


# **SRIRAM'S IAS**



## **GENERAL STUDIES**

**ADDITIONAL TOPICS IN MODERN HISTORY**

---

**11A/22; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor; Old Rajinder Nagar; New Delhi -60**

**Ph. 011-25825591; 42437002; 9811489560**

**73-75; 1<sup>st</sup> Floor; Ring Road; Beside GTB Metro Station**

**Kingsway Camp; New Delhi.**

**Ph. 08447273027**



## British Policy towards Native Princely States

Along with the rise of British colonialism and the spread of British imperialism, the policies, followed by the British from time to time also underwent change according to conditions and exigencies. One such example is their very policy towards the Native Princely States.

The whole policy of the British towards the native princely states can be studied under three broad phases. The first phase may be termed as the "age of relative isolations" or the phase of ring fencing. The second one of the policy of subordinate isolation and the third subordinate union.

During the 1<sup>st</sup> phase the policy of relative isolationism was conspicuously followed. Since the British were more commercial and enterprising company, and they still did not consolidate their position, they had to maintain, the policy of isolationism. For, the Mughals continued to be the paramount was less completely, to challenge the might of the British. Secondly commercial interests of the British compelled them often to depend upon the native princess. Also, the British were cautious to the fact that they were aliens on the soil of India and hence any aggressive policy towards native princely states would mean devastation.

During this phase, till the situation warranted, the time and condition required, the British remained isolated. When their interests were endangered, they immediately interfered and sorted out the matter. Best example was Robert Clive's attitude towards the Nawabs of Bengal, establishment of dual government, suspension of it later in 1772 and assuming directly the power shows a deliberate and systematic policy. Clive rejected the proposal to take over the administration in 1767 and denied, for it would mean interference and the people might not accept the change of power immediately. The policy was further refined and modified by Warren Hastings. All through his administration isolation was maintained and at the same time British interests were taken care of.

A shift in the policy was envisaged by Warren Hastings, as the changing conditions demanded it. In the North, Constant threat of Marathas remained and in the South Hyder Ali became a scourge to the British imperialism. A new policy was required to tackle this situation, as a result, *ring fencing policy* was introduced. According to this, buffer states, would be created between the British and their enemies. Secondly, the buffer states would constitute a ring fencing against the British empire and protect it from the onslaught of the enemies. This was put into practice in the Anglo Mysore wars when Hyderabad was used as the buffer state. Similarly, Avadh and Rohikhand were used as buffer states against the Marathas.

During the times of Wellesley, the policy of relative isolation was altogether given up and the ring fencing policy was modified. He saw to it that, the buffer states and the ring fencing provinces would not any longer remain the same, rather, they were first brought under the control of the British and from there the policy of expansionism would be carried out effectively.

For instance subsidiary alliances system when introduced in 1799 the Nizam was the first to be forced to sign. Later the same system was thrust on the other princely states. For the first time, attempt was made to bring the princely states systematically under the British control, by creating such conditions that could not assure autonomy to the states. British banked upon the mutual rivalry and suspicion among the native princess and gradually brought one after the other under their control.

The change in the attitude was clearly reflected when Lord Hastings became the governor general. With him the second stage of the relations between the Native Princely States and British, namely "**Subordinate isolation**" started. He replaced, the policy of 'mutual reciprocity and amicability' followed till then. Rather, in this stage isolation of the NPS continued at each and every level. First they were made to accept the British over lordship or paramountcy. Later British interfered in the administration. Even after the conquest and annexation, isolation took place as the British never treated, the NPS as a part of British Empire in India. Rather, what they did was, they controlled each and every aspect of the administration and name sake retained the princes.

The policy of subordinate isolation was effectively carried out by Dalhousie with his Doctrine of Lapse. It was carried out at three stages. Firstly, undermining the prestige of the NPS, secondly negating their traditional and hereditary rights and thirdly by suspending, their privileges. The states of Satara, Sambalpur, Jhansi, Bhagalpur, Udaipur were conquered under Doctrine of Lapse. The titles of the nawabs of Travancore, Arcot were suspended.

Lord Canning further carried out the audacity and declared that, after Bahadur Shah, Mughals would not be allowed to stay in Red Fort. The Indian princes would be merely addressed as princess.

The policy of subordinate isolation was intolerable and much more exploitative, as it humiliated the princess at every level. Precisely, this was why the 1857 revolt took place, and the British had to change their attitude and tactics towards Native Princely States.

The third phase called "**Subordinate Union**" was characterized by, at the outset no interference of the British in internal politics, no political conquest under any pretext, autonomy to NPS's in the internal administration perfect amicability between the princes and the British.

