SRIRAM'S IAS

GENERAL STUDIES

HISTORY

(Post Independence Consolidation , Reorganization Within the Country, Decolonization And World History)

11A/22; 1st Floor; Old Rajender Nagar; New Delhi -60
Ph. 011-25825591; 42437002; 9811489560
73-75; 1st Floor; Ring Road; Beside GTB Metro Station
Kingsway Camp; New Delhi.
Ph. 08447273027

Story of Civilisation — NCERT
WORLD WARS — L. MUKHERJEE.
David Mason — Europe since century

Post-independence consolidation and reorganization within the country.

Integration of States

Princely States in British India

The early history of British expansion in India was characterised by the co-existence of two approaches towards the existing princely states.

- The first was a policy of annexation, where the British sought to forcibly absorb the Indian princely states into the provinces, which constituted their Empire in India.
- The second was a policy of indirect rule, where the British assumed suzerainty and paramountacy over princely states, but conceded some degree of sovereignty to them.

In 1858, the policy of annexation was formally renounced, and British relations with the princely states thereafter were based on indirect rule, whereby the British exercised paramountacy over all princely states with the British crown as ultimate suzerain, but at the same time respected and protected them as allies.

During the 20th century, the British made several attempts to integrate the princely states more closely with British India, creating the Chamber of Princes in 1921 as a consultative and advisory body, transferring the responsibility for supervision of smaller states from the provinces to the centre in 1936, and creating direct relations between the Government of India and the larger princely states superseding political agents. The most ambitious was a scheme of federation in the Government of India Act 1935, which envisaged the princely states and British India being united under a federal government. This scheme came close to success, but was abandoned in 1939 as a result of the outbreak of the Second World War. As a result, in the 1940s, the relationship between the princely states and the crown remained regulated by the principle of paramountacy and the various treaties between the British crown and the states.

Reasons for integration

The Saurashtra and Kathiawar regions of Gujarat were home to over two hundred princely states, many with non-contiguous territories. The termination of paramountacy would have in principle meant that all rights that flowed from the states' relationship with the British crown would return to them, leaving them free to negotiate relationships with the new states of India and Pakistan "on a basis of complete freedom". Early British plans for the transfer of power, such as the offer produced by the Cripps Mission, recognised the possibility that some princely states might choose to stand out of independent India. This was unacceptable to the Congress, which regarded the independence of princely states as a denial of the course of Indian history, and consequently regarded this scheme as a "Balkanisation" of India.

The Congress had traditionally been less active in the princely states because of their limited resources which restricted their ability to organise there and their focus on the goal of independence from the British, and because Congress leaders, in particular Gandhi, were sympathetic to the more progressive princes as examples of the capacity of Indians to rule themselves. This changed in the 1930s as a result of the federation scheme contained in the Government of India Act 1935

and the rise of socialist Congress leaders such as Jayaprakash Narayan, and the Congress began to actively engage with popular political and labour activity in the princely states. By 1939, the Congress' official stance was that the states must enter independent India, on the same terms and with the same autonomy as the provinces of British India, and with their people granted responsible government. As a result, it insisted on the incorporation of the princely states into India in its negotiations with Mountbatten.

Accepting Integration the Princes' Position

The rulers of the princely states were not uniformly enthusiastic about integrating their domains into independent India. Some, such as the kings of Cochin, Bikaner and Jawhar, were motivated to join India out of ideological and patriotic considerations, but others insisted that they had the right to join either India or Pakistan, to remain independent, or form a union of their own. Bhopal, Travancore and Hyderabad announced that they did not intend to join either dominion. Hyderabad went as far as to appoint trade representatives in European countries and commencing negotiations with the Portuguese to lease or buy Goa to give it access to the sea, and Travancore pointed to the strategic importance to western countries of its thorium reserves while asking for recognition. Some states proposed a subcontinent-wide confederation of princely states, as a third entity in addition to India and Pakistan. Bhopal attempted to build an alliance between the princely states and the Muslim League to counter the pressure being put on rulers by the Congress.

A number of factors contributed to the collapse of this initial resistance and to nearly all princely states agreeing to accede to India. An important factor was the lack of unity among the princes. The smaller states did not trust the larger states to protect their interests, and many Hindu rulers did not trust Muslim princes, in particular Hamidullah Khan, the Nawab of Bhopal and a leading proponent of independence, whom they viewed as an agent for Pakistan. Others, believing integration to be inevitable, sought to build bridges with the Congress, hoping thereby to gain a say in shaping the final settlement. The resultant inability to present a united front or agree on a common position significantly reduced their bargaining power in negotiations with the Congress. The decision by the Muslim League to stay out of the Constituent Assembly was also fatal to the princes' plan to build an alliance with it to counter the Congress, and attempts to boycott the Constituent Assembly altogether failed on 28 April 1947, when the states of Baroda, Bikaner, Cochin, Gwalior, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Patiala and Rewa took their seats in the Assembly.

Mountbatten's role

Lord Louis Mountbatten played an important role in convincing reluctant monarchs to accede to the Indian Union. Mountbatten believed that securing the states' accession to India was crucial to reaching a negotiated settlement with the Congress for the transfer of power. The princes also believed that he would be in a position to ensure the independent India adhered to any terms that might be agreed upon, because Jawaharlal Nehru and Patel had asked him to become the first Governor General of the Dominion of India.

Pressure and diplomacy

Vallabhbhai Patel as Minister for Home and States Affairs had the responsibility of welding the British Indian provinces and the princely states into a united India. By far the most significant factor that led to the princes' decision to accede to India was the policy of the Congress and, in particular, of the two key figures in the States Department, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and V. P. Menon. The Congress' stated position was that the princely states were not sovereign entities, and as such could not opt to be independent notwithstanding the end of paramountacy. The princely states, it declared, must therefore accede to either India or Pakistan.

Instruments of Accession

Patel and Menon backed up their diplomatic efforts by producing treaties that were designed to be attractive to rulers of princely states. Two key documents were produced. The first was the Standstill Agreement, which confirmed that the agreements and administrative practices that existed as between the princely state in question and the British would be continued by India. The second was the Instrument of Accession, by which the ruler of the princely state in question agreed to the accession of his kingdom to independent India, and to granting India control over specified subject matters. The nature of the subject matters varied depending on the acceding state. The states which had internal autonomy under the British signed an Instrument of Accession which only ceded three subjects to the government of India—defence, external affairs, and communications, each defined in accordance with List 1 to Schedule VII of the Government of India Act 1935.

Rulers of states, which were in effect estates or talukas, where the Crown exercised substantial administrative powers, signed a different Instrument of Accession, which vested all residuary powers and jurisdiction in the government of India. Rulers of states, which had an intermediate status, signed a third type of Instrument, which preserved the degree of power they had under the British.

The accession process

The limited scope of the Instruments of Accession and the promise of a wide-ranging autonomy and the other guarantees they offered, gave sufficient comfort to many rulers, who saw this as the best deal they could strike given the lack of support from the British, and popular internal pressures. Between May 1947 and the transfer of power on 15 August 1947, the vast majority of states signed Instruments of Accession. A few, however, held out. Some simply delayed signing the Instrument of Accession. Piploda, a small state in central India, did not accede until March 1948. The biggest problems, however, arose with a few border states, such as Jodhpur, which tried to negotiate better deals with Pakistan, with Junagarh, which actually did accede to Pakistan, and with Hyderabad and Kashmir, which declared that they intended to remain independent.

Junagarh: Although the states were in theory free to choose whether they wished to accede to India or Pakistan, Mountbatten had pointed out that "geographic compulsions" meant that most of them must choose India. In effect, he took the position that only the states that shared a border with Pakistan could choose to accede to it.

The Nawab of Junagadh, a princely state located on the southwestern end of Gujarat and having no common border with Pakistan, chose to accede to Pakistan ignoring Mountbatten's views, arguing that it could be reached from Pakistan by sea. The rulers of two states that were subject to the suzerainty of Junagadh—Mangrol and Babariawad—reacted to this by declaring their independence from Junagadh and acceding to India. In response, the Nawab of Junagadh militarily occupied the states. The rulers of neighbouring states reacted angrily, sending their troops to the Junagadh frontier and appealed to the Government of India for assistance.

A group of Junagadhi people, led by Samaldas Gandhi, formed a government-in-exile, the Aarzi Hukumat ("temporary government"). India believed that if Junagadh was permitted to go to Pakistan, the communal tension already simmering in Gujarat would worsen, and refused to accept the accession. The government pointed out that the state was 80% Hindu, and called for a plebiscite to decide the question of accession. Simultaneously, they cut off supplies of fuel and coal to Junagadh, severed air and postal links, sent troops to the frontier, and reoccupied the principalities of Mangrol and Babariawad that had acceded to India.

Pakistan agreed to discuss a plebiscite, subject to the withdrawal of Indian troops, a condition India rejected. On 26 October, the Nawab and his family fled to Pakistan following clashes with Indian troops. On 7 November, Junagadh's court, facing collapse, invited the Government of India

to take over the State's administration. The Government of India agreed. A plebiscite was conducted in February 1948, which went almost unanimously in favour of accession to India.

Kashmir: At the time of the transfer of power, Maharaja Hari Singh ruled Kashmir, although the state itself had a Muslim majority. Hari Singh was equally hesitant about acceding to either India or Pakistan, as either would have provoked adverse reactions in parts of his kingdom. He signed a Standstill Agreement with Pakistan and proposed one with India as well, but announced that Kashmir intended to remain independent. However, Sheikh Abdullah, the popular leader of Kashmir's largest political party, the National Conference, who demanded his abdication, opposed his rule. Pakistan, attempting to force the issue of Kashmir's accession, cut off supplies and transport links.

Shortly thereafter, Pathan tribesmen from the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province of Pakistan crossed the border and entered Kashmir. The invaders made rapid progress towards Srinagar. The Maharaja of Kashmir wrote to India, asking for military assistance. India required the signing of an Instrument of Accession and setting up an interim government headed by Sheikh Abdullah in return. The Maharaja complied, but Nehru declared that it would have to be confirmed by a plebiscite, although there was no legal requirement to seek such confirmation.

Indian troops secured Jammu, Srinagar and the valley itself during the First Kashmir War, but the intense fighting flagged with the onset of winter, which made much of the state impassable. Prime Minister Nehru sought U.N. arbitration, arguing that India would otherwise have to invade Pakistan itself, in view of its failure to stop the tribal incursions. The plebiscite was never held, and on 26 January 1950, the Constitution of India came into force in Kashmir, but with special provisions made for it in the Constitution's Article 370. India did not, however, secure administrative control over all of Kashmir. The northern and western portions of Kashmir came under Pakistan's control in 1947, and are today referred to as 'Pakistan-Occupied Kashmir'.

Hyderabad

Hyderabad was a landlocked state in south-eastern India. While 87% of its 17 million people were Hindus, its ruler Nizam Osman Ali Khan was a Muslim, and Muslim elite dominated its politics. The Muslim nobility and the Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen, a powerful pro-Nizam Muslim party, insisted that Hyderabad must remain an independent state and stand on an equal footing to India and Pakistan. Accordingly, the Nizam in June 1947 issued a firman announcing that on the transfer of power, his state would be resuming independence. The Government of India rejected the firman, terming it a "legalistic claim of doubtful validity".

The Nizam was prepared to enter into a limited treaty with India, which gave Hyderabad safeguards not provided for in the standard Instrument of Accession, such as a provision guaranteeing Hyderabad's neutrality in the event of a conflict between India and Pakistan. India rejected this proposal, arguing that other states would demand similar concessions. A temporary Standstill Agreement was signed as a stopgap measure, even though Hyderabad had not yet agreed to accede to India.

The situation deteriorated further in 1948. The Razakars ("volunteers"), a militia affiliated to the Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen and set up under the influence of Muslim radical Qasim Razvi, assumed the role of supporting the Muslim ruling class against upsurges by the Hindu populace, and began intensifying its activities and was accused of attempting to intimidate villages. The Hyderabad State Congress Party, affiliated to the Indian National Congress, launched a political agitation. On 13 September, the Indian Army was sent into Hyderabad under Operation Polo. The troops met little resistance and between 13 and 18 September took complete control of the state. The Nizam was retained as the head of state in the same manner as the other princes who acceded to India.

Laccadive Islands, or Lakshadweep

The Laccadive, Minicoy, and Amindivi Islands, now Lakshadweep, were in 1947 British possessions in the Laccadive Sea which administratively formed part of the Madras Presidency. In accordance with the Indian Independence Act, the islands transferred automatically to the Union of India. On the orders of Vallabhbhai Patel, a ship of the Royal Indian Navy was sent to the Laccadives to hoist the Indian national flag and ensure the islands' integration into the Union of India, aiming to thwart any similar attempt by Pakistan.

Four-step integration

Merger

The bulk of the larger states, and some groups of small states, were integrated through a different, four-step process. The first step in this process was to convince groups of large states to combine to form a "princely union" through the execution by their rulers of Covenants of Merger. Under the Covenants of Merger, all rulers lost their ruling powers, save one who became the Rajpramukh of the new union. The other rulers were associated with two bodies—the council of rulers, whose members were the rulers of salute states, and a presidium, one or more of whose members were elected by the rulers of non-salute states, with the rest elected by the council.

The council from among the members of the presidium chose the Rajpramukh and a deputy Rajpramukh, or Uprajpramukh. The Covenants made provision for the creation of a constituent assembly for the new union, which would be charged with framing its constitution. In return for agreeing to the extinction of their states as discrete entities, the rulers were given a privy purse and guarantees similar to those provided under the Merger Agreements.

Through this process, Patel obtained the unification of 222 states in the Kathiawar peninsula of his native Gujarat into the princely union of Saurashtra in January 1948, with six more states joining the union the following year. Madhya Bharat emerged on 28 May 1948 from a union of Gwalior, Indore and eighteen smaller states. In Punjab, the Patiala and East Punjab States Union was formed on 15 July 1948 from Patiala, Kapurthala, Jind, Nabha, Faridkot, Malerkotla, Nalargarh, and Kalsia. The United State of Rajasthan was formed as the result of a series of mergers, the last of which was completed on 15 May 1949. Travancore and Cochin were merged in the middle of 1949 to form the princely union of Travancore-Cochin. The only princely states which signed neither Covenants of Merger nor Merger Agreements were Kashmir, Mysore and Hyderabad.

Constituent Assembly

The Constitution of India classified the constituent units of India into three classes, which it termed Part A, B, and C states. The former British provinces, together with the princely states that had been merged into them, were the Part A states. The princely unions, plus Mysore and Hyderabad, were the Part B states. The former Chief Commissioners' Provinces and other centrally administered areas, except the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, were the Part C states. The only practical difference between the Part A states and the Part B states was that the constitutional heads of the Part B states were the Rajpramukhs appointed under the terms of the Covenants of Merger, rather than Governors appointed by the central government. In addition, Constitution gave the central government a significant range of powers over the former princely states, providing amongst other things that "their governance shall be under the general control of, and comply with such particular directions, if any, as may from time to time be given by, the President". Apart from that, the form of government in both was identical.

Reorganisation

The distinction between Part A and Part B states was only intended to last for a brief, transitional period. In 1956, the States Reorganisation Act reorganised the former British provinces and princely

states on the basis of language. Simultaneously, the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution removed the distinction between Part A and Part B states, both of which were now treated only as "states", with Part C states being renamed "union territories". The Rajpramukhs lost their authority, and were replaced as the constitutional heads of state by Governors, who were appointed by the central government. These changes finally brought the princely order to an end. In both legal and practical terms, the territories that formerly were part of the princely states were now fully integrated into India and did not differ in any way from those that were formerly part of British India. The personal privileges of the princes the privy purse, the exemption from customs duty, and customary dignities survived slightly longer, but were abolished in 1971.

Colonial enclaves

The integration of the princely states raised the question of the future of the remaining colonial enclaves in India. At independence, the regions of Pondicherry, Karikal, Yanam, Mahe and Chandernagore were still colonies of France, and Daman and Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Goa remained colonies of Portugal. An agreement between France and India in 1948 provided for an election in France's remaining Indian possessions to choose their political future. A plebiscite held in Chandernagore on 19 June 1949 resulted in a vote of 7,463 to 114 in favour of being integrated with India. It was ceded to India on 14 August 1949 and de jure on 2 May 1950.

In the other enclaves, however, the pro-French camp, led by Edouard Goubert, used the administrative machinery to suppress the pro-merger groups. Popular discontent rose, and in 1954 demonstrations in Yanam and Mahe resulted in pro-merger groups assuming power. A referendum in Pondicherry and Karaikal in October 1954 resulted in a vote in favour of merger, and on 1 November 1954, de facto control over all four enclaves was transferred to the Republic of India. A treaty of cession was signed in May 1956, and following ratification by the French National Assembly in May 1962, de jure control of the enclaves was also transferred.

Portugal, in contrast, resisted diplomatic solutions. It viewed its continued possession of its Indian enclaves as a matter of national pride and in 1951; it amended its constitution to convert its possessions in India into Portuguese provinces. In July 1954, an uprising in Dadra and Nagar Haveli threw off Portuguese rule. The Portuguese attempted to send forces from Daman to reoccupy the enclaves, but were prevented from doing so by Indian troops. Portugal initiated proceedings before the International Court of Justice to compel India to allow its troops access to the enclave, but the Court rejected its complaint in 1960, holding that India was within its rights in denying Portugal military access. In 1961, the Constitution of India was amended to incorporate Dadra and Nagar Haveli into India as a Union Territory.

Goa, Daman and Diu remained an outstanding issue. On 15 August 1955, five thousand non-violent demonstrators marched against the Portuguese at the border, and were met with gunfire, killing 22. In December 1960, the United Nations General Assembly rejected Portugal's contention that its overseas possessions were provinces, and formally listed them as "non-self-governing territories". Although Nehru continued to favour a negotiated solution, the Portuguese suppression of a revolt in Angola in 1961 radicalised Indian public opinion, and increased the pressure on the Government of India to take military action. African leaders, too, put pressure on Nehru to take action in Goa, which they argued would save Africa from further horrors.

On 18 December 1961, following the collapse of an American attempt to find a negotiated solution, the Indian Army entered Portuguese India and defeated the Portuguese garrisons there. The Portuguese took the matter to the Security Council but a resolution calling on India to withdraw its troops immediately was defeated by the USSR's veto. Portugal surrendered on 19 December. This take-over ended the last of the European colonies in India. Goa was incorporated into India as a centrally administered union territory and, in 1987, became a state.

Sikkim: The former princely state of Sikkim, located at a strategically important point on the border between India and China, was integrated into India in 1975 as its 22nd state.

Three princely states bordering India—Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim—were not integrated into the Republic of India in the period between 1947 and 1950. Nepal had been recognised by the British and the Government of India as being de jure independent. Bhutan had in the British period been considered a protectorate outside the international frontier of India. The Government of India entered into a treaty with Bhutan in 1949 continuing this arrangement, and providing that Bhutan would abide by the advice of the Government of India in the conduct of its external affairs.

Historically, Sikkim was a British dependency, with a status similar to that of the other princely states, and was therefore considered to be within the frontiers of India in the colonial period. On independence, however, the Chogyal of Sikkim resisted full integration into India. Given the region's strategic importance to India, the Government of India signed first a Standstill Agreement and then in 1950 a full treaty with the Chogyal of Sikkim which in effect made it a protectorate which was no longer part of India. India had responsibility for defence, external affairs and communications, and ultimate responsibility for law and order, but Sikkim was otherwise given full internal autonomy.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Chogyal, supported by the minority Bhutia and Lepcha upper classes, attempted to negotiate greater powers, particularly over external affairs, in order to give Sikkim more of an international personality. Kazi Lhendup Dorji and the Sikkim State Congress, who represented the ethnic Nepali middle classes and took a more pro-Indian view, opposed these policies. In April 1973, an anti-Chogyal agitation broke out; the agitators demanded the conduct of popular elections. The Sikkim police were unable to control the demonstrations, and Dorji asked India to exercise its responsibility for law and order and intervene.

India facilitated negotiations between the Chogyal and Dorji, and produced an agreement, which envisaged the reduction of the Chogyal to the role of a constitutional monarch and the holding ofelections based on a new ethnic power-sharing formula. The Chogyal's opponents won an overwhelming victory, and a new Constitution was drafted providing for Sikkim to be associated with the Republic of India. On 10 April 1975, the Sikkim Assembly passed a resolution calling for the state to be fully integrated into India. This resolution was endorsed by 97% of the vote in a referendum held on 14 April 1975, following which the Indian Government amended the constitution to admit Sikkim into India as its 22nd state. Thus, Sikkim was merged with the Indian Union as its 22nd State.

*****

Consolidation of India as a Nation

A major problem, perhaps the most serious one that India has faced since 1947 has been of national unity or consolidation of the nation. The problem is also sometimes referred to as national integration or the integration of Indian people as a political community.

Unity in Diversity

The Indian nation is the product of a historical process and has been therefore in the making for very long, at least some five centuries. The roots of India's nationhood lie deep in its history and also in its experience of the struggle for independence. Pre-colonial India had already acquired some elements of common existence and common consciousness. Despite its immense cultural diversity, certain strands of a common cultural heritage had developed over the centuries, knitting its people together and giving them a sense of oneness, even while inculcating tolerance of diversity and dissent. As the poet Rabindranath Tagore put it, the unity of India is the 'unity of spirit'. Elements of political, administrative and economic unity had developed especially under the Mughals. The politics of the rulers and their territorial ambitions often cut across regions and were, at their most ambitious, subcontinental in their reach. Also, despite backward means of transport and communication, a great deal of India-wide trade, specialization of production and credit networks developed, especially during the late medieval period. A feeling of Indianness, however vague, had come into being, as testified by the currency of the concepts of Bharat Varsha and Hindustan. As pointed out in an earlier chapter, the colonialization of the Indian economy, society and polity further strengthened the process of India's unification. From the middle of the nineteenth century, Indians were more and more sharing common economic and political interests and social and cultural development even though they continued to be differentiated by language and ethnicity.

The national movement, as seen in Chapter 3, played a pivotal role in welding Indians together politically and emotionally into a nation and integrating them into 'a common framework of political identity and loyalty'. The depth, duration and deep social penetration of this movement carried the feeling of unity and nationhood to the mass of the people.

