the maladjustments in the economy caused by the Second World War (1939 – 45) and the Partition of India.

The First Five Year Plan had very limited resources – an outlay of Rs. 2,069 crores (later revised to Rs2, 377.7 crores) for the Public (Government) Sector. It had therefore taken great care in allocating these resources. It gave topmost priority to agriculture, including irrigation and power. That was because the Plan wanted to complete projects already at hand which were going to increase the production of food and raw materials needed for industry. It also gave priority to transport particularly railways, which would be the sinews of the entire effort to follow in India.

In industries, the Plan left the progress largely to the resources of the Private Sector. It made a modest beginning in setting up key industries like iron and steel, heavy chemicals, heavy electrical industries, etc.

That Plan also planned for the development of social services like education, technical training and health. It made adequate financial provision for technical training because of its importance to the process of development itself in India.

The First Five Year Plan also laid emphasis on the utilization of local man-power for local development and for that reason initiated a Programme of Community Development. That programme which aimed at transforming the social and economic life of the village was to be implemented through the agency of the National Extension Service.

- (a) Achievements of the First Five Year Plan. When the First Five Year Plan ended in March, 1956, India had made significant advance in fulfilling the tasks set for that Plan. As a result of that Plan : (i) The national income of India increased by about 18 percent over the five years; (ii) The output of food grains increased by 20 percent; of cotton by 45 percent, and of oilseeds by 8 percent ; (iii) Over 6 million acres of additional land area was brought under irrigation through major works, and another 10 million acres benefited from smaller irrigation works; (iv) Industrial production went up steadily;(v) In Public Sector several important industrial projects were completed; (vi) Considerable new private investment, especially in producer and capital goods industries was made; and (vii) preliminary work in connection with the three plants and a heavy electrical plant was completed and foundation was laid for the larger industrial development which was to be undertaken in the Second Five Year Plan.

3. The Second Five Year Plan (1956 – 57 to 1960 -61) and its Achievements. The process of economic and other development in India was continued by the Second Five year Plan. It provided for a larger increase in production, investment and employment, economy more dynamic and more progressive.

- (a) Objectives of the Second Five Year Plan. (i) a sizable increase in a national income, so as to raise the level of living in the country; (ii) rapid industrialization with particular emphasis on the development of basic and heavy industries ; (iii) a large expansion of employment opportunities; and (iv) reduction of inequalities in incomes and wealth and a more even distribution of economic power.
- (b) Socialistic Pattern of Society – An Additional Objective. The Second Plan pointed out that the task before was not merely of raising living standards but of generating a dynamism in the economy which would lift it continually to higher levels of material well – being and of intellectual and cultural achievements. It was thought by the framers of that Plan that “a rising standard of material welfare is not an end itself; it is essentially a means to better and fuller life”. It was therefore decided by the Second plan that “the Pattern and lines of economic development must from the start be related to the basic objectives which the Indian society had in view”.

Those basic objectives were summed up in the phrase “Socialistic Pattern of Society”. The Socialistic Pattern of Society as the objective of social and economic policy was accepted by the Indian Parliament in 1954. It meant that “the primary criterion for determining the lines of advance must not be private profit but social gain. Also that the pattern of development and the structure of socio-economic relations should be so planned that they result not only in appreciable increases in national income and employment but also in greater equality in incomes and wealth. In other words, the benefits of economic development must accrue more to the relatively less privileged classes of society and a milieu (environment, social surroundings) should be created in which the small man has chances of rising in life. In effect, the socialist pattern was a more concretized expression of the Directive Principles of State Policy embodied in the Constitution”.

(c) Development of the Mixed Economy – an Additional Objective. The adoption of the goal of a socialist pattern of society meant that the state in India would be taking on itself heavy responsibilities like: (i) causing rapid expansion of the Public Sector; (ii) playing a dominant role in planning to shape the private as well as public investment; and (iii) initiating the developments which the private sector was unwilling or unable to undertake

According to the Second Plan the Private Sector was to play its part within the framework of the overall plan. By that “the Second Plan envisaged that an increase in the output of goods and services should be secured through development of both the private and the public sector. The idea was that the two sectors should function in union (agreement), leading to a ‘Mixed Economy’ in India.

(d) Promotion of Cooperative Activity – an Additional Objective. The Planning Commission felt while preparing the Second Plan that “cooperation should become the principal basis of organization in several branches of economic life, notably in agriculture, small industry, distribution, construction, and provision of essential amenities for local

communities. The Industrial Policy Resolution (1956) of the Planning Commission pointed out that “The principal of cooperation should be applied wherever possible and steadily increasing proportion of the activities of the of the Private Sector developed along cooperative lines”.