Lord Canning made explicit the basic idea of subordinate union, as it reflected in the "Queen's Proclamation Act". In fact, this was the basis on which the British policy was drafted towards the NPS. However, in reality the British did not follow the basic tenets of the Act and rather acted according to the time and condition. They interfered when the matters got warranted for instance Lord Mayo, sternly warned, the Nawabs of Anand (Madhukar Shah and Jawahar Singh) to ensure better administration. In the same way the territory of Nawab of Kurnool was annexed in 1878. The conquest of Burma, the British policy in Afghanistan and Sindh go against to the spirit of queen's proclamation. Further, in 1878, the British made it clear to the native princes that the

crown was the empresses of India by proclaiming Queen Victoria as the overlord of Indian Territory.

The policy of 'Subordinate Union' subserved the British interests in so far as to say that the Association of Indian native princes was founded with the intention of winning the support of the princes. After 1858 particularly, the British required the support of princes against the educated middle classes. As a result perfect understanding was reached between princes and the British. British extended all their support and sympathies to the princely states, all though the freedom movement. From the round table conferences to Mountbatten plan they were accorded the "Right Of Self-Determination". In turn the princely states solidly stood behind the British government and suppressed all the nationalist struggles, taking place in their respective states. Thus, even in the last phase, though an understanding of interest reached between British and princes, the British controlled every aspect of the princely states and made use of them. All through the course "Isolation and subordinate", existed in one way or the other.

## COMMUNALISM

Communalism may be defined as a socio-politico-economic and cultural ideology represented by people of some community, to satisfy all their ends. The means and the ends in communalism would invariably come from religion and get strengthened on the grounds of religious identity.

### Growth of Communalism

Just as the freedom movement underwent different phases, communalism also saw different phases from time to time. The very emergence of communalism and its development up to 1906 may be termed as the phase of moderate communalism. From 1906-1938, extreme communalism from 1938-47 it was militant communalism.

Under moderate communalism it did not take a radical view of the politics. Rather, it stood for certain legitimate rights and protection of the minority interests. Up to the formation of the Muslim league, remained rather both within Congress and the Muslim league, remained rather mild and democratic in their nature. The Aligarh movement of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan intended to promote Muslims, not at the cost of the Hindus, rather the movement was assisted by Hindus also. Likewise the moderate leadership of congress tried to promote the spirit of nationalism and succeeded in winning such nationalists like Bhaduruddin Tyabji, Hassan nazami and Hakim Azmal Khan and others. Even though Tilak performed Ganesh and Shivaji festivals, it was not his intention to offend the sentiments of the Muslims. Just as that when Muslim league was founded in 1906, it did not intend to wage a struggle against the Hindus.

### Extreme Communalism

The instances that lead to the change from moderatism to extremism in communal politics were separate electorates to Muslim in 1909, congress trying to win the support of the league in Lucknow pact 1916, the Khilafat issue championed by Gandhi, failure of the non-cooperation movement and the communal riots such as moplah rebellion (on the method of struggle and when Gandhi suspended the movement without consulting the Muslims) the differences between the two became severe. From 1924 religion became a source of practical politics for Jinnah.

Motilal Nehru committee report was rejected by league on the grounds that it did not favour communal electorates and in turn made Jinnah to put forth the 14 point formula. During the courses of Civil Disobedience movement and round table conferences league kept itself separated from the freedom movement and insisted on constitutional guarantees and separate electorates to the Muslims.

When government of India 1935 Act was passed and elections were held in 1937, league came to power in three provinces on the ground of communal ideology, whereas congress in eight provinces where Hindus constituted majority. The congress refusing to form coalition governments with the league was also a potent factor for widening the differences between the two.

League took an offensive stand against congress, criticized its governments as they were violating minority rights and appointed Raja of Pirpur committees. The committee exaggerated the atrocities and this further created serious differences between congress and league. When congress ministries resigned Jinnah instigated Muslim to celebrate, "the day of deliverance" October 16<sup>th</sup>, 1939, an act that provoked congress and Hindus. The extreme communalism reached its peak point when a separate geographical identity called Pakistan was conceived for the Muslims by Rahmat Ali in 1933 and was championed by Mohammed Iqbal in the Allahabad league session in 1938 and by Jinnah in 1940 Lahore session.

### Militant Communalism

During this phase communalism assumed a violent turn and militancy characterizing the India Politics. It so happened for the league gave a clear-cut idea called Pakistan. Further, it remained adamant on whatever the proposal, either in the form of constitutional reform or guaranteeing the minority rights proposed by the British government. For instance the August offer of Lord Linlithgow was rejected by the league on the grounds that either in the viceroys executive council or in the war cabinet, Muslims be given a parity share, regarding portfolios. Further in the formation of the constituent assembly also, the league insisted that, no legislation or any reform be introduced on a minority religion without the consent of at least 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total members.