The leaders of the national movement realized that the making of the nation was a prolonged and continuous process, and one which was open to continuous challenges and interruption, disruption and even reversal. One such disruption had already occurred in 1947. As founders of the republic, these leaders were therefore fully aware that after independence too the process of unifying India and national integration was to be carefully sustained, promoted and nurtured through ideological and political endeavours. In fact, the leaders of India after 1947 saw the preservation and consolidation of India's unity as their biggest challenge. As Nehru put it in 1952, 'the most important factor, the overriding factor, is the unity of India'. To quote him again: 'Personally, I feel,' he said in 1957, 'that the biggest task of all is not only the economic development of India as a whole, but even more so the psychological and emotional integration of the people of India.

India's complex diversity is legendary. It consists of a large number of linguistic, cultural and geographic-economic zones. It has followers of different religions, Hindus, Muslims, Christians. Sikhs, Parsis, Buddhists and Jews, apart from tribals with myriad belief systems. In 1950, the Indian constitution recognized fourteen major languages, besides hundreds others, many of which were spoken by just a million persons. The 1961 Census listed 1,549 languages as mother tongues. The tribals, constituting over 6 per cent of the population, are dispersed all over India.

Given this diversity, the leaders of the national movement realized that the Indian nation had to be built on a very broad foundation.

India could be unified and its segmentation overcome only by accepting this immense diversity and not counterposing it to the process of nation-in-the-making. The emergence of a strong national identity and the preservation of India's rich diversity were seen as simultaneous processes. Regional cultural identities would develop not in conflict with but as part of the all-India identity. This entire outlook was epitomized in Nehru's approach who wrote in early 1951: 'We have to remember always that India is a country with a variety of cultures, habits, customs and ways of living ... It is very necessary, I think, for all of us to remember that this wonderful country of ours has infinite variety and there is absolutely no reason why we should try to regiment it after a single pattern. Indeed that is ultimately impossible. At the same time, the hope as well as the answer were there: 'But India is far greater, far richer and more varied than any part of it. We have to develop an outlook which embraces all this variety and considers it our very own.'[4] Thus, the differences in language, culture, religion and ethnicity were to be seen not as obstacles to be overcome, not as antithetical to national consolidation, but as positive features that were sources of strength to emerging nationhood. Consequently, the consolidation of independent India was to occur around the concept of 'unity in diversity'.

It was, however, recognized that the diversity of India could also be a source of weakness. Diversity could be used for divisive purposes and transformed into disruptive tendencies, such as communalism, casteism and linguistic or regional exclusiveness. The problem of integrating diverse loyalties was therefore quite real, especially as rapid social changes led to increase in the scale and number of social conflicts. The issues of jobs, educational opportunities, access to political power and share in the larger economic cake could and did fuel rivalries and conflicts based on religion, region, caste and language. Special efforts were necessary, different from those in other parts of the world, to carefully promote national unity. The broad strategy for national consolidation after 1947 involved territorial integration, mobilization of political and institutional resources, economic development and adoption of policies which would promote social justice, remove glaring inequalities and provide equal opportunities.

The leadership evolved a political institutional structure conducive to national consolidation. At the heart of this structure lay the inauguration of a democratic and civil libertarian polity. The argument was rejected that democracy and national integration were not compatible in the case of newly liberated and developing countries, and that an authoritarian political structure was needed to hold together such a diverse nation as India. On the contrary, precisely because India was so diverse it needed democracy rather than force or coercion to bind it. Nehru repeatedly warned his countrymen that in India 'any reversal of democratic methods might lead to disruption and violence'. India, he underlined, could only be held together by a democratic structure with full freedom as also opportunity for the diverse socio-economic, cultural and political voices to express themselves.

The constitutional structure established in 1950 encompassed the demands of diversity as well as the requirements of unity. It provided for a federal structure with a strong Centre but also a great deal of autonomy for the states. The makers of the constitution kept in view the difference between decentralization and disintegration and between unity and integration and centralization. The constitutional structure was not only conducive to national integration but provided the basic framework within which the struggle against divisive forces could be carried on. The political leadership was to use elections both to promote national consolidation and to legitimize its policies of integration. The parliament was the institution where basic and ultimate power resided and which acted as the open arena where different political trends could express themselves as also contend for power. Invariably, the issues and problems, as also programmes and policies, debated there were all-India in scale. As Asoka Mehta put it, the parliament acted as the great unifier of the nation.

Also, political parties acted as a great integrating force. All the major post-1947 political parties Socialist Party, Communist Party of India, Jan Sangh and later the Swatantra Party were all-India in character and in their organization and ideology; they stood for the unity of the country. They strove for national goals and mobilized people on an all-India basis and on all-India issues even when their capacity to do so was limited to particular regions. All this was perhaps even more true of Congress in the post-independence years. It had a strong and large organization covering almost all parts of the country. It was able to maintain internal party coherence and unity, and was also willing to play the role of a cementing force in society and polity. It is important to remember that immediately after independence, with the rapid marginalization of the communal parties, the major divide in Indian politics and among the intelligentsia was on political and ideological grounds rather than on the basis of caste, religion or language. It is also significant that the major vocal social groups and classes the bourgeoisie, the working class and the intelligentsia were all-India in outlook and stood for national unity. Indian nationalism, both before and after independence, had little difficulty in coming to terms with the emerging class consciousness as also class organizations such as trade unions and Kisan Sabhas on one side and the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI) on the other. No section of Indian society or polity saw loyalty to a class or class organization as threatening national cohesion.

The role of the leadership and its manner of functioning in nation-making and national consolidation is quite important. The leaders of the national movement thought in national terms and were fully committed to national unity and consolidation, and this commitment was widely accepted. Further, the prominent leaders of independent India Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Patel, Maulana Azad, Rajendra Prasad were not associated with any one region, language, religion, or caste. This was also true of the prominent Opposition leaders such as Jayaprakash Narayan, J.B. Kripalani, Rammanohar Lohia, Syama Prasad Mookerjee, B.T. Ranadive and Ajoy Ghosh.

A major asset of the Congress leadership was that it was well versed in accommodative politics. It had been able to keep united diverse political and ideological trends during the anti-imperialist struggle. Following this, after 1947, despite near-total political dominance, it was willing to conciliate and accommodate, to listen to and appease the Opposition parties and dissenting groups. In particular, it was quite sensitive to popular rumblings on linguistic or other cultural issues. Reacting strongly to violence, it responded, often sympathetically, to demands pressed through non-violent means and mass backing. Nehru, for example, was willing to persuade and accommodate the Communists once they gave up recourse to violence. Other political parties too, including the CPI, came to share after some time the same means, methods and values for resolving social conflicts, differing only in rhetoric.

The Indian army and administrative services were also a force for forging national unity. India developed after 1947 a national administrative service with recruitment to its top echelons, the IAS, the IPS, and other central services, taking place on the basis of individual merit, irrespective of caste or religion, from all regions and linguistic areas. These services were all-India in character and sentiment and all officers selected were given common training and owed allegiance to the central government, which also had the ultimate power to promote or discipline them. The central services, as also the state services, were basically non-political and accepted the authority of the party which was voted to power by the people. Likewise, the army was a national force whose officers and ranks were recruited from all parts of the country.

The Indian economy, national market, and transport and communication networks were further unified after 1947. Industrial development was promoted on a national scale and dams, steel mills, fertilizer plants, cement factories, and heavy machinery and electric plants soon became symbols of national endeavour as well as national unity.

Jawaharlal Nehru and other leaders saw economic development as essential for national consolidation. Soon after independence, the government set up a Planning Commission and took active measures for planned economic development. Though the government and the Planning Commission did not succeed in putting an end to regional economic disparities, they did avoid inequality in the distribution of economic resources among states. In general, the central government followed accommodative policies towards the states. Consequently, though there was constant grumbling and plenty of grievances there was no serious discontent in the states and regions on grounds of discrimination by the central government and therefore no separatist feelings on that account.

National integration also required policies which would promote social justice and greater social and economic equality. The national movement had also linked the process of nation-in-the-making with socio-economic changes in the interests of the oppressed and the deprived. Consolidation of the nation after independence had to be judged in terms of how it affected their lives. The entire Indian people and not merely the middle and upper classes had to benefit from the coming of independence and processes of economic development and political democracy.

The constitution laid the basis for reduction of social disparity by putting an end to any discrimination on grounds of religion, caste or sex. Redeeming the national movement's major pledge to the depressed sections of society, it provided reservations for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in educational institutions, employment and in the legislatures. Soon after 1947, a number of social reforms and welfare laws were passed. Landlordism was abolished and there was some redistribution of land. A law was passed making untouchability an offence. Unfortunately, no struggle against the hierarchical caste system followed, so that, on the one hand caste discrimination and oppression continued, on the other, casteism or the use of caste solidarity for electoral and other political purposes began to grow. The momentum of social reform was lost by the early 1950s. Removal of social oppression and social discrimination and exploitation, based on caste, religion, language or ethnicity, and of gross economic inequality has remained the weakest part of the agenda for national integration.

From the start, the founding fathers stood for secularism as the basis for the nation. Undaunted by Partition and the accompanying riots, they remained loyal to the secular vision of the national movement. They also dealt firmly with communal violence and on the whole succeeded in protecting the religious minorities. Independent India's foreign policy served as another unifying force. The policy of non-alignment and anti-colonialism and Nehru's growing stature as a world figure contributed to a sense of national pride in India among all sections of people all over the country and irrespective of their political alignment.

At the moment of freedom, the need for unity was urgent but also present was the problem of integrating diverse loyalties. The strategies and approaches promoting integration required time but the people were in a hurry and there was plenty of scope for conflicts. Many observers, in fact, predicted growing disunity and even break-up of the country. In the next section and the following chapters we will study some of the areas of diversity which produced conflicts and the manner in which these differences were sought to be resolved.

The Language Problem

The language problem was the most divisive issue in the first twenty years of independent India, and it created the apprehension among many that the political and cultural unity of the country was in danger. People love their language; it is an integral part of culture. Consequently, linguistic identity has been a strong force in all societies. This is even more true of a multilingual society like India's. Linguistic diversity would inevitably give birth to strong political currents around issues linked to language, such as educational and economic development, job and other economic opportunities and access to political power.

The Indian constitution recognizes twenty-two major languages, including English and Sanskrit. In addition, there are a myriad languages spoken by the tribals and others, with or without their own scripts. The model that independent India has adopted is not that of assimilation into, or suppression of, the many languages by one of them. This is in any case impossible in a democratic polity. The feasible option is to accept and live with this 'multiplicity' in a manner that conflict situations do not emerge or persist for long.

The problem posed to national consolidation by linguistic diversity has taken two major forms. These are discussed here in two separate sections: (i) the dispute over official language of the union and (ii) the linguistic reorganization of the states.

The Official Language

The controversy on the language issue became most virulent when it took the form of opposition to Hindi and tended to create conflict between Hindi-speaking and non-Hindi-speaking regions of the country. The dispute was not over the question of a national language, that is one language which all Indians would adopt after some time, since the view that one national language was essential to an Indian national identity had already been rejected overwhelmingly by the secular majority of the national leadership. India was a multilingual country and it had to remain so. The Indian national movement had carried on its ideological and political work through the different Indian regional languages. Its demand then was for the replacement of English by the mother tongue as the medium for higher education, administration and courts in each linguistic area. Jawaharlal Nehru had clearly put across this view in 1937: 'Our great provincial languages . . . are ancient languages-with a rich inheritance, each spoken by many millions of persons, each tied up inextricably with the life and culture and ideas of the masses as well as of the upper classes. It is axiomatic that the masses can only grow educationally and culturally through the medium of their own language. Therefore, it is inevitable that we lay stress on the provincial languages and carry on most of our work through them . . . Our system of education and public work must therefore be based on the provincial languages.

The issue of a national language was resolved when the constitution-makers virtually accepted all the major languages as 'languages of India' or India's national languages. But the matter could not end there, for the country's official work could not be carried on in so many languages. There had to be one common language in which the central government would carry on its work and maintain contact with the state governments. The question arose what would be this language of all-India communication? Or what would be India's official and link language? Only two candidates were available for the purpose: English and Hindi. The Constituent Assembly heatedly debated which one should be selected.

But, in fact, the choice had already been made in the pre-independence period by the leadership of the national movement, which was convinced that English would not continue to be the all-India medium of communication in free India. For example, even while appreciating the value of English as a world language, through which Indians could access world science and culture and modern Western ideas, Gandhiji was convinced that the genius of a people could not unfold nor could their culture flower in a foreign language. In fact, Gandhiji, during the 1920s emphasized that English is 'a language of international commerce, it is the language of diplomacy, it contains many a rich literary treasure, and it gives us an introduction to Western thought and culture'. But he argued English occupied in India 'an unnatural place due to our unequal relations with Englishmen'. English 'has sapped the energy of the nation ... it has estranged them from the masses . . . The sooner therefore educated India shakes itself free from the hypnotic spell of the foreign medium, the better it would be for them and the people.' And he wrote in 1946: T love the English tongue in its own place, but I am its inveterate opponent if it usurps a place which does not belong

to it. English is today admittedly the world language. I would therefore accord it a place as a second, optional language. Nehru echoed these sentiments in his 1937 article on 'The Question of Language' and also during the Constituent Assembly debates.

Hindi or Hindustani, the other candidate for the status of the official or link language, had already played this role during the nationalist struggle, especially during the phase of mass mobilization. Hindi had been accepted by leaders from non-Hindi-speaking regions because it was considered to be the most widely spoken and understood language in the country. Lokamanya Tilak, Gandhiji, C. Rajagopalachari, Subhas Bose and Sardar Patel were some of Hindi's enthusiastic supporters. In its sessions and political work, the Congress had substituted Hindi and the provincial languages in place of English. In 1925, Congress amended its constitution to read: 'The proceedings of the Congress shall be conducted as far as possible in Hindustani. The English language or any provincial language may be used if the speaker is unable to speak Hindustani or whenever necessary. The proceedings of the Provincial Congress Committee shall ordinarily be conducted in the language of the Province concerned. Hindustani may also be used.' Reflecting a national consensus, the Nehru Report had laid down in 1928 that Hindustani which might be written in the Devanagari or Urdu script would be the common language of India, but the use of English would be continued for some time. It is interesting that ultimately the constitution of free India was to adopt this stand, except for replacing Hindustani by Hindi. The real debate in the Constituent Assembly occurred over two questions: Would Hindi or Hindustani replace English? And what would be the time-frame for such a replacement to happen?

Sharp differences marked the initial debates as the problem of the official language was highly politicized from the beginning. The question of Hindi or Hindustani was soon resolved, though with a great deal of acrimony. Gandhiji and Nehru both supported Hindustani, written in the Devanagari or Urdu script. Though many supporters of Hindi disagreed, they had tended to accept the Gandhi-Nehru viewpoint. But once Partition was announced, thesechampions of Hindi were emboldened, especially as the protagonists of Pakistan had claimed Urdu as the language of Muslims and of Pakistan. The votaries of Hindi now branded Urdu 'as a symbol of secession'. They demanded that Hindi in the Devanagari script be made the national language. Their demand split the Congress party down the middle. In the end the Congress Legislative Party decided for Hindi against Hindustani by 78 to 77 votes, even though Nehru and Azad fought for Hindustani. The Hindi bloc was also forced to compromise: it accepted that Hindi would be the official and not the national language.

The issue of the time-frame for a shift from English to Hindi produced a divide between Hindi and non-Hindi areas. The spokespersons of Hindi areas were for the immediate switchover to Hindi, while those from non-Hindi areas advocated retention of English for a long if not indefinite period. In fact, they wanted the status quo to continue till a future parliament decided to shift to Hindi as the official language. Nehru was for making Hindi the official language, but he was also in favour of English continuing as an additional official language, making the transition to Hindi gradual, and actively encouraging the knowledge of English because of its usefulness in the contemporary world.

The case for Hindi basically rested on the fact that it was the language of the largest number, though not of the majority, of the people of India; it was also understood at least in the urban areas of most of northern India from Bengal to Punjab and in Maharashtra and Gujarat. The critics of Hindi talked about it being less developed than other languages as a literary language and as a language of science and politics. But their main fear was that Hindi's adoption as the official language would place non-Hindi areas, especially South India, at a disadvantage in the educational and economic spheres, and particularly in competition for appointments in government and the public sector. Such opponents tended to argue that imposition of Hindi on non-Hindi areas would lead to their economic, political, social and cultural domination by Hindi areas.

The constitution-makers were aware that as the leaders of a multilingual country they could not ignore, or even give the impression of ignoring, the interests of any one linguistic area. A compromise was arrived at, though this led to the language provisions of the constitution becoming 'complicated, ambiguous and confusing in some respects'. The constitution provided that Hindi in Devanagari script with international numerals would be India's official language. English was to continue for use in all official purposes till 1965, when it would be replaced by Hindi. Hindi was to be introduced in a phased manner. After 1965 it would become the sole official language. However, parliament would have the power to provide for the use of English for specified purposes even after 1965. The constitution laid upon the government the duty to promote the spread and development of Hindi and provided for the appointment of a commission and a Joint Parliamentary Committee to review the progress in this respect. The state legislatures were to decide the matter of official language at the state level, though the official language of the Union would serve as the language of communication between the states and the Centre and between one state and another.

Implementation of the language provisions of the constitution proved to be a formidable task even though the Congress party was in power all over the country. The issue remained a subject of intense controversy, and became increasingly acrimonious with the passage of time, though for many years nobody challenged the provision that Hindi would eventually become the sole official language.

The constitution-makers had hoped that by 1965 the Hindi protagonists would overcome the weaknesses of Hindi, win the confidence of non-Hindi areas, and hold their hand for a longer period till such time they had done so. It was also hoped that with the rapid growth of education Hindi too would spread and resistance to Hindi would gradually weaken and even disappear. But, unfortunately, the spread of education was too slow to make an impact in this respect.

Moreover, the chances of Hindi's success as an official language were spoilt by the proponents of Hindi themselves. Instead of taking up a gradual, slow and moderate approach to gain acceptance of Hindi by non-Hindi areas and to rely on persuasion, the more fanatical among them preferred imposition of Hindi through government action. Their zeal and enthusiasm tended to provoke a counter-movement. As Nehru told parliament in 1959, it was their overenthusiasm which came in the way of the spread and acceptance of Hindi for 'the way they approach this subject often irritates others, as it irritates me'. Hindi suffered from the lack of social science and scientific writing. In the 1950s, for example, there were hardly any academic journals in Hindi outside the literary field. Instead of developing Hindi as a means of communication in higher education, journalism, and so on, the Hindi leaders were more interested in making it the sole official language.

A major weakness of the Hindi protagonists was that, instead of developing a simple standard language which would get wide acceptance or at least popularize the colloquial Hindi as spoken and written in Hindi areas as also in many other parts of India, they tried to Sanskritize the language, replacing commonly understood words with newly manufactured, unwieldy and little understood ones in the name of the 'purity' of language, free of alien influences. This made it more and more difficult for non-Hindi speakers (or even Hindi speakers) to understand or learn the new version. All India Radio, which could have played an important role in popularizing Hindi, instead took to so Sanskritizing its Hindi news bulletins that many listeners would switch off their radios when the Hindi news was broadcast. Nehru, a Hindi speaker and writer, was to complain in 1958 that he was unable to understand the language in which his own Hindi speeches were being broadcast. But the purifiers of Hindi did not relent and resisted all attempts to simplify the Hindi of news broadcasts. This led many uncommitted persons to join the ranks of the opponents of Hindi.

Nehru and the majority of Indian leaders, however, remained committed to the transition to Hindi as the official language. They believed that, though the study of English was to be encouraged, English could not continue forever as India's official language. In the interests of national unity as

also economic and political development they also realized that full transition to Hindi should not be time-bound and should await a politically more auspicious time when the willing consent of the non-Hindi areas could be obtained. The non-Hindi leaders also became less and less open to persuasion and their opposition to Hindi increased with time. One result of this alienation of non-Hindi-language groups was that they too were not open to rational arguments in favour of Hindi. Instead they veered towards an indefinite continuance of English.

Sharp differences on the official language issue surfaced during 1956-60, once again revealing the presence of disruptive tendencies. In 1956, the Report of the Official Language Commission, set up in 1955 in terms of a constitutional provision, recommended that Hindi should start progressively replacing English in various functions of the central government with effective change taking place in 1965. Its two members from West Bengal and Tamil Nadu, Professor Suniti Kumar Chatterjee and P. Subbaroyan, however, dissented, accusing the members of the Commission of suffering from a pro-Hindi bias, and asked for the continuation of English. Ironically, Professor Chatterjee was in charge of the Hindi Pracharini Sabha in Bengal before independence. The Commission's report was reviewed by a special Joint Parliamentary Committee (JPC). To implement the recommendations of the Committee, the President issued an order in April 1960 stating that after 1965 Hindi would be the principal official language but that English would continue as the associate official language without any restriction being placed on its use. Hindi would also become an alternative medium for the Union Public Service Commission examinations after some time, but for the present it would be introduced in the examinations as a qualifying subject. In accordance with the President's directive, the central government took a series of steps to promote Hindi. These included the setting up of the Central Hindi Directorate, publication of standard works in Hindi or in Hindi translation in various fields, compulsory training of central government employees in Hindi, and translation of major texts of law into Hindi and promotion of their use by the courts. All these measures aroused suspicion and anxiety in the non-Hindi areas and groups. Nor were the Hindi leaders satisfied. For example, Professor Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, an eminent linguist and a former staunch advocate and promoter of Hindi, stated in his dissenting note to the Report of the Official Language Commission that the outlook of the commission was one of the 'Hindi speakers who are to profit immediately and for a long time to come, if not forever'. Similarly, in March 1958, C. Rajagopala-chari, ex-president of the Hindi Pracharini Sabha in the South, declared that 'Hindi is as much foreign to the non-Hindi speaking people as English to the protagonists of Hindi'. On the other hand, two major champions of Hindi, Purshottamdas Tandon and Seth Govind Das, accused the Joint Parliamentary Committee of being pro-English. Many of the Hindi leaders also attacked Nehru and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, the Minister of Education, for dragging their feet in implementing the constitutional provisions and deliberately delaying the replacement of English. They insisted that the deadline for the changeover to Hindi laid down in the constitution must be rigidly observed. In 1957, Dr Lohia's Samyukta Socialist Party and the Jan Sangh launched a militant movement, which continued for nearly two years, for the immediate replacement of English by Hindi. One of the agitational methods adopted by the followers of Lohia on a large scale was to deface English signboards of shops and in other places.