Achievements of the Second Five Year Plan. As a result of the execution of the schemes of the Second Plan, (a) there was an increase in the national income of Indian of 20 percent as against the initial target of 25 percent set before it by the Second Plan; (b) per capital income rose from Rs.284 in 1950 – 51 to Rs 306 in 1955 – 56 and Rs. 330 in 196 – 61 ; (c) over the decade ending 1960 – 61 agricultural production expanded by about 40 percent and the output of food grains by 46 percent ; and (d) the net output of organized manufacturing industries increased nearly two fold.

As a result of his achievements of the Second plan and the confidence of the valuable experience gained by the Planning Commission under its chairman, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, it prepared the Third Five Year Plan on a more ambitious scale.

4. The Third Five Year Plan (1961 – 62) and its Working. The Principal aims of the Third Plan were (i) to secure and sustain, in he subsequent plans, an increase of 5 percent per annum in national income; (ii) to achieve self – sufficiency in food. Grains and increase agricultural production to meet the requirement of industry and exports; (iii) to expand basic industries like steel, chemical industries, fuel and power and establish machine-building capacity, so that the requirements of further industrialization can be met within a period of ten years or so mainly from the country’s resources; (iv) to ensure substantial expansion of employment opportunities and fuller utilization of the manpower resources; and (v) to establish progressively greater equality of opportunity and to reduce income and wealth disparities and concentration of economic power.

- (a) The Working of the Third Five Year Plan. The implementation of the schemes of the Third Plan was hampered by abnormal circumstances. As a result, it did not achieve the expected success. Its working was obstructed by (i) the Chinese aggression in 1962; (ii) the aggression of Pakistan in 1965; (iii) the disruption in the flow of foreign aid; (iv) the necessity of stepping – up in defence outlays led to inflationary pressures ; (v) the severe and widespread drought which hit the country in the last year of the Third plan resulted in sharp fall in agricultural production; (vi) the fall in the agriculturists income and the sharp rise in prices resulted in reduction of savings and investment, etc.

When the Third Plan was being operated in India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who had initiated economic planning in India, expired on 27th May, 1964. After his the schemes of economic planning were continued by his successors.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

During 1947 – 1964, rapid development of science and technology took place independent India. That was mainly because of the support given to that activity by India's Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, who had education in the scientific subjects and who had understood the role which science plays in making the life of man modern, happy and progressive in the world.

1. Science in India 1947 – 1964. The Directive Principles of State Policy embodied in the constitution of India require the States to direct its policy in such a manner as to make effective provision for securing the right to work for its citizens. The Government of independent India under Nehru took steps in that direction. By introducing the Five Year Plans it tried to increase employment in India during 1947 – 64. The Government under Nehru wanted to eliminate poverty also from the life of the people of India.

As the Government under Nehru has realized that the increase in employment and the elimination of poverty can be achieved by the application of improved methods and techniques which were to be evolved with the help of science and technology, it decided by its Scientific Policy Resolution of 1958 to “foster, promote and sustain, by all appropriate means, the cultivation of science and scientific research in all its aspects – pure, applied, and educational”. Prime Minister Nehru, who wished to effect rapid development of science and technology in India, then took prompt steps to implement that Resolution.

- (i) Reinvigoration of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, which was established in 1942 had not done much work before independence. But when Nehru became its President after Indian Independence, that organization took steps to expand scientific research by setting up National Laboratories and Institutes in India.
 - (a) National Laboratories and Institutes. The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research had set up 28 national laboratories and institutes at various centers in India by 1964. They covered the most vital fields of science and technology, such as physics, chemistry Fuel, metallurgy, Roads, Food, Building, Drugs, Glass and Ceramic, Electro-Chemistry, Leather, Bio-Chemistry, Mechanical Engineering, Public Health, Construction and Operation of Aircraft, Botany, Petroleum Refining and Processing of Natural Gas, Petrochemical, etc. The scientific research work carried out in the National Laboratories and Institutes proved to be of great help to the Indian industries.
 - (b) Sponsored Research. Through a liberal system of grant –in- aid scientists in other technical institutes, industrial laboratories and universities were enabled by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research to pursue fundamental and applied research and develop. Their own special fields. In 1964, there were more than 495 such schemes which were in progress. While yielding practical results those schemes provided opportunities of training

for young research workers and developed centres of independent research work in India. The Council also awarded junior fellowships to the talented young scientists in order to further their research activity.