During the Cripps proposal also, there was no understanding between the Congress and the league. In the proposal congress found an element for unity to prevail where as for the League, even though the provinces were given the right of self determination, there was no mentioning of Pakistan. Further, Jinnah was not confident that the provincial assemblies would support the idea of separation from India and the creation of Pakistan.

All through the Quit India Movement the Muslims remained isolated and didn't take part in the movement at all. During the Gandhi Jinnah talks (1944), the inevitable clash between the congress and the league took place on the issue of leadership representation, in the sense that Jinnah insisted that he should be recognized as the sole representative of the Muslims of Indians, as Gandhi for the Hindus and the congress.

The C. R. formula (1944), was rejected by Jinnah, as 'moth eaten', 'maimed and mutilated'. For conducting plebiscite in the majority Muslims area was never asked by the Muslim league nor was there any guarantee that, the league would win a mandate for Pakistan.

Lord Wavell plan and the consequent Shimla conference in 1945 could not solve the political deadlock between the league and congress. According to this plan the portfolios in viceroy's cabinet would be divided equally, between the Congress and Muslim League. Even though the proposal was initially accepted by the congress, it rejected the whole plan later, when Jinnah insisted that he should have the sole right to appoint the Muslim members in the viceroy's executive council. The fear of the congress was that, if once it accepts it the nationalist Muslims like Moulana Abdul Kalam Azad and Ansari would be denied a respectable position in the politics. Secondly, it would mean acknowledging Jinnah as the sole leader of the Muslims.

In 1945, General elections were held congress formed governments in eight provinces and the league in three. It demonstrated the communal division of India. In 1946 when Cabinet mission plan rejected the proposal of creating Pakistan, the militancy in communalism reached its culmination point. The direct Action Day for Pakistan (August 16<sup>th</sup> 1946), virtually saw a blood bath. Communal riots shook Calcutta, Muradabad, Patna and Lucknow.

The league as also resorted to 'dodging tactics'. This further tested the patience of secularists and much more liberal leaders, both in congress and the factions like Hindu Mahasabha also. The Muslim league first refused to join the interim government. In the same way, when the Constituent Assembly was formed, first it refused to join and later joined the assembly only to obstruct the proceedings. The fear that it was outnumbered and its voice would not be heard made the league to take much more stern and obstinate stand against congress. The failure of congress to deal with this situation, was mainly responsible for the partition of India and accepting Mountbatten plan. Leaders were convinced that it was difficult to get away along with the Muslim League and there was no guarantee that the league would not repeat the same in future course of time.

Partition of India could have been avoided at two levels first the congress would have given its consent to the league in sharing the portfolios equally for time being during the Shimla conference. This would have made the league more responsible to congress. Secondly, Nehru as the acting vice president of the interim government could have avoided partition by not giving consent to Mountbatten plan. Thirdly at least the understanding reached between Vallabhbhai Patel, Mahadev Desai and Liaquat Ali in 1946 could have been endorsed by congress.

Partition proved inevitable for no leader was confident that a safe and secured administration would be possible in India by cooperating with the Muslims. Also, all the leaders became preys to the time and condition. They could not rise above the time and think of future consequences.

### **Nature of communal parties:**

1. The communal parties surprisingly never represented anything connected with their community in terms of religious identity or the preservation of cultural identity. In most of these demands either political grievances or financial concessions or things connected with material well being dominated. In short the communal parties all together ignored not only the religious aspect but the problem of the masses also.
2. In contrast to the spirit of nationalism and anti imperialism, invariably, the communal parties opposed freedom movement. Their concept of freedom struggle was restricted to satisfy the grievances of their community particularly in political and economic aspects.
3. In Indian Freedom Movement the communal factions never hesitated to join hands against congress.
4. The communal politics never proved to be genuine in any aspect, as they were organized on false consciousness. Their demands differed from time to time, changed with the condition and got nurtured purely in the atmosphere of suspicion. The whole issue of communalism as such, was a reaction to the false issues and misconceptions. Islamic fundamentalism started against Hindus and in turn Hindu extremism reacted sharply. It was a chain of action that multiplied the complexity, promoted suspicious and hatred finally leading to a catastrophe.

