

succession their influence and trade in India. They established at first factories and later their political power and managed the foreign trade of India. New ports arose. Goa, Bombay, Ceylon, Madras, Calcutta and others became gradually the great centres and harbours of trade. Both shipping and trade fell into their hands. The later development of steam ships, and internal development of roads, water-ways and railways for military purposes strengthened European commerce with India. Its machine made products found their way under the British rule and encouragement into India in large quantities. The building of Suez Canal and the control of Egypt by England helped this process. Now these various means and methods have largely contributed to the growth of European commerce with and in India. But the measures which the British adopted helped largely the import of English manufactured goods and the export of raw materials or precious metals. The taxation system, the railway system and restrictions, customs, prohibitions, and a host of other rules were created to facilitate the import of British and other manufactured goods. India was treated as a great customer. Her industries were checked and ruined. There was no state aid or intervention in favour of Indian industrial advance. Most of this trade is in European hands who control railways and railway rates, shipping and shipping rates, ports and harbours, river navigation and all other things commercially important. Government of the country looks largely after their interests. One of the glaring instances of this favouritism was the excise duty on cotton goods

imposed against the wishes of India in the interests of Lancashire cotton industry. The net loss which India incurs in maritime shipping which is in the hands of England is nearly 50 crores of rupees.

Banking. Banking has been known in India from very early times. Indigenous bankers and their banks have financed the internal trade of the country and the needs of its rulers. To-day also indigenous bankers serve a useful purpose in the very large internal trade of the country. Their advances, their bills of exchange or Hundis, and their letters of credit have helped merchants in their daily routine and in times of extreme commercial activity and needs. Without their help the enormous internal trade of the country which comes to roughly 2,000 crores of rupees annually would not be carried on. In matters of foreign trade, however, which is worth 400 crores annually, European bankers and banks hold the reins and finance the concerns. They encourage and help only European and not any indigeneous enterprise or firm. These banks make roughly 30 crores of profit every year in this lucrative business of financing foreign trade. The Imperial Bank of India which is under a statutory management is also largely controlled by European interests. All the savings and deposits of the country public and private are used by it largely in their interests. The Insurance companies which are also largely foreign use their large capital in foreign interests, and earn a profit of nearly 20 crores a year. Thus though there is a large amount of Indian commerce foreign and internal, it is largely controlled by foreigners who make large profits in various ways.

Indians lose heavily in shipping, railways, banking and insurance every year. These figures of commerce, banking, insurance and means of communication will be helpful to understand the present position of Indian trade.

Exports :—

Total exports of merchandise in 1925-26 was roughly 400 crores of rupees.

Imports :—

Total imports of merchandise in 1925-26 was roughly 240 crores of rupees.

Total foreign seaborne trade of India was worth 640 crores in 1925-26.

*Principal articles of Import (1925-1926).*

			<i>Per cent.</i>
Cotton manufactures...	...	...	29%
Iron and steel	...	...	8%
Machinery	...	...	7%
Sugar	...	...	7%
Railway plant	...	...	2%
Hardware	...	...	2%
Mineral oil	...	...	4%
Other articles	...	...	41%
			<hr/> 100

*Principal articles of Export (1925-1926).*

		<i>Per cent.</i>
Jute, raw and manufactures	...	26
Cotton, raw and manufactures	...	28
Food grains	...	13
Seeds	...	8
Tea	...	7
Hides and skins	...	2
Other articles	...	16
		<hr/>
		100

<i>Year.</i>	<i>Imports Rs. (crores).</i>	<i>Exports Rs. (crores).</i>	<i>Total extending re-exports.</i>
1913—14	183	244	427
1919—20	101	198	299
1920—21	142	172	314
1921—22	124	182	306
1922—23	138	214	352
1923—24	120	240	360
1924—25	137	250	387
1925—26	143	246	389

The total route mileage of Indian railways in 1927 was 39,048, and the total capital at charge on all railways including those under reconstruction amounted to Rs. 788·67 crores.

The Government of India organised a Commerce Government De- and Industry Department in 1905 and put it in charge of a member of the department. Executive council. There is a Director-General of Commercial Intelligence who looks after its working. But the commercial and the currency and exchange policy of Government of India has not been at all beneficial to the development of Indian commerce and industrial enterprise. The deliberate manipulation and



change of currency and exchange system have been disastrous to Indian economic prosperity. It has helped foreign interests. As a result India has become a debtor country. It is indebted to the extent of more than 1,000 crores of rupees. The debt is three-fourths productive and one-fourth non-productive. Its exports of articles or precious metals are more than her imports. It has to give more in order to meet the heavy cost of British administration civil and military, the interest on debts incurred, pensions and allowances, and the enormous profits made by European merchants in industries and commerce. This excess is stated to amount annually more than 40 crores of rupees if we exclude the commercial and industrial profits which would come to about 100 crores more. This is the drain which India suffers without any real compensation of industrial or commercial or political advance in return. It is largely impoverishing the people because their industrial and commercial life is in the hands and interests of foreigners, and they cannot satisfy their primary wants of life with the help of the poor and limited agriculture which they carry on for their subsistence. Poverty and indebtedness are the grim facts of Indian economic life. Every attempt to prove otherwise has only emphasized the facts in a new way. The state is largely responsible for this condition.

#### 6. ECONOMIC ORGANISATION OF A VILLAGE.

When a group of people or a tribe settle on a piece of small territory mainly for agricultural purposes a village comes into existence. The tribal bond of blood existing in the

nomadic or pastoral stage of life gives place gradually to the territorial tie of neighbourhood and attachment to the soil in the new agricultural and industrial stage. Village community is primarily an economic community depending on the ownership and cultivation and production of a fixed piece of land area. The families which compose the community clear and cultivate the land and subsist on its produce. If they belong to one tribe then they have social inter-relationships, but if they belong to different tribes they help one another in economic matters for which they have primarily come together and continue to associate. In political matters also which concern the peace and order in the community and its protection against hostile foreign groups they are joint and associate together. Thus cultivation of the land and protection of the land community settled on it are the primary concerns of a village organisation. Later on social relations between different sections develop on this permanent habitation and ideas of a higher welfare, religious, intellectual, moral, or recreational take place.

But the village originally existed and was meant to exist as a self-sufficing or self-contained unit. Its piece of land was either owned and cultivated by itself communally or owned in common and cultivated in partition, but protected jointly. There was to each family a homestead, and to the community the whole soil. The principle of communal cultivation gave place to individual cultivation. When the village came under a larger political group, individual proprietorship of land developed at the cost of communal proprietorship.

In the economic organisation of the village community the proper cultivation of the soil formed the chief factor. The needs of agriculture regulated the industrial and social and political relations. The agricultural work maintained a large class of peasants and their helpers. The cultivator was the chief person. His helpers were a group of artisans and labourers. They consisted of a carpenter, a smith, a potter, a herdsman, a weaver, a cobbler, a barber, a priest, an astrologer, a physician, a scavenger, a watchman, a political head or a village leader, a washerman, a bard, whose duty was to repair and to prepare his agricultural tools and implements and to help him in building his house, in supplying his home wants of cloth, utensils, medicine, and cleanliness and his religious and educational wants, and his other necessities, political, economic, and educational and who shared in the field produce for the services rendered. These different functionaries of the village were a part and parcel of the economic organisation. In Indian villages they evolved into different and rigid professional castes who entered into no blood relationship with one other, but they were like brothers sharing in the village produce according to the division of labour. These crafts were not many. They were rudimentary. The number of these sharers was generally twelve. Exchange of produce and articles when it came was rudimentary and by barter. Later on, weekly markets were held at different villages. Money economy and credit and capital system came very late. A village consisted of three portions—one for habitation or homestead, one for cultivation and

one for pasture. There was a forest beyond where wood was collected and hunting done. The homestead and cultivated land was owned severally but the pasture and forest land was sometimes enjoyed in common.

These village people regarded themselves as a united or closely associated group for **Communal life,** material, moral and political purposes. In order to protect themselves against aggression by outsiders and from thorns from within they developed a corporate idea of a village assembly or council of family elders called *gramasamiti* or *sabha* in Vedic times, and later on village *panchayat*. The functions of these bodies were primarily political, that is, the preservation of peace and security of the village and its folk. As a direct result it became necessary for it to preserve the village customs and laws and to adjudicate on disputed matters, and to impose penalties on those who broke them. They were territorial organisations dealing with the common concerns and needs of the village community as a whole. They carried on primarily administrative, judicial, economic and military functions and added later on welfare functions to their primary duties. At the head was the village headman, an elected or hereditary official, called in old times Gramani and later Patel. There were other village officials, judicial and magisterial, who looked after disputes and peace. The village assembly or *panchayat* consisted of village elders and was presided over by the headman. The representatives consisted of all castes. There was no formal election. The individual was merged in the family.

The family was represented by its head or elder member. It was a territorial body looking after common economic and political concerns of the village. They were the trustees of the community on whose behalf they did the work of direction and supervision. These elders who were the heads of households were called *gramavradhas* or *mahajana*. These were local autonomous bodies and well trained in the art of local government. The united village life was expressed in a common temple and tank, a common meeting-place, a common sanitation and a common political and economic organisation. The village looked after the maintenance of roads, bridges and ferries jointly.

It had the following sources of revenue; taxes on carts and artisans, market fees, ferry charges, marriage and burial fees, land revenue or share. It also exacted compulsory labour on some occasions for the purposes of roads, tanks, bridges, etc.

This Gramapanchayat which was called a Puga or Gana must be differentiated from the Gramapanchayat and the Jatipanchayat. The latter looked after social, religious, vocational and educational matters. It consisted of elders of the families belonging to a definite caste. They maintained their own social laws, religious practices and vocational status and needs. It was not a political body, and belonged only to a section of the community. If a caste *panchayat* dealt largely with vocational matters, it came to be called a Sreni or guild in towns whose main object was to maintain and develop its own technical skill and economic rights and privileges, and

to regulate its out-put, prices etc. A Grama *panchayat* consisted of different caste people and not representatives of one caste alone. Thus it is a territorial body or a neighbourhood group, whilst Jat *panchayat* is a socio-religious group managing and adjudicating upon social and religious matters.