- (c) Cooperative Research Associations. The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research assisted the Cooperative Research Associations in the different industrial fields by giving them monetary help of different kinds, technical, advice, procurement of expertise and materials, etc. That had increased the activity of scientific research in India.
- (d) Liaison, The Liaison units were set up by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research in some of the laboratories to maintain contact with the industry, industrial and trade associations, government departments and other users of research. An Industrial Liaison and Extension Service Unit was maintained at New Delhi to make use of the available scientific knowledge for the economic betterment of rural and semi-urban communities. That helped the growing activity of scientific research in India.
- (e) Vigyan Madirs. Forty –eight centre known as “Vigyan Madirs” were set up by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research at sites covered by Community Development projects. Those centre’s disseminated scientific knowledge among the rural population and through it educated them in the potentialities of the methods of science as applied to their day- to – day life. The Council also undertook the activity of producing popular editions of scientific literature in the Indian languages in order to popularize knowledge of science among the people.

(ii) Atomic Energy and outer Space Research. (a) Atomic Energy Research. One of the important spheres in which India had made progress in the Nehru Era was atomic research. It was due to the encouragement which Nehru had given to that research that India became one of the leaders in that field.

The Atomic Energy Commission which was established in 1948 was responsible for planning and implementing the programme for the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Its chairman was Dr. Homi J. Bhabha.

That programme aimed at the encouragement of the uses of atomic energy in agriculture, biology, industry and medicine, mainly through the production and application of radioisotopes; and at the development of atomic energy of a source of electric power. That programme was under the charge of the Department of Atomic Energy, whose secretary was Dr. Homi J. Bhabha, the renowned Indian scientist.

(b) Outer Space Research. An Indian National Committee on Space Research (INCOPSPAR) was constituted to aid and advise in the formulation and execution of policies on the peaceful uses of outer space. A sounding rocket launching facility was to be set up in Kerala in cooperation with the national Aeronautical and Space Administration of the U.S.A. A satellite ground communication facility for participation in the programme to develop a system of communications via satellites was also to be set up. Due to that India made a beginning in the outer Space Research in the Nehru Era.

(iii) Other Departmental Research Activities. In the Nehru Era, research activities were undertaken in the subjects of their concern by the Hydraulic Research Stations, the Botanical Survey of India, the Zoological Survey of India, the Geological Survey of India, the Department of Anthropology, the Indian Meteorological Department, the Forest Research Institute, the All India Radio, the Railway Board, the Roads Organization, the Indian Standards Institutes, etc.

(iv) Other Institutions financed by private endowments and Governmental assistance like the Bose Institute, Calcutta. Birbal Sahani Institute for Palace-botany, Luck now, Indian Institute of science, Bangalore, Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmadabad, etc., undertook useful and productive research activities in the subjects of their undertaking and thereby helped India to effect progress in scientific matters in the Nehru Era.

(v) Medical Research. The Indian Council of Medical Research (established in 1912) was engaged in the promotion and coordination of medical research in India. As a result of its schemes and grants – in –aid, different medical institutions carried out research in the methods of malaria eradication, preparation of bacterial vaccines, sterile solutions, tuberculosis, cancer, influenza etc., in the Nehru Era. As a result of that research, when steps were taken to control different diseases. The health of the Indian people improved.

(vi) Agricultural Research. The Indian Council of Agricultural Research (established in 1929) aided promoted and coordinated agricultural and animal husbandry education and research in India in the Nehru Era. In order to make its work more effective the Government of India developed it into one of the biggest institutions of its kind in Asia. That organization as well as other research institutes concerned with agriculture carried out useful hint era see her veterinary diseases and their cure, quality of milk and in commodities like cotton, jute, coconut, sugarcane, tobacco, oilseed, fish and fish products, etc,. As result of that research agriculture and animal husbandry improved in India during 1947 – 64.

INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY

The achievement of freedom enabled India to formulate an independent foreign policy. In formulating it, and in guiding India's foreign relations, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who was the Vice-President of the Interim Government from September, 1946 to 14th August, 1947, and the Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs form 15th August, 1947 to 27th May, 1964, played a leading role. After him, foreign policy was continued by his successors with some modifications.