### **Rise & Growth of Communalism**

The unique feature of Indian freedom Movement was the rise and growth of Nationalism and Communalism simultaneously with the freedom movement. The phenomena of communalism, even though was not new under the British but definitely assumed serious proportions with devastating consequences. The study of the origin of communalism in modern times requires a thorough understanding of the socio-economic and political conditions of modern India ever since the British became the Masters of India.

Even though the pre-British times witnessed communal clashes between the Hindus and the Muslims, particularly under the Mughals they were characterized more by the political and



economic factors. The same Mughal dynasty against which other communities revolted had the distinction of producing one of the greatest secular personalities namely Akbar. However, the whole fabric of India society remained harmonious till the advent of the British.

In the assessment of different factors responsible for the growth of communalism the first comes, the overall backwardness of the Muslims as a minority. This happened so as, "the Muslims remained, as the traditional and conservative elite classes of the feudal medieval times. With the ascendancy of British imperialism, the Muslim aristocratic classes lost their estates and gradually impoverished. Also when English replaced Persian as the official language in 1840, it practically deprived the Muslims of any prospects of employment opportunities in the government services. The reason was that they remained orthodox and clung to either Persian or Arabic. Consequently, they could not compete with Hindus in securing jobs in the government offices. Secondly, the so called process of modernization and overall economic development benefited the Hindus. The Muslims could not compete along with the Hindus in trade and commercial enterprises. Thirdly, the existing framework of colonialism could not accommodate itself the requirements of both Hindus and Muslims at a time. As a result, a feeling was generated amongst the Muslims that they lagged behind the Hindus and the developed Hindu majority would take advantage of the situation and dominate them.

The so called process of Indian Renaissance and the religious reform movements did have their role in promoting communalism. Almost all the Hindu reform movements instead of promoting secularism looked backwards and derived inspiration from the Vedas. For, most of the reforms social reform was religious reform. As a result, obviously the Muslims were given the impression that the reform movements were revivalistic than reformistic. Particularly Arya Samaj and its ideology (cow protection and Sudhi movement), directly affected the sentiments of the Muslims. On the other hand, Islam also underwent revivalistic movements like Ahal-I-Hadis and Ahal-I-Qurran. These movements nurtured communalism. Unfortunately the thinkers of modern India failed to acknowledge the contribution made by Islam in enriching the Indian culture. Thus, the failure of the reform movement in promoting secularism directly lead to the emergence of communalism from the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The policy of divide and rule, followed by the British from time to time further added stimulus to communalism. It started first with, dividing the Indian history on the communal grounds ancient India was identified with Hindu, medieval with Islam and modern with the British by the colonial historian like J S Mill. Till 1870, the British held the Muslims as the most dangerous community, against their rule in India. And as such, Muslims were humiliated and were deliberately been denied any opportunities for further development, but from 1870's British sensed threat from the educated middle classes of the Hindus. This was why Muslims like sir Syed Ahmed Khan were encouraged against Hindus, partition of Bengal was carried out, communal electorates for the Muslims were granted and constitutional guarantees were accorded to them against the majority Hindus.

The failure of congress leadership to allay the fears of the minority Muslims and to promote a secular ideology was also responsible for the growth of communalism. Particularly, extremists like Tilak organized Ganesh and Shivaji festivals in Maharashtra Bipinchandra Pal organized Durga festivals in Calcutta. During the Vandemataram movement Bankimchandra Chatterjee projected the Muslim landlords as tyrants and exploiters. This created a fear psychosis amongst the Muslims.

Further, bringing religion into politics also gave a spurt to the communal activity. Congress leaders like Tilak tried to win the cooperation of the Muslims through the Lucknow pact by accepting communal electorates. Likewise Gandhi tried to bank upon the Khilafat issue during non-cooperation movement. The same had become a precedence for Jinnah later and the whole course of Muslim league politics were characterized by religion.

More than anything "It was the false consciousness" generated by the British and cultivated by the Muslims that nurtured by the communal politics and communalism. It was the unconfounded fear that congress was dominated by the Hindus and hence would bring about t

he rule of the Hindus, was felt by Sir Syed Ahmed Khan in 185. Likewise the Muslims demanded separate communal electorates under the false consciousness that, if adult franchise was given on the basis of property and education, most of the Hindus would get right to vote. As educationally backward and financially impoverished the Muslims might not get the proportionate representation in voting. This would mean less representation for the Muslims, and this was precisely why they stood for separate communal electorate. Behind every communal event, including demand for constitutional guarantees, the unconfounded fears and false consciousness reflected time and again.

## **GROWTH OF THE CIVIL ADMINISTRATION**

The British once became the master of Bengal. Their utmost prerogative was to introduce an administrative system that would subserve the interest of the colonialism. It was also motivated by breeding a class of administrators that would remain loyal to the British and ensure a smooth functioning of the system. Further the British also envisaged a policy of extending control effectively over the colonial subject.