The higher castes in India such as Brahmanas and others have not caste *panchayats*.

When kings imposed their rule on a number of villages, a new factor in administration arose in the village. The villages which came under or sought his protection had to obey him in political matters. They had to pay him for protection rendered, and to obey his decisions in matters of larger disputes. He became a sharer in their produce. It was given to him in lieu of protection in normal as well as in perilous times. The king protected them and looked after his financial interests through a set of his own royal officers. They either negotiated with the village headman for king's dues and privileges, or sometimes the village headman accepted in addition to his representative capacity king's authority and an office under him. In this double capacity he had often to work. The king's police, judge, and revenue official either came from the capital or the village head accepted these separate police, judicial and revenue charges. Thus the old self-governing character of the village in political matters was lost when large political and territorial associations came into existence. The village retained local autonomy in some minor matters, and the hand of the king through his agent, administrative and

judicial, intervened in matters of royal and country's provincial interests. Similarly in economic matters also its self-sufficing character was lost owing to the development of provincial and national trade with the growth of easy means of communication, and of a transport system and money economy. Thus the village community which was a politically ordered society with all the branches of administration and government and an economically ordered body with all the division of labour and an organisation of workers or functionaries as sharers became a part of a wider political unit and an economic world in due course of time. Its exclusiveness and isolation were lost. It became linked with other rural and urban communities and thus entered into a new national economy.

#### 7.—THE ECONOMIC ORGANISATION OF A TOWN.

The town is a wider territorial unit. It is often an enlarged village. Its life social, economic and political is many sided and more complex. A large number of human beings congregate there owing to commercial, industrial, religious or political advantages. Its situation, material resources, communications, climate, or associations are more advantageous than other places. It serves better for industry, commerce, protection or religion. Any one of these causes or a number of them attract people. Economic and political considerations chiefly prevail. Merchants and artisans gather there because it is often well protected-being a strong-hold or because it is a pilgrim centre. It is often a centre of strong Government. These are some of the factors which

create a town or city out of a village. The total number of towns and cities in India were 2313 and urban population  $3\frac{1}{2}$  crores in 1911.

The urban community is generally more industrial and commercial. Its population follows various occupations. They are not necessarily subsidiary to any one occupation as in a village. They are all helpful to one another. They are highly advanced in skill and technique and are severally organised into guilds or unions of craftsmen and merchants. Their products or services are in demand and exchanged at various places inside and outside the town. They not only supply the local urban market but also outside markets with their special goods. Town is generally not a self-sufficing and isolated economic unit, unless it is an enlarged village. It needs outside goods and exchanges for them her own products. Even self-governing Greek cities imported foreign articles, and maintained a slave class in the surrounding districts which worked on farms and gave agricultural produce to the leisured, political and literary classes of cities.

Each profession or occupation in the city was organised on a guild basis. A guild or Sreni was an association of persons engaged in a particular vocation of industry or commerce. It was either a craft guild or a merchant guild. Each guild consisted of one caste or different castes who followed the same vocation in a particular locality. The guild included masters, journeymen and apprentices. It chiefly sought economic ends. It is economic in conception as caste is



social and religious. One caste if it follows different occupations may possess different guilds. Guilds of traders and bankers were often composed of different castes. Thus a guild is a conglomerate structure. It looked after the interests and regulation and control of its trade or craft. It settled wages, output, disputes, prices and quality of articles, weights and measures, education, etc. It also undertook welfare or charitable functions, and built temples, tanks, wells, shade-trees, rest-houses, and granted charities. The guild council or *panchayat* did this work and was composed of the elders (Mahajan) of the occupational families. Its head was called a Sresthin or Shetya who was often elected. Matters were decided by majority. These guilds were many. There were guilds of weavers, carpenters, potters, tailors, dyers, washermen, and of merchants dealing in various goods. All these guilds (Srenis) of artisans, traders and bankers sometimes federated into a town organisation called *naigama*. It had a town council or panchayat which looked after their joint interests and social and political welfare. There was a *nagarseth* who was at the head of the whole organisation. Matters were decided by a majority. It was composed of the heads or seths of various guilds in the town. This body or board was often called Mahajan, and its power extended over communities doing business in the town. Nagarseth was often consulted by the king in state matters. These bodies controlled markets, exchanges, public holidays, charities. Their bills of exchange and rates of interests served the needs of the internal trade of the country. They levied fees

and fines for various purposes and thus organised the economic life of the urban and the provincial community before states undertook to regulate or to interfere in these matters. They maintained the traditional skill and technique and quality.

Trades and industries gradually came to be localised either in separate villages or in particular portions of towns. If a village happened to be confined to a particular industry the village headman and the guildhead were often the same. The city was an association of several quarters, each having a separate industry. There were weaver's quarters, goldsmith's quarters, banker's quarters, marchant's quarters smith's quarters and so on.

Such a town or city by constant association and internal dependence of its inmates came to possess a new and common social, religious and political life. There developed a civic spirit of neighbourhood, service and help amongst its different members. Their common town council looked after the security and wellbeing of the town. If it happened to enjoy political autonomy it administered its governmental affairs, and looked after its cleanliness, public works and charities. It had its own watchmen and police, its judges and magistrates, and its other officials.

In many cases kings or central authority of the country administered the political affairs of the city through its own officials in whose hands lay the jurisdiction over local crimes and disputes. It was carried on in con-

The town and central government.

sultation with the local representatives. The king collected his taxes, customs and other dues through his own officials. But in matters of vocation, religion and social customs the people were largely self-governing. The king's officer or the king intervened only in cases of conflict between different groups and interests who had no common organisation to decide their conflicts, or in political matters or seditions and dangers against the established authority.

To-day this old order has changed. Government has undertaken to regulate all matters economic and political from the centre. It had destroyed the self-governing power of village and town panchayats. The villager has no vote in village matters. There is no real village panchayat. In towns a new sort of local self-government has arisen which is based on individual representation and not on guild representation, and is largely controlled by the central government.

Old indigenous industries and trades have decayed under the stress of foreign competition and hence the guilds are also gone. There is no industry except that of a shopkeeper or a retail trader whose influence is very little in society. Foreigners have captured the trade and industries of the country, and the former skilled artisan and merchants have gradually become labourers on land or in mills wherever possible. The political influence which property gives and the personality which it creates are wanting. Indian towns are becoming dominated by government servants or professionals who are connected with the government machinery.

Decay of urban  
industrial life.

To-day the capitalistic system of society has changed the old order. Large scale production and the dominance of capital in the economic organisation and production have changed the old status order or fixity of society and brought in the contract order, the wages system, the perpetual flux of occupations and wealth, and the antagonism of the rich and poor in wealth, instead of that of the high and the low by birth.

There are to-day associations of employers and associations of workers or trade unions opposed to each other. Amongst them there are persons of all sorts and castes whose economic interests bind them for peace or war against their opponents in economic matters. There are also chambers of merchants which look after their economic interests as a whole and guard them with the help of political rights and representatives.

Besides the usual economic organisation of towns and villages which we have noticed, a new element of economic relations between different persons arose when lands were freely and largely granted to a few persons by kings for their services in war or peace. These grants of lands or rights to revenue on land were also made for religious purposes. Hence arose a new system of economic relationship between the landlord and the tenant or cultivator. India is spread with such landholders called Jagirdars, Talukdars, Inamdars, and Devas-thanams or Wakfs. This landed political and religious aristocracy has also influenced the economic life of the

people and encroached upon their proprietary and political rights, and reduced them to slavery and poverty. This system developed a personal relation of lordship and dependence and not a true civic relation of a locality. A cultivator became the 'man' of his lord, and had to render exacting personal services and burdensome dues and fines. He was in a way tied to the soil and to the lord without any real personal or proprietary rights. Thus he got degraded economically and morally. His was a life of a serf or a slave and not of a free citizen. This system also led to unequal distribution of wealth and work amongst the people and has maintained the hereditary conception of property and society upto to-day.

In the economic organisation of Indian society the caste system still plays a very large part. Change of occupation is not frequent. The high or low character of any occupation as determined by social tradition and conception also controls the development or progress of the economic life of India. Against all these odds India is to-day striving to create a modern economic society and organisation.

The urbanisation of India has been going on very slowly during the last 30 years. Only 10·2 per cent. of its population is urban.

---

## APPENDIX I.

*Statistics of towns and villages.*

India.		India.	
1	2	1	2
Area in square miles	1,805,882	Total population ...	318,942,480
Number of towns and villages,	687,981	(a) In Towns ...	32,475,276
(a) Towns ...	2,316	(b) In Villages...	286,467,204
(b) Villages ...	685,665	Males ...	163,995,554
Number of Occupied Houses.	65,198,389	(a) In Towns ...	17,845,248
(a) In towns ...	6,765,014	(b) In Villages...	146,150,306
(b) In villages...	58,433,315	Females ...	154,946,926
		(a) In Towns ...	14,680,028
		(b) In Villages..	140,316,896

## APPENDIX II.

*1. Distribution of the people of India by occupation.*

The subjoined table gives a summary idea of the distribution of the peoples of India according to their occupation.