1. Nature of the Indian Foreign Policy. The foreign policy of India was the product of the age-old traditions of Indian thought and philosophy and the lofty idealism of her leaders in the freedom struggle. Through the ages, the Indian thought and philosophy has fostered in India a pluralistic outlook and habit of tolerance, which rule out acceptance of one

particular version of truth. "Truth, to the Indian mind, is one but has many facets". This tradition explains the stress India laid on non-alignment and peaceful negotiation in her foreign policy during the Nehru Era (1947 – 64). The Indian thought and philosophy since ancient times has also stood for human freedom and dignity. As a result the Indian foreign policy under Nehru was against colonialism and fascism. It also stood in support of pacifism (principle that war should and could be abolished) in the world.

2. Objectives of the Indian foreign Policy. The objectives of the foreign policy of India were simple and clear. Those were: - (i) the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security; (ii) the promotion of self-determination for all colonial people as colonialism was not only a violation of fundamental human rights but also a persistent source of international conflict; (iii) opposition to racialism and support to the promotion of an egalitarian society in which discrimination based on colour, race or class did not exist; (iv) peaceful settlement of international disputes and conflicts; and (v) active support to all international organizations, especially the United Nations Organization.

3. Non-Alignment – the Corner Stone of Indian Foreign Policy, At the time when India became an independent nation in 1947, there had taken place the emergence of two hostile power blocs of nations – one dominated by the United States of America, and the other dominated by Soviet Russia – on the international scene. True to her ancient tradition of thought and philosophy, India decided to stay away from those power blocks and thereby assert her independence and sovereignty by following a policy of non-alignment. This was mainly because the power blocks or group-alignments against one another had led the world in the past towards war and which would have again led to disaster on an even vaster scale.

The policy of non-alignment did not imply neutrality in international relations. It certainly did not mean "sitting on the fence" or isolationism. On the contrary it was "a positive, active and constructive policy seeking to lead to collective peace, on which alone collective security can really rest". In its true sense, non-alignment meant freedom of action which is part of independence. It "enabled its adherent to judge each issue on its merits and not on the basis of pre-determined attitude developed by alignment with one block or the other".

(a) Need for the Non-alignment policy in the World. The period in which India initiated its non-alignment policy was characterized by the cold war between the Western and Communist camps, and a state of "armed fear" in the world. That was a period of military pacts and alliances, especially of the establishment of the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) in 1948, and the Warsaw Pact. In the Nehru Era (1947 – 64), the Super Powers – America and Russia – had indulged in an armaments race at a furious pace. There were frequent testings of the nuclear weapons by the Super Powers, as well as the United Kingdom and France. The international situation therefore had become full of danger in the Nehru Era. It was therefore necessary that remaining aloof from the competition of those power blocks India played a role of minimizing the differences between them in order to

save the world from the third world war. As a result the non-alignment policy pursued by Indian was very much beneficial for the world in the Nehru Era.

It was beneficial for India also as India had decided to build a socialistic pattern of society and pursue the goals of political democracy, economic development, and secularism for the good of its people.

4. The Panchasheel – the Five Principle of peaceful Co-existence. A very important trend in the foreign policy of India in the Nehru Era was peaceful co-existence or Panchasheel, which was formally enunciated in the Sino-Indian agreement of 29th April, 1954, concerning trade and intercourse between India and Tibet, The five principle of the concept of peaceful co-existence or the Panchasheel were; - (i) Mutual respect for each others territorial integrity and sovereignty; (ii) Mutual non-aggression;(iii) Mutual non-inference in each other's internal affairs; (iv) Equality and mutual benefit ; and (v) Peaceful co-existence.

About the importance of those principles in the international sphere Nehru felt that many of the problems and the troubles of the world would disappear if those principles were adopted in the relations of various countries. By voicing out the concept of the Panchasheel, India sought to make its five principles the basis of practical State policy and conduct in international relations. "This meant essentially a willingness to live and work together with other nations, and the desire and the attempt to effect a peaceful change with a friendly approach, with no fear, hatred, or aggressive intent. It is an essential consequence of a democratic approach and outlook as much to international affairs as to internal affairs".

In the Nehru Era when the Cold war was in full swing , a characteristic feature of India's foreign policy was strident opposition to the Cold War and the creation of the Western and Communist blocks, etc., "In its role in world affairs, India endeavored not to succumb to the climate of war and fear generated by the Cold War, but to consider international problems as dispassionately as possible. It sought to build up an " area of peace". It felt quite rightly that the larger the area was, the more the danger of war receded in the world.

5. The Non- Aligned Summit Conferences. The Indian concept of Non- alignment had earned more adherents in Afro-Asian world by 1954 – 55.