Frantic attempts in this regard were made by Robert Clive and Warren Hastings. However neither Clive nor Hastings could effectively curb the increasing corruption among the civil servants and check the unhealthy practices. Primarily the whole administrative system was manned by the servants of East India Company. The regulating Act 1773 for the first time assured an effective control over the administrative system.

Under Lord Cornwallis whole civil administration was given a new impetus. For the first time the administrative services were categorised, salaries of the employees and conditioned of services were clearly laid down. All the services were declared "covenanted services of EIC". For the first time the principle of seniority was followed regarding promotions. However, the entry into the civil services was not open to the Indian subject, as Cornwallis held them, in a low profile.

Under Lord Wellesley a concerted effort was made to train the civil servants of EIC in the basic issues of Indian society, culture and economy. A school was founded in this regard at Fort Williams at Calcutta in 1800. Later in 1806 Haileybury college was founded in London to train EIC servants.

All the appointments to the covenanted services under EIC were restricted for the English only till a provision was made in 1854 Charter Act. The Act also provided for recruitment through competitive examinations. Further it effectively brought all the appointments made to the different services under the control of the Board of Control which was under the control of the British Cabinet. It was queen's proclamation Act 1858 that assured the induction of the Indian into the decision making and other covenanted services under the government. All the appointments were to be made by the Secretary of the State for India on the recommendations of the civil services board. However Indians could not avail of the privileges as British deliberately restricted the scope by reducing the age limit from 22 to 21 in 1866 and from 21 to 19 in 1878.

Satyendra Nath Tagore and Subhas Gupta could become the earliest civil servants by 1863.

Under Lord Lytton much more stringent measures were taken against the Indians. Categorically, he refused to hold the examinations simultaneously in India and England. It was during his time, "the statutory services" were created for the first time. They were meant for the elite sections of the Indians to be appointed in the covenanted services, not less than 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total vacancies. However in 1884 the statutory services were abolished under Lord Dufferin.

The congress since its formation in 1885 advocated for increasing the age limit and to hold the examinations at a time in England and India. In 1886 Dufferin promised to induct more Indians into the civil services and appointed Lord Aitchison committee to go into the details and suggest ways and means for the particular purpose. The committee recommended for.

1. Abolition of the differences between covenanted and uncovenanted services. It divided all the services into three categories.
  - a. imperial Indian civil services
  - b. provincial services
  - c. Subordinate services

It also increased the age limit to 22 years. However it did not admit the claim for simultaneous exams to the Indians in India. Further, Indians had to satisfy more with subordinate services and provincial services.

In 1894 the House of Commons recommended for holding the civil services exams both in England and India at a time. However this could not materialize due to protest from the conservative party.

The Montague Chelmsford reforms started a new phase in the history of the civil services. For the first time, services were brought under the effective control of the provincial Governments. They also conceded the demand for creating separate provincial recruitment boards.

In 1927 Lord Lee committee was appointed to provide equal opportunities for the Indians to get into the imperial services. The committee recommended for the 'Principle of parity recruitment' between the Indians and the English. It also suggested that, not less than 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the total civil services posts must be reserved for the Indians even though the British government continued to discriminate the Indians against the British officers.

The Government of India Act 1935 provided for a Federal Service commissions and also Provincial Service Commissions.

## **Rise and Growth of Indian Left Wing**

The rise and growth of socialist thinking and Marxism as concrete ideology with leftist orientation started developing in Indian from the 2<sup>nd</sup> decade of 20<sup>th</sup> century. The overall development of Indian left is to be studied under two broad headings.

1. Left wing within congress
2. Left wing outside congress

The gradual courses of development of the leftist movements and ideology was a byproduct of series of drastic changes, taking place in the Indian polity and economy.

The post world war-I, economic scenario created a lot of frustration among the rural youth and urban working classes. The economic depression affected badly both the workers and peasants alike. It was at this juncture; the Soviet Russia Revolution participated by the masses proved to be an eye-opening factor for most of the Indian intellectuals.

Marxism and scientific socialism the popular concepts started influencing the intellectual thinking of the Indians from the 2<sup>nd</sup> decade of 20<sup>th</sup> century. They found in Marxism solutions to

all the social and economic problems Indians were facing particularly thinkers like M.N Roy were convinced that no political struggle is meaningful without social and economic equality and for this, socialism was the correct ideology.