Order No.	Occupation.	Population supported in 1921.
	Total population ...	316,055,231
	A—Production of Raw Materials ...	231,194,403
	I—Exploitation of animals and vegetation	230,652,350

Order No	Occupation.	Population supported in 1921.
1	Pasture and Agriculture ...	229,045,019
2	Fishing and Hunting ...	1,607,331
	II—Exploitation of minerals ...	542,053
3	Mines ...	398,968
4	Quarries and Hard rocks ...	74,945
5	Salt, etc ...	68,140
	B—Preparation and supply of Material substances.	55,612,694
	III—Industry ...	33,167,018
6	Textiles... ..	7,847,829
7	Hides, Skins, and Hard materials from the animal kingdom.	731,124
8	Wood ... ..	3,613,583
9	Metals ... ..	1,802,208
10	Ceramics ... ..	2,215,041
11	Chemical products properly so called and analogous.	1,194,263
12	Food industries ...	3,100,361
13	Industries of dress and toilet ...	7,425,213
14	Furniture industries... ..	27,065
15	Building ditto ... ..	1,753,720
16	Construction of means of transport	52,793
17	Production and transmission of physical forces (heat, light. electricity, native power etc.)	24,881
18	Other miscellaneous and undefined industries.	3,387,937
	IV—Transport ... ..	4,331,054
19	Transport by air ... ..	629
20	Transport by water .. ..	745,399
21	Transport by road ... ..	2,145,949
22	Transport by rail ... ..	1,231,672
23	Post office, telegraph and tele phone service.	207,405

Order No.	Occupation.	Population supported in 1921.
	V—Trade ... ..	...
24	Banks, establishments of credit, exchange and insurance.	993,492
25	Brokerage, Commission and Export.	242,628
26	Trade in textiles ... ..	1,286,277
27	Trade in skins, leather and furs...	233,862
28	Trade in wood ... ..	227,667
29	Trade in metals ... ..	64,688
30	Trade in pottery, bricks and tiles	62,498
31	Trade in chemical products ...	120,028
32	Hotels, cafes, restaurants, etc ...	706,332
33	Other trades in food-stuffs ...	9,282,651
34	Trade in clothing and toilet articles	284,868
35	Trade in furniture ... ..	173,188
36	Trade in building materials ...	76,810
37	Trade in means of transport ...	331,900
38	Trade in fuel ... ..	519,296
39	Trade in articles of luxury and those pertaining to letters, and the art and sciences	459,868
40	Trade of other sorts... ..	3,048,570
	C—Public administration and liberal arts.	9,846,050
	VI—Public force ... ..	2,181,597
41	Army ... ..	757,383
42	Navy ... ..	571
43	Air force ... ..	1,033
44	Police ... ..	1,422,610
45	VII—(Order 45) Public administra- tion.	2,643,882
	VIII—Professions and Liberal Arts...	5,020,571
46	Religion... ..	2,452,614
47	Law ... ..	336,510



Order No.	Occupation.	Population supported in 1921.
48	Medicine ... ..	659,583
49	Instruction ... ..	805,228
50	Letters and arts and sciences ...	761,636
	D—Miscellaneous ... ..	19,402,084
51	IX—(Order 51) Persons living principally on their income.	497,835
52	X—(Order 52) Domestic service ...	4,570,151
53	XI—Insufficiently described occupations (Order 53 General terms which do not indicate a definite occupation)	11,098,566
	XII—Unproductive ... ..	3,253,532
54	Inmates of Jails, asylums, and almshouses.	145,467
55	Beggars, vagrants and prostitutes	3,020,680
56	Other unclassified non-productive industries.	87,385

Briefly stated :—

Agriculture supports 70·9% with 55% dependants & 45 workers

Industry	„	10·7%	„	52%	„	48%	„
Commerce	„	7·1%	„	56%	„	44%	„
Professions	„	1·6%	„	59%	„	41%	„
Other occupations.	„	9·7%	„	46%	„	54%	„

## CHAPTER III. POLITICAL LIFE.

### 1.—HISTORICAL FORMS OF GOVERNMENT.

India has passed through various forms of political organisation. Her political history is a record of various invasions and dynasties, of various tribal polities and republics. From the time of the Vedic Aryans to the present British rulers we are able to study a number of types of polities in India.

In the Vedic period the states were small, generally known as Janarajyas or Ganarajyas, organised within a grama or a number of gramas. The polity was largely a tribal one, where the king or Rajan was the head and the leader of the Vis or Jana or people, and administered their affairs with the advice or command of the Sabha and the Samiti. These two bodies which consisted of the rich and the learned people (Sabha) and of all the people (Samiti) dealt with judicial and communal affairs in their meetings. They also elected or approved of the king, and sometimes deposed him for his bad behaviour or incapability.

Wherever the tribal feeling and tribal independence remained this form of democratic organisation continued to exist till later on. The earlier and later republics in India are the models and growths of this Vedic form. The king's or the leader's functions are found expressed in such utterances as इयंतेराट्, यन्तासि यमनो, ध्रुवोसि धरुषः कृष्यैत्वा, क्षेमायत्वा, रथ्यैत्वा, पोष्यायत्वा. The people and the king shared in this power and in the regulation of the community.

There was however another current which developed the autocratic power and the kingdoms of India. The constant conquest of one part of the country by another, and the need of maintaining a strong administration in the hands of one or a few gradually developed monarchies and aristocracies, and their irresponsible or autocratic power. The people over whom they came to rule had to be checked and kept in obedience. There was no question or desire of sharing the political power with the people. No doubt kings in those days were expected to be good and to rule according to old established laws, institutions and customs of the people and had no right to interfere in them. Still the political power, that is, that of administration and justice remained in their hands. There was a great impetus to the rise of monarchies in view of the ambitions of rulers to become '*chakravartins*'. Religion encouraged these ambitions. The various great sacrifices such as Asvamedha, Vajapeya and others were the great instruments of the conquerors. When their rule or authority or suzerainty spread over a large part of the country and the people, the people's direct share in the political power of the country was not possible, because the rulers and the ruled were not of the same tribe or custom, the ruled comprised different tribes and people, and the distance between one part of the kingdom and the other, and the differences between them could not create any unity or joint desire amongst them. To give them a share in the central government was neither practicable nor desirable. They had no common will or interests amongst them, and the central

administration had to be strong in those days to protect the people from foreign invasion and to prevent them from internal quarrels of one group against the other.

These conquests and re-conquests of strong rulers or races led to the destruction of earlier republics and the Vedic polity disappeared, because it could not work on a large scale and under new monarchies.

Monarchy has been largely the dominant type of government in the history of the world.

It is since the American revolution and the French revolution that democracies on a large scale have been thought of and attempted in Europe and elsewhere. A large part of Europe has only come under their influence in the 20th century.

But though monarchies came into existence, developed and prevailed in a large part of the world on account of invasions, conquests and reconquests, still there were new religious or intellectual forces which continued to help their consolidation and legitimacy. The Divine Right theory started by priests or royal advocates and the absolute sovereignty of the state or rulers advocated by great thinkers based on the Hobbes's theory of a social contract or Hegel's theory of real will and personality of the state have helped the maintenance of royal despotism and the basis of monarchy in a philosophical way.

But even then there were thinkers who propounded and the people or the king who accepted the idea of a good monarchy. They showed who was a good king and how he can rule well. Indian political and religious thinkers

developed the theory of a Saptanga Rastra, as the Europeans did of the limited monarchy. This conception of State became the political practice in India. The coronation oath which every new or hereditary monarch had to take made the king swear allegiance to the preservation of the established laws and institutions of the people, and did not allow him to be self-willed and irresponsible, but compelled him to rule in the interests of the people. This theory contemplated the desposition or destruction of a bad king. It also emphasised the fact that the king alone was not the state, but he was only one element (Svami) of the state or Rastra. The other elements were counsellors (Amatya), people (Paura and Janapada), fort (durga), treasury (kosa), army (bala), ally (mitra). Without them a state was not complete nor possible nor virtuous and prosperous. The king was only one of the three powers of a state. He is the Prabhusakti (controlling or guardian element). The other powers are Mantrasakti (counsellors or the thinking element), and Utsahakti (the people or the energy element). The king had to be virtuous, selfdisciplined and educated. He must look after the peace and the prosperity of the people in consultation with good and virtuous consellers and expert administrators, and with the wishes, wisdom and virtues of the people. He is not above Dharma, but must obey and protect it. The dharma consisted not only of that enjoined by Sruti, and Smṛti, and Purana, but also of desadharma, jatidharma, kuladharmā, pugadharma and srenidharma. The king could not interfere in these duties or laws of various territorial and functional groups. His Rajasanas

generally related to criminal, judicial and administrative, military and foreign matters, and sometimes in times of danger to the state to other matters, but merely as temporary directions. The highest duty and end of the king was according to Kautilya प्रजा सुखे सुखं राज्ञः प्रजानां च हिते हितं नाम प्रियं हितं राज्ञः प्रजानां प्रियं हितं ॥

Hindu society was organised on a group-and-function principle. In cases of conflicts of groups and functions a controlling and coercive authority or a specialised political organ was wanted. The king was that authority at the head and that specialised organ, and he was also directly the political authority without whose protection no group can exist and no function can be performed. But the people organised in various territorial and functional groups were largely self-governing. The *Jati* (socio-religious group), the *sampradaya* or *pantha* (religious group), the *varna* sociofunctional group), the *sreni* (vocational group), the *Vidyapitha* or *Asrama* (the educational group), the *Parisad* (the literary group), the *Grama*, *Pura*, and *Janapada* (the territorial group), and others were the usual constituent groups in a *rastra* or society whose life was sectional but voluntary and self-organised with its own laws organisation and administrators. King intervened and preserved the groups and their functions only in cases of their mutual conflicts and when they promoted sedition against the existing political order.

In matters of local government also king allowed a good deal autonomy to villages, town and provinces. His officers only supervised and seldom intervened. It is only in large matters of war and peace, taxation and administration

that the central government was mainly responsible and organised. No doubt the state undertook some welfare functions in its own hands, such as the promotion of some industries and international commerce. They were in the nature of monopolies and also of national importance and difficult to be organised by private enterprise. Under political functions came security of life, liberty, property and honour of the people, and provision of maintenance for the old, the diseased, the orphans and the widows, and the giving of grants to the religious and the learned.

The Amatyas or Mantris were organised into a Ministers. Parisad or cabinet of ten, twelve, sixteen or twenty whose advice was sought on state matters and amongst whom the various portfolios of government were distributed for proper execution. King was enjoined to listen to their advice and thus carry on the government. There were also a large number of superintendents appointed to look after the various departments of the state. These were above thirty in a well organised and efficient state, such as Kautilya describes. Hindus had devoted great thought to the art of Government and the detailed organisation of its various needs and departments. Its judicial organisation was in the hands of legal experts who were well versed in law, learned and independent. Its charity department, economic and welfare departments were also well organised.

Its foreign relations were well studied and its interests well guarded. Its laws of warfare were well developed. All this was developed as a regular science and rules based on experience and study were laid down for the guidance of a king.