Fully aware of the danger that the official language issue could pose to Indian polity, the leadership of the Congress took the grievances of the non-Hindi areas seriously and handled the issue with great care and caution. The attempt was to work for a compromise. Nehru, time and again made it clear that an official language could not and would not be imposed on any region of the country and that the pace of transition to Hindi would have to be determined keeping in view the wishes of the non-Hindi people. In this he was supported by the leaders of Praja Socialist Party (PSP) and Communist Party of India (CPI). PSP criticized Hindi extremism and said that it 'might severely strain the unity of a multilingual country like India'.

The highlight of Nehru's approach was a major statement in parliament on 7 August 1959. To allay the fears of the non-Hindi people, he gave a definite assurance: 'I would have English as an alternate language as long as the people require it, and I would leave the decision not to the Hindi-knowing people, but to the non-Hindi-knowing people.' He also told the people of the South that 'if they do not want to learn Hindi, let them not learn Hindi'. He repeated this assurance in parliament on 4 September 1959. In pursuance of Nehru's assurances, though with delay caused by internal party pressures and the India-China war, an Official Languages Act was passed in 1963. The object of the Act, Nehru declared, was 'to remove a restriction which had been placed by the Constitution on the use of English after a certain date, namely, 1965'. But this purpose was not fully served as the assurances were- not clearly articulated in the Act. The Act laid down that 'the English language may . . . continue to be used in addition to Hindi'. The non-Hindi groups criticized the use of the word 'may' in place of the word 'shall'. This made the Act ambiguous in their eyes; they did not regard it as a statutory guarantee. Many of them wanted a cast iron guarantee not because they distrusted Nehru but because they were worried about what would happen after Nehru, especially as the pressure from the Hindi leaders was also growing. The death of Nehru in June 1964 increased their apprehensions which were further fuelled by certain hasty steps taken and circulars issued by various ministries to prepare the ground for the changeover to Hindi in the coming year. For example, instructions were given that the central government's correspondence with the states would be in Hindi, though in the case of non-Hindi states an English translation would be appended.

Lai Bahadur Shastri, Nehru's successor as prime minister, was unfortunately not sensitive enough to the opinion of non-Hindi groups. Instead of taking effective steps to counter their fears of Hindi becoming the *sole* official language, he declared that he was considering making Hindi an alternative medium in public service examinations. This meant that while non-Hindi speakers could still compete in the all-India services in English, Hindi speakers would have the advantage of being able to use their mother tongue.

Many non-Hindi leaders in protest changed their line of approach to the problem of the official language. While previously they had wanted a slowing down of the replacement of English, now they started demanding that there should be no deadline fixed for the changeover. Some of the leaders went much further. The Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) and C. Rajagopalachari, for example, demanded that the constitution should be amended and English should be made the official language of India.

As 26 January 1965 approached, a fear psychosis gripped the non-Hindi areas, especially Tamil Nadu, creating a strong anti-Hindi movement. On 17 January, the DMK organized the Madras State Anti-Hindi Conference which gave a call for observing 26 January as a day of mourning. Students, concerned for their careers and apprehensive that they would be outstripped by Hindi speakers in the all-India services, were the most active in organizing a widespread agitation and mobilizing public opinion. They raised and popularized the slogan: 'Hindi never, English ever.' They also demanded amendment of the constitution. The students' agitation soon developed into statewide unrest. The Congress leadership, though controlling both the state and the central governments, failed to gauge the depth of the popular feeling and the widespread character of the movement and instead of negotiating with the students, made an effort to repress it. Widespread rioting and violence followed in the early weeks of February leading to large-scale destruction of railways and other Union property. So strong was the anti-Hindi feeling that several Tamil youth, including four students, burned themselves to death in protest against the official language policy. Two Tamil ministers, C. Subramaniam and Alagesan, resigned from the Union cabinet. The agitation continued for about two months, taking a toll of over sixty lives through police firings. The only eminent central leader to show concern for the agitators was Indira Gandhi, then Minister for Information and Broadcasting.

At the height of the agitation she flew to Madras, 'rushed to the storm-centre of trouble', showed some sympathy for the agitators and thus became, after Nehru, the first northern leader to win the trust of the aggrieved Tamils as well as of the people of the South in general.

Efforts were made by the Jan Sangh and the Samyukta Socialist Party (SSP) to organize a counter-agitation in the Hindi areas against English, but they did not get much public support.

The agitation forced both the Madras and the Union governments and the Congress party to revise their stand. They now decided to yield to the intense public mood in the South, change their policy and accept the major demands of the agitators. The Congress Working Committee announced a series of steps which were to form the basis for a central enactment embodying concessions and which led to the withdrawal of the Hindi agitation. This enactment was delayed because of the Indo-Pak war of 1965, which silenced all dissension in the country.

With the death of Lai Bahadur Shastri in January 1966, Indira Gandhi became the prime minister. As she had already won the trust of the people of the South, they were convinced that a genuine effort would be made to resolve the long-festering dispute. Other favourable factors were the Jan Sangh's muting of their anti-English fervour and the SSP's acceptance of the basic features of the agreement worked out in 1965.

Despite facing economic problems and the weakening of the Congress's position in parliament in the 1967 elections, Indira Gandhi moved the bill to amend the 1963 Official Language Act on 27 November. The Lok Sabha adopted the bill, on 16 December 1967, by 205 to 41 votes. The Act gave an unambiguous legal fortification to Nehru's assurances of September 1959. It provided that the use of English as an associate language in addition to Hindi for the official work at the Centre and for communication between the Centre and non-Hindi states would continue as long as the non-Hindi states wanted it, giving them full veto powers on the question. A virtually indefinite policy of bilingualism was adopted. The parliament also adopted a policy resolution laying down that the public service examinations were to be conducted in Hindi and English and in all the regional languages with the proviso that the candidates should have additional knowledge of Hindi or English. The states were to adopt a three-language formula according to which in the non-Hindi areas, the mother tongue, Hindi and English or some other national language was to be taught in schools while in the Hindi areas a non-Hindi language, preferably a southern language, was to be taught as a compulsory subject.

The Government of India took another important step on the language question in July 1967. On the basis of the report of the Education Commission in 1966 it declared that Indian languages would ultimately become the medium of education in all subjects at the university level, though the time-frame for the changeover would be decided by each university to suit its convenience.

After many twists and turns, a great deal of debate and several agitations, small and big, and many compromises India had arrived at a widely accepted solution to the very difficult problem of the official and link language for the country. Since 1967, this problem has gradually disappeared from the political scene, demonstrating the capacity of the Indian political system to deal with a contentious problem on a democratic basis, and in a manner that promoted national consolidation. Here was an issue which emotionally divided the people and which could have jeopardized the unity of the country, but to which a widely acceptable solution was found through negotiations and compromise. And it was not only the national leadership provided by the Congress, with some hiccups on the way, which came up to the mark; the Opposition parties too measured up when it came to the crunch. In the end, the DMK, in whose rise to power the language issue played an important role, also helped by cooling down the political temper in Tamil Nadu.

Of course, no political problem is solved for all times to come. Problem-solving in a nation as complex as India is bound to be a continuous process. But it is significant that Hindi has been making rapid progress in non-Hindi areas through education, trade, tourism, films, radio and television. The use of Hindi as an official language has also been growing though English is still dominant. Simultaneously, English, as a second language, has been spreading fast, including in the Hindi-speaking areas. A witness of this is the number of private English-medium schools, however poor in staff and other facilities, which now dot the countryside from Kashmir to Kanyakumari. The standards of spoken and written English have fallen but the English-knowing classes have multiplied manifold. Both English and Hindi are likely to grow as link languages just as regional languages are more and more occupying the official, educational and media space. The proof of the growth of Hindi, English and regional languages lies in the rapid growth of newspapers in all of them. In fact, English is not only likely to survive in India for all times to come, but it remains and is likely to grow as a language of communication between the intelligentsia all over the country, as a library language, and as the second language of the universities. Hindi, on the other hand, has so far failed to perform any of the three roles. Of course, the ideal of making Hindi the link language of the country remains. But the way in which the enthusiastic protagonists of Hindi promoted Hindi's cause, they pushed back the chances of this happening for a long time to come.

*****

The Linguistic Reorganization of the States

The reorganization of the states on the basis of language, J. a major aspect of national consolidation and integration, came to the fore almost immediately after independence. The boundaries of provinces in pre-*1947* India had been drawn in a haphazard manner as the British conquest of India had proceeded for nearly a hundred years. No heed was paid to linguistic or cultural cohesion so that most of the provinces were multilingual and multicultural. The interspersed princely states had added a further element of heterogeneity.

The case for linguistic states as administrative units was very strong. Language is closely related to culture and therefore to the customs of people. Besides, the massive spread of education and growth of mass literacy can only occur through the medium of the mother tongue. Democracy can become real to the common people only when politics and administration are conducted through the language they can understand. But this language, the mother tongue, cannot be the medium of education or administration or judicial activity unless a state is formed on the basis of such a predominant language.

It is for this reason that, with the involvement of the masses in the national movement after 1919, Congress undertook political mobilization in the mother tongue and in 1921 amended its constitution and reorganized its regional branches on a linguistic basis. Since then, the Congress repeatedly committed itself to the redrawing of the provincial boundaries on linguistic lines. Just five days before he was assassinated, Gandhiji, while urging the people to 'discourage all fissiparous tendencies and feel and behave as Indians', also argued that 'the redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis was necessary if provincial languages were to grow to their full height'. It was therefore more or less universally assumed that free India would base its administrative boundaries on the linguistic principle.

But the national leadership had second thoughts on the subject immediately after independence. There were various reasons for this. Partition had created serious administrative, economic and political dislocation; and independence, coming immediately after the War, was accompanied by serious economic and law and order problems. Also there was the vexed Kashmir problem and a war-like situation vis-a-vis Pakistan. The leadership felt that the most important task for the present was to consolidate national unity; and any effort undertaken immediately to redraw the internal boundaries might dislocate administration and economic development, intensify regional and linguistic rivalries, unleash destructive forces, and damage the unity of the country. Speaking on the lirtguistic question, Nehru clearly stated on 27 November 1947: 'First things must come first and the first thing is the security and stability of India.' Hence, while still committed to linguistic states, Nehru and other leaders accorded the task of redrawing India's administrative map a low priority. The task, they felt, could wait for some years.

The question of the linguistic reorganization of India was, however, raised quite early in the Constituent Assembly. It appointed in 1948 the Linguistic Provinces Commission, headed by Justice S.K. Dar, to enquire into the desirability of linguistic provinces. The Dar Commission advised against the step at the time for it might threaten national unity and also be administratively inconvenient. Consequently, the Constituent Assembly decided not to incorporate the linguistic principle in the constitution. But public opinion was not satisfied, especially in the South, and the problem remained politically alive. To appease the vocal votaries of linguistic states, the Congress appointed a committee (JVP) in December 1948 consisting of Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Patel and Pattabhi Sitaramayya, president of the Congress, to examine the question afresh. This committee advised against the creation of linguistic states for the time being, emphasizing on unity, national security and economic development as the needs of the hour.

Yet, the Congress leadership would not oppose any popular demand. In the JVP report, as well as afterwards, the Congress leadership laid down that where the demand for a linguistic state was insistent and overwhelming and where other language groups involved were agreeable to it, a new state could be created. The JVP report was followed by popular movements for states' reorganization all over the country, which persisted with varying degrees of intensity till 1960. The demand for a separate Andhra state for the Telugu people was an example. The demand had been popular for nearly half a century and had the support of all political parties.

The JVP accepted that a strong case for the formation of Andhra out of the Madras Presidency existed, particularly as the leadership of Tamil Nadu was agreeable to it. But it did not concede the demand immediately, because the two sides could not agree on which state should take Madras city. The Andhra leaders were unwilling to concede Madras even though on linguistic as well as geographic grounds it belonged to Tamil Nadu.

On 19 October 1952, a popular freedom fighter, Patti Sriramalu, undertook a fast unto death over the demand for a separate Andhra and expired after fifty-eight days. His death was followed by three days of rioting, demonstrations, hartals and violence all over Andhra. The government immediately gave in and conceded the demand for a separate state of Andhra, which finally came into existence in October 1953. Simultaneously, Tamil Nadu was created as a Tamil-speaking state.

The success of the Andhra struggle encouraged other linguistic groups to agitate for their own state or for rectification of their boundaries on a linguistic basis. Nehru was not in favour at that time of continuing with the redrawing of India's internal administrative boundaries, but he was too much of a democrat to sternly and consistently oppose the demands. As Nehru's biographer, S. Gopal, has put it: 'He felt that it would be undemocratic to smother this sentiment which, on general grounds, he did not find objectionable. Indeed, a linguistic mosaic might well provide a firmer base for national unity. What concerned him were the timing, the agitation and violence with which linguistic provinces were being demanded and the harsh antagonism between various sections of the Indian people which underlay these demands.'

To meet the demand halfway and to delay matters, Nehru appointed in August 1953 the States Reorganisation Commission (SRC), with Justice Fazl Ali, K.M. Panikkar and Hridaynath Kunzru as members, to examine 'objectively and dispassionately' the entire question of the reorganization of the states of the Union. Throughout the two years of its work, the Commission was faced with meetings, demonstrations, agitations and hunger strikes. Different linguistic groups clashed with each other, verbally as well as sometimes physically. As the Commissioners reported in sorrow: 'It has been most distressing to us to witness ... a kind of border warfare in certain areas in which old comrades-in-arms in the battle for freedom have pitted against one another in acrimonious controversy . . . Deliberate attempts to whip up popular frenzy by an appeal to parochial and communal sentiments; threats of large-scale migration; assertions such as that if a certain language group is not allowed to have an administrative unit of its own, its moral, material and even physical extinction would follow as an inevitable consequence; ... all point to an acute lack of perspective and balance.'[4] The SRC submitted its report in October 1955. While laying down that due consideration should be given to administrative and economic factors, it recognized for the most part the linguistic principle and recommended redrawing of state boundaries on that basis. The Commission, however, opposed the splitting of Bombay and Punjab. Despite strong reaction to the report in many parts of the country, the SRC's recommendations were accepted, though with certain modifications, and were quickly implemented.

The States Reorganisation Act was passed by parliament in November 1956. It provided for fourteen states and six centrally administered territories. The Telangana area of Hyderabad state was transferred to Andhra; Kerala was created by merging the Malabar district of the old Madras

Presidency with Travancore-Cochin. Certain Kannada-speaking areas of the states of Bombay, Madras, Hyderabad and Coorg were added to the Mysore state. Bombay state was enlarged by merging the states of Kutch and Saurashtra and the Marathi-speaking areas of Hyderabad with it.

The strongest reaction against the SRC's report and the States Reorganisation Act came from Maharashtra where widespread rioting broke out and eighty people were killed in Bombay city in police firings in January 1956. The Opposition parties supported by a wide spectrum of public opinion students, farmers, workers, artists, businessmen organized a powerful protest movement. Under pressure, the government decided in June 1956 to divide the Bombay state into two linguistic states of Maharashtra and Gujarat with Bombay city forming a separate, centrally administered state. This move too was strongly opposed by the Maharashtrians. Nehru now vacillated and, unhappy at having hurt the feelings of the people of Maharashtra, reverted in July to the formation of bilingual, greater Bombay. This move was, however, opposed by the people of both Maharashtra and Gujarat. The broad-based Samyukta Maharashtra Samiti and Maha Gujarat Janata Parishad led the movements in the two parts of the state. In Maharashtra, even a large section of Congressmen joined the demand for a unilingual Maharashtra with Bombay as its capital; and C.D. Deshmukh, the Finance Minister in the central cabinet, resigned from his office on this question. The Gujaratis felt that they would be a minority in the new state. They too would not agree to give up Bombay city to Maharashtra. Violence and arson now spread to Ahmedabad and other parts of Gujarat. Sixteen persons were killed and 200 injured in police firings.

In view of the disagreement over Bombay city, the government stuck to its decision and passed the States Reorganisation Act in November 1956. But the matter could not rest there. In the 1957 elections the Bombay Congress scraped through with a slender majority. Popular agitation continued for nearly five years. As Congress president, Indira Gandhi reopened the question and was supported by the President, S. Radhakrishnan. The government finally agreed in May 1960 to bifurcate the state of Bombay into Maharashtra and Gujarat, with Bombay city being included in Maharashtra, and Ahmedabad being made the capital of Gujarat.

The other state where an exception was made to the linguistic principle was Punjab. In 1956, the states of PEPSU had been merged with Punjab, which, however, remained a trilingual state having three language speakers Punjabi, Hindi and Pahari within its borders. In the Punjabi-speaking part of the state, there was a strong demand for carving out a separate Punjabi Suba (Punjabi-speaking state). Unfortunately, the issue assumed communal overtones. The Sikh communalists, led by the Akali Dal, and the Hindu communalists, led by the Jan Sangh, used the linguistic issue to promote communal politics. While the Hindu communalists opposed the demand for a Punjabi Suba by denying that Punjabi was their mother tongue, the Sikh communalists put forward the demand as a Sikh demand for a Sikh state, claiming Punjabi written in Gurmukhi as a Sikh language. Even though the demand was supported by the Communist Party and a section of the Congress, it had got mixed up with religion. But Nehru, as also the majority of the Punjab Congressmen, felt that the demand for a Punjabi state was basically a communal demand for a Sikh-majority state 'dressed up as a language plea'. Nehru and the Congress leadership were clear that they would not accept any demand for the creation of a state on religious or communal grounds. The SRC had also refused to accept the demand for a separate Punjabi-speaking state on the ground that this would not solve either the language or the communal problem of Punjab. (The several powerful movements for a Punjabi state are discussed separately in the chapter on the Punjab crisis.) Finally, in 1966, Indira Gandhi agreed to the division of Punjab into two Punjabi-and Hindi-speaking states of Punjab and Haryana, with the Pahari-speaking district of Kangra and a part of the Hoshiarpur district being merged with Himachal Pradesh. Chandigarh, the newly built city and capital of united Punjab, was made a Union Territory and was to serve as the joint capital of Punjab and Haryana.

Thus, after more than ten years of continuous strife and popular struggles the linguistic reorganization of India was largely completed, making room for greater political participation by the people. Events since 1956 have clearly shown that loyalty to a language was quite consistent with, and was rather complementary to, loyalty to the nation. By reorganizing the states on linguistic lines, the national leadership removed a major grievance which could have led to fissiparous tendencies. States reorganization is, therefore, 'best regarded as clearing the ground for national integration'. Also, even though during the agitation for states' reorganization the language of warring camps was used, language has not subsequently defined the politics of the states.

Equally important, linguistic reorganization of the states has not in any manner adversely affected the federal structure of the Union or weakened or paralysed the Centre as many had feared. The central government wields as much authority as it did before. The states have also been cooperating with the Centre in planning and economic development. Hardly any person complains of discrimination in the raising or expending of resources on grounds of language. If anything, the national government has been strengthened by the creation of coherent state units. To quote W.H. Morris-Jones: 'The newly fashioned units, it is true, have a self-conscious coherence, but they are willing, thus equipped, to do business with the centre, to work as parts of a whole that is India.'

Thus, states' reorganization has not only not weakened the unity of the country but as a whole strengthened it, thereby disappointing the prophets of gloom and removing the apprehensions of the friendly. To quote the political scientist Rajni Kothari: 'In spite of the leadership's earlier reservations and ominous forebodings by sympathetic observers, the reorganization resulted in rationalizing the political map of India without seriously weakening its unity. If anything, its result has been functional, in as much as it removed what had been a major source of discord, and created homogeneous political units which could be administered through a medium that the vast majority of the population understood. Indeed it can be said with the benefit of hindsight that language, rather than being a force for division has proved a cementing and integrating influence.'

States' reorganization did not, of course, resolve all the problems relating to linguistic conflicts. Disputes over boundaries between different states, linguistic minorities and economic issues such as sharing of waters, and power and surplus food still persist. Linguistic chauvinism also finds occasional expression. But the reorganization has removed a major factor affecting cohesion of the country.

Minority Languages

An important aspect of the language problem has been the status of minority languages. Unilingual states were not possible in whatever manner their boundaries were drawn. Consequently, a large number of linguistic minorities, that is, those who speak a language other than the main or the official language of the state, continue to exist in linguistically reorganized states. Overall nearly 18 per cent of India's population do not speak the official language of the states where they live as their mother tongue. There is of course a great deal of variation among the states on this count. According to the 1971 census, the percentages of linguistic minorities to total population ranged from 4 in Kerala to 34 in Karnataka, 3.9 in Assam to 44.5 in Jammu and Kashmir.

From the beginning, the important point to be decided upon was the status and rights of these minorities in their states. On the one hand, there was the question of their protection, for there was the ever-present danger of them being meted out unfair treatment, on the other, there was the need to promote their integration with the major language group of a state. A linguistic minority had to be given the confidence that it would not be discriminated against by the majority and that its language and culture would continue to exist and develop. At the same time, the majority had to be assured that meeting the needs of the linguistic minority would not generate separatist sentiments or demands and that the minorities would develop a degree of state loyalty.

To confront this problem certain Fundamental Rights were provided to the linguistic minorities in the constitution. For example, Article 30 states that 'all minorities, whether based an religion or language, shall have the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice' and, more important, 'that the state shall not, in granting aid to educational institutions, discriminate against any educational institution on the ground that it is under the management of a minority, whether based on religion or language'. Article 347 lays down that on a demand being made on behalf of a minority, the President may direct that its language shall be officially recognized throughout the state or any part thereof for such purposes as he might specify. The official policy since 1956, sanctioned by a constitutional amendment in that year, has been to provide for instruction in the mother tongue in the primary and secondary classes wherever there is a sufficient number of children to form a class. The amendment also provides for the appointment of a Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities to investigate and report regularly on the implementation of these safeguards. On the whole, the central government has tended to play a very positive role in defence of the rights of the minorities, but the implementation of the minority safeguards is within the purview of the state governments and therefore differs from state to state. In general, despite some progress in several states, in most of them the position of the linguistic minorities has not been satisfactory. The constitutional safeguards have quite often been inadequately enforced. The Commissioner for Linguistic Minorities has in his reports regularly noted innumerable cases of discrimination against linguistic minorities in matters of schooling, admission to technical and medical institutions and employment in the state public services because of lack of proficiency in the official language of the state. However, a redeeming feature is that quite often facilities for primary education in the mother tongue of the minorities have been provided, though these may be inadequate in terms of competent teachers and textbooks. But even here the big exception is the all-round failure in the case of tribal minority languages.