The existing congress leadership disgusted the workers and peasants alike. Rather it continued to be dominated by the landlord aristocrats and commercial bourgeoisie. At this juncture an alternative leadership was required to protect the interests of the workers and the peasants. Further even within the congress, a faction led by J. Nehru and Bose started criticizing the techniques of Gandhi and were disenchanted with the satyagraha movement. The failure of congress to stand up to the expectations of masses in large number and providing solution to the social and economic inequalities in India were directly responsible for the growth of left wing within congress and outside.

The practical conditions also satisfied for the growth of left movement in India. Already by that time (20's) labour class unions were formed, AITUC came into being and peasant unrest also required a cohesive network and ideology. To satisfy all this the leftist thinking proved to be the most amenable solution.

### **The left beyond congress**

The origins of left wing can be traced as far back as 1920's when radical humanist M N Roy effected an escape to Afghanistan and there from to Soviet Russia along with the Afghanistan Mujaheds namely Shaukat Osmani and Ahmed Jaferi. It was due to spread in India. He maintained contacts with Nalini Gupta and other nascent and embryonic communist groups in different parts of India.

Communism as an ideology started developing at the instance of S. A. Dange in Bombay, Sringeravelu in Madras, Gulam Hussain in Lahore and Ahmed Jaferi in Calcutta. Journals like 'Socialist' founded by Dange in Bombay, 'Navyuga' in Guntur, 'Atmasakshi' and 'Dhumkheta' in Bengal continued to spread the left ideology. It was all with the concrete efforts of Roy and other thinkers like Dange and Gulam Hussain the Communist party was founded, in Tashkent in 1925. Even before its inception the communist came under severe repression, by the British government. Way back in 1922, prosecutions were leveled against M. N. Roy and Nalini Gupta in the famous 'Peshawar conspiracy case'.

In 1924 Dange and all other popular communists were prosecuted under 'Kanpur conspiracy case'. However the left movement as such did not receive any set back with these conspiracy cases. Rather it got further strengthened with the support from communists from England like Peter Harlot who came to India, mobilized finances and strengthened the party membership.

The attitude of the communists towards congress and the national movement was quiet cordial till the end of the first phase i.e. 1928. During this period, the communists accepted the congress

as the main representative party of the Indians and extended their support to congress. Rather they remained within congress and extended their loyalties to the Nationalistic movement.

From the second stage that was from 1929 to 34 the attitude of the communists was changed. They started criticizing congress as a party dominated by bourgeoisie. They also found fault with the ideology of the congress for not being pro-working classes. They cited the example of suspending the Civil Disobedience Movement by Gandhi as an attempt to protect the interests of bourgeoisie.

It was during this phase communists tried to formulate different sub-organs like workers and peasant parties in different parts of India. They succeeded in capturing the leadership of a labour organization. However it was also during this phase the party incurred the wrath of the British for organizing All India Mill workers strike in 1934 and as a result banned.

During the third stage (1935-39), the communists retracted on their attitude towards congress and again started approaching the congress leadership. The basis for this change was the Broadley-Dutt debate in 1936 in the sixth communists international held in Moscow. There it was decided to extend support to all the bourgeoisie national movements against British colonialism. However, the communists were welcomed by the Congress socialists particularly like J. P. Narain and Bose. But when they tried to surpass and dominate the politics within congress they expelled from congress party. Moreover the year 1939 was particularly not favourable for the left wing within congress which could not mobilize support to S. C. Bose and its attempt to capture power in the congress leadership was foiled, by the Right wing under the leadership of Gandhi in 1939. In the fourth phase, the communist politics made them extremely unpopular with the masses, for they shifted their stand from time to time. As long as Russia did not join the war, the communists supported the National movement. But when Russia joined hands with England against Germany, Indian communists also joined hands with British bureaucracy and in some cases even acted as informers against congress leaders. Their withdrawal from Q. I. M. made them very unpopular in the eye of public.

### **Congress Social Party**

The origin of CSP and left wing within congress go way back to 1922, when Non-Cooperative Movement was suspended by Gandhi. A section within congress that came under the influence of Marxism and socialism expressed its faith in socialism and found fault with Gandhian techniques. This was the faction represented by Jawaharlal Nehru and S. C. Bose in the beginning. Jawaharlal Nehru came under the strong influence of socialism, practical solution to India's social and economic problems. His visit to soviet Russia in 1924 and participation in Brussels conference in 1927 had created tremendous impact on the mind of Nehru. Second important factor that prompted Nehru to accept socialism was the idea that the so called modernization and transformation would not be possible in India without socialism. The followers of Nehru and Bose known as congress radicals influenced the congress politics till

1933. It was at their instances socialism was accepted as the goal of congress in 1931 Karachi session. The very election of Nehru as the president of Congress in 1929 shows the strength of socialists within congress.