To Hindus Politics was a science and an art and a human necessity.

Such was the Hindu conception of a good king and of a well-organised Government. The other forms of Government which prevailed in some parts of the western and northern India were aristocratic and democratic republics. These were called Ganarajyas. In them either only a class or the whole people took part in Government. Some of them were known as Vairajyas or Bhaujyas. Then there were imperial or federal forms of Government of a developed type, such as Samrajyas, Maharajyas and others where suzerainty lay in one or was exercised jointly. The conception of '*Chakravartin*' and '*Sarvabhauma*' was a unitary conception of India as one *rashtra* which was attempted to be realised by a number of kings in the past. In historical times Chandragupta and Asoka achieved it and several kings had struggled for it. Later on feudal conception of Society and State arose in India. Kings and their vassals became hereditary rulers and lords of the soil by right of conquest and kingly grants. Peoples' original right to land, personal freedom and citizenship was gradually encroached upon. Land became King's or Lord's private property. People worked as mere tenants-at-will or landless labourers. Political power attached to land came to be regarded as a family or private hereditary possession. It could be transferred by marriage or gift or personal defeat in a battle. People did not count. They passed to the new possessor, grantee or heir, along with the land like trees and chattel attached to the soil. Hereditary Jagirdars, Inamdars, Taluqdars and others arose under this conception of society and state. Hereditary rulers prospered and continued to exist on this. Hindu, Muslim and English rulers have adopted many of the principles and practices arising out of this medieval conception of life and rule.



Muslims brought their theocratic conception of Muslim polity, society and state into India. According to them the state is only the police of the spiritual power. God is the ruler. Khalifa is His agent on the earth, carrying out the Kuranic commands. Political power is for the maintenance and promotion of true religion. Both powers are in the hands of Khalifa. But he exercises the lower one in the interests of the higher one. Politics is subordinated to religion. Sinners and apostates are also considered to be seditionists and rebels. Non-muslims cannot be full citizens. Some of them can be tolerated like Jews and Christians as men of the Book, but not others such as idolators. They were to be treated as Kaffirs. A religious tax known as Jazia was to be levied upon them if they were allowed to live in the conquered country.

This theocratic conception of the state and its ruler left no chance for any development of democratic ideas of government.

Muslim monarchy was an irresponsible monarchy. Excepting the Koran to none was allegiance due by the ruler. There was no right to rebel against Kuranic injunctions or Khalifa's orders. It was both a sin and a sedition to do so. Thus it was primarily an allegiance to a particular religion and its leader and not to the state and its ruler. As long as the Khilafat remained undivided, the force of this theory was great. But under conflicting theories about the election or succession of Khalifa and the ensuing conflicts of their followers the Khilafat split into three Khalifas in three parts of the world. Its political power gradually decayed and was usurped by Sultans who were stronger.

persons or governors, having conquered a large part of Khalifa's territory. Such Sultanates or Amirates were established in various parts of Muslim world or they were new conquests of non-Muslim territories. These Sultans had very little religious power of their own, but had full political power over the conquered territories. Therefore though they had accepted Kuranic teachings still they tended to become powerful rulers and to look to their stability and interests from the political point of view. No doubt they used their religious ideas to trouble or oppress their subjects by depriving them of their political rights and financial security, still for the safety of their rule they had to ally themselves with the dominant races in the country who were non-Muslims and give back to them some of their religious rights and political privileges. They often used them against their Muslim opponents in a civil or a foreign war.

In India the Muslim rulers were compelled to soften the rigour of the original Muslim polity, though here and there a few rulers imitated and practised their religious conceptions and measures against their subjects. Sher Shah and Akbar tried to become territorial and political rulers and to minimise the influence of religion on politics. To them every one, be he a Muslim or a non-Muslim, was an equal citizen with civil, religious and political freedom as enjoyed by others.

But still they retained the feudal conception of Feudal conception. political power. There were no democratic ideas. State was a personal acquisition and therefore personal property. The kingdom did not belong to the God in heaven as to a God on earth, who along

with his followers and vassals shared the fortunes and disasters of his political acquisitions. The property and the power given to his military followers reverted to him on their death or sedition. He may re-grant it to their successors at his sweet will. There was no inalienable right in power and property given to any one except himself. Thus it will be seen there was no identity of interest created between the ruler and the ruled. The ruled on the contrary possessed no rights of their own. The ruler was all in all. What pleased him had the force of law. What displeased him had the character of crime and sedition. Whatever he allowed to exist was tolerated. It was a measure of necessity or expedience, not a law based on any principle of justice or equality. Muslim rulers wherever they adopted out of necessity or choice the attitude of tolerance and the idea of people's welfare did not interfere in their local, social or religious matters. Castes, sects and village panchayats managed largely their internal affairs. The central government and its officers were mainly interested in foreign policy and war, preservation of internal peace, and collection of revenue. In organising these military, police, and revenue departments, large power was generally vested in military officers. Civil authorities were subordinated to them or controlled by them. It is only Sher Shah and Akbar amongst Muslim Emperors who subordinated for a time military to civil authority. Judicial authority was exercised directly by the prince, or the Qazi when one of the parties happened to be a Muslim, and when offences were high, and by village or town panchayats when offences were ordinary and concerned

the people. Thus there were official and administrative courts to look after judicial matters of dispute between government and the people, and between the people themselves.

The executive departments were not fixed nor well organised. They increased or decreased according to a ruler's wishes. He interfered personally in all matters whenever he wanted to do so. Thus government machine emanated from him and worked under him.

It was thus a personal despotism unchecked by religion, by people or people's counsellors and representatives.

The British system of government is the result partly of conquest, partly of imitation and partly of English tradition and creation. As the conquerors of India their rule is an imposition and a despotism, as the successors to old sovereigns it is irresponsible and absolute, and as the representatives of British ideas of constitutional freedom and form of government it is to-day an experiment in dyarchy or a condominium of the British and Indian elements based on representatives ideas. The idea of a government fully responsible to the people is not as yet accepted or appreciated, much less practised.

The government of British India is largely auto-  
 cratic. The power vests in the Viceroy  
 and the Secretary of the state who is  
 responsible to the British Parliament. The rule is maintained and carried on in the interests of the rulers, that is, the British people. Its organisation is bureaucratic and is in the hands of a Civil Service, members

of which are appointed, controlled, and regulated by the Secretary of State. The British Parliament is the ultimate sovereign in Indian matters. There is no representative of India in it, nor is it responsible and responsive to Indian public opinion. There is no Indian control over India. The Governor General is not bound by the resolutions of the new Indian Legislature. They are recommendatory nor mandatory. He can override it in all matters. Similarly the Governors of Provinces possess unlimited powers in provincial matters. They can certify or restore items not passed by a legislative council. They can pass laws not approved by it. In Reserved subjects he is supreme, in Transferred subjects he is influential and holds the balance with the help of the official and nominated block.

There is no real democratic form of government in India. It is the rule of the executive. Rule of the Executive dominates. even in judicial and legislative matters. The final and the certifying and overriding power is in its hands. The British have however differentiated, organised and developed the technique of every-day administration, of the forms of various laws and legal and judicial procedure, of service regulations, of departmental relations, and of many other items. It is a well-organised, well-differentiated and well-controlled bureaucracy with duties, functions, and rights properly laid down. But it is still a foreign government largely carried on in its own interests and not a national government primarily and wholly worked in people's interests.

## 2. THE STATE AND THE PEOPLE.

We live in an age when in the development of large national policies or the undertaking of great public works of promise and utility, it is everywhere seen and realised that co-operation and organisation are the two essential factors. To be effective men must get together, and to act together they must have a common understanding and a common object. To give to any undertaking or enterprise an uninterrupted continuity and a successful footing and growth, individual efforts and management are found to be insufficient because they are spasmodic. Co-operation amongst a large number of individuals strengthened by an efficient organisation, has proved a great secret of success, a key to the solution of all difficult problems, and a panacea for many evils. Still more effectively has it been shown or proved by the history of the advanced nations that state which represents the natural as well as the artificial co-operation and organisation of a whole people, residing in a country for their own well-being, is the ideal body which should pay attention to the progress of its people, and initiate and originate, plan and start, establish and continue all things requiring its help, encouragement, advice or protection.

There is a class of new theorists who preach that the State should undertake to do everything and leave nothing to private effort or enterprise. They would throw the responsibility of every work on the

Co-operation and  
organisation  
necessary.

Individualist  
and collectivist  
theory of the  
state,

State, and reduce the individual, if not to a nonentity, at least to the condition of a tool or a machine. Nobody thinks that one could wish to reach this stage or to adopt this attitude, and to relegate individuality to the background. We owe many things to individual efforts, originality and intellect. The position we want to take and the path we wish to follow are to utilise the individual and the State both in their respective spheres. Objects which a few individuals cannot accomplish, the State must be asked to achieve. But we should not look to the State to do for us what we could and ought to do for ourselves. Otherwise all the individual virtues of daring and enterprise, originality and invention, honest competition and noble self-development would be lost, and man would sink into his primitive savage state. We believe there are many things which must be reserved for private efforts. We look to the State only when there are great undertakings in which the whole nation must co-operate and organise; and co-operation and organisation are only possible, if the State representing the sovereign rights of the community and possessing all the resources of the nation, undertakes the duty and responsibility zealously on itself.

In these days of stormy activities and surpassing efforts among some of the great nations **The duty of the state.** to push forth their own interests, to dominate others and to crush the weak, the State cannot and ought not to sit idle and only think of peace and order in the land while a whole nation is in a state of miserable existence. Many functions, which were considered to be outside its sphere, have

come to be entrusted to the State. Its activities have increased, its power has widened, its outlook has expanded, and its responsibilities have been enlarged. It has now to be seriously attentive to the progress and development of its people on all sides. It must manage and promote every movement for their health, wealth and prosperity. The State must now represent the nation as a whole and not any class or individual interests. Those days of whims, of boons and grants, of personal favour and despotism, are gone. Unless the State represents the interests of the nation, it hardly deserves to be called a State. The right of the State to exist must be based solely on the support accorded to it by the enlightened and educated popular will and favour. One may go so far as to say that the State must act as the parent of the nation, an ever acting force ready to do every thing by moulding its policy, promoting its healthy evolution, and leading it to higher and brighter paths of knowledge and activity.