Among the minority languages, Urdu is a special case. It is the largest minority tongue in India. Nearly 23.3 million people spoke Urdu in 1951. Urdu speakers constituted substantial percentages of the population in Uttar Pradesh (U.P.) (10.5), Bihar (8.8), Maharashtra (7.2), Andhra Pradesh (7.5) and Karnataka (9). Moreover, an overwhelming majority of Muslims, India's largest religious minority, claimed Urdu as their mother tongue. Urdu is also recognized as one of India's national languages and is listed in the Eighth Schedule of the constitution.

While nearly all the major languages of India were also the official languages of one state or the other, Urdu was not the official language of any state except the small state of Jammu and Kashmir where the mother tongues were in any case Kashmiri, Dogri and Ladakhi. Consequently, Urdu did not get official support in any part of the country. On the contrary, it faced official discrimination and hostility both in U.P. and Bihar. We may briefly take up the case of U.P., though the position was no different in Bihar. The U.P. government decided early on to declare Hindi as the only official language of the state; the subterfuge was that Hindi and Urdu were not two separate languages and therefore there was no need to make Urdu a second official language! In practice, Urdu began to be abolished in many primary schools. Its use as a medium of instruction was also increasingly limited. For example, in 1979-80, only 3.69% of primary school students received instruction in Urdu while the number of Urdu speakers in 1981 was 10.5 per cent. The Hindi protagonists also began to eliminate Urdu words from written Hindi. The neglect of Urdu in the state led the well-known left-wing Urdu critic S. Ehtesham Husain, to complain: 'Urdu is being constantly termed as only an off-shoot or variety of Hindi, a foreign language, a language of the Muslims, an instrument of communal hatred and an enemy of Indian unity. All these contrary things are said in the same breath, to suppress it.'

Urdu speakers, therefore, were persistent in demanding that Urdu should be recognized as the second official language in the states where it had a large presence, especially in U.P. and Bihar. The U.P. government was equally consistent and successful in opposing the demand; its

main justification being that the SRC had recommended that at least 30 per cent population in a state should speak a language before it could be made the second official or regional language.

Jawaharlal Nehru, in particular, was very supportive of Urdu and critical of the anti-Urdu thinking and activities of a large number of persons, including Congressmen, in northern India. 'Urdu,' he told parliament, 'is an example of integration in India, not only of languages but of minds, literatures and cultures. It is cent per cent an Indian language.' He pointed out that Urdu had 'enriched Indian culture and thought'. He asked the chief minister of Uttar Pradesh to declare Urdu as a second official language in districts where it was widely used and in other areas to give it the full facilities of a minority language. But even when Nehru succeeded in persuading the Uttar Pradesh government to agree to take certain steps in this regard, they were nullified by laxity in their implementation. The Uttar Pradesh government refused to pass legislation giving legal sanctity to the rights granted to Urdu on the ground that such a step might lead to communal riots.

The governments of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka were more supportive of Urdu. In Andhra, Urdu has been recognized since 1968 as an additional language for the Telangana region. And in both the states, adequate facilities are provided for instruction through the medium of Urdu in the primary stage and for instruction in Urdu at the higher school stages.

Two other aspects of Urdu's position may be noted. First, unfortunately the question of Urdu has got entangled with the communal question. While many Muslims regard it as the language of their community as such, many Hindu communalists are hostile to it because of their anti-Muslim ideological position. Second, despite active hostility of many and official neglect, Urdu continues not only to exist but even grow in terms of literary output, journals and newspapers and especially as the language of films and television because of its inherent vigour and cultural roots among the Indian people.

*****

Integration of the Tribals

The task of integrating the tribal people into the mainstream was extremely complex, given the varied conditions under which they live in different parts of the country, and their different languages and distinct cultures. The 1971 Census recorded over 400 tribal communities numbering nearly 38 million people and constituting nearly 6.9 per cent of the Indian population. Spread all over India, their greatest concentration is in Madhya Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, north-eastern India, West Bengal, Maharashtra, Gujarat and Rajasthan. Except in the Northeast, they constitute minorities in their home states. Residing mostly in the hills and forest areas, in colonial India they lived in relative isolation, and their traditions, habits, cultures and ways of life were markedly different from those of their non-tribal neighbours. Nevertheless, except in the Northeast, the two had for centuries interacted culturally, socially, economically and politically.

In most parts of the country, colonialism brought radical transformation of the tribals as their relative isolation was eroded by the penetration of market forces and they were integrated with the British and princely administrations. A large number of money-lenders, traders, revenue farmers and other middlemen and petty officials invaded the tribal areas and disrupted the tribals' traditional way of life. They were increasingly engulfed in debt and lost their lands to outsiders, often being reduced to the position of agricultural labourers, sharecroppers and rack-rented tenants. Many were forced to retreat further into the hills. Belated legislation to prevent alienation of land by the tribal people failed to halt the process. Verrier Elwin, who lived nearly all his life among the tribal people in central and north-eastern India and who was one of the formative influences in the evolution of the new government's policies towards the tribals, was to refer to the fate of the tribal people under British rule as follows: 'But now they suffered oppression and exploitation, for there soon came merchants and liquor-venders, cajoling, tricking, swindling them in their ignorance and simplicity until bit by bit their broad acres dwindled and they they sank into the poverty in which many of them still live today.'[1] Simultaneously, 'missionaries were destroying their art, their dances, their weaving and their whole culture'.

Colonialism also transformed the tribals' relationship with the forest. They depended on the forest for food, fuel and cattle feed and for raw materials for their handicrafts. In many parts of India the hunger for land by the immigrant peasants from the plains led to the destruction of forests, depriving the tribals of their traditional means of livelihood. To conserve forests and to facilitate their commercial exploitation, the colonial authorities brought large tracts of forest lands under forest laws which forbade shifting cultivation and put severe restrictions on the tribals' use of the forest and their access to forest products.

Loss of land, indebtedness, exploitation by middlemen, denial of access to forests and forest products, and oppression and extortion by policemen, forest officials, and other government officials was to lead to a series of tribal uprisings in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries for example the Santhal uprising and the Munda rebellion led by Birsa Munda and to the participation of the tribal people in the national and peasant movements in Orissa, Bihar, West Bengal, Andhra, Maharashtra and Gujarat.

Roots of India's Tribal Policy

The preservation of the tribal people's rich social and cultural heritage lay at the heart of the government's policy of tribal integration. As Jawaharlal Nehru, the main influence in shaping the government's attitude towards the tribals, put it: 'The first problem we have to face there [in the tribal areas] is to inspire them [the tribal people] with confidence and to make them feel at one with India, and to realise that they are part of India and have an honoured place in it.' At the same time, 'India to them should signify not only a protecting force but a liberating one'. Indian nationalism, Nehru thought, was capable of accommodating the uniqueness of the tribal people.

There were two major approaches regarding the place to be accorded to tribals in Indian society. One approach was to leave the tribal people alone, uncontaminated by modern influences operating outside their world and to let them stay more or less as they were. The second approach was that of assimilating them completely and as quickly as possible into the Indian society all around them. The disappearance of the tribal way of life was not to be regretted; it was to be welcomed for that would represent their 'upliftment'.

Jawaharlal Nehru rejected both these approaches. The first approach, of treating the tribal people 'as museum specimens to be observed and written about', was, he said, 'to insult them'. The tribal people, he wrote, 'could not be left cut off from the world as they were'. Isolation was in any case impossible at this stage, for the process of penetration by the outside world had already gone too far and 'it was not possible or desirable to isolate them'. The second approach of allowing them 'to be engulfed by the masses of Indian humanity', or of their assimilation through the operation of normal outside forces was also wrong, according to Nehru. This would lead to the loss of the tribals' social and cultural identity and of the many virtues they possessed. In fact, he pointed out, 'if normal factors were allowed to operate, unscrupulous people from outside would take possession of tribal lands . . . and forests and interfere with the life of the tribal people'. This would also 'upset their whole life and culture, which had so much of good in them'.

Instead of these two approaches, Nehru favoured the policy of integrating the tribal people in Indian society, of making them an integral part of the Indian nation, even while maintaining their distinct identity and culture. There were two basic parameters of the Nehruvian approach: 'the tribal areas have to progress' and 'they have to progress in their own way'. Progress did not mean 'an attempt merely to duplicate what we have got in other parts of India'. Whatever was good in the rest of India would 'be adopted by them gradually'. Moreover, whatever changes were needed would be 'worked out by the tribals themselves'.

The problem was how to combine these two seemingly contradictory approaches. Nehru stood for economic and social development of the tribal people in multifarious ways, especially in the fields of communication, modern medical facilities, agriculture and education. In this regard, he laid down certain broad guidelines for government policy. First, the tribals should develop along the lines of their own genius; there should be no imposition or compulsion from outside. The non-tribals should not approach them with a superiority complex. Rather, the understanding should be that they had an equal contribution to make to the evolution of the common culture and social and political life of the country.

Second, tribal rights in land and forests should be respected and no outsider should be able to take possession of tribal lands. The incursion of the market economy into tribal areas had to be strictly controlled and regulated. Third, it was necessary to encourage the tribal languages which 'must be given all possible support and the conditions in which they can flourish must be safeguarded'.

Fourth, for administration, reliance should be placed on the tribal people themselves, and administrators should be recruited from amongst them and trained. As few as possible outsiders should be introduced as administrators in tribal areas and they should be carefully chosen. They should have a sympathetic and understanding approach, and should not consider themselves superior to or apart from the tribal people. They should be prepared to share their life with the tribal people among whom they work. Fifth, there should be no over-administration of tribal areas. The effort should be to administer and develop the tribals' througl them own social and cultural institutions.

Nehru's approach was in turn based on the nationalist policy towards tribals since the 1920s when Gandhiji set up ashrams in the tribal areas and promoted constructive work. After independence this policy was supported by Rajendra Prasad, the first President of India, and other major political leaders.

To give shape to the government's policy, a beginning was made in the constitution itself which directed under Article 46 that the state should promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the tribal people and should protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation, through special legislation. The governors of the states in which tribal areas were situated were given special responsibility to protect tribal interests, including the power to modify central and state laws in their application to tribal areas, and to frame regulations for the protection of tribals' right to land and also their protection from moneylenders. The application of the Fundamental Rights was amended for this purpose. The constitution also extended full political rights to the tribal people. In addition, it provided for reservation of seats in the legislatures and positions in the administrative services for the Scheduled Tribes as in the case of the Scheduled Castes. The constitution also provided for the setting up of Tribal Advisory Councils in all states containing tribal areas to advise on matters concerning the welfare of tribals. A Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes was appointed by the President to investigate whether the safeguards provided for them were being observed.

Legislative as well as executive action was taken by the state governments to prevent loss of tribal lands to non-tribal people and to prevent exploitation of the tribals by moneylenders. The central and state governments created special facilities and organized special programmes for the welfare and development of the tribal areas and the tribal people including the promotion of cottage and village industries and generation of employment among them. Large expenditures were undertaken and large sums set apart in the Five-Year Plans for the purpose. The funding for tribal welfare significantly increased after 1971.

In spite of the constitutional safeguards and the efforts of the central and state governments, the tribals' progress and welfare has been very slow, and even dismal. Except in the Northeast, the tribals continue to be poor, indebted, landless and often unemployed. The problem often lies in weak execution of even well-intentioned measures. Quite often there is a divergence between central and state government policies, the latter being less in tune with tribal interests. In particular, state governments have been relatively ineffective in administering the positive policies and laws laid down by the central government or by the state governments themselves, as repeatedly shown by the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and in the reports of the Planning Commission. Quite often the funds allocated for tribal welfare are not spent or are spent without corresponding results, or are even misappropriated. One of the watchdogs of tribal interests, the Tribal Advisory Councils, have not functioned effectively. Often the administrative personnel are ill-trained or even prejudiced against tribals. But sympathetic officials are also known to be quickly transferred out of tribal areas under the pressure of traders, moneylenders, forest contractors and land grabbers.

A major handicap from which tribals suffer is denial of justice, often because of their unfamiliarity with the laws and the legal system. Laws preventing transfer of land to outsiders have continued to be evaded, leading to alienation of land and eviction of tribals. Rapid extension of mines and industries has worsened their conditions in many areas. While deforestation proceeds apace through the cooperation of corrupt officials and politicians with forest contractors, the tribals' traditional right of access to the forest and its produce is continuously curtailed. Forest laws and regulations are also used by unsympathetic and often corrupt forest officials to harass and exploit the tribal people. As a result of loss of land, deforestation and restrictions on the access to the forest, the tribal people have been facing growing unemployment and have been increasingly driven into more inaccessible stretches of hills and jungles.

The progress of education among the tribal people has been disappointingly slow. In many areas, primary education through the tribal languages has taken place, but in others the state governments have tended to neglect tribal languages and education through their medium.

Tribal society almost everywhere has also been gradually developing class differences and a class structure with those belonging to the upper crust often joining forces with the upper crust of the outsiders. Further, the major gains of whatever development takes place in the fields of education, employment in administration, economy and political patronage are reaped by the small segment of the tribal elites which has slowly emerged and grown.

On the whole, though there are a few danger signals, certain positive developments in the tribal sphere have occurred since 1947. Legislation to protect tribal rights and interests, activities of the tribal welfare departments, Panchayati Raj, spread of literacy and education, reservations in government services and in higher educational institutions, and repeated elections have led to increasing confidence among the tribal people and greater political participation by them or at least by the growing middle classes and intelligentsia among them in the constitutional political processes. They are now insisting on a greater and more active political role for themselves, and acquiring increasing representation in different political structures and institutions. Above all, they are demanding a greater share in national economic development.

Protest movements have sprung up among tribals out of their frustration with the lack of development and welfare. These are bound to produce positive results in time. The government policy has usually been conciliatory, though not necessarily successful in redressing tribal grievances. But some of the protest movements have taken to violence, leading to strong state action against them. Little ground has been gained by them, though they have often dramatically drawn national attention to the tribal condition.

The growing tribal antagonism towards the non-tribal people or outsiders living in tribal areas has been another unfortunate development. Undoubtedly, some of the outsiders like traders, moneylenders, landlords and government officials have been a scourge of the tribal areas, but, over decades, many other outsiders peasants, workers, teachers, doctors and other middle- and lower-middle-class persons have now settled there, outnumbering the tribals in almost all tribal areas outside the Northeast. The mass of the tribals and non-tribals are equally poor and have a common interest in economic and social development as also social and economic justice. Besides, most of the middle-class non-tribals, including many of the traders and industrialists, do perform useful economic functions in the tribal areas. Any undue antagonism and antipathy between the tribals and non-tribals would be inimical and even dangerous to both. It is no longer true that the only relationship that can exist between the two is an exploitative one. Tribals cannot expect to revert to isolation from their non-tribal neighbours or to prevent massive interaction with them, including their in-migration. In fact, the two can protect and promote their interests only through mutual cooperation.

Tribals in the Northeast

The tribes of north-eastern India, consisting of over a hundred groups, speaking a wide variety of languages and living in the hill tracts of Assam, shared many of the features and problems of the tribal people in the rest of the country. But their situation was different in several respects. For one, they constituted the overwhelming majority of the population in most of the areas they inhabited. Then, non-tribals had not penetrated these areas to any significant extent, though economic contacts between the tribal and the non-tribal areas had been developing over time. This was because of the British policy in the late nineteenth century.

The tribal areas occupied by the British then formed part of the Assam province but were given a separate administrative status. Their socio-political structure was not disturbed and a deliberate policy of excluding the outsiders from the plains was followed. In particular, no non-tribal plainsmen were allowed to acquire land in the tribal areas because of which the tribals suffered little loss of land.

At the same time, the British government permitted and even encouraged the Christian missionaries to move in and establish schools, hospitals and churches and to proselytize, thus introducing change and modern ideas among some of the tribal youth. The missionaries, in turn, collaborated with the colonial authorities and helped keep the nationalist influence out of the tribal areas, besides encouraging their isolation from the rest of the population of Assam and India. In fact, immediately after independence, some of the missionaries and other foreigners even promoted sentiment in favour of separate and independent states in north-eastern India. The virtual absence of any political or cultural contact of the tribals in the Northeast with the political life of the rest of India was also a striking difference. A powerful factor in the unification of the Indian people as a nation was the common bonds forged in the course of the anti-imperialist struggle. But this struggle had little impact among the tribals of the Northeast. To quote Jawaharlal Nehru: 'The essence of our struggle for freedom was the unleashing of a liberating force in India. This force did not even affect the frontier people in one of the most important tribal areas. And again: 'Thus they never experienced a sensation of being in a country called India and they were hardly influenced by the struggle for freedom or other movements in India. Their chief experience of outsiders was that of British officers and Christian missionaries who generally tried to make them anti-Indian.

The tribal policy of the Government of India, inspired by Jawaharlal Nehru, was therefore even more relevant to the tribal people of the Northeast. 'All this North-East border area deserves our special attention,' Nehru said in October 1952, 'not only the government's, but of the people of India. Our contacts with them will do us good and will do them good also. They add to the strength, variety and cultural richness of India.

A reflection of this policy was in the Sixth Schedule of the constitution which applied only to the tribal areas of Assam. The Sixth Schedule offered a fair degree of self-government to the tribal people by providing for autonomous districts and the creation of district and regional councils which would exercise some of the legislative and judicial functions within the overall jurisdiction of the Assam legislature and parliament. The objective of the Sixth Schedule was to enable tribals to live according to their own ways. The Government of India also expressed its willingness to further amend the constitutional provisions relating to the tribal people if it was found necessary to do so with a view to promote further autonomy. But this did not mean, Nehru clarified, that the government would countenance secession from India or independence by any area or region, or would tolerate violence in the promotion of any demands.

Nehru's and Verrier Elwin's policies were implemented best of all in the North-East Frontier Agency or NEFA, which was created in 1948 out of the border areas of Assam. NEFA was established as a Union Territory outside the jurisdiction of Assam and placed under a special administration. From the beginning, the administration was manned by a special cadre of officers who were asked to implement specially designed developmental policies without disturbing the social and cultural pattern of the life of the people. As a British anthropologist who spent nearly all his life studying the tribal people and their condition wrote in 1967, 'A measure of isolation combined with a sympathetic and imaginative policy of a progressive administration has here created a situation unparalleled in other parts of India. NEFA was named Arunachal Pradesh and granted the status of a separate state in 1987. While NEFA was developing comfortably and in harmony with the rest of the country, problems developed in the other tribal areas which were part of Assam administratively. The problems arose because the hill tribes of Assam had no cultural affinity with the Assamese and Bengali residents of the plains. The tribals were afraid of losing their identities and being assimilated by what was, with some justification, seen to be a policy of Assamization. Especially distasteful to them was the attitude of superiority and even contempt often adopted by non-tribals working among them as teachers, doctors, government officials, traders, etc. There was also a feeling among them that the Assamese government failed to understand them and

tended to neglect their interests. This feeling represented not so much the reality as the failure of the political leadership of Assam to redress tribal grievances in time and with deep concern.

Soon, resentment against the Assam government began to mount and a demand for a separate hill state arose among some sections of the tribal people in the mid-1950s. But this demand was not pressed with vigour; nor did the Government of India encourage it, for it felt that the future of the hill tribes was intimately connected with Assam though further steps towards greater autonomy could be envisaged.

But the demand gained greater strength when the Assamese leaders moved in 1960 towards making Assamese the sole official language of the state. In 1960, various political parties of the hill areas merged into the All Party Hill Leaders Conference (APHLC) and again demanded a separate state within the Indian Union. The passage of the Assam Official Language Act, making Assamese the official language of the state, and thus the refusal of the demand for the use of the tribal languages in administration, led to an immediate and strong reaction in the tribal districts. There were hartals and demonstrations, and a major agitation developed. In the 1962 elections, the overwhelming majority of the Assembly seats from the tribal areas were won by the advocates of a separate state, who decided to boycott the State Assembly.

Prolonged discussions and negotiations followed. Several commissions and committees examined the issue. Finally, in 1969, through a constitutional amendment, Meghalaya was carved out of Assam as 'a state within a state' which had complete autonomy except for law and order which remained a function of the Assam government. Meghalaya also shared Assam's High Court, Public Service Commission and governor. Finally, as a part of the reorganization of the Northeast, Meghalaya became a separate state in 1972, incorporating the Garo, Khasi and Jaintia tribes. Simultaneously, the Union Territories of Manipur and Tripura were granted statehood. The transition to statehood in the case of Meghalaya, Manipur, Tripura and Arunachal Pradesh was quite smooth. Trouble arose in the case of Nagaland and Mizoram where secessionist and insurrectionary movements developed.

Nagaland

The Nagas were the inhabitants of the Naga hills along the Northeast frontier on the Assam-Burma border. They numbered nearly 500,000 in 1961, constituted less than 0.1 per cent of India's population, and consisted of many separate tribes speaking different languages. The British had isolated the Nagas from the rest of the country and left them more or less undisturbed though Christian missionary activity was permitted, which had led to the growth of a small educated stratum.

Immediately after independence, the Government of India followed a policy of integrating the Naga areas with the state of Assam and India as a whole. A section of the Naga leadership, however, opposed such integration and rose in rebellion under the leadership of A.Z. Phizo, demanding separation from India and complete independence. They were encouraged in this move by some of the British officials and missionaries. In 1955, these separatist Nagas declared the formation of an independent government and the launching of a violent insurrection.