In the evolution of the policy non- alignment, an event of major importance was the first summit conference of the Non-aligned Nations at Belgrade in September 1961, and subsequently the second conference of the Non-aligned Nations at Cairo in 1961. The Belgrade Conference was attended by 25 non-aligned nations. As the concept of non-alignment came to be accepted by more nations in the world, 46 African, Asian and Latin American nations attended the Cairo Conference in 1964. In those conferences, the non-aligned countries voiced out their desire for peace in the world. They also decided to oppose imperialism.

6. **Stand Against Colonialism and Racial Discrimination.** Another dominant note in the foreign policy of India under Nehru was the vigorous stand taken by her against colonialism and racial discrimination. Every year after 1946 India emphasized in the General Assembly of the United Nations that racial segregation in any form in the Union of South Africa and in other parts of the world was a violation of fundamental human rights. India also condemned from time to time the minority regime in Rhodesia, as it abhorred racialism and racial discrimination which was practiced in Rhodesia.

7. **Pan-Asianism.** India being the first nation in Asia to become free from the Western colonial rule, it was natural for her to take up the cause of the freedom of other Asian nations which were subjugated by the Western Powers. After the Second World War (1939 - 45) a radical change took place in Asia. That was because the Asian nations, which were under Western Powers, were violently throwing off the clutches of colonialism. At that time, in the Asian Relations Conference of 1947, Nehru supported the cause of the freedom of those Asian nations.

India under Nehru gave unreserved support to the Asian freedom movement, As a result in January, 1949; it convened a conference to discuss ways and means to ensure the independence of Indonesia, which was struggling at that time to secure freedom from the foreign rule. The 15 countries who attended that conference, gave unstinted support to the freedom struggle of Indonesia. That paved a way for the independence of Indonesia, which was achieved on 29th December, 1949.

8. **Support to Afro-Asian Solidarity.** Afro – Asian solidarity was another important ingredient of the foreign policy of India in the Nehru Era. As India had won her freedom from foreign rule it always championed the cause of dependent peoples of Asia and Africa.

In the Bandung conference, which was held in 1955 in Indonesia and which was attended by 29 Afro-Asian nations, India played an important role in strengthening the cause of the Afro –Asian solidarity. In order to strengthen and serve the cause of the Afro. Asian solidarity, India maintained close contact with other Afro-Asian nations in the United Nations Organization and elsewhere.

9. **India and the Commonwealth.** After the acquirement of independence in 1947, thought it was possible for India to give up its membership of the British Commonwealth of Nations, India decided to be member of that organization as it pursued a policy of friendly cooperation even with those whose colonial rule she had been fighting in the past. Its membership of that organization did not inhibit her freedom of action for the cause of world peace and of elimination of racial discrimination and colonialism. The Commonwealth provided a useful forum where India could work for the major objectives of her foreign policy in the Nehru Era.

REORGANIZATION OF LINGUISTIC STATE

Until 1919 the Government of India was a unitary and undemocratic government. Therefore, the division of British India into provinces was mainly a matter of administrative

convenience. To the alien government of the British, it was of little consequence whether or not the provincial boundaries corresponded to the languages of their subjects.

(a) Demand for the Reconstitution of the provinces on Linguistic Basis. As the political consciousness of the Indians grew and they desired to have more of active participation of the people in the administration, they started expressing the view that the provinces should be formed on the basis of the languages of the people.

i) The British View. As a result, both the Montague-Chelmsford Report and the Simon Commission had suggested that some redistribution of provinces on linguistic and ethnic consideration might receive attention.

ii) The Congress View. The Indian national Congress also shared such inclinations in 1908 and in its Nagpur Session of 1920 it accepted the linguistic organization of the British provinces as a definite objective. The Nehru Committee, which was appointed by the Indian National Congress under the Chairmanship of Pandit Motilal Nehru in 1928, expressed a view that British provinces should be regrouped on a linguistic basis. Thenceforth that policy was followed by the Indian National Congress up to time India became independent in August, 1947.

iii) Fear of Separatism entertained by the Congress. After independence the demand to organize provinces on linguistic basis gathered force in India. But after independence the congress leaders feared that the acceptance of the linguistic principle for the organization of the provinces would encourage separatist tendencies, which were already present in the Indian political character since long and which had ruined the Indian nation earlier, and would lead to cause emotional disintegration. Therefore they were not enthusiastic about that matter. But as a result of public pressure in that matter, in 1948 the Congress appointed a Committee of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, and Pattabhi Sitaramayya, known as the "J.V.P." Committee. That committee pointed out that "if the units of the federation corresponded too closely with linguistic divisions, fissiparous tendencies might develop and indeed the Provinces might loom larger than India in the eyes of their inhabitants". The committee felt that the linguistic provinces might prove dangerous to Indian unity. As a result Prime Minister Nehru was not in favour of the creation of linguistic provinces.