In modern times we note that it has become a  
Its function in recognised function of the State to develop  
modern times. the material and physical, moral and  
mental welfare of the people, because it has usurped  
or there have fallen upon it the functions of other  
social, religious, and educational groups of the community. State, though primarily it is the community  
organised for political purposes, has under Greek and  
German, Patriarchal, Absolutist and Collectivist influences become an organisation dominant and directive  
in all social purposes. The social and welfare activities of the State are expressed in its industrial, social  
and educational legislation, and are carried out by its



ministrant departments of Industry, Commerce and Communication, Agriculture and Irrigation, Education and Public Health and others. That the State is responsible for the welfare of the people is an accepted maxim, and England, France, Germany and Japan have followed a State-aid and protection policy from the latter half of nineteenth century, and have brought their countries to a higher level of culture, material prosperity, and scientific advance. Conscious regulation of the life of the people and the protection and promotion of their interests by its laws and executive departments have become the watchwords of State's duties. The interests of the State and the people are now considered and developed under democratic organisations. But in India the political problem is complicated.

The present political life of the people moulds itself and rests on the fact of the foreign rule in the country. All the movements and aspirations are directed against the evils and interests created by it. Modern world does not tolerate foreign rule. It believes in the self-determination of peoples. Foreign rule has never proved a blessing in the end. It is a rule in the interests of the few primarily, and it stunts the growth and prevents the application of indigenous talent to problems of national power and freedom. Its ideas and interests are contrary to those of the ruled. It is an authoritarian order and an imposition. It is hardly an encouraging agency and an impetus to freedom. In its conflict and contact with the people it may awaken them from lethargy and generate indirectly forces

which would help them to unite, to remove internal evils, to adjust internal relations and to create a spirit of co-operation. But the character of the people as a whole suffers and deteriorates when the government follows the policy of 'divide and rule.'

Realisation of this fact came late in the minds of the people. The fundamental defect and the detrimental effect of the foreign rule in India came to be realised in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Then the educated people began to associate in small groups to think about it and to find out remedies against it or to minimise its effects by proposing suggestions and reforms. At this point of time constitutional agitation began in the country. But the movement was not merely political. It was also a religious, social, economic and educational revival and renaissance when men's thoughts turned inwards towards themselves. In trying to find the root causes of the country's political fall, all the aspects of its life were examined. Its social ideas and forms, its religious beliefs and rituals, its industrial position and progress, its educational strength and advance, all came to be noted and studied, and their faults or unsuitability were pointed out, and reforms and ideas were suggested and worked for. In this pursuit and struggle lay the birth of the new freedom and the decay of the old superstition, and the opportunity of human service and the strength of personality and indigenous power. No doubt in the way of success of this national reform movement difficulties of environment, old and new, traditional and vested, were very great, but had to be opposed and overcome.

Foreign rule had created a ~~mercenary~~ army and Effects of the police, new privileged classes and foreign rule. vested interests, whose loyalty to the new masters was steadfast being based on selfish interests. Moreover, classes which were hitherto non-political in revenge for their old grudges about social status, and those communities who were converted to or belonged to foreign religious faiths in their hatred, antagonism or fear of indigenous faiths, sided with and supported the new masters from whom they expected and got special communal rights and privileges. Additional difficulties were created by foreign, military and civil servants, capitalists, industrialists, merchants, planters, and bankers who were intensely interested in the maintenance of the new political order in the country which made their livelihood, industry, trade and plantation easily possible and extremely profitable. Any movement towards the political freedom of the country had the potentiality of the loss of these concerns and profits. India for the Indians would not be a welcome cry to them. It meant a new competition and restriction, and a national system of indigenous protection. Under these difficulties and protests the new national movement had to work. Moreover the ignorance and apathy of masses born out of medieval conditions of life and society, and the exclusive religious and orthodox outlook of fatalism were very discouraging features of the Indian mentality and society. Its division into groups and units not properly balanced and harmonised has been a great obstacle in her national solidarity and strength, and in her every great forward movement.

Foreign rule may be sometimes of indirect good if it is carried on solely and wholly in the interests of the governed. Such a rule if possible may be termed as an aristocratic rule in the words of Aristotle, that is, the rule of the few able in the interests of many. But such a thing is generally not possible. Foreigners by their rule and stay create vested interests in public services and offices, in industrial and commercial concerns and undertakings, in agricultural settlements and plantations, in religious institutions and conversions, and in social and racial cross-breeds. There is no conquest of a country done in the interests of that country. It is primarily the political ambition or economic interests which are the actuating or compelling motive. The human benevolence or the so called divine trustee-ship of the foreign rule breaks on the rock of vested interests and political glory and ambition, and is falsified by history. Where foreigners have got mixed up and amalgamated socially with the indigenous population, there only any new virtues and practices brought in by conquerors have done good to the conquered. Two antagonistic interests cannot create a new and good life. In this there is a dominance of one race and the dwarfing of another. There is hardly any rejoicing together, any common aspiration or spirit. Hence no coalition and coalescence are possible. On the contrary new disturbing and eccentric groups and units are created within the national organism who refuse to amalgamate because of their selfish or eccentric hopes and ideas, and are permanent parasitic sores in the body politic.

It may be noted that there is no identity of interests but there is a natural antithesis between the ruler and the ruled. The economic interests of both clash, and the political needs and aspirations of both differ. One deprecates the civilisation and the social life of the other, and considers it incapable of enjoying or creating political freedom and free political institutions. One calls the East unchangeable and the West alone progressive. Under such a position and view-point the wishes and the wisdom of the people alone have to be respected. There is no right to tyranny in the world, but there is one to self-government.

---

## CHAPTER IV. POLITICAL LIFE—(continued).

### 3. INDIAN NATIONAL MOVEMENT.

The rise of a new national movement requires a ~~The early pioneers~~ mental and moral awakening of the people which gives strength to their convictions and ardour to their struggles. The conscience of man must awaken against the surrounding ills. His liberty of conscience must assert itself in his immediate environment and thus create by his utterances, work and sufferings, a working ideal for others to follow. Such an awakening or divine discontent with the existing order took place in the minds of some great personalities in the very beginning of the nineteenth century in India. This discontent from within was preached and practised either in the shape of reform, revival or revolution. It gained admirers and followers, and they began to work and to organise for achieving their ideas in the respective spheres of life they undertook to mould or to change. The early awakening was religious and social. The religious awakening, revival and reform were largely due to the efforts of Raja Ram Mohan Rai, Swami Ramkrishna Paramahansa, Swami Dayananda Saraswati, Swami Vivekananda, Theosophists, their associates and a number of others. This awakening also promoted and helped largely the social and educational awakening.

The social reform movement was largely fostered by Raja Ram Mohan Rai, Swami Dayanand, Justice Ranade, and a number of others. The industrial revolution was pioneered by J. N. Tata and others

encouraged by the Swadeshi movement. There were a host of other persons whose names cannot be easily enumerated here who by their example and silent work awakened their localities, communities, castes and sects to a new sense of national value, a large expanding outlook, and higher principles of individual, social and spiritual freedom.

All these persons and their early struggles created a basis and a background for the rise of a higher political and national or human consciousness. Political facts were making political awakening possible in different parts of the country. In 1876 Indian Association was started at Calcutta with the object of organising a system of active political propaganda throughout the country and rousing the people to a sense of political unity and joint activity. It was backed by the educated classes. Surendra Nath Banerji was its moving and guiding spirit. The Delhi Durbar of 1877 created and strengthened a feeling of unity and constitutional agitation to check the autocratic rule in India. The starting of the National League in Bengal in 1884, the Madras Mahajana Sabha in 1884 and the Bombay Presidency Association in 1885 was the sign of the times. The controversies over the Ilbert Bill (1883) brought the fundamental fact and policy of the British rule in India to the forefront. The antithesis between the interests of the ruling class and the ruled was evident everywhere. India must unite in order to speak for itself and to assert itself.

Indian history shows that India was tried to be The early forces of united religiously, socially, culturally unity. and politically by her great saints, reformers, scholars teachers and rulers. But though their attempts succeeded to a large extent in having created larger human groups and territorial units, the religious, social, cultural and political forces were not sufficient in maintaining her national unity in political matters. The ambition of her kings and the ambition of her invaders divided her politically, religiously and culturally into changing groups struggling with one another and against the invader, though during the time of the Maurya and Mogul Emperors, there was a larger political unity in India. These failed because of their later weaknesses or religious rigours. Even under the British rule there is no political unity of India. Many native states are quasi-independent and claim full independence. One third of India is not directly ruled by the British. But the conditions for the rise of national consciousness and the awakening of the people are better to-day than they were before, because of the world-currents of democracy and nationalism. These ideals and movements combined with the grievances resulting from various political disabilities, economic ills and educational backwardness have brought together thinking Indians and the masses first to protest against the political power of the country held responsible for their existing grievances and secondly to work for their removal. Thus there is an internal force which wants to reform and progress, and an external pressure which compels to unite and to protest or to fight.



The nineteenth century in India was the age of Indian Renaissance and Reformation. A new force. New values and ideals were preached and practised by a succession of great thinkers and leaders. The mind of India renewed itself under the impact of Western civilisation and the hard and humiliating knocks of English rule. The old meek attitude had to be given up. A new vigorous and defensive as well as aggressive attitude had to be taken up in order to save oneself and one's nation from the overflowing of Western currents.

The first step is always difficult to take because it is new and not sure of its ground and future policy. The formation of the Indian National Congress was this first step of Indians. Historically it manifested the natural growing desires of the people and was the expression of the underlying currents and the developing forces of the country. The history of the Indian National Congress then is largely the history of the origin and growth of national sentiment and life in India. It focussed at one centre all the forces and the personalities working for the progress and emancipation of the country. We had before local and class associations, communal and sect organisations, but national dissociation. Congress however fostered and formed a public opinion without which there could be no consciousness of national self and therefore no self-government. The Congress movement linked town with town, district with district, province with province, class with class, and community with community. The dissociation of a medieval type of life was brought to an end. The personal

contact and intercourse of these representatives created a feeling and consciousness of identity of interests and aspirations and they began to show "Idem sentire de republica", and made various classes and personalities to merge their social distinctions and personal idiosyncracies in common political action and national aspiration.