The Government of India responded with a two-track policy in line with Jawaharlal Nehru's wider approach towards the tribal people discussed earlier in this chapter. On the one hand, the Government of India made it clear that it would firmly oppose the secessionist demand for the independence of Naga areas and would not tolerate recourse to violence. Towards a violent secessionist movement it would firmly follow a policy of suppression and non-negotiations. As Nehru put it, 'It does not help in dealing with tough people to have weak nerves.'[16] Consequently, when one section of the Nagas organized an armed struggle for independence, the Government of India replied by sending its army to Nagaland in early 1956 to restore peace and order.

On the other hand, Nehru realized that while strong and quick military action would make it clear that the rebels were in a no-win situation, total physical suppression was neither possible nor desirable, for the objective had to be the conciliation and winning over of the Naga people. Nehru was wedded to a 'friendly approach'. Even while encouraging the Nagas to integrate with the rest of the country 'in mind and spirit', he favoured their right to maintain their autonomy in cultural and other matters. He was, therefore, willing to go a long way to win over the Nagas by granting them a large degree of autonomy. Refusing to negotiate with Phizo or his supporters as long as they did not give up their demand for independence or the armed rebellion, he carried on prolonged negotiations with the more moderate, non-violent and non-secessionist Naga leaders, who realized that they could not hope to get a larger degree of autonomy or a more sympathetic leader to settle with than Nehru.

In fact, once the back of the armed rebellion was broken by the middle of 1957, the more moderate Naga leaders headed by Dr Imkongliba Ao came to the fore. They negotiated for the creation of the state of Nagaland within the Indian Union. The Government of India accepted their demand through a series of intermediate steps; and the state of Nagaland came into existence in 1963. A further step forward was taken in the integration of the Indian nation. Also, politics in Nagaland since then followed, for better or for worse, the pattern of politics in the other states of the Union.

With the formation of Nagaland as a state the back of the rebellion was broken as the rebels lost much of their popular support. But though the insurgency has been brought under control, sporadic guerrilla activity by Naga rebels trained in China, Pakistan and Burma (Myanmar) and periodic terrorist attacks continue till this day. We may also refer to one other feature of the Naga situation. Even though the record of the Indian army in Nagaland has been on the whole clean, especially if the difficult conditions under which they operate are kept in view, it has not been without blemish. Its behaviour has been sometimes improper and in rare cases even brutal. Too many times innocent people have suffered. But then it has also paid a heavy price through the loss of its soldiers and officers in guerrilla attacks.

Mizoram

A situation similar to that in Nagaland developed a few years later in the autonomous Mizo district of the Northeast. Secessionist demands backed by some British officials had grown there in 1947 but had failed to get much support from the youthful Mizo leadership, which concentrated instead on the issues of democratization of Mizo society, economic development and adequate representation of Mizos in the Assam legislature. However, unhappiness with the Assam government's relief measures during the famine of 1959 and the passage of the Act in 1961, making Assamese the official language of the state, led to the formation of the Mizo National Front (MNF), with Laldenga as president. While participating in electoral politics, the MNF created a military wing which received arms and ammunition and military training from East Pakistan and China. In March 1966, the MNF declared independence from India, proclaimed a military uprising and attacked military and civilian targets. The Government of India responded with immediate massive counter-insurgency measures by the army. Within a few weeks the insurrection was crushed and government control restored, though stray guerrilla activity continued. Most of the hard-core Mizo leaders escaped to East Pakistan.

In 1973, after the less extremist Mizo leaders had scaled down their demand to that of a separate state of Mizoram within the Indian Union, the Mizo district of Assam was separated from Assam and, as Mizoram, given the status of a Union Territory. Mizo insurgency gained some renewed strength in the late 1970s but was again effectively dealt with by the Indian armed forces. Having decimated the ranks of the separatist insurgents, the Government of India, continuing to follow the Nehruvian tribal policy, was now willing to show consideration, offer liberal terms of amnesty to the remnants of the rebel forces and conduct negotiations for peace.

A settlement was finally arrived at in 1986. Laldenga and the MNF agreed to abandon underground violent activities, surrender before the Indian authorities along with their arms, and re-enter the constitutional political stream. The Government of India agreed to the grant of full statehood to Mizoram, guaranteeing full autonomy in regard to culture, tradition, land laws, etc. As a part of the accord, a government with Laldenga as chief minister was formed in the new state of Mizoram in February 1987.

Jharkhand

Jharkhand, the tribal area of Bihar consisting of the Chota Nagpur and the Santhal Parganas, has for decades spawned movements for state autonomy. In this area are concentrated several major tribes of India, namely, Santhal, Ho, Oraon and Munda. Unlike traditional tribes, nearly all of these practice settled plough agriculture on the basis of family farms. Economic differentiation has set in; there are a significant number of agricultural labourers and a growing number of mining and industrial workers. The landholding pattern among tribals is as unequal and skewed as among non-tribals. A large class of moneylenders has also developed among them. The tribal society in Jharkhand has increasingly become a class-divided society. Most of the tribals practise two formal religions Hinduism and Christianity.

The Jharkhand tribes, however, share some features with other Indian tribes. They have lost most of their land, generally to outsiders, and suffer from indebtedness, loss of employment and low agricultural productivity. They organized several major rebellions during the nineteenth century; and many of them actively participated in the national movement after 1919.

In 1951, the Scheduled Tribes constituted 31.15 per cent of the population in Chota Nagpur (30.94 in 1971) and 44.67 per cent of the population in the Santhal Parganas (36.22 in 1971). Thus, nearly two-thirds of Jharkhand's population in 1971 was non-tribal. The overwhelming majority of both tribals and non-tribals were equally exploited poor peasants, agricultural labourers and mining and industrial workers. Inequality in landholding and the moneylender menace were equally prevalent among the two as was the commercialization of agriculture and commercial activity.

With the spread of education and modern activity in the tribal areas, a movement for the formation of a separate tribal state of Jharkhand, incorporating Chota Nagpur and the Santhal Parganas of south Bihar and the contiguous tribal areas of Madhya Pradesh, Orissa and West Bengal, started during the late 1930s and 1940s. Realizing that the interests of the tribal people could be best promoted and their domination by non-tribals ended if they had a state of their own within the Union of India, the Jharkhand party was founded in 1950 under the leadership of the Oxford-educated Jaipal Singh. The party achieved a remarkable success in the 1952 elections when it won 32 seats in Chota Nagpur and emerged as the main Opposition party in the Bihar Assembly. It won 25 seats in 1957.

But the Jharkhand party faced a major dilemma. While it demanded a state where the tribal people would predominate, the population composition of Jharkhand was such that they would still constitute a minority in it. To overcome this problem the party tried to give its demand a regional character by opening its membership to the non-tribals of the area and underplaying its anti-non-tribal rhetoric, even while talking of the empowerment of tribals and their dominance of the new state. The States Reorganisation Commission of 1955, however, rejected the demand for a separate Jharkhand state on the ground that the region did not have a common language. The central government also held that tribals being a minority in Jharkhand could not claim a state of their own.

By the early 1960s the rank and file of the party began to get disheartened and frustrated. The Jharkhand party could win only 20 seats to the Bihar Assembly in 1962. In 1963, a major part of the leadership of the party, including Jaipal Singh, joined Congress, claiming that by 'working

from within Congress' it stood a better chance of getting its demand for a separate state accepted by the government.

Several tribal parties and movements developed in Jharkhand after 1967, the most prominent being the Jharkhand Mukti Morcha (JMM), which was formed in late 1972. The JMM revived the demand for the Jharkhand state, but it made two innovations. It recognized the hard reality that nearly two-thirds of the population of Jharkhand was non-tribal and that, therefore, a movement which appealed only to the tribal people could not acquire the requisite political strength. The JMM, thus, began to assert that all the older residents of the Jharkhand region, whether tribal or non-tribal, were exploited, discriminated against and dominated by north Bihar and the recent migrants. It put forward the demand for a separate state as a regional one on behalf of the peasants and workers of the region. Concentrating on economic issues, it also acquired the support of the non-tribal poor, several non-tribal leaders and political activists joined it, though the bulk of its following was still that of tribals. The tribal leaders felt that despite the minority character of tribals in the projected Jharkhand state, they would have a far greater representation and weight in the new state than they had in Bihar as a whole.

The JMM turned to a radical programme and ideology. Joined by other groups, especially leftist groups such as the Marxist Coordination Centre, it organized several militant agitations on issues such as recovery of alienated land, moneylenders' exploitation, employment of tribals in mines and industries and improved working conditions and higher wages in the latter, police excesses, high-handedness of forest officials and increasing liquor consumption. Shibu Soren emerged as the charismatic leader of the JMM during the early 1970s.

Cooperation with the leftists did not, however, last long; nor did the tribal-non-tribal alliance. The movement for the Jharkhand state underwent constant ups and downs and splits over the years with new groups coming up every so often. Major differences among the Jharkhand leaders pertained to the question of cooperation or alliance with the main all-India parties. Many of them believed that in parliamentary democracy, a small number of MPs or MLAs could not on their own easily get their demands accepted. Shibu Soren, his followers and some others were also aware of the futility of permanently confronting state power and the inevitable recourse to violence and armed struggle as advocated by the movement's ultra-leftist fringe.

The movement also found it difficult to shift completely from tribal to class-based regional politics, since it was basically built around tribal identity and tribal demands. In particular, the policy of reservations for tribals contained the seeds of continuing differences between tribals and non-tribals. Tribal society was also not homogeneous; it contained landlords, rich peasants, traders and moneylenders. However, for various reasons, Jharkhand finally came into existence as a state on 15 November 2000. Simultaneously Chhattisgarh and Uttaranchal were created out of Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh respectively and given the status of states on \ November and 9 November 2002.

*****

Regionalism and Regional Inequality

In the 1950s, many saw regionalism as a major threat to Indian unity. But, in fact, regionalism at no stage was a major factor in Indian politics and administration; over time, it tended to become less and less important. What precisely is regionalism needs to be first understood for appreciating its role in Indian politics.

Local patriotism and loyalty to a locality or region or state and its language and culture do not constitute regionalism, nor are they disruptive of the nation. They are quite consistent with national patriotism and loyalty to the nation. To have pride in one's region or state is also not regionalism. A person can be conscious of his or her distinct regional identity of being a Tamil or a Punjabi, a Bengali or a Gujarati without being any the less proud of being an Indian, or being hostile to people from other regions. This was put very well by Gandhiji in 1909: 'As the basis of my pride as an Indian, I must have pride in myself as a Gujarati. Otherwise, we shall be left without any moorings.'

The Indian national movement too functioned on this understanding. From the beginning it functioned as an all-India movement and not as a federation of regional national movements. It also did not counterpose the national identity to regional identities; it recognized both and did not see the two in conflict. Aspiring to or making special efforts to develop one's state or region or to remove poverty and implement social justice there, is not to be branded as regionalism. In fact, a certain inter-regionalrivalry around the achievement of such positive goals would be quite healthy and in fact we have too little of it. Also, local patriotism can help people overcome divisive loyalties to caste or religious communities.

Defending the federal features of the constitution is also not to be seen as regionalism. The demand for a separate state within the Indian Union or for an autonomous region within an existing state, or for devolution of power below the state level, may be objected to on several practical grounds, but not as regionalist, unless it is put forward in a spirit of hostility to the rest of the population of a state. If the interests of one region or state are asserted against the country as a whole or against another region or state in a hostile manner and a conflict is promoted on the basis of such alleged interests it can be dubbed as regionalism.

In this sense, there has been very little inter-regional conflict in India since 1947, the major exception being the politics of the DMK in Tamil Nadu in the 1950s and early 1960s. The role of the DMK is discussed in Chapter 22, but it may be observed that the DMK has also increasingly given up its regionalist approach over the years. Some cite the example of Punjab in the 1980s, but, as we shall see in Chapter 24, Punjab's was a case of communalism and not regionalism.

Regionalism could have flourished in India if any region or state had felt that it was being culturally dominated or discriminated against. In 1960, Selig Harrison, US scholar and journalist, in his famous work, *India The Most Dangerous Decades*, had seen a major threat to Indian unity because of conflict between the national government and the regions as the latter asserted their separate cultural identities. But, in fact, the Indian nation has proved to be quite successful in accommodating and even celebrating in Nehru's words India's cultural diversity. The different areas of India have had full cultural autonomy and been enabled to fully satisfy their legitimate aspirations. The linguistic reorganization of India and the resolution of the official language controversy have played a very important role in this respect, by eliminating a potent cause of the feeling of cultural loss or cultural domination and therefore of inter-regional conflict.

Many regional disputes, of course, do exist and they have the potential of fanning interstate hostility. There has been friction between different states over the sharing of river waters: for example, between Tamil Nadu and Karnataka, Karnataka and Andhra, and Punjab and Haryana

and Rajasthan. Boundary disputes have arisen out of the formation of linguistic states as in the case of Belgaum and Chandigarh. Construction of irrigation and power dams has created such conflicts. But, while these disputes tend to persist for a long time and occasionally arouse passions, they have, as a whole, remained within narrow, and we might say acceptable, limits. The central government has often succeeded in playing the role of a mediator, though sometimes drawing the anger of the disputants on itself, but thus preventing sharper inter-regional conflicts.

Economic Imbalances and Regionalism

Economic inequality among different states and regions could be a potential source of trouble. However, despite breeding discontent and putting pressure on the political system, this problem has not so far given rise to regionalism or feeling of a region being discriminated against.

At independence, the leadership recognized that some regions were more backward than others. Only a few enclaves or areas around Calcutta, Bombay and Madras had undergone modern industrial development. For example, in 1948, Bombay and West Bengal accounted for more than 59 per cent of the total industrial capital of the country and more than 64 per cent of the national industrial output. Under colonialism, agriculture had also stagnated, but more in eastern India than in northern or southern India. Regional economic disparity was also reflected in per capita income. In 1949, while West Bengal, Punjab and Bombay had per capita incomes of Rs 353, 331 and 272 respectively, the per capita incomes of Bihar, Orissa and Rajasthan were Rs 200, 188 and 173 respectively.

From the beginning, the national government felt a responsibility to counter this imbalance in regional development. Thus, for example, the 1956 Industrial Policy Resolution of the Government of India asserted that 'only by securing a balanced and coordinated development of the industrial and agricultural economy in each region can the entire country attain higher standards of living'. Similarly, recognizing 'the importance of regional balance in economic development as a positive factor in promoting national integration', the National Integration Council of 1961 urged that 'a rapid development of the economically backward regions in any State should be given priority in national and State plans, at least to the extent that the minimum level of development is reached for all states within a stated period'.

From the beginning, the central government adopted a whole range of policies to influence the rates of growth in poorer states and regions so as to reduce their economic distance from the richer states and regions. A major government instrument in bringing this about was the transfer of financial resources to the poorer states. Important in this respect was the role of the Finance Commission, provided for in the constitution and appointed periodically by the President. The Commission decides the principles on which disbursement of central taxes and other financial resources from the central government to the states occurs. Various Finance Commissions have tried not only to do justice among the states but also to reduce interstate disparity by giving preferential treatment to the poorer states, by allocating larger grants to them than their population would warrant and by transferring resources from the better-off states to them.

Planning was also seen as a powerful instrument that could be used to remove regional inequality. The Second Plan reflected this objective and it was reiterated in the succeeding Plans. The Third Plan explicitly stated that 'balanced development of different parts of the country, extension of the benefits of economic progress to the less developed regions and widespread diffusion of industry are among the major aims of planned development'. For this purpose, the Planning Commission allocated greater plan assistance to the backward states. This assistance is given in the form of both grants and loans on the basis of a formula which assigns an important place to the degree of backwardness of a state. Moreover, bias in favour of backward states in the devolution of

resources from the Centre to the states, in the form of both financial and Plan transfers, has tended to increase with time.

Public investment by the central government in major industries such as steel, fertilizers, oil refining, petrochemicals, machine-making, heavy chemicals and in power and irrigation projects, roads, railways, post offices and other infrastructural facilities, has been a tool for the reduction of regional inequality. India has relied heavily on public investment since the beginning of the Second Plan in 1957 and an effort has been made to favour backward states in regard to this investment.

In the planning and location of the public sector enterprises balanced regional growth has been an important consideration, though this has entailed a certain economic cost to the enterprises concerned. Bihar and Madhya Pradesh have gained the most from such investment; Assam, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir and the north-eastern states have also benefited a great deal from the development of infrastructure, especially roads. Government incentives have been provided to the private sector to invest in backward areas through subsidies, tax concessions, and concessional banking and institutional loans at subsidized rates. The system of licensing of private industrial enterprises, which prevailed from 1956 to 1991, was also used by the government to guide location of industries in backward areas.

Following nationalization of banks in 1969, the expansion of the network of their branches was used to favour backward areas. Banks and other public sector financial institutions were directed to promote investment in these areas. Also, various ministries have evolved schemes for development of backward areas. In particular, poverty eradication programmes, such as the Food for Work programme and the Integrated Rural Development Programme, adopted since the 1970s, and to some extent education, health and family planning programmes and the public distribution system have favoured poorer states.

One sector where the principle of the reduction of regional disparity has not been kept in view is that of investment in irrigation and subsidies to agricultural development. This has been especially so since the 1960s when the Green Revolution began and investment in rural infrastructure and technological innovation was concentrated in Punjab, Haryana and western U.P., namely, areas where irrigation was or could be made available readily. In particular, investment in and development of rain-fed dry land agriculture was neglected. The result was an increase in regional agricultural disparity. The spread of the Green Revolution technology during the 1970s to Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, eastern U.P. and parts of Rajasthan, and during the 1980s to the eastern states of Bihar, West Bengal, Orissa and Assam has redressed the regional imbalance to a certain extent.

Economic mobility of population through migration of unskilled labour from the backward regions and of skilled labour to them can also contribute to the lessening of regional disparity; and the Indian constitution guarantees this mobility. There has been a great deal of migration from one state to another. Some states Himachal Pradesh, Orissa, Bihar and Kerala have benefited from out-migration just as Bengal, Gujarat and Maharashtra have benefited from in-migration. Certain other states, like Punjab and Karnataka, have had the benefit of both out-migration and in-migration. Unfortunately, as we shall see in the next section, efforts have been made by some states to put checks on interstate migration.

It would be appropriate here to ask how far have the various efforts of the national government succeeded in reducing regional inequality. The picture that emerges is a mixed one. There has been a marginal improvement but regional inequality, especially in terms of per capita income, continues to remain a prominent feature of the Indian economy. Possibly, the situation would have been much worse but for the government's actions which has prevented the widening of the economic

gap between states and regions. There are also other dimensions to be observed with regard to the impact of these policies.

For one, there has certainly been a decline in interstate industrial disparity, especially in the organized manufacturing sector. There is also less disparity in terms of social welfare as represented by life expectancy, infant mortality and literacy, though a few states like Kerala and Tamil Nadu have moved far ahead. As we have seen above, the increased disparity in agriculture is also gradually getting redressed though the rain-fed dry areas are still lagging behind. While the percentage of people below the poverty line has steadily declined in all the states, it is in the advanced states that maximum progress has been made, so that the inter-regional disparity in the distribution of poverty has been growing. Overall, while there has been economic growth in all states, the rates of growth of different states have been highly differential, leading to interstate disparities remaining quite wide.

Some backward states have managed to pick themselves up, while others have failed to do so, with the result that there has been a change in the hierarchy of states in terms of development and per capita income. Thus, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa are still at the bottom. Kerala, Punjab and Gujarat continue to remain on the top. There has been an improvement in the position of the previously underdeveloped states of Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, while there has been deterioration in that of Assam, West Bengal, Maharashtra and U.P, with U.P. moving to the bottom level and West Bengal to the middle. Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan have stagnated, remaining just above the bottom level. On the whole, Haryana is an example of states which have improved their position and Bihar of one of those whose position has worsened.

Why then does regional inequality persist on such a wide scale? What are the constraints on its decline? Or why have Bihar and U.P. performed so poorly. It emerges that the constraint is not essentially of geography, that is, of inequality in size or natural resources. Bihar, U.P. and Orissa are, for example, very well endowed by nature; their people well known for their industriousness because of which they are welcomed in the rest of the country, and indeed overseas in the West Indies, Mauritius and Fiji to where some have migrated.

The major reason, at the all-India level, for the continuing regional disparity has been the low rate of economic growth. To make a dent on this requires a high rate of national growth so that large revenues can be raised and devoted to the development of the backward regions without adversely affecting national growth itself. The rate of growth of the Indian economy was around 3.5 per cent till the end of the 1970s and around 5 per cent in the 1980s. This was not high enough to have a significant impact on regional inequality despite policies consciously designed to favour backward regions being followed. It is only in the last few years that the rate of growth of the economy has touched 8 to 9 per cent, while population growth has also slowed down. A reduction in economic inequality may come about, provided the right type of regional developmental policies continue to be followed.

We, however, feel that the roots of some states' backwardness lie in their socio-economic and political organization itself. For example, the agrarian structure in Bihar and eastern U.P. is still quite regressive and in many parts of these states land reforms have been inadequately implemented. (This was also true of Orissa till recently.) The feudal mentality is still quite strong. Also, in Bihar and Orissa land consolidation has been tardy, though ongoing, which played an important role in the agricultural development of Punjab and Haryana. The backward states have a lower level of infrastructural facilities, such as power, irrigation, roads, telephones, and modern markets for agricultural produce. These are essential for development and have to be developed by the states themselves being mostly State subjects.

States also have a low level of social expenditure on education and public health and sanitation, which are also state subjects. Besides, they suffer from a lack of financial resources to meet Plan

expenditure. Increased central financial assistance is unable to offset this weakness. A vicious cycle is set up. A low level of economic development and production means less financial resources and limited expenditure on infrastructure, development planning and social services. And this low level of expenditure in turn leads to low levels of production and therefore of financial resources.

Political and administrative failure also bolsters backwardness. Bihar and U.P. are classic cases of states bedevilled by high levels of corruption, sheer bad administration, and deteriorating law and order. As a result, whatever central assistance is available is poorly utilized and often diverted to non-development heads of expenditure. Further, development of infrastructure, including roads and electricity, is neglected and the existing infrastructure is riddled with inefficiency and corruption. All this turns away the private sector, which is a major source of development in the advanced states. The role of greater administrative efficiency is also proved by the better rates of economic growth in the relatively better administered states of South and western India as compared to Bihar and Uttar Pradesh.