But after that there developed an agitation of the Telugu speaking people who wanted the creation of Andhra. In that agitation Sri Potti Srimulu died when he had undertaken a fast unto death for the creation of the Andhra State. The abnormal situation which developed as a result of his death, led Prime Minister Nehru in 1953 to agree for the formation of an Andhra State. That made the people of the languages also to demand states based on their languages. The Central Government then appointed the Fazal Ali Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr. Fazal Ali in December, 1953, in order to decide whether linguistic states should be formed in India after taking into account the unity and security of India, and financial, economic and administrative consideration. After making

some modifications in the recommendations of that commission the Parliament of India passed the States Reorganization Act, 1956.

(b) The states Reorganization Act, 1956 According to this Act (1) a new State of Andhra Pradesh was created by adding certain territories to the existing state of Andhra, (2) a new state of Kerala was created by comprising the territories of the existing States of Travancore –Cochin, and (3) a new Part ‘C’ State known as locative, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands was created.

As result of these and other matters there existed according to that Act the following thirteen Part ‘A’ States: (i) Andhra Pradesh, (ii) Assam. (iii) Bihar, (iv) Bombay, (v) Kerala, (vi) Madhya Pradesh, (vii) Madras, (viii) Mysore, (ix) Orissa, (x) Punjab, (xi) Rajasthan, (xii) Uttar Pradesh, and (xiii) West Bengal.

That Act created Jammu and Kashmir as the Part ‘B’ State. IT also created the following Six Union territories : - (i) Delhi, (ii) Himachal Pradesh, (iii) Manipur, (iv) Tripura, (v) the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and (vi) the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands.

c) The Zonal Councils. As it was felt that the creation of the linguistic States would bring in danger the national unity of India, on the suggestion of the Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru the States Reorganization Act of 1956 created the Zonal Councils in the interests of national integration. According to it, the following five Zonal Councils were created consisting the different states; (i) the Northern Zone consisting of Punjab, Rajasthan, Kashmir, Delhi, and Himachal Pradesh; (ii) the Central Zone of Uttar Pradesh, and Madhya Pradesh; (iii) the Eastern Zone of Bihar, West Bengal, Orissa, Assam, Manipur, and Tripura; (iv) the Western Zone of Bombay ,and Mysore, and (v) the Southern Zone of Andhra Pradesh, Madras, and Kerala.

The Zonal Councils, which to have the Chief Ministers of the States included in them and other members, were to discuss subjects like social and economic planning, inter-State transport, position of the minorities, local self government, cottage industries and problems commonly related top their states. The zonal councils were to act as purely advisory bodies.

(d) Reaction against the States Reorganization Act of 1956. The creation of the above States was not wholly satisfactory. The people of the different States therefore raised their cry against the arrangement of the States created by the States Reorganization Act of 1956.

(i) Agitation for then Samyukta Maharashtra and Gujarat. The States Reorganization Act of 1956 had established a composite State of Bombay in which were to be the territories of the Marathi Speaking people of Maharashtra and the Gujarati speaking people of Gujarat. Since that arrangement was not in tune with the linguistic aspirations of both, the Maharashtra’s and the Gujarati people, they agitated for the creation of the separate states, Maharashtra and Gujarat respectively in order to satisfy their linguistic aspiration. The agitations of the Marathi speaking people were organized by the samyukta Maharashtra Samiti, and for the Gujarat Samiti. Taking into account the determination and the wisdom of those organizations to server the cause of their languages, the Government of India created

the States of Maharashtra and Gujarat after abolishing the Bombay States when the Indian Parliament passed a Bill to that effect on 25 April, 1960.

(ii) Agitation for the Creation of the Punjabi Suba. There also developed an agitation in the Punjab for the creation of the Punjabi Suba. The Government of India then appointed a Boundary Commission to decide about that matter.

(e) Creation of the States of Nagaland (1962). As the people of the Naga Hills-Tuensang area asked for the creation of a separate State, the Government of India created the Nagaland State in 1962.

Thus by 1962, in India were created the States on the basis of the aspirations of the people. As a result the people of India are living a life of mutual cooperation with each other. There has not been created any danger to the national unity as a result of the creation of those linguistic States. As these States have the concern of the betterment of their subjects, they are making a rapid headway towards progressive life.