The local and provincial associations which made the early local and the later development of a national provincial organisation possible by their common outlook were such as the British Indian Association in Bengal (1851), the Bombay Association (1851), the Sarvajanic Sabha in Poona (1872), and great personalities, like Dadabhai Naoroji, Surendranath Bannerji, Ranade, working in their own way and trying to solve individual problems. They now and then criticised the Government, but did not attack the very conception of a foreign rule in India. Their ideas were vague about the political future of India. Their methods were also not settled or effective, nor had they a systematic programme. There was not developed even an idea of a united nationality. But their local and provincial efforts showed the similarity of India's ills and needs in political and economic matters, and also to a certain extent in religious and social matters. Before the Congress work began this state of affairs was realised by very few. They felt intensely, but could not act vigorously in a sea and an atmosphere of apathy surrounding them. The public had to be educated. The earlier associations and leaders did this to a certain extent locally, but the awakening of the people on a national scale was possible only when national

representatives met together in one place with the conscious idea of being the members of a common country and the aspirants of a common future. Unless every policy adopted was conceived to apply to the country as a whole, there could not be a feeling of one nationality. Thus Indian national Congress arose to solve the political and national needs of India.

The followers of the Congress or the men of A national men- national mentality rising above class  
tality. interests, political apathy and extra-territoriality, and religious communalism increased rapidly under the pressure of public grievances economic and political, the force of new ideas and education, and the influence of great personalities.

There were Parliamentary Englishmen like Burke, Bright, Bradlaugh and Besant and there The promoters of the National Movement, were English civil servants and merchants like Hume, Cotton and Wedderburn, Digby and Yule who realised and pointed out the effects of foreign rule and the sufferings and grievances of the people, and helped them to give vent to them and to protest against them in various ways. With their backing and example Indian leaders came forward to ventilate their thoughts on the Indian situation and to work for their country's good. They organised lectures, press campaigns and conferences. These methods of public speaking, public writing and public meeting strengthened the movement for the awakening of the people, and made them aware of public life and problems which a conquered and modern nation must solve.

But amongst these English friends and Indian <sup>Rise of different</sup> leaders arose a number of schools of political schools. thought or parties whose ends and methods differed. In the beginning the differences were not realised nor acute but later on when experience and understanding developed and all the phases revolutionary of the various public problems were realised, the loyalist, the conservative, the liberal and the radical or mentalities could not agree with one another or pull on together. The loyalist said that the government knew what was best for the people and that they must <sup>The Loyalist.</sup> quietly obey and do what was told. The conservatives and constitutionalists said that there <sup>The Conservative.</sup> were grievances of the people which might be made known to the government in forms of petitions, resolutions and deputations, and the government would then be touched, and would give what they desired and deserved but that they must wait till then. The third school of Liberals or Moderates believed in agitation in the country and emphatic pro- <sup>The Liberal.</sup> tests against wrongs done to or bad laws imposed upon India politically and economically. They had a national consciousness but no national organisation or urge or feeling of strength behind them. They waited for events to develop or for good sense in rulers to come. They demanded and pressed for a share in the government of the country and for some forms of political opportunity to the people by writing in the press, or speaking in the legislative councils, and on the platform. This school was confined to a few educated persons in the country whose motto was caution and moderation, and intellectual

fight. Any change which contemplated disorder they abhorred. India being inhabited by many races with conflicting conceptions and ideals was not, they thought, fit for any sudden change or disorder. It must move slowly but surely. There should be discontent but no disorder, reform or revival but no revolution. They took part in awakening the people to their ills and causes of those ills, and educated them about the affairs of the country and about the government which was responsible for them.

This passive attitude and programme of the *The Nationalist* Liberals could not suit or attract active minds who believed in strong methods and programmes. They believed in emphasizing the ultimate demand and in resorting to active or direct methods. They spread strong discontent amongst the people and disaffection against the government. They broke some laws and suffered. They did not resent even revolutionary methods. They wanted to mould events and to break the bounds of law which were harassing and narrow. They did not feel any faith in the promises and declarations of the government. It was only the strong discontent and resentment of the people, they believed, that would make the government yield and reform itself. Co-operation with the government was not their creed nor was non-cooperation accepted by them as a programme. They expressed their ideals in the words 'Swaraj', 'Swadeshi', 'National Education', and 'Boycott'. It was essentially to be a movement of the people constructed and carried on by them. Their hope rested on the work of the people. If the government gave anything, it was to

be utilised, but a constant struggle was to be carried on in which people were to be trained and the government to be opposed. This school termed itself as the 'Nationalist school' and was also known as 'the Extremist school'. Out of this school arose later two schools, one of complete non-cooperation and the other of responsive co-operation. The non-cooperators considered the existing system of government as a great evil and therefore no one was to co-operate with it in any way, and they adopted the method of civil disobedience and nonpayment of taxes as the legitimate weapons of political struggle. They concentrated on constructive programme of work which they believed would strengthen the national movement and meet the national needs. They believed in nonviolence and suffering without retaliation for the cause they undertook as the most efficacious methods against a government which was well organised and well armed. They would not associate with the government in any way especially in the legislative councils, public services, and educational institutions. The other school of responsive co-operators believed in part obstruction and in part association. If any good were possible to be done by association or obstruction within the councils, offices or educational institutions it was to be done. They did not believe in keeping away from these public bodies which would function and do harm if left alone. They could not be destroyed in view of the conditions in the country and the character of the people, and therefore they must be stopped from functioning or prevented

from mischief or utilised or improved if they at all could be. But struggle and opposition was to be carried on there, and an attempt was to be made to meet the bureaucracy at all points of advantage or struggle.

The school of the revolutionists believed even in violent methods to achieve their aims of political independence. Their methods were therefore secret and confined to a few ardent and passionate persons who were willing to risk their lives in the methods they adopted. They did not believe in the efficacy of any other mild methods. Therefore they could not bring the people as a whole or in mass in their movements. Many sympathised with their zeal, ardour, and sacrifice but thought them to be impracticable and even dangerous to orderly progress. Their value was that they made the government realise the depth, strength and extent of feeling against foreign rule and for political reform in India. They exerted indirectly some pressure on the progress of reforms in India.

There are also various other shades of opinion and differences amongst the people, but the Indian public opinion crystallised itself into these main forms. Then there are also some communal schools of political thought which are influenced by religious, racial or social considerations of their own community. They can hardly be called national since they believe in acquiring political privileges at the cost of other communities and base political rights not on any human or national considerations but on religion, race and caste. Their outlook is still sectarian, feudal and racial. But they will have to give up this desire for extra privileges in a struggle for

nationalism and democracy which they profess to believe in. But at present their outlook and methods are checking the unity and progress of the country.

**The Viceroyalty of Lord Lytton and its imperialism.** Lord Lytton's viceroyalty (1876-1880) roused the thinking mind of India to the realities of the British rulers' mind. Lord Lytton had come to acquire an 'enduring fame' in India and in Asia. He wanted to be personally like a Kaiser-i-Hind, a title assumed by the sovereign of England and proclaimed in a Durbar in India 1877. He passed the Vernacular Press Act of 1878 by which the freedom of papers not printed in English was curtailed. By the Arms Act of 1878 he disarmed the people. He tried to bring about an exclusion of Indians from appearing for Civil Service Examination. The age limit was brought down to nineteen so that very few Indians if at all could appear. He declared against higher education being given to Indians. He in 1876 abolished customs duty on imported cotton goods in England's interests. He wasted India's crores in Afghan wars and Asiatic ambitions. He increased salt tax. The people suffered and died enormously in the famine of 1877-1878 for want of relief. He set aside all public opinions and protests in the pursuit of his imperialist policy. He acted like a veritable Czar not a Kaiser.

Lord Ripon's administration (1880-1884) reversed many of the acts of policy of Lord Viceroyalty. Lytton regarding Afghanistan, Vernacular Press (1882) and salt tax, and also tried to improve education and to introduce Local Self-government measures. But the mentality of the British people



of the official and non-official class whose vested interests and privileges were encroached upon became fully evident during the Ilbert Bill controversy and Controversy (1883—1884). The Bill proposed to remove every judicial disqualification based merely on race distinctions by force of which Indian District Magistrates, and Sessions Judges would have tried Europeans. The Europeans raised a most violent opposition to the measure. Indians also raised an agitation in favour of it. There was bitter racial feeling displayed by Europeans. The result was Indians began to lose faith in the British people and in their sense of justice or fair play and freedom. The Bill was withdrawn in 1884, and Lord Ripon resigned in December, 1884. This made the people realise who ruled India and in whose interests. This was the atmosphere just before the formation of Indian National Congress in 1885. Lytton's policy and the Ilbert Bill Controversy and sequel were the two main political factors which created a sense of the reality about the political position of Indians and their utter helplessness in face of European interests and opposition. Various local associations and meetings in the country had debated and condemned these acts.

This awakened the Indian national consciousness and strengthened its desire to unite its scattered forces and communities on one political platform and one political object. Babu Surendranath Bannerji travelled over the whole country in 1878 after the Durbar at Delhi of 1877, and brought home to the people the common grievances and common ambitions or necessities of the people.

Indians began to think in terms of India's ills and needs and a change was immediately seen in the viewpoint of the educated looking at all problems nationally. The natural result was a desire for a common national organisation to ventilate and redress grievances. The idea of forming a National Congress was formed at Madras in 1884 when seventeen men met in the house of Dewan Bahadur Raghunath Rao. The result of their deliberations was to start a political national movement. In March 1885 it was decided to hold a meeting of representatives from all parts of India during the Christmas holidays. The formation of the Indian National Congress. Surendranath Banerji, S. Subramania Iyer, K. T. Telang, Dadabhai Naoroji and other leaders took an active and leading part. The First Session of the Congress took place in Bombay in the year 1885. There were seventy-two representatives from all parts of India. A. O. Hume who took a leading part in the creation of the Congress from the very beginning wanted that the Congress should deal with social matters. He had consulted Lord Dufferin who was then the Viceroy of India about the aims and objects the Congress should have. He advised that it should deal with political matters, desires and grievances of the people which government were anxious to guage. Great persons like Dadabhai Naoroji, P. M. Metha, M. G. Ranade, G. G. Agarker, Surendranath Banerji, Ragunath Rao, A. O. Hume, W.C. Bannerji, K.T. Telang, D.E. Wacha, N.G. Chandavarkar, P. Rangiah Naidu, S. Subramanya Iyer, P. Ananda Charlu, and others were present on the its objects (1885.) platform. They adopted the following as the objects of the Congress.