In passing, it may be mentioned that disparities in development also exist within each state. In many cases, this inequality has become a source of tension and given birth to sub-regional movements for separate states within the Indian Union, or greater autonomy for the sub-regions within the existing states, or at least special treatment and safeguards in matters of employment, education and allocation of financial resources. Examples of such sub-regional feelings are the movements in Telangana in Andhra Pradesh, Vidarbha in Maharashtra, Saurashtra in Gujarat, Bundelkhand in Uttar Pradesh, Darjeeling district or Gorkhaland in West Bengal, Bodoland in Assam, and the areas consisting of the old princely states of Orissa. It is because of these regional feelings that Uttaranchal, Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh were created out of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar and Madhya Pradesh, though the tribal and linguistic factors were also important.

Undoubtedly, regional economic inequality is a potent time-bomb directed against national unity and political stability. So far, fortunately, it has been 'digested', absorbed and mitigated because it is not the result of domination and exploitation of backward states by the more advanced states or of discrimination against the former by the national government. It is noteworthy that the politically important Hindi-speaking states of the Indian heartland Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan, with nearly 37 per cent of the seats in the Lok Sabha are economically backward. On the other hand, Punjab, Haryana, Gujarat and Maharashtra, with only about 17 per cent of the seats in the Lok Sabha, are the high-income states. It is, therefore, impossible for anyone who talks of the Hindi-belt states' domination of the others to be taken seriously.

On the other hand, the backward Hindi-belt states wield so much political clout that it is impossible for them to accuse the central government or non-Hindi states of dominating or discriminating against them. It is interesting that so far accusations of central domination have come from the relatively developed states of Punjab and West Bengal obviously for political and not economic reasons. However, one hears less and less about central domination in these states too.

In the all-India services too, like the IAS, the Hindi areas are not advantaged. It is Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Kerala and West Bengal which have a higher representation than their population warrants.

Another reason for the lack of regionalism and feeling of discrimination among the poorer states has been the consciousness of their intelligentsia that their poverty and backwardness are basically the result of the actions of their own political and administrative classes. After all, feelings of deprivation and lack of progress are essentially articulated by the intelligentsia. At the same time, the vast majority of the people in the poorer states are blissfully unaware of their backwardness and poverty in comparison with other states. This leads both to absence of discontent with their

position as also to a lack of effort to reach equality with the more advanced states. However, with the spread of education and the reach of the visual and print media, such as television and newspapers, this state of affairs is likely to change.

Nevertheless, as was fully realized by the founders of the Republic, it is necessary to first contain regional inequality within politically and economically reasonable and acceptable limits and then to gradually move towards its elimination, by raising the rates of growth of the poorer states by all available means including greater central assistance as also greater self-effort by them. This also, of course, means that, as Ajit Mozoomdar has argued, the national government needs to wield 'greater authority than in industrialised countries, to be able to devise and implement strategies of economic and social development, and to deal with the problems of regional disparities, which are more acute'. It also must have the authority 'to mediate and resolve conflicts between states over the appropriation of natural resources' and 'to effect significant resource transfers from richer to poorer states'.[4]

Sons of the Soil Doctrine

Since the 1950s, an ugly kind of regionalism has been widely prevalent in the form of the 'sons of the soil' doctrine. Underlying it is the view that a state specifically belongs to the main linguistic group inhabiting it or that the state constitutes the exclusive 'homeland' of its main language speakers who are the 'sons of the soil' or the 'local' residents. All others who live there or are settled there and whose mother tongue is not the state's main language, are declared to be 'outsiders'. These 'outsiders' might have lived in the state for a long time, or have migrated there more recently, but they are not to be regarded as the 'sons of the soil'. This doctrine is particularly popular in cities, especially in some of them.

Unequal development of economic opportunities in different parts of the country, especially the cities, occurred in the surge of economic progress after 1952. Demand or preference for the 'local' people or 'sons of the soil' over 'outsiders' in the newly created employment and educational opportunities was the outcome. In the struggle for the appropriation of economic resources and economic opportunities, recourse was often taken to communalism, casteism and nepotism. Likewise, language loyalty and regionalism was used to systematically exclude the 'outsiders' from the economic life of a state or city. The problem was aggravated in a number of cities or regions because the speakers of the state language were in a minority or had a bare majority. For example, in Bombay, in 1961, the Marathi speakers constituted 42.8 per cent of the population. In Bangalore, the Kannada speakers were less than 25 per cent. In Calcutta, the Bengalis formed a bare majority. In the urban areas of Assam, barely 33 per cent were Assamese. After 1951 the rate of migration into the cities accelerated.

The important questions that arise are, why did the 'sons of the soil' movements develop in some states and cities and not in others, why were they directed against some migrants and linguistic minority groups and not others, why were some types of jobs targeted and not others, why technical and professional education as against the so-called arts education? Conflict between migrants and non-migrants (and linguistic minorities and majorities) was not inherent and inevitable. In general, the two have lived harmoniously in most of the states. Clearly, there were specific conditions that precipitated the conflict.

The 'sons of the soil' movements have mainly arisen, and have been more virulent, when there is actual or potential competition for industrial and middle-class jobs, between the migrants and the local, educated, middle-class youth. The friction has been more intense in states and cities where 'outsiders' had greater access to higher education and occupied more middle-class positions in government service, professions and industry and were engaged in small businesses, such as small-scale industry and shopkeeping. Active in these movements have also been members of the lower-

middle class or workers, as well as rich and middle peasants whose position is unthreatened, but who increasingly aspire to middle-class status and position for their children. All these social groups also aspire to give their children higher education, especially technical education, such as engineering, medicine and commerce. The economy's failure to create enough employment opportunities for the recently educated created an acute scarcity of jobs, and led to intense competition for the available jobs during the 1960s and 1970s. The major middle-class job opportunities that opened up after 1952 were in government service and the public sector enterprises. Popular mobilization and the democratic political process could therefore be used by the majority linguistic group to put pressure on the government to appropriate employment and educational avenues and opportunities. Some groups could then take advantage of the 'sons of the soil' sentiment for gaining political power. This was not of course inevitable. The Communist Party refused to use anti-migrant sentiments in Calcutta because of its ideological commitment, one reason why the city has not witnessed any major 'sons of the soil' movement. Similarly, though Congress may have taken an opportunist and compromising stand when faced with major 'sons of the soil' movements, it has not initiated or actively supported them.

'Outsiders' have been often far more numerous in rural areas as agricultural labourers or as workers in low-paid traditional industries, such as jute or cotton textiles, than in the cities. Here, however, the 'sons of the soil' sentiment was absent, nor hostility towards the 'outsiders' manifested because no middle-class jobs were involved. The 'locals' also did not compete with the 'outsiders' for these jobs. Consequently, there has been little conflict with the 'locals' when there has been large-scale migration of labourers from Bihar and Uttar Pradesh to Punjab and Haryana or Bombay city, or of workers from Bihar to the jute and other mills of Calcutta, or of workers from Bihar and Orissa to the tea plantations in Assam and Bengal, or of Oriya building workers to Gujarat, and domestic workers all over India. Such migrations have not posed a threat to the local middle classes; and in the last case that of the domestic workers the middle classes have been the chief beneficiaries as also promotees of the migration. However, more recently, because of the higher salaries and education and skill involved, competition between migrants and the 'locals' has tended to develop for employment in the technologically advanced industries.

Another factor that has influenced the emergence or non-emergence of anti-migrant movements in an area or region has been the existence or non-existence of a tradition of migration. When people of a state, especially the middle classes, have themselves migrated, there has been little opposition to immigration. This has been the case with West Bengal, Kerala, Punjab, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh; On the other hand, 'sons of the soil' movements have flourished in Maharashtra, Assam and the Telangana area of Andhra Pradesh, the people of which have not had a tradition of migration.

The Indian constitution is to some extent ambiguous on the question of the rights of the migrants. Article 15 prohibits any discrimination on the grounds of religion, race, caste, sex or place of birth. Article 16 prohibits discrimination in the employment or appointments to any office under the state on grounds of 'descent, place of birth or residence'. However, parliament, though not any state legislature, can pass a law laying down the requirement of residence within a state for appointments under that state. Under political pressure and taking advantage of the ambiguity in the constitution, many states in fact reserve jobs, or give preference for employment in state and local governments and for admission into educational institutions to local residents. The period of residence is fixed or prescribed in such cases. Also, while the constitution permits reservation or preference in state jobs only on grounds of residence and not language, some state governments have gone further and limited the preference to those local residents whose mother tongue is the state language. They have thus discriminated against long-term migrants, their descendants, and even the residents who can speak the state language but whose mother tongue is a minority language in the state. This has, of course, been in clear violation of the constitution. Many state governments have also given directions to private employers to give preference to local persons for employment in their enterprises.

The main argument put forward for reservation in employment and education for the local persons has been that in the states concerned they are socially, economically and educationally backward and are not able to compete with the more advanced migrant communities. Also, in technical colleges and universities, the more backward local students would be overwhelmed by the more advanced students from other states. It is because of this, in the post-Nehru era, even the central government has tended to support preference for residents of a state in employment in central public sector enterprises below the level of a certain technical expertise and in colleges and universities. Reservations on grounds of residence have also been approved by the courts. However, as brought out earlier, reservations for the tribal people are in a separate category.

While reservation of jobs in state administrations and seats in institutions of higher education for the backward local residents was undesirable from the point of view of national integration, some justification could be found for it. However, there was none for the anti-migrant movements of the 1960s which tried to restrict the flow of migrants from other states and which openly proclaimed antagonism and generated hostility against them. These militant anti-migrant and 'sons of the soil' movements were mainly centred in the urban areas of Assam, Telangana in Andhra, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Orissa.

The worst case was that of the movement led by the Shiv Sena which appealed to extreme regional chauvinism and assumed fascist proportions. Founded in 1966, under the leadership of Bal Thackeray, the Shiv Sena demanded that preference in jobs and small businesses should be given to Maharashtrians, who were defined as those whose mother tongue was Marathi. Raising the slogan of 'Maharashtra for the Maharashtrians', the Shiv Sena organized a militant, and often violent movement against South Indians, especially Tamils, who were declared to have a disproportionate share of office jobs such as clerks and typists in private firms and small businesses such as tea shops and eating places. In 1969, the Sena gave Bombay city a taste of fascist violence when it organized arson and terror against South Indians, looted and destroyed their tea-stalls and eating places, overturned cars of Tamils and tore off Tamil signs from shops. The Shiv Sena could not, however, sustain its hate-South Indian campaign or become a major political force outside Bombay city or get the support of any all-India political party. It, therefore, soon shifted its ideological base to Hindu communalism. Gaining a wider political constituency, it was then able to ally itself with the Bharatiya Janata Party.

The 'sons of the soil' movements in Assam and Telangana, which also assumed serious proportions and were quite complex, had some additional and distinctive features. Both these movements will therefore be discussed in the chapters on state politics.

While protective and preferential regulations have been widespread since the late 1960s, antagonism, hostility and violence against migrants have abated in recent years. The problem posed by the 'sons of the soil' doctrine is still a somewhat minor one and there is no ground for pessimism on that score. Even at its height, only a few cities and states were affected in a virulent form, and at no stage did it threaten the unity of the country or the process of nation-in-the-making. Besides, its effects on the Indian economy have been negligible: migration within the country has not been checked; interstate mobility is in fact growing. But the problem is likely to linger till economic development is able to deal effectively with unemployment, especially among the middle classes, and regional inequality.

Looking back at the divisive issues of the post-independence period, the linguistic reorganization of the states, the integration of the tribals, and regional inequality and regionalism, it is to be observed that the prophets of gloom and doom have been disproved. Linguistic states have strengthened not weakened Indian unity, even while permitting full cultural autonomy to different linguistic areas. Hindi and English are growing as all-India languages. Regional movements like

the DMK have been doused after 1967 and are content to rename Madras state as Tamil Nadu and Madras city as Chennai. Tribals feel secure in the Indian Union regarding their cultural and economic autonomy, and have also gained greater strength themselves, as also political support in the country over time. The process of nation-in-the-making is being pushed forward. A national identity, that of being Indian, has come to be accepted by all on the subcontinent, and the fact of Indian unity is irreversible.

This should not suggest that all problems related to these issues have been resolved for all time. Further social and economic development, spread of education, deepening of democracy and politicization, as has been seen elsewhere, could create new sources of tension and conflict leading to disrupture tendencies. Optimism is to be tempered with a continuing concern for threats to Indian unity. Yet, India's past experience in overcoming disruptive forces may be instructive for the future. The role and legacy of the freedom struggle, the quality and wisdom of the leaders, the leadership's correct understanding of India's diversity, the leadership's rejection of secessionist demands, while respecting those within the constitutional framework, the democratic political structure, and the acceptance of the need for a strong national government within a federal structure have all contributed to promote Indian unity. Here, it must be added that a strong state should not be mistaken for an authoritarian one. A strong national government does not entail weak state governments or a national government that rides roughshod over the federal provisions of the constitution. Federalism does not mean a weak national government, rather *a* non-dominating national government which observes the federal features of the polity. A strong but democratic nation state is a necessity for a developing country with strong federal features. What it does with its strength depends on the political nature of the government and the ruling party of the day.

*****

Decolonisation and the Birth of New Nations in the Post-War World

The World War II was undoubtedly the single biggest convulsion to ever shake the mankind. In a previous Chapter we have seen how much devastation it caused in terms of human life and economies. It also provided tectonic changes in the career of nations and civilisations. One of the single biggest impact it had was to ring out the colonial order, which for the previous few centuries had caused so much human misery and conflict.

Decolonisation

There is no doubt that had the World War II not occurred, the great European Empires would not have dissolved at the rapid rate they did after 1945. Though nationalist opposition created problems for Britain in India and the French in Vietnam, these constituted more the exception than the rule because in most of the colonies held by the European powers the gulf between the ruler and the ruled was top wide. Most of the colonial people lived in Utter poverty. There was so much awe of European power based on the rule of the gun and foreign-origin laws that the, colonials in most parts of the empires could n H dream of ever upsetting the status *quo*.

In 1945, Britain's Empire was the largest of all consisting of the entire Indian sub-continent, Burma (Myanmar), Malaya (Malaysia) which included Singapore, huge tracts of Africa, Cyprus, Hong Kong, islands in the Caribbean Sea (the West Indies), islands in the Pacific like Fiji, the Falklands and Gibraltar. The French (Francophone) Empire 'was' second biggest comprising large territories in Africa, Indo-China and the Garibbean. Together, the two European giants also held strategic places in West Asia takenFrom Turkey after the World War I. Britain held Jordan and Palestine while France had Syria (known as 'mandated territories'). Besides, Holland had colonies like Indonesia and the Dutch East Indies, Belgium had Congo and Rwanda; Portugal controlled Angola, Mozambique, Guinea and Goa; Spain clung on to Morocco, Spanish Guinea, Ifni and Spanish Sahara, and lastly, Italy had Libya, Somalia and Eritrea.

The World War II's aftermath began a shakeup that lasted for the next three decades. By 1975, there was transfer of power to-'national governments in most of these countries and new nations were born put of old colonies. The Dutch and' the French did not always shed power willingly as was seen in Indonesia and Indo-China respectively.

Causes of the End of the Colonial Empires

The World War II certainly rang the bell on the Imperial order. Where there were existing nationalist struggles, it gave the oppressed people new stimulus. The sight of an Asian power, Japan, humbling the armies of Britain, France and Holland in Malaya, Hong Kong, the Dutch East Indies and Indo-China shattered the myth about European invincibility. When the Allies were humbled, the local people in Indo-China and Indonesia took up arms against their Japanese conquerors. After the War ended, they did not meekly accept their former masters back, but continued with their resistance'. Besides, the Allies relied a lot on recruits in their armies to fight the Germans in Europe and Japan in Asia. These soldiers returned after the War with a resolve to address the problems of their countries. Their European masters could no longer take their loyalty for granted.

The European powers were also weakened by, the World War II. The cream of their own youth was lying in graves across the world. A sense of fatigue had replaced the old vigour with which they defended their Empires. All these countries themselves went under the shadow of the United States, a country which did not quite tolerate colonialisation. During the War itself President Roosevelt had prevailed upon the Allied powers to accept the Atlantic Charter (1941) that formed the template on

which the post-War world was to be reorganised. It contained two points, i.e. nations should not expand by taking territory from other nations, and all people should have the right to choose their own forms of government. Though the British under Churchill, a committed imperialist, tried to interpret this in their own way saying the Atlantic Charter applied only to Nazi Germany, Roosevelt made it clear that the alms went beyond. It was to apply all over the world. The next US President, Harry S. Truman, who worked with Churchill's successor Clement Atlee of the Liberal Party applied pressure on Britain to bow out of India. Though the British left India before long, it delayed giving independence to other countries. The US, on the other hand, maintained diplomatic pressure for two reasons.

Firstly, Washington feared that communism sponsored by Moscow would Inspire liberation struggles of the colonials. There was a second and more commercial interest involved. The Americans eyed prospective markets for their goods in the newly Independent world. Not surprisingly, the newly created United Nations, which right from the outset was dominated by the US, issued periodic statements against colonialism. We will now run through the individual accounts of some important nations which won their independence in the aftermath of the World War II. Form the history of the last two years of India as a colony, how forces of nationalism received new energy and suffered the tragedy of partition that created two nations, is well known. We shall see how the Indian experience in fact anticipated events in many other countries in their own hour of freedom.

West Indies, Malaya and Cyprus

The British West Indies was the collective term given to a large assortment of islands to the Caribbean Sea. There are large islands like Jamaica and Trinidad, while others like Grenada, St. Vincent, Barbados, the Seychelles, Bahamas and Antigua are small. The British had Honduras in Central South America and Guyana in the north-east of the continent. The total population in these islands was roughly 6 million. There were doubts whether the small islands like Grenada, St. Vincent and Antigua which had populations of less than 100,000 each, would be viable as Independent states.

The British at first thought of transferring power to a federation of these islands. But Honduras and Guyana wanted to retain their separate identities. Jamaica and Trinidad were also unwilling to join the federation. The British government nevertheless established the West Indies Federation in 1958. But there was resentment as these Islands had few things in common. Jamaica arid Trinidad withdrew from this collective in 1961. In the following year, Britain granted independence separately to each of these islands. Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago were the-first, to get independence. Guyana followed in 1966 and one by one; the others followed quit until Bahamas which took the name of Belize in 1981, and the tiny Islands of St. Kitts and Nevis became free to 1983. Though these countries rejected the concept of a federation, they soon realised the virtues of regional co-operation. They formed tile Caribbean Free Trade Association In 1968 and the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM) in 1973 in which, all the former British colonies except Guyana and Belize joined.

Malaya was liberated from. Japanese occupation in 1945. There was a problem of ethnic rivalry in the country between the Malayas and the Chinese. It also had a strong population of Indian origin and European population. As a step towards-Independence, the British encouraged the country's nine states, each ruled-by a Sultan, and Its own territories of Malacca and Penang to form a Federation of Malaya in 1948. Each state was given its own legislature for governing local affairs while a central government had overall control: But Singapore was retained as a colony at that stage.

However, communist insurgents began to make trouble. Led by Chin Pen, a guerilla leader who had put up resistance against the Japanese, they began to foment violence and strife in the country. The British declared a state of emergency in 1948 which remained in force till 1960. During this period, the communists were effectively dealt with. Meanwhile, the dominant Malaya population gained the political ascendancy under Tunku Abdul Rahman and rapidly mobilised the support of

the non-communist sections of the Chinese and Indian population. The British finally transferred power in 1957. In 1963, a Federation of Malaysia was established. Brunei's Sultan however did not join it and formed a separate sultanate which got independence in 1984. Singapore initially joined the Federation, but the largely Chinese dominated island was left to chart its own independent career in 1965. The rest of the Malaysian federation remains intact to this day.

The issue of Cyprus was the most complicated problem. The British Labour government's attempts to grant it independence were thwarted by the resistance from within. The country had 80 per cent Greek Orthodox Christians and 20 per cent Muslims of Turkish origin. The Greek Cypriots wanted to unite with Greece but this was resisted by the Muslims. When Winston Churchill returned to power in 1951, he caused further misgivings by slowing down the process of Cyprus' independence. This caused strong anti-British feeling, particularly among the Greeks. Astruggle for freedom broke out under Archbishop Makarips. A guerilla movement under General Grivas, called *Eoka*, waged constant war against the British troops after it became clear that the British were no longer interested in granting Cyprus its Independence, but retain it as a military base for strategic reasons. More than 35,000 British troops were stationed in the country. The problems were exacerbated by the Muslims who started a campaign to divide the country along religious lines.

Finally to avoid a civil war the British Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan granted Cyprus full Independence in 1960. Archbishop Makarios dropped the idea of merger of Cyprus with Greece arid became the country's first President. But peace lasted only for three years and civil war broke out again. In 1974, Turkey intervened to establish a separate state in the north of the country. The country is still divided with Greek Cypriots controlling the South and the United Nation's peacekeepers keeping peace between the two groups.

Hong Kong's Accession To China

Before 1842. Hong Kong was a tiny island inhabited by fishermen. As it had little economic importance, the rulers of China ignored it. But its strategic location was first recognised by the British who needed a naval base in the eastern Indian Ocean. At the end of the First Opium War in 1842, China ceded Hong Kong to Britain permanently. In 1860, the area known as Kowloon which falls in mainland China opposite Hong Kong was ceded *by* China to Britain under the Peking Convention. These two areas would still have been under the British had not the Second Opium War concluded with another treaty in 1898 resulted in the British converting the freehold into a 99-year lease. The British did this because they got more territory on the Chinese mainland which was of great strategic importance to them. Beginning 1900, Hong Kong saw a steady influx of immigrants who were fleeing the civil war in mainland China, Over the next 90 years, the island came to be heavily populated by people from all over the world seeking jobs in the island's service-oriented economy. The biggest wave came after mainland China became communist in 1949. Hong Kong's rule under Britain was not democratic. The island's *Governor* was nominated by the British Prime Minister.

In the 1980s, Britain grew alarmed at the approaching end of its leasehold over. Hong Kong. By this time living standards in the island was one of the highest in Asia. There was concern that the spirit of free enterprise which made Hong Kong prosperous would be terminated under communist rule. The people of Hong Kong were mostly of Chinese origin and they began to Emigrate to Britain, Australia, Canada and other countries fearing an end to their freedom.