The congress socialists realized the importance of founding a party within congress, so as to give more impetus to the socialist movement. In 1934 the CSP was founded by Acharya Narendra Dev, J.P. Narian and Minu Massani in Bombay.

The ideology of CSP was : firstly, giving more importance to imperialist struggle against British. Secondly, to transform gradually the congress into the manifold of socialism. Thirdly, to organize peasant and working class movement, independent from the leadership of congress.

The CSP desperately tried to occupy important positions within congress and influences the decision making. It proved successful in 1938 when Bose was elected as President of Haripura session. However the CSP attempt to capture congress leadership was resisted by the right wing and Bose had to resign in 1939, by yielding to the pressure from the right wing within congress.

It was to the credit of congress socialist that anti Zamindari movements were organized in different provinces. They were also responsible for implementing the land reforms. However their failure to implement the contents of the agenda proclaimed in the Wardha session 1934, particularly distribution of land to the working classes did not materialize. As a result serious differences arose between the Right and left wing within congress making Bose to have the congress party.

The significant contribution of CSP was also found during Quit India Movement of 1942 when all the leaders were put behind the bars, it was the CSP that provided the leadership. J P. Narayana, Aroma Asaf Ali and Narendra Dev continued the underground activities, inspired the people and kept the spirit of Nationalism intact.

The problems for the CSP were; it could not exercise its independence rather it remained as another organ of the congress party and merely reflected the socialist inclination of some of its leaders.

Secondly it failed in successfully exposing the drawbacks of the right wing leadership and ideology.

## **State People's Movement**

With the growth of British paramountcy in India more than one – third of the people of India came under indirect influence of the British government through the existence of the native princely states. The very creation of the native princely states, was meant to subserve the colonial interests of the British referred to the princely states as 'the bull works of the British colonialism'. However the growth of popular movements in the native princely states was a result of much a suppression of the British as that of the princely states.

### **Cause for State People's Movement:**

1. The general distress among the different sections of the society in the native princely states was alarmingly high; by the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the conditions of the peasants people were deplorable than their counterparts in British India. The artisans were the worst affected sections in the native states on accounts of general stagnation in the domestic economy as well due to the deindustrialization of the British all over India. However it was the middle class that spearheaded the mass movements in princely states, championing the causes of peasants and workers against the native princess.
2. The process of modernization and westernization spread also to the native princely states. As a result of English education, a new educated intelligence came into being, generated awareness and lead the popular movements.
3. The very formation of India National Congress in 1885 gave an impetus to the state's people's movement. The All India character of the Congress, its popular programmes like Swadeshi and Vandemataram movements and the concept of Poorna Swaraj had profound impact on the minds of the people of the princely states. In congress, they found an expression for these hopes and ambitions. In fact at every movement, the princely states looked upon at congress for guidance and inspiration.
4. The role of the British government and its highhandedness in the administration of princely states, gave a new spur to the peoples movements. The British in association with the princes, resorted to all sorts of exploitation and suppression of the people. The very creation of the chamber of Indian prices in 1911 was meant to express the solidarity between the British and the native states.

### **Origin of States Peoples Movement:**

The origin of the SPM's lay in the very popular agrarian and civil rebellions that took place in India in the later part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Even though all the movements were suppressed ruthlessly by the British and the native princes, they undoubtedly marked a beginning in a new direction, finally culminating in the formation of series of democratic organizations and associations. A first step in this regard took place into the formation of praja parishad, a first political organization of its kind, in Baroda in 1917, to focus on all political, social and economic



issues of the princely states. From 1918 the example of Baroda was very much followed by the other princely states different local committees were formed.

The H Buttler was appointed for the promotion of better relation between, the native princess and the British. However it was a move to curb the increasing tide of democracy and popular institutions. As a result, the committee's recommendations were opposed by the people of princely states.

With the formation of the All India States People's Conference in 1927 at the instance of Balwant Rai Mehta, Manmaya Lal Kothari and G R Abayankar in the state of Kathiawar. The SPM got more strengthened. The first meeting of AISPC resolved to fight for

1. Distinction between private and public finances as per the expenditure of the princes was concerned
2. Local self – governments be established with elected representatives
3. Separation of judiciary from the executive
4. No arbitrary taxation on the people

The conference stood for the overall development of the princely states and further for civil liberties. However the AISPC suffered from its dual character. It could be anti – feudal but could not be anti – colonial altogether. Its fight against native princes was against the traditional feudal order. Till the outbreak of the Quit India movement the princely states did not experience anti – colonialism.