1. The promotion of personal intimacy and friendship amongst all the more earnest workers in our country's cause in various parts of the Empire.

2. The eradication by direct friendly personal intercourse of all possible race, creed, or provincial prejudices amongst all lovers of our country, and the fuller development and consolidation of those sentiments of national unity that had their origin in their beloved Lord Ripon's ever memorable reign.

3. The authoritative record, after this has been carefully elicited by the fullest discussions, of the matured opinions of the educated classes in India on some of the more important and pressing of the social questions of the day.

4. The determination of the lines and methods by which during the next twelve months it is desirable for native politicians to labour in the public interests.

These objects do not show any definite political objective or method of work. They aimed at the creation of national unity and the expression of considered opinions on social problems.

The President of the Second Congress pointed out that it was purely a political body. Consideration of political problems. On political matters Indians were united and therefore a common action was possible to meet common needs. On other questions they were necessarily divided, and therefore no united action was possible. Each community differed in its social needs. Therefore the Congress followed only a policy of political action in which all communities could unite. But the political movement generated and

encouraged other movements in the country. Communities and provinces began to set their houses in order.

There was from the beginning a political atmosphere and a political spirit about the Congress work. It adopted the policy of dealing only with political matters. The reactionaries and bureaucrats ridiculed, abused and opposed it in all ways. Lord Dufferin later on went to the length of calling it seditious. But Englishmen like Hume, Wedderburn, Bradlaugh and Yule worked for it along with the Indians.

The nature of the resolutions passed during the first fourteen years was by way of suggesting changes and reforms in the Administration, Legislature, Judiciary, Public Services, Military expenditure, Policy of economic drain, Poverty of masses, Famine policy, Heavy civil expenditure and taxation, Disarmament of the people, Technical and Primary education, Land revenue system, Forest law, Excise duty, the India Council, Home charges, Disabilities of colonial Indians, Frontier policy, Use of old Regulations for detention and deportation, Press Acts, Exchange policy, and a number of other matters of general importance which affected the welfare and rights of the people.

The Congress also laid emphasis on the creation of representative institutions based on elective principles, the principle of no taxation without representation, a large share in public services and administration, the opening of the military career, the separation of judicial and executive systems, the introduction of trial by jury, Permanent settlement, the extension of Local Self-government,

and a number of other principles which are based on advanced constitutional ideals and demands of democracy. Resolutions of prayers and protest were passed concerning these items in the annual sessions of the Congress. In order to strengthen the work of the <sup>its branches and</sup> Indian National Congress, <sup>activities,</sup> deputations to England, a Congress Branch in England (1889), an Indian Parliamentary Committee in the House of Commons (1893), were suggested and formed. A paper called "India" was also started in England (1890) to inform and educate the English public about Indian demands and grievances.

Public speeches were delivered in the country mentioning these demands and the public <sup>Some prominent personalities of the Congress movement,</sup> opinion was thus educated and awakened to a recognition of its political needs. Great names adorn the whole course of the Congress movement during this period. A few of them may be mentioned here in addition to those already given. They are R. C. Dutt, B. G. Tilak, G. K. Gokhale, Bishan Narain Dhar, Raja Rampal Singh, T. Madhva Rao, Badd-rud-din Tyabji, Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sankaran Nair, Lajpat Rai, Eardly Norton, Man Mohan Ghose, N. G. Chandavarkar, R. N. Mudholkar, Bepin Chandra Pal, Lal Mohan Ghose, Kali Charan Bannerji, Pandit Ayodhya Nath, Ambica Charan Mujumdar, Muhammad Ali Jina, Alfred Webb, Subba Rao, Rash Behari Ghose, Muhammad Rahmat-ullah Sayani, Ali Muhammad Bhimji, S. P. Sinha, Chimanlal Setalwad, Bhupendranath Basu, Baikunthanath Sen, Rambhuj Dut Chaudhari, Lala Harkisan Lal, Alfred Nandi, Vijayaraghavachariar, P. C. Roy, Motilal Ghose, G. S.

Khaparde, Ganga Prasad Varma, M. K. Gandhi, Moti Lal Nehru, G. R. Das, Muhammad Ali, Hasan Inam, C. Y. Chintamani, Harchandra Rai Vishandas, Tej Bahadur Sapru, Mazarulul Haque, Dr. Ansari, Hakim Ajmal Khan, Pattabhi Sitaramayya. Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Satyamurti, Srinivas Iyengar, Rangaswami Aiyangar, N. C. Kelkar, M. S. Aney, B. S. Munje, V. J. Patel, M. R. Jayakar, J. M. Sen Gupta, and a number of others.

In 1899 the Congress adopted new rules about its Revision of its constitution. Its object was defined as objects and orga- "to promote by constitutional means nisation. (1899) the interests and well-being of the Indian Empire", and it was to consist of delegates elected by political associations or other bodies and by public meetings. Its affairs were to be managed by the Indian Congress Committee. Provincial Congress Committees and British Congress Committee were to be formed to carry on the Congress work. This early history of the Congress shows a large agreement amongst its members about its objects and work. It The value of the was not a partisan or communal body. work of the early Congresses. Its leaders were broadminded, farsighted, unselfish and earnest. They awakened the country to a sense of its wrongs and to a value of its rights and responsibilities, and created a common sentiment of political unity and patriotism, and made the people to organise and to cooperate, and to help one another. It represented and reflected the opinions and wishes of every community in India which thought in national terms. Its leaders and presidents came from all parts and provinces, from all castes and communities,

It was a thoroughly representative and national institution. It did not favour one community at the cost or neglect of the other. Its national character. It has never been accused of selfishness, but only of political ambition. It did not interfere in social problems, and industrial needs. Therefore new bodies like Indian Social Conference (1888) and Industrial Conference (1904) came into existence to solve them. But it remained the centre of all inspiration and the main-spring of all activities, because it was the source of all national consciousness and awakening. The best and active minds of the country associated with it and worked for it. There was a succession of such men coming from all parts and communities which showed their vitality and political consciousness. They were self-sacrificing and self-reliant, resolute and resourceful, patriotic and persevering.

At first the Congress worked on the idea of a gradual Indianisation of the government The early aim. and piecemeal reforms in all its branches. The idea of Swarajya as a goal and a remedy for all ills developed at the end of the nineteenth century and took shape in the twentieth. They criticised the government but had not attacked in a formal way the very conception of a foreign rule. The idea of full self-government had not arisen. The atmosphere was not ripe for it. New events had to take place, and the value of British promises had to be tested before a response could come for the idea of self-government and a reasoning could take place as to the ultimate place of the British in the government of the country.

The new party whose influence was to dominate the politics of the Congress after 1900 was the party of B. G. Tilak known as the Nationalist or Extremist party. The acts of repression and the facts of political and economic depression of the people made this party conceive of Swaraj as the only panacea for India's numerous ills. Government's plague and famine policy, Lord Curzon's repressive and unpopular policy were the immediate causes for the growth and strengthening of this party. The arrest and deportation of persons under century-old company regulations without trial, the officialising of Universities (1904), the Partition of Bengal (1905), and the irresponsible course of administration led to the rapid development of this new party in politics. It adopted Swadeshi, Boycott and National Education as its methods of obtaining Swarajya. Tilak and Arabindo Ghose were its great leaders.

Lord Curzon (1899-1905) overdid Lord Lytton in his Czarian policy and methods. He set the whole country against his policy and acts. But he was after winning enduring eminence in every field of activity. His methods were autocratic. He thought too little of the public opinion and too great of personal wisdom and virtue. As an imperialist of the first rank he entered into a Tibetan military expedition (1903-4) without any provocation, and wasted Indian money in large amounts. But the result of the expedition was nil, and his imperial fame did not increase. His imperious treatment of the Nizam of Hyderabad



and the forcible acquisition of Berar (1902) were in the same line. He passed the official Secrets' Act (1903) against public opinion. He brought under full official control the higher education by the Universities Act (1904). The final decision concerning affiliation or disaffiliation of colleges and the inspection of affiliated colleges were kept in the government's hands. He took away all the independence of higher educational institutions, and there was none in the lower. He called the Queen's proclamation of 1858 as an impossible charter. People suffered and died largely during the famine of 1898-1900. Still there was money left for Delhi Durbar which was similar to the one held by Lord Lytton in 1877. He declared Indians to be liars and treated with contempt their opinions, and considered himself a paragon of virtue and wisdom and benevolence. But his crowning act was the Partition of Bengal (1905) in the teeth of public opposition. It was a province homogeneous, well-knit and united in sentiment, language and ambition. He rent it into two and joined the parts with other neighbouring but heterogeneous provinces which had very little in common as regards language, sentiment or common development. This impetuous act of his raised a storm of protest throughout the country and increased the people's national consciousness because of a deep humiliation. This gave rise to the ideas of Swaraj, Swadeshi, Boycott and National education. The Congress whose aims and methods of work were upto now approved by all developed two schools of thought, one the Moderate, and the other the Extremist. There was opposition on both sides to

each other's goal and methods. Split was bound to come and it came at the Surat Congress in 1907. Before that the work of the Congress had gone on usual lines. There was a protest against Lord Curzon's officialisation of Universities, and the Partition of Bengal. The acts and policy and utterances of Lord Curzon had deepened the sense of wrong and humiliation caused by foreign rule in India. Gokhale condemned the administration in very strong terms in the Benares Congress of 1905. He even approved of boycott as a political weapon but it was to be used at the last extremity, and when there was a strong and popular feeling behind it. The popular feeling rose high and became strong on account of the Partition in Bengal and the repression by government to check the popular movement for its repeal.