Britain made a formal request to China to renew the leasehold, but the communist chairman in Beijing, Deng Xiaoping, refused and demanded Britain to return the whole of Hong Kong to China. Not willing to challenge the Chinese, Britain agreed. In 1984, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and her Chinese counterpart, Zhao Ziyang, signed a Joint Declaration requiring Britain to transfer sovereignty of Hong Kong to China at midnight on 30 June 1997.

In return China agreed to grant Hong Kong and its people a higher degree of freedom and autonomy. Most significantly, it was allowed to retain its capitalist system up to 2047. But the road to the transfer was not smooth. It was marked by much bickering. After the Tiananmen Square massacre in Beijing which was ordered by China's totalitarian regime to suppress a peaceful democratic demonstration, the people of Hong Kong. grew understandably nervous. Thousands of Hong Kong citizens applied for British citizenship. To stem this the British tried to introduce democratic reforms, but these meant very little at that stage because China would nullify them anyway after the transfer.

In July 1997, Chris Patten, the last British Governor of Hong Kong, left. The Chinese government installed an interim legislature to replace the old colonial chamber. All the last minute humanitarian and democratic .measures introduced by Patten were abolished. Hong Kong was declared a Special Autonomous Region (SAR) and a-businessman, Tung Chee-hwa, was named the Chief Executive. He got a second term to February 2002.

Independence of British Africa

By 1945, the breeze of nationalism was blowing across Africa. During the World War II, colonial troops fought on the Allied side and imbibed this spirit. For some decades preceding this a new generation of African youth were getting educated In Britain and were assimilating the ideas of democracy and nationalism. The British Labour government under Atlee was willing to transfer power to the colonies. Atlee nursed the dream of Britain continuing to dominate the economic affairs of its former colonies through a process that Is known as neo-colonialism. This phenomenon, which' took *k* larger shape in the rest of the developing countries, also known as the Third World, will be discussed in a subsequent Chapter. But in the African context, Britain did not wish to transfer power immediately. Rather, the tendency was to linger the process as much as possible.

The British had three kinds of colonies in Africa In 1945. In West Africa, it had the Gold Coast, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Gambia: This region had minimum British or even European presence. Granting independence to these countries was therefore quite simple. Sierra Leone became. Independent in 1961 and Gambia in1965. In the East African colonies of Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika on the other hand, matters were more Complicated. There was a large population of British and Asian settlers' who were apprehensive of going under the 'native rule; The 'settler factor' was most serious in the third category of colonies, i.e. Nyasaland and Northern and Southern 'Rhodesia in Central Africa, where the Europeans controlled the local economies, owned huge tracts of land, and kept the locals marginalised from the profits generated In their own countries.

In Tanganyika (renamed Tanzania in 1964) Julius Nyrere, the leader of the Tanganyika 'African National Union CTANU), led the campaign for an African. Government which he promised would be tolerant towards the whites. The British granted independence in 1961. Uganda became independent in 1962 with Milton Obote as the Prime Minister. But the country suffered much from tribal rivalry.

The most complex problem in East Africa was Kenya because the white .settlers there refused to live under black majority rule. Jomo Kenyatta's Kenya African Unity Party was the true representative of the Kenyans. The British government tried to trick the Kenyans by giving them only six seats in a Legislative Council which had 54 members. African.patience ran out and a secret society called .the Mau Mau started' attacking the White settlers. This gave the British the excuse they needed to prolong their rule. They stationed more than 100,000 troops in the country and brutally suppressed nationalist elements. Kenyatta became the symbol of African nationalism when he was jailed for six years. The British displayed Nazi like brutality when they opened concentration camps to prevent the Kikuyu tribes from getting, organised. Finally, international pressure forced Britain to give up. They released Kenyatta and pulled out of the country in 1963. Kenyatta did not wreak vengeance on the whites. Kenya has since been a moderate state.

Central Africa represented more problems in the process of transfer of power. It was in this region that white settlers were most concentrated. Anticipating African independence, the white population of Nyasaland, Northern and Southern Rhodesia proposed to Churchill to allow them to set up a Central African Federation in which they would find strength in numbers and effectively keep the Africans out of power, The British allowed them to have a Federal Parliament in Salisbury, the .capital of Southern" -Rhodesia. The Africans got incensed at this strategy to marginalise them. Under three .visionary leaders, Kenneth Kaunda of Northern Rhodesia, Joshua Nkomo of Southern Rhodesia and Hastings Banda of Nyasaland, they began a campaign for black majority rule. In 1960* the Labour government set up a commission to go into the problem. The Commission recommeded universal suffrage, an. end to racial discrimination and the rights of territories: to leave the federation. In 1963, Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia became fully independent and assumed the names Malawi and Zambia respectively.

Southern Rhodesia saw fierce clashes with the whites who wanted to preserve their privileges. "The British backed them, but at the same time tried to mollify world opinion by impressing upon the Rhodesian Prime Minister, Ian Smith, that Africans should be given at least 'one-third of the seats in. the Parliament. This was a ridiculous proposal because only about 200,000 whites were to- get two-thirds of the seats, while four million Africans would get only one-third. Cornered, Smith declared independence for Rhodesia in 1965. The United Nations condemned this and all member states were encouraged to boycott trade with the illegal regime. Neighbouring South Africa and Mozambique, were sympathetic to Smith and offered Rhodesia the chance to survive the international boycott. The sanctions were also flouted by |he United States whose corporations could not resist Rhodesian chrome, which was the cheapest in the world. This hypocrisy displayed -by the world powers helped the Smith regime declare' itself a republic in 1970 and continue with its suppression of the Africans.

The situation suddenly improved after Portugal left Mozambique in 1975. Its President, Samora Machel, applied economic sanctions against Rhodesia. and allowed Zimbabwean nationalists to operate from guerilla bases in Mozambique, Smith tried in vain to resist the Zimbabweans by even hiring foreign mercenaries. Robert Mugabe's guerilla, Zimbabwe African National Council controlled most parts of the country by 1979. Smith was forced to negotiate. In December 1979, under British mediation, it was resolved that a new republic, by the name' of Zimbabwe would be created .and in its Parliament 80 out of'100 seats would be reserved for the Africans. Zimbabwe officially became independent in 1980 under Mugabe as its Prime Minister.

It must be conceded that of all the colonists, Britain at least made efforts to gracefully exit from their occupied territories. The French, Dutch and Portuguese were, in the most part', not concerned with the winds of change sweeping the world and tried to cling to, their possessions for as long as possible. The French, on regaining their country after four years of German occupation in 1944, adopted the infamous Brazzaville Declaration which clearly ruled out any autonomy or self-rule for its colonies, thereby making the choice of being forced out as we shall now see.

Independence of the French Colonies

French Indo-China comprised the modern nations of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. The region went under Japanese occupation during World War II when the French were thrown out. The Vietnamese communists, under their charismatic leader, Ho Chi Minh put up tough resistance against the Japanese occupiers. 'Naturally, when the French tried to return to their former colonies after the World War H, the Vietnamese people revolted. For eight years, a war of independence was waged. Finally, in 1954, when it became clear that the French cannot hold on, the liberal premier of France, Pierre Mendes-France sued for peace. At the July 1954 Geneva Conference, Vietnam, -Laos and Cambodia were granted independence.

In Tunisia, the French faced a guerilla, movement led by the *New,* Destour group of Habib Bourghiba. The French sent more than 70,000 troops into Tunisia, imprisoned Bourghiba, and tried to brutally Suppress the nationalist struggle there. But the infiltration of communists caused concern in Paris. The French realised that unless they accepted Tunisian Independence under a moderate leader like Bourghiba, worse trouble would be in store for them. Therefore, they released the popular, leader and granted Tunisia independence in March 1956. A similar situation faced them in Morocco where the nationalist party, the *Istiqlal* and the trade unions opposed the French. The French government realised that it could not wage wars in Indo-China and Africa at the same time. So they allowed King Muhammed V to return to the country from exile and grant Morocco independence in 1956.

Algeria represented a bigger problem for France as there were more than 1 million French settlers there. At first the Independence movement of the natives was peaceful. But after the World War II, it became more militant under the leadership of Ben Bella's National Liberation Front. A full-scale war broke out in which more than 700000 French troops tried to suppress the Algerians in a most barbaric manner. This war also caused problems within the French society at home. There was so much resentment to this brazen attempt at perpetuating colonialism that the Fourth Republic of France, established in 1944, fell and civil war seemed imminent, The army urged General Charles de Gaulle, the hero of the World War II, to lead the country as it was convinced that he would never give up French claims in Algeria.

In October 1958, the Fifth Republic commenced in France .under Charles de Gaulle. The French Army, meanwhile, was facing, major reverses in .Algeria. Charles de Gaulle had the pragmatism to realise that outright victory was Impossible for the French and began to negotiate with Ben Bella. The generals of the French Army sponsored a terrorist movement called the OAS, which began a terrorist campaign both inside France and Algeria against those who favoured Algerian independence; The French became tired of war and there was widespread approval for De Gaulle's peace moves. In July 1962, the French withdrew arid Ben Bella became independent Algeria's first President. Charles de Gaulle was truly in favour of reconciliation with the colonies. He terminated the post-World War II policy of treating, colonial, territories as a part of France and preferred giving them outright independence. The events in Indo-China impressed upon him the need to form a new plan. In 1958 soon after coming to power he proposed that the 12 colonies of French West' Africa and French Equatorial Africa have their own self government for local affairs under elected Parliaments while the policies regarding their taxation and foreign affairs would be determined in Paris. A referendum was held in each of these countries. France offered liberal aid to those countries which accepted tills Plan while the ones which opted for independence were denied French assistance. Only Guinea, under President Sekou Toure, opted for outright independence. This inspired the people of Togo, Cameroon and Madagascar to follow suit. They became independent in 1960.

Dissolution of Other Empires

The other empire-building European nations viz., Holland, Belgium, Spain and Portugal, showed more obstinacy than France In bowing to international opinion and leave their colonies. The Dutch exploited the, East Indies (Indonesia) and did little to alleviate the sufferings of the people. Ahmed Sukarno was the nationalist leader of the country. When the Japanese invaded Indonesia in 1942, the Dutch allowed Sukarno to administer the country and promised full Independence after the War. When the World War II ended, Sukarno declared full independence of Indonesia.

Holland made a weak bid to regain possession of Indonesia by sending its army But the United Nations also asked Holland to grant. Indonesia its independence. In 1949, Indonesia became free but Holland retained West Irian and the Dutch crown was recognised. But in the following year. Sukarno broke out of the union and expelled Europeans, from West Irian. The other Dutch possession Surinam, became free in 1975.

Belgium had colonies in Africa, i.e. Belgian Congo and;Ruanda-Urundi. They were quite brutal colonisers who denied the local people any education and played one tribe against the other. In Ruanda-Urundi, the Meets, of the rivalry between the majority Tutsi and the Hutu tribes, is still raging.

But nationalist movements broke out-in 1959 in Leopoldville, the capital of Belgian Congo. After suppressing it for some time, the Belgian government suddenly decided that it would grant the country independence. In June, 1960, Congo became free-under Patrice Lumumba. Ruanda-Urundi was given its independence in 1962 after -its division into two states, Rwanda and Burundi, both governed by the Tutsis. Spain had Spanish. Sahara, Spanish Morocco, Ifni and Spanish Guinea, The Spanish dictator, General Franco, did not resist the- nationalist movements as he had no interest in colonies. He gave up Spanish Morocco for unification with the newly independent and former French; Morocco in 1956. Ifni was given, the choice to Join Morocco, which it did in 1969. Guinea became independent as Equatorial Guinea in 1968. However, in the case of Spanish Sahara, Franco made an exception as It had rich resources pf. phosphates. But after Franco's death In 1975, it was given up, Portugal; was also opposed to giving its colonies in Africa viz., Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea, their Independence. They 'also owned the eastern half of the island of Timor on the Indian Ocean. The Salazar government in Lisbon kept the colonials backward and illiterate. But revolts broke but in Angola in 1961 where Agostinho Neto's MPLA (People's Movement for Angolan Liberation) was the main nationalist movement. The USSR backed this uprising as the MP.LA had Communist leanings. Portugal fought a bitter war which by 1973 was costing the country nearly half its annual budget. Naturally, the common people of Portugal, who were sick of this policy, resisted. In 1974, the Salazar dictatorship was overthrown by a military coup. Soon Portugal freed all its colonies

Italy was the only colonising nation which- accepted the indigenous independence demands with any grace. Moreover, after the World War II, it no longer had the international clout to resist independence movements. Ethiopia was handed back to the rule of Emperor Haile Selassie who had been forced into exile in 1935 when the Italians invaded the country. Libya was given, independence in 1951, Eritrea was handed over to Ethiopia in 1952 but allowed to maintain a large degree of autonomy. Italian Somaliland was merged with British Somaliland to form the independent republic of Somalia in 1960.

The British Commonwealth- Of Nations And Neo-Colonialism

The British Commonwealth of Nations had existed in the form of having special relationships among the white dominions of Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa since the early partofthe20th century. After the World War II, when the Labour government decided to free the colonies one by one, there was a huge demand from domestic industrial lobbies of Britain to maintain preferential trade ties with the newly independent countries. It was perceived that since these countries are inherently weak as their economies had been devastated by centuries of colonisation and largely because of untrained workforce and managements and inexperienced governments, Britain would be able to maintain long-distance control over their affairs to its advantage. This was the genesis of neo-colonialism. The British Commonwealth of Nations was thus extended to include every former colony: The latter continued associating with each other and with Britain as sovereign nations. Some, however, still relied on Britain as their only overseas market British companies enjoyed virtual monopoly over vital sectors of their economies well into the 1980s. This continued extraction of wealth from its former colonies made Britain maintain its aloofness from the moves to form the European Economic Community. Britain was content with supreme rights over an international market of 800 million.

It must, however, be conceded that the British Commonwealth did not evolve into a pernicious system only to exploit the former colonies. As a body it took a bold stand against the racist regime

of South Africa in 1961 and promoted economic, scientific and technical cooperation among the member states. The British monarch remains a symbolic head of the forum.

In contrast, the French implemented neo-colonialism with vigour. As we have noted earlier, France was initially quite reluctant to give independence to its colonies. When the pressure from the forces of nationalism became too great, it gave up direct political control but at the same time ensured that French economic interests, even monopolies remained protected. That was one of the reasons why Tunisia, and Morocco were made free quite early. Under President Charles de Gaulle, neo-colonialism became an article of faith. He persuaded the French conservatives to agree to his decision to give up political hegemony over Algeria in return for continued indirect French control overits economy. The independence of the other African republics was also not quite complete in this respect. All of them discovered, to their dismay, that Frances still influenced their economic and foreign policies.

The United States, because of its overarching influence over the former empire-building western European powers, also participated in neo-colonialism. The newly independent countries became heavily dependent on their investments, markets and were thus sucked into debt traps. The worst hit countries were the African nations which were either badly prepared or quite unprepared to manage their own affairs. They had few literate, leave alone skilled people to carry out effective governance and thus got quickly trapped by the bribes and inducements offered to them by western companies and governments. The lot of the common people, therefore, did not show much improvement. As many of these countries had artificial boundaries, drawn up by the European colonizers in the 19th century to suit their own interests, they inherited many conflicts, Forinstance, in Nigeria and the former Belgian Congo, tribal differences quickly escalated into a civil war. In some countries, the governments made attempts to introduce socialist reforms like nationalisation of their industries. The western powers led by the US, branded these governments as 'communist' and therefore, unjustly out off aid, plunging them into deeper political and economic crises. This happened in Indo-China, Indonesia, East Timor, Chad., Angola, Mozambique, Zaire and Jamaica.

Thus, we find that the World War II had, in general, a salutary influence on the destinies of more than half of the world's population which was groaning under the yoke of colonialism. It also changed the geographical contours of nations permanently. New ones were born on the ruins of old and many such processes are still on.

*****

Structural changes in the production process.

(Transformed feudal societies into capitalist societies)

Industrial Revolution

medieval societies into modern times

The term "Industrial Revolution" was coined by Auguste Blanqui, a French economist, in 1837 to denote the economic and social changes arising out of the native industries with simple instruments, to industries in factories with power-ridden machinery. But it gained currency and recognition when Arnold Toyanbee, a great historian, used it in 1882.

Historians, however, question the appropriateness of the term on the ground that the Industrial Revolution covers a period far too long to justify a single label. The period is from 1740 to about 1850 in Britain and from 1815 to the end of the 19th century in Europe. Moreover, the term "Revolution" is misleading for describing a complicated series of forces, processes and discoveries which worked very slowly but gradually and created a new economic organisation. It is suggested that it is *better to call it evolutaion and not revolution.* It is also suggested that instead of calling it the Industrial Revolution, it should be called, *"The Transition of Industrialism".* Despite of these objections the term Industrial Revolution is preferred and it is in common usage.

The Industrial Revolution was not a revolution in the normal sense of the word. Revolutions are generally spontaneous, violent and bloodthirsty. The Industrial Revolution was free from all these characteristics. It was a long, slow and evolutionary process of change.

Before going to discuss the forces and factors that paved the way for the industrial or technological revolution, let us note in brief its antecedents in the late medieval and early eighteenth century. During this period European society was mainly agricultural. Whatever industries there existed, were confined to the "domestic" sector. There was no machinery, or water-power or steam to work those industries. Manual labour was the chief source of power. Each village was practically self-sufficient. Roads were in a battered state and travelling was risky and troublesome. There was no large scale corporate activity. The individual worker worked as a single unit.

Industrial revolution had taken place in England in the 18th and 19th centuries. But before these great changes in the techniques of production could come, certain important things had happened earlier. Without these earlier happenings Industrial Revolution would not have been possible. These pre-requisites for the promotion of the later day Industrial Revolution were as follows.

Desire for material advancement

Without the desire for the material advancement progress is simply not possible. This desire had grown in Europe in the early part of the modern period, mainly under the influence of *Renaissance*. The early part of the modern period is also known as the *Age of Reason.* In this age philosophers like Voltaire, Rousseau, etc; *formulated certain basic laws of mankind.* One of these laws was *that man should lead a happy life*. The second was that *man had certain natural rights* of which *rights of life, liberty and property were the most fundamental ones.* The third law was that *in order to enjoy a good life man had to possess wealth* which he could accumulate and use.

- Powerful ideas during renaissance. (Humanism, etc)
- Protestantism – Luther questioned the ~~King~~ Church
- Requirement of raw MATERIAL (Crusades → European blockade → navigational discoveries, colonies → raw material, market, labour)

A desire for material improvement was emerged not only from such reasoning but also from the fact *that the only way a commoner could rise in a society dominated by nobility was by acquiring wealth.*

In those days of desire for material advancement *raising loans for productive purposes was also considered right.* Under the *Protestant ethic* giving money in the form of loan and charging interest on it was also not considered wrong.

This *overall attitudinal change* in regard to bettering one's own life was the major prerequisite for the Industrial Revolution.

Supply of rawmaterials

The next important prerequisite of the Industrial Revolution was the supply of rawmaterials. In this respect also Europe had an advantage because, due to, the Geographical explorations and discoveries and the resultant Commercial Revolution, Europe could get rawmaterials such as cotton, sugarcane, indigo, etc; both from the Orient and the new world.

Markets

The other prerequisite for the Industrial Revolution was *the availability of markets* for the distribution of the finished goods. Under the impact of the Geographical discoveries and the consequent Commercial Revolution the European markets had grown internally and externally. The growth of markets widened the chance to realise adequate profit and also a chance to produce more for the market. This widening of the market was also an important condition for the progress in the industrial front.

The need of labour force

(Mechanisation of agriculture → change in occupational str. of population)

Besides the rawmaterials and the market the Industrial Revolution required *labour force which offered itself for wages.* The labour force which was needed now was to be a mobile one and also skilled. The growth of population in Europe greatly facilitated the labour supply. Moreover, *the advancements in the agricultural production released labour from rural areas.* Thus the labour supply for industrial work had gone up in Europe.

Guild activists also provided SKILLED LABOUR

Transportational facilities

The mere availability of labour, raw-materials and the growth in the size of markets were of no use if there were no proper transportational facilities. The Hollanders came out with a new kind of ocean going vessel during this time. The principle of steam lining was made use of in devising this new ship known as FLUTE. By this the cost of ship building had come down by one-third. In regard to internal commerce England witnessed a veritable mania of canal and road making.

Developments in the agriculture sector

Another major aspect of economy that witnessed much progress before the Industrial Revolution could take place was *in the field of agriculture.* No doubt that many of the agricultural advancements had taken place along with the changes in the industrial techniques. But some of the agricultural changes had preceeded Industrial Revolution. *Thus the growth in the agricultural productivity generated enough surplus to support the Industrial Revolution and also the rising urban population.*

It may be stated here that Britain was the first country in the world to experience the Industrial Revolution and several factors paved the way for the same.

Factors responsible for the Industrial Revolution in Britain

i. The main advantage that England had was that it was here that *Agricultural Revolution* had first taken place. It helped Britain in many a way.

Firstly it generated agricultural surplus which in its turn provided the required capital for the industrial progress.

Secondly, it provided raw-materials.

Thirdly, it released the labour force from the rural areas and also created a demand for industrial goods.

ii. England had an empire where Sun never sets. Thus the colonies not only supplied the raw-materials to the industries but also served the purpose of markets.

iii. In England coal was found in abudance. Not only coal was available in abundance, but it was also found in juxtaposition with iron. This fact greatly facilitated the advent of Industrial Revolution in England.

iv. Britain enjoyed a *labour force that was mobile and skilled.* The British labour structure was such that *six out of ten* were employed in agriculture and the other four were already in the handicraft industry, whereas, in the rest of *Europe ten out of nine were in agriculture.* The British advantage was that it was easier to teach technical skills to those who were already employed in the handicrafts. Likewise the Scottish Primary System which was much in vogue in England *created a literate labour force* and hence it became easier to teach industrial skills to literate labourers than to illiterate labourers.

v. England also developed by this time adequate transportational facilities. *England witnesed a veritable mania of canal and road making.* England was criss-crossed with canals that could be used for transportation. During this period *England experienced a new system of road making.* This new method consisted in creating a firm foundation by dumping fairly large stones in the road bed and then covering these with smaller stones and finally covering the whole with gravel and clay. Such road could withstand heavy loads and much traffic. Thus transportational facilities were also paved the way for industrial revolution in England.

vi. England also *enjoyed relative peace* when compared to the other continental countries. The English Channel prevented, to a very great extent, the involvement of English in the continental wars. This greatly helped England, because her resources were not misspent on unproductive wars.