## **Popular Movements**

Even though there were 50 princely states, and series of popular uprising took place amongst them the most important one being. Rajkot in 1939, in Mysore 1938, the famous Orissa uprising 1939 and the famous Hyderabad state people uprising in 1940's.

The famous Rajkot state people's movement was organized under the leadership of Jamunlal Bajaj and Vallabh Bhai Patel at the instance of Gandhi at Rajkot in 1939. It was against the heavy taxation policy of the princely states against the peasant. Gandhi resorted to a fast unto death in Rajkot in 1939 and compelled the Goekwar ruling family to revise its policy on more moderate and considerate lines towards the peasants.

In the state of Mysore a popular movement was organized in 1939 demanding responsible government. It was organized by Bashyam, one of the founders of states congress in association with the people's federation of new Brahmmins founded by K C Reddy and H C Dasappa. The movement started in the city Mysore and soon became violent. Riots took place in Kolar district.

At the instance of INC, Vallabhai Patel entered into an agreement with Mirza Ismail Khan, the Diwan of Mysore, to introduce responsible government. Further, the state congress unit of Mysore, also came to be recognized by the princely state of Mysore.

In Orissa the people's movement championed the cause of forced labour and heavy taxation. In 1939 Naba Kishore Choudhary organized a popular movement in Dhenkanal. The movement spread to Banapur and Rampur. The British agent Berzel Gatte was murdered by the people. At the instance of Gandhi, the movement was pacified, forced labour was abandoned and a moderate taxation was introduced.

In Hyderabad the SPM started with the formation of Hyderabad state congress unit by Swami Ramananda Teertha in 1939. In 1939, the students of Osmania University organized the Vandemataram movement as a token of support to congress. However, the movement remained as merely anti – feudal against the suppression of Nizam.

With the formation of communist party in 1939 in Hyderabad state the people's movement got a momentum. The famous Telangana Rytanga Poratamu was organized under the leadership of the communists. Added to this, the Telugus of Nizam state founded the Nizam Andhra Mahasabha in 1939 and demanded a representative and responsible government. The people's movement was characterized by not only anti Nizam atrocities but also for the recognition of the Telugu language in the Nizam state. With the police action, the problem was settled once for all.

In the state of Travancore A K Gopal Krishna Pillai and E M S Namboodripad founded the local Congress committee in 1939. A movement was started against the autocracy of C P Ramaswamy Iyenger, the diwan of Travancore. The movement was successful and diwan was forced to do away with the oppressive land revenue policy and initiated a liberal process of forming the representative government.

## **Congress and AISPC**

The relations between the congress and AISPC were quite normal as from the beginning congress followed a policy of relative isolation and relative interference. Way back in 1920 Nagpur session, the question of SPMs came to the notice of congress. However congress resolved to maintain neutrality and isolation and further felt that the SPMs be carried out independently. In the first Round Table Conference meeting the AISPC demanded its right to represent the people. However its request was turned down by the British government. It was congress that supported AISPC and endorsed its proposal.

In 1939 Haripur session, the congress resolved to bring the different SPMs into the mainstream of freedom struggle. In 1939 Tripuri session congress welcomed the proposal and suggestion of Nehru to forge an alliance with the SPMs and to form an united front against the British and later Nehru was elected honorary President of AISPC were not different from the congress.

However congress was particular about the union of princely states with the British India. In 1942, when Cripps proposed for a federation and conceded the right of self determination to princely states the congress outrightly rejected the proposal as the question of autonomy of the princely states was against the national interest. In 1946, the cabinet mission plan, categorized the different provinces of India, much against to the displeasure of congress. The chamber of princes on the other hand welcomed the proposals of Cripps and Cabinet mission plan and made desperate attempts to retain their control over the native princely states.

It was to the credit of such leaders of AISPC like Shaik Abdulia of Kashmir, T. T. Krishnamachari of Kerala, Krishna Menon of Travancore, that public opinion was mobilized in favour of the merger of the native princely states with Indian dominion. Even leaders like Taj Bahadur Sapru and M R Jayakar stood for an integrated approach between princely states and Indian dominion. Finally it was left to Sardar Patel to accomplish the task of merging the princely states with the Indian Union.

The state people's movements in different parts of India did have their share in the freedom movement in so far as mobilizing the consciousness among the people. Though in the beginning they remained anti feudal, later they became anti – colonial once they came under the influence of the congress. They strengthened the cause of Nationalism and the idea of Nation making. Had there not been cooperation between AISPC and congress it would have definitely been difficult for the architects of modern India to see a India united.