Dadabhai Naoroji who became the President of the Dadabhai defines Congress at Calcutta (1906) put the the new aim aim of the Congress as twofold: "First and most important is the question of policy and the principles of the system of government under which India is to be governed in the future, and secondly to watch the present system of administration, and introduce reform till it was radically altered and based upon right principles and policy". He declared that it was absolutely necessary for the welfare and progress of the people to have Swaraj or self-government like that of the United Kingdom or the Colonies. He believed that India was fit for it, and therefore a beginning should be made immediately. His words were "Self-government is the only and chief remedy. In self-government lie our hope, strength and greatness.

Be united, persevere and achieve self-government, so that the millions now perishing by poverty, famine, and plague, and the scores of millions that are starving on scanty subsistence may be saved, and India may once more occupy her proud position of yore amongst the greatest and civilised nations of the west ”.

Though the congress adopted the goal of Swaraj or self-government definitely, there was taking place a split in the ranks of the Congressmen. One section held to the old ideals and methods of appeal and slow progress ; the other section convinced by the repressive policy and coercive legislation of the government lost their belief in appeals to Parliament and in the policy of co-operation and came to advocate Swadeshi, Boycott and National Education as the chief methods of political agitation. The struggle between the two wings to capture the Congress took place at Surat (1907). Talik led the Nationalist party. But the forces of the old order backed by loose legalities succeeded in keeping the Congress in the hands of the Moderate leaders. The Congress meeting was broken at Surat.

The Moderates however adopted a new creed for the Congress at Madras, (1908), by which they excluded a large number of nationalists from entering the Congress. This creed was prepared by a national Convention of Moderates held at Surat immediately after the break-up of the Congress. A Convention Committee appointed

Split in the Congress at Surat (1907).  
Moderates and Extremists.

Moderates capture the Congress.

by it met at Allahabad and drafted the 'creed' and the rules finally. There was no mention of Swaraj or self-government in it. The article (I) of the creed was "The objects of the Indian National Congress are the attainment by the people of India of a system of government similar to that enjoyed by the self-governing members of the British Empire and a partition by them in the rights and responsibilities of the Empire on equal terms with those members. These objects are to be achieved by constitutional means, by bringing about a steady reform of the existing system of administration, and by promoting national unity, fostering public spirit, and developing and organising the intellectual, moral, economic and industrial resources of the country." By article (II) it was made compulsory on each delegate to sign in writing his acceptance of the objects of the Congress as laid down in article (I) of this constitution, and his willingness to abide by this constitution. The Madras Congress of 1908 was held under this constitution. The new constitution as such with later amendments was passed by the Congresses of 1911 and 1912.

In the meanwhile the government was carrying on its extreme policy of repression, deportation, breaking of public meetings and conferences under the Seditious Meetings Act, of flogging young men and the persecution of the Press, and was trying to break the spirit of national revolt against its policy. Feelings had run high at the time of the Surat Congress, and in the country revolutionary crime had made

its appearance at Muzaffarpur in 1908. Consequently the government did not lessen its rigour but added new repressive laws to the Statute book. The Criminal Law Amendment Act (1908) and the Press Act (1910) were the chief of them.

After the Surat split the government would not allow the Nationalists to hold a rival Congress after Surat split, session of the Congress at Nagpur in 1908. Tilak's trial and conviction in 1908 left the Nationalist party without a strong and a practical leader. Hence the Moderate wing kept under its control and carried on year by year the annual Congress meetings, where the same type of old resolutions about piecemeal reforms were repeated. Protests were made against the Partition of Bengal, and the coercive laws and deportations, and appeals were made for a larger share in the administration and representation in the Legislative Councils. Emphasis was also laid on compulsory and free primary education, technical and industrial education. Complaints against the usual grievances were repeated. There were also resolutions against Indentured Labour system and for the release of political prisoners. Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909 were the result of people's agitation after the Partition of Bengal. The inadequacy of Monto Reforms. But they were half-heartedly given. The Executive dominated everywhere. The Legislative Councils contained a large number of nominated members, and their powers were merely advisory and also limited. The rules framed under the Act took away or diluted many of the things intended by the Act. Those Reforms were welcomed by the Moderates

in their now exclusive Congress. But their total inadequacy to serve as a check on the Executive irresponsibility was soon realised. Their unreal Parliamentary character was immediately evident in their working. The restrictions they placed on the people's elected representatives only made the people agitate for more reforms. The agitation against their inadequate and unsatisfactory character gradually strengthened till 1914. But it required a number of additional forces and personalities to bring about a change.

The facts which influenced the development of the Congress after 1914 were the release of Tilak and the entry of the Nationalist party into the Congress (1916), the World War (1914—1918), the rise of Home Rule League's agitation (1916), the Lucknow pact (1916), the Montford Reforms (1918), the Rowlatt Act (1918), and the Punjab atrocities (1919) and humiliations, and the personality, preaching and doctrines of Gandhi, and the consequent rise of Non-cooperation movement and the awakening of the masses, the Khilafat agitation, and the establishment of Legislative Councils under new reforms leading ultimately to the growth of responsible government in India.

As soon as Tilak returned from his Mandalay prison (1914) to which he was sentenced for six years of imprisonment, he considered the policy of aloofness from the Congress adopted by the Nationalists was not wise under the new circumstances. Whatever may be the unjust actions and moderate or governmental influences which had

kept the Congress in the hands of the Moderate party, had bound it down by a creed and had not allowed the formation of a rival Congress in 1908 by the Nationalist party, the time had gone by to feel, fret and fight about the Surat or later incidents, and the moment had arrived to unite under one body even by accepting the restrictions created by the Moderate creed of the Congress. He advised his followers to join the Congress. He seems to have felt sure that the active forces and public opinion were on his side, and that in a democratic and representative body like the Congress the real Indian democracy of which he was the leader would make itself felt, and would ultimately control the aim, the constitution and the policy of the body. It was a wise decision. The new afforced Congress would work unitedly during the Great War which was going on.

There also was a move on the part of Mrs. Annie Besant and Besant and her associates to take a leading part in the politics of the country. Improvement in the political position of the people was felt by them to be a necessity in order that India may progress on all sides in religious, social, educational and political matters whose simultaneous development was necessary for one another. Mrs. Annie Besant was also anxious that the connection between India and England should not break but remain for the sake of mutual help and strength.

The war also gave impetus to the political aspirations of the people. It was given out that the war was a war for liberty and a destruction of autocracy. The new war aims

involving hatred towards foreign rule and love of liberty and recognising the right of self-determination and independence of people did not lay down any territorial limits to their adoption. The government of India had become conciliatory being in difficulties and it could not oppose publicly the demands for advanced political reforms in India, though they could restrict the activities of workers under the Defence of India Act (1915) or other acts, such as Tilak, Annie Besant and others.

The Moderates' vision had also widened. They <sup>The Nationalists</sup> were willing to give up the policy of <sup>enter the Congress</sup> excluding the powerful Nationalists party from the Congress by opening a new but small door to it. There were some negotiations amongst the party leaders. Mr. Tilak and Mr. Gokhale met at Poona in 1914. In the Congress of 1914 held at Madras however no real approaches were made to admit Nationalists. In 1915 Mr. Gokhale and P. M. Mehta died. But in the Congress of 1915 certain modifications in the rule for election of delegates were made. It was not necessary for a delegate to be a member of a Congress Committee in order to be elected. On this the Tilak party joined the Congress of Lucknow 1916. Under the new political and national atmosphere India asserted her right of Home rule or self-government within the Empire on a basis of equality with the self-governing Colonies.

However Mr. Tilak and Mrs. Annie Besant in 1916 <sup>The work of Home</sup> had started their active propaganda <sup>Rule Leagues</sup> apart from but not in opposition to the Congress through their papers and through the newly



started two Home Rule Leagues and associations which wanted to awaken and to train the masses to their political duties, rights and responsibilities. The war did wake up the people and the government, the one for reforms or Swaraj, the other for recruits, loans and sympathy in its struggle. The cry of Home rule appealed to all and there was nothing legally against it. The aspirations and activities of the people rose and all the parties worked unitedly to become a self-governing nation. The Congress of 1915 had passed a resolution on self-government asking for "further and substantial measures of reform towards the attainment of self-government as defined in Article I of the constitution, namely, reforming and liberalising the system of government in this country so as to secure to the people an effective control over it", by giving provincial autonomy and financial independence, by the expansion and reform of the Legislative Councils, by giving control over the executive, a liberal measure of local self-government and others. A programme of continuous work educative and propagandist was decided to be carried on. In 1916 the United Congress

The Congress-  
League Scheme.  
(1916) adopted the Congress-League Scheme at Lucknow. In this scheme the most important item was of Muslim communal representation which was recognised and a certain percentage of seats in each province was fixed for them. This unity between the two parties and two communities created a favourable atmosphere for national awakening and advance. The time and cry for piecemeal reforms was over. A new sense of self-respect demanded Swaraj as early as possible.

Thus the great bugbear of Indian politics was brought within the sphere of 'practical politics'.

The Home rule Leagues carried on agitation and work amongst the people in all parts of India during 1916, 1917, and 1918. They supplemented actively the work of the Congress and popularised the Congress League Scheme. Annie Besant's internment along with her assistants in 1917 added a great impetus to the movement. A number of leading peoples joined the Home rule movement.

On 20th August, 1917, was made the Declaration by The August Britain about constitutional advance in Declaration. (1917) India, namely, that the goal of Britain in India was Responsible government. The declaration was "the policy of 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 administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government as an integral part of the British Empire". The progress in this policy was to be achieved by successive stages. Mr. Montagu visited India in 1917. The Indian National Congress, the Muslim League, and the two Home Rule Leagues presented memorials asking for self-government. The Montagu-Chelmsford report on Indian constitutional Reforms was presented to the British government in July, 1918. Indian opinion was not satisfied with the nature of the reforms proposed. There was half-heartedness in the scheme proposed and the right of the people to full responsible self-government was not conceded. The Executive in