Progressive English gave incentives and recognition to "INNOVATION" Academy of Science in England.

vii. Another important fact was that *the English church got itself separated from the Roman Catholic church.* In England the church lands were confiscated and thus one-fourth of the national resources were brought into productive use.

(Anglicist church)

PROGRESSIVE MINDED English,

viii. Moreover, in England special recognition was given to the material advancement. The English did not look down up on the NEW RICH. In fact the rising middle classes were absorbed in the higher social classes. Thus the reward for material advancement was greater in England than elsewhere.

ix. The agricultural surplus and the surplus wealth of England were *not in the possession of the feudal lords,* who normally spend it for conspicuous consumption, but in the hands of those *who were interested in investing it for further productive exercises.*

x. The Bank of England and the National Debt were the two institutions which provided ready money for economic and industrial developments at a nominal rate of interest.

Thus no other country in Europe, except England, had so many potentialities for industrial development. Forces were favourable for a change in England. The Industrial

Napolean's Continental system – export and import blocked from and to England

Revolution provided England with money for her wars against the Revolutionary France and Napoleon. As a matter of fact these wars gave a further fillip to the English Industrial Revolution and encouraged greater production. Thus it is said :

forced England to go 4 more production

"Napoleon's career enabled the Industrial Revolution to go forward in England and the Industrial Revolution enabled England to overthrow Napoleon".

Technological developments

In the early phase of Industrial Revolution the most far reaching inventions were made in the *textile, ferrous metal* and *power machines industries.* Some of the first important changes that occurred in the industrial techniques in the 18th century had taken place in the textile industry.

Textile industry

Changes at first occurred in the textile industry, because in the first place the textile techniques were already at such point of development that only a few minor alterations had to be effected to render both spinning and weaving semi-mechanised and semi-automatic. However, the textile industry had enjoyed certain advantages at this time.

Firstly, it was relatively free to use techniques to reduce the cost of production, for the cotton textile trade was not subjected to guild regulations.

Secondly, the monopolistic guilds never existed in cotton because it was a new industry.

Weaving field

The first major improvement in textile manufacturing came *in the field of weaving.* In 1733 John Kay invented what was known as *"The Flying Shuttle"*. This doubled the speed of weaving and saved labour considerably. This invention enabled the weavers to turn out greater output. It also made possible the weaving of broad cloth by one man.

With the use of Flying Shuttle the normal rotation of four spinners to one weaver was completely upset. Obviously, the supply of spinners had to be increased for *new techniques of spinning had to be developed* if full advantage was to be taken of the Flying Shuttle.

Spinning sector

In 1765, James Hargreaves invented a machine known as *"The Spinning Jenny"*. This new machine had eight spindles and consequently *one spinner was able to do the work of eight spinners.* The Spinning Jenny was a simple wooden frame on which eight spindles moved by the turning of a wheel. Thus spinning became mechanised and consequently spinning became faster and easier to do so.

Mechanical power

The Flying Shuttle and Spinning Jenny were a success. Yet, it was soon evident that both devices could be more automatic and that mechanical power could be used to draw the machines and thus relieve the physical burdens placed up on the operator.

In 1769, Richard Arkwright invented *"Water-frame"*. This machine consisted of a series of rollers and was run by water-power or horse-power. It helped the manufacture of hard and firm yarn suitable for weaving. The rollers could not work in small places and *consequently the Water-frame of Arkright ushered in the factory system.* That is why he has been called as the *"Parent of the factory system"*.

In 1779 Samuel Crompton invented a machine known as *"The Mule"*. This new machine combined the advantages of the Spinning Jenny and Water-frame. It made the production of fine muslin possible.

In 1785 Edmund Cartwright invented the *"Power Loom"*. In the application of mechanical power to weaving the crucial invention was the Power Loom. *It paved the way for speedy weaving.*

All these inventions not only increased the production of cotton goods but also the demand for the raw cotton grew by leaps and bounds. Here, however, a real bottleneck existed, for picking seeds from raw cotton, was a slow a laborious task. A successful solution to the problem was found by the American Whitney. His *"Cotton Jin"* mechanised the removal of seeds from the raw cotton and greatly facilitated this task.

The use of machines in the cotton textile trade was soon picked by the other industries. The advantages of the division of labour and mechanisation were very quickly realised and put to use.

The *woolen industry* and the *silk industry* also employed many of the devices invented in the cotton textile industry.

Sewing was also mechanised with the invention of the Sweing machine.

Machine building industry

When machines were introduced in so many industries to such an extent, the need for machine building industry received considerable impetus. Moreover, the machines were now being worked constantly and with great speed. They now needed a machine building material that could withstand this kind of stress.

The iron was no longer capable of meeting the demands of the industry. Thus there was a need for a new and harder machine building material. It is in this context that the developments were made *in the ferrous metallurgy. Steel making was perfected now.* The credit for steel making goes to Bessember. However, the Bessember method of making steel could not make use of the Phosphorous iron ore which was available in England and France. So the second method of making steel was invented by Sir William Siemons and Martin. This came to be known as Siemens-Martin Process. With that the Phosphorous iron ores could be used for steel making. Moreover, Manganese was added to steel to give it greater ductability, Tongsten to give it hardness and Chromium to prevent from oxidising.

In the melting of iron, coal could not be used earlier. In the 18th century Darby first reduced coal to coke and then used it to melt iron. With this iron melting became easier and more efficient. This is the time when the *galvanising process was also invented so that iron could be free from rusting.*

Mechanical power

Once the machines were being used and machine building material was made more efficient there was a great need for running the machines with the help of the *mechanical power.*

The *Wind Mill* and the *Water Wheels* were cumbersome affairs. So there was a great need to have *better inorganic power sources.* It is in this context that we have to see the *development of Steam Engine by James Watt.* Once the steam engine was invented, it was put to various uses. Stevenson invented the *Locomotive* and Robert Fultion used steam to run a ship.

The next important industry in which improvements were made was the *Chemical industry.* By now the progress in Chemistry had gone on to such an extent that pure science was in a position to contribute to industry. It was the time when Henry Cavendish discovered the *chemical composition of water.* At the same time *Sulfuric acid,* and *Soda* were discovered. Thus the *industrial Chemistry* gained momentum.

Thus, all though, the finding of ways for making cloth by machines, the development of cheaper methods of making iron and steel, and the invention of the steam engine were the most crucial inventions in

bringing about the mechanisation of industry on a large scale which contributed to the technological revolution. In all phases of production, efforts were made to find ways for improving output while diminishing human effort.

Impact of the Industrial Revolution

The Industrial Revolution brought a series of changes in the method of manufacture, production and distribution and drastically affected the economic, social and political life of the people. It transformed an overwhelmingly agricultural society into an industrial society.

Economic impact

Earlier, guilds in d villages produced the requirements of the village.

- Traditional Guild system lost relevance with d advent of industries.
- "Specialised Labour" came up.
- capitalist class developed with d rise of industrial revolution.
- A large section of society, however, got alienated from d production process.
- Stiff competition b/w industrial world led 2 mad rush for colonies (more colonies v have, more raw material and bigger market v have)
- Industrial rev. responsible 4 colonial wars (2 world wars)

England dependent on US for cotton; both in turn dependent on Africa for slaves and raw mat. Japan dependent on West for technological know-how.

i. The Industrial Revolution paved the way for *factory system*. A variety of articles and goods began to be manufactured in large quantities in big factories.

The machines were made in various trades by the end of the 19th century. The machines were heavy enough to be housed in well-constructed and sometimes specially built establishments, which meant that they were actually concentrated in buildings that came to be *known as factories*. This concentration was made by the fact that *mechanised power* at first *water* and then *steam* could not be provided economically unless it worked many machines at once. And the use of power and the large *supplies of raw-materials* coming from overseas meant that the location of the plant had to be in hills where there was water, power or at places where the raw-materials could be brought by water and where coal could be delivered at low cost. Power driven machinery was most economical when machines were banked side by side and supervised by only few workers. This technical revolution in industry led to factory system.

ii. The major economic impact was *the quantity of goods produced had gone up enormously*. With the application of division of labour, use of machines and the factory system man was able to produce goods on such a scale never even imagined before. This gave *tremendous acceleration for the development of internal and international trade*. ECONOMIC INTERDEPENDENCE of nations

- power got transferred from feudal classes to d middle classes – d class responsible 4 innovation, new ideas, every revolution!

iii. Another important impact is that concentration of machinery in large factories meant that investors who could mobilise large amounts of money for equipment came to own the means of production. This is one of the hall marks of the *capital system. Infact with Industrial Revolution industrial capitalism or what is known as mature capitalism was born.*

- Changed d very def. of power. It established beyond doubt that power goes with "technology" and "progress" — established 1st in American Civil war

iv. The Industrial Revolution produced capitalist class and working class. The developments that occurred in the internal and international trade enabled the capitalist class to amass abnormal profits. The wages earned by the working class were not in tune with the profits secured by the capitalist class. Thus *Industrial Revolution paved the way for the unequal distribution of wealth.*

v. The third quarter of the 19th century witnessed certain changes. Firstly, U.S.A. Russia, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Italy and Japan were industrialised. Secondly, substantial advancements were made in the scientific and technological sectors. Thirdly, productive capacity of the industries was increased by leaps and bounds. Thus the industrial revolution reached its dazzling pinnacle. The resultant effect of it was that there occurred ruinous competition between the industrialised countries for raw-materials and markets.

They tried to establish colonies, protectorates and spheres of influences. This *economic imperialism not only created bad blood in between the industrialised countries but also paved the way for the outbreak of the First World War.*

vi. Industrial Revolution led to *international economic dependence.* The textile industries of Britain depended up on the steady supply of raw cotton from the U.S.A. and India. A urbanisation progressed in Britain and Europe. Less food was grown in these countries which became heavy importers of wheat, meat and tropical food products from Asia. South-East-Asia, etc. Europe exported manufactured goods in exchange for food.

vii. The Industrial Revolution had its *impact on agriculture also* as some of the inventions included agricultural machines, mechanical ploughs, cultivators, drill, thresher, etc; reduced the labour and time of the farmers and performed their work better.

viii. Along with industry, *baking, insurance, stock exchange markets and joint stock companies* had grown up and the monetisation of economy was complete.

Political impact

i. In the political field, the industrial capitalist class did not tolerate much of the state's interference in economic affair. They supported the policy *Laissaz faire.* It implies two things; i.e; unfettered relations between the seller and the buyer and between employer and employee.

new ideas came up — socialism, Communism... all was of result of Industrial revolution.

The industrial capitalists formed the very core of the middle class of Britain. They also championed the cause of the *BILL OF RIGHTS* with the *right to property and liberty* being given the highest importance. Though the capitalist needed central government, to see the business agreements are honoured, they tried to limit the powers of the state. *The growth of democratic government in the west European countries and particularly in England can be seen in this light.*

ii. As a result of the Industrial Revolution, *the military superiority of a country became dependent upon the extent of the industrialisation in that country.* Industrialised countries could alone produce modern military weapon. For example the Northern states succeeded in the American Civil War (1861 - 65) because they were more industrialised than the Southern states.

Impact on society (max^m. impact)

i. Industrial Revolution also brought changes in society. The feudal social relationship gave way to new social relationships under industrial capitalism. *Nobility lost its importance.*

• Villages lost their closed and self-sufficient nature. They get integrated into national economy.
• ~~Lour~~ Labour class migration led to erosion of traditional family system. (no more joint families)
• Urbanisation.
• Settlement of labour in urban areas led to "slums" — a new problem of society.
• Pollution • Psychological disorders — generation of a sense of social insecurity.

ii. The Industrial Revolution witnessed the birth of *industrial capitalist class and the working class.* On the other hand the vast majority of the people became wage earners and had to be on the move in search of work. They also had to live in the city lumps. Some of the people who could not adjust to the change and could not learn the new trades became distitudes.

In general the communality of the villages was broken and men became rootless. Moreover, inspite of the reduction in working hours man was now subject to the rigorous discipline of factory or office. Thus a price had to be paid for the progress in material advancement under industrialisation. However, many of these drawbacks have been

overcome in *the western societies with the growth of trade unionism and welfare statism.* States passed laws regulating the work in the industries and in general regulating the labour relations.

iii. Industrial Revolution also *encouraged scientific investigation.* The necessity of experts was felt as manufacturing techniques became more and more complex. *The profession of engineers became an integral part of the industrial society.*

iv. Nonetheless one aspect of the industrialisation that the world had not yet been over come is *the pollution problem* and *the rapid depletion of non-renewable environmental resources.* This is the major problem that the world is facing today.

Thus the industrial or technological revolution leading to factory system brought in its train both good and ill effects. The Socialist Movement was an attempt to remove the ill effects of the concentration of wealth while retaining the benefits of industrialisation. Thus efforts are still being made to remove the ill effects of the Industrial Revolution. The *concept of mixed economy* and the *democratic socialism* are efforts in that direction.

France.
↓
Jean Coulbert
Finance Minister
of Louis XIV (Bourbons dynasty)
- Glass industry, wine industry
- France acquired iron & steel rich Lorraine and Alcess from Germany.
- France, 1st to experience Ind. rev. in Europe.
- The French middle class "Hengoknots" led to d dev. of France

Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, Denmark

Cameralism — German process of industrialisation.
After its unification, and
- Italy took long for start of ind. rev. bcoz of instability.
- best known for Wine Industry
- effectively used its coal mines for industrialisation.

RUSSIA - d last to undergo industrial revolution in Europe.
- Peter • Catherine responsible.
- Technological know-how from France
- ship building

JAPAN -- d last to undergo industrial revolution.
• MEIJI RESTORATION

US = 18th century.
- Pittsburg and Philadelphia Univ. gave academic requirements for industrial revolution.
• England had d policy of discouraging ind. rev. etc

- Literature for industrialisation translated into Japanese lang.
- Japanese students went to US univ. to learn technical know how.
- Cooperative Societies.
- MNCs developed in Japan.

• Ship building industry
• heavy mechanics industry
• Wine • Glass • paper making

First World War
(1914 - 1919)

The greatest event that witnessed the first quarter of the 20th century was the First World War. In nature and character it sharply deviates from the previous wars.

Firstly, it was *a complete war.* It was fought on the land, in the air and over the seas.

Secondly, it was *fought in different countries* distributed throughout the length and breadth of the world.

Thirdly, *almost all the countries of the world,* either directly or indirectly experienced vibrations of the war.

Bismarck and the secret diplomatic military alliances

The *Prussio - Danish war,* the *Austro-Prussian war,* the *Franco-Prussian war* and the *Treaty of Frankfurt of 1871* saw the unification of Germany and the emergence of the German empire. Bismarck followed generous policy towards Austria after the Austro-Prussian war. But his attitude towards France was rather stiff. After the French defeat at Sedenin 1870, Bismark refused to give easy terms to France and after a long siege of Paris, he imposed a very humiliating treaty on France. The terms of the treaty are as follows.

i. France was asked to pay a very heavy war indemnity of five million francs.

ii. France was asked to give up her right over Alssace and part of Lorraine. Lorraine was French in blood, speech and sentiment. The German annexation of these territories was described as snatching away of children from the breast of the mother. Thus *the people of France stood for the war of revenge.*

Bismarck knew fully well the sentiments of the French men and therefore to safeguard Germany *he decided to quarrantine France or to put her in cold storage.* The main object of the foreign policy of Bismarck *was to isolate France diplomatically* so that she may not be able to get an ally with whose help she may try to get back Alssace and Lorraine. To realise this object he maintained friendly relations with Russia, Austria, Italy and England.

In 1873 Bismarck set up the *"Three Emperor's League".* By means of this he was able to bring together Austria, Russia and Germany. It was not a treaty of alliance but it indicated cordial relations between these powers. *It emphasised the common interests of the three emperors.* It also implied that Austria had forgotten her humiliation in the battle of Sadowa, and was prepared to accept expulsion from the German territories. However, Bismarck's ultimate aim was to secure a military alliance with Austria

and Russia to weaken France. But his hopes were dashed to the ground. During the war scare of 1875, Russia informed Germany frankly she would not depend upon her neutrality in the event of a German attack on France. This showed that Bismarck could not depend upon Russia and ultimately he decided to cultivate intimate relations with Austria. The *Three Emperor's League* completely broken up in 1878. In the *Congress of Berlin of 1878* Bismarck gave an opportunity for Austria to dominate some provinces in the Balkan peninsula and the same was denied to Russia. Thus Germany finally concluded a diplomatic military alliance with Austria and this was called as the *Austro-German Alliance* or the *Dual Alliance.*

In 1882 Bismarck entered into *Triple Alliance* with Italy and Austria. It is pointed out that Bismarck encouraged France to capture Tunis which was desired by Italy. The object was to create one more enemy to France and also win over that enemy (Italy) to his side. When France established her protectorate over Tunis in 1881, Italy decided to join the Austro-German Alliance. Thus the *Triple Alliance* was the work of Bismarck to weaken France.

As long as Bismarck was in power France and Russia had not been able to come together. However, after the dismissal of Bismarck in 1890, Germany did not care for Russia and consequently Russia leaned towards France. In 1894, *Franco-Russian Alliance* was concluded and it was purely a military alliance. This state of affairs continued for some time.

England had followed the policy of splendid isolation in the 19th century. Now she thought of her position very keenly. She began to fear the consequences of being alone in the world. In the first instance she tried to enter into an alliance with Germany. But failed. Then she entered into an alliance with Japan in 1902 - *Anglo - Japanese Alliance.* England did this with the intention of safeguarding her position in the Far East.

friendly understanding (lecture 51

In 1904 England and France entered into a treaty known as *Entente Cordiale.* This alliance gave England a free hand in Egypt.

In 1907 England signed *Anglo-Russian Convention* with Russia, there came into existence what is known as the *Triple Entente.* (Entente cordiale)

Germany in the meanwhile won over to her side Turkey, an important country located in the eastern part of Europe.

Thus the Europe was divided into two war camps. In one camp were England, France, Russia and Japan. In the other camp were Germany, Austria, Turkey and Italy. There was not only jealousy but also enemity between these war camps. It was the mutual hatred created by the system of secret diplomatic military alliances which ultimately brought out the war of 1914.

Economic imperialism

England, France and Holland first experienced industrialisation. By the end of the 19th century Germany and Italy emerged as independent nations and immediately started competing with the other industrialised countries. This period also witnessed substantial developments in the scientific and technological sectors. The production was accelerated by leaps and bounds. Thus these industrialised countries tried to possess colonies for the supply of raw-materials and to serve the purpose of markets in every nook and corner of the world. That led to bitterness and rivalries. The efforts to establish colonies, Protectorates and spheres of influences in various parts of the world also resulted in bad blood among nations. When Germany tried to capture markets which were already under the control of Britain, that led to bitterness between the two countries. Britain was not prepared to give up her colonies, protectorates, sphere of influences and markets to satisfy the economic hunger of Germany.

Another important factor that fanned the flames of rivalry and enimity was *tariff restrictions.* Every country preferred exports but not imports. Thus there were *tariff wars* between the various countries. It resulted in the worsening of the relations between the nations.

Militarism

In the later part of the 19th century and in the beginning of the 20th century most of the powerful countries in Europe started building up powerful standing armies, elaborate espionage system, strong navies and a powerful class of military and naval officers headed by General Staff. Much of the national wealth was spent to increase the strength and power.

These powerful armaments were alleged to be for defence and in the interest of peace. They actually created a *sense of universal fear, suspicion, mistrust and hatred in between the nations.* This is amply attested by the naval competition between England and Germany. For every ship built by Germany, two ships were built by England. Such a race in building powerful and dangerous weapons could end only in a war. Moreover, militarism put too much of power in the hands of the General Staff. *Under these circumstances preserving peace was a precarious proposition.*

Lack of machinary to control international relations

There was confusion and anarchy in the international relations of the nations. Everything was kept as secret and nothing was known about them to the people. It was found that the secrets of diplomacy were not even known to all the members of the same ministry. Even the legislatures were kept completely in the dark with regard to international commitments. For example although Sir Edward Grey allowed in January 1906 the holding of naval and military conversations between France and England the Cabinet came to know of them in 1912 and the Parliament was informed of the same in 1914.

Secret diplomacy created a lot of confusion in the minds of people. Hysteria took the place of sobriety and sincerity. Forgery, theft, lying, bribery and corruption existed in every foreign office and Chancellory throughout Europe.

Although there was a *"code of international law and morality"* there was no power to enforce the same. Many resolutions were passed in the international conferences. The *states followed these resolutions more in breaching rather than in honouring*. Every state considered it to be sovereign and did not regard itself to be bound by its international commitments. Although Italy was as member of *Triple Alliance,* she entered into separate agreements with France in 1902 and Russia in 1909. She was prepared to have an extra dance with the members of the opposite camp. *Thus the lack of international machinery and the refusal to accord recognition to the international law and morality created tensions and bitter feelings amongst nations.*

Excessive or narrow nationalism

The excessive or narrow nationalism and competitive patriotism fanned the flames of hatred, enimity and bitterness amongst nations. *The love of one's country demanded the hatred of another.* Love of Germany demanded the hatred of France and vice versa.

Italy and Germany after unification started the policy of expansion at the expense of the national sentiments of others.

It was the *intense nationalism in Serbia* which created bitterness between Serbia and Austria-Hungary. This was also responsible for the murder of Arch Duke Francis Ferdinand in 1914. Thus the intense or excessive nationalism roused ill feelings between the countries of Europe which in its turn paved the way for the outbreak of the First World War.

Alssace-Lorraine question

The Franco-Prussian war and the treaty of Frankfurt enabled Germany to occupy Alssace and a part of Lorraine. The government of the Third Republic in France left no stone unturned to keep alive the spirit of revenge and the hope of recovery of Alssace and Lorraine.

There was also *economic motive* for getting back the Alssace and Lorraine. The iron deposits are found in abundance in these regions. The iron and steel magnates of France felt that their industries were paralised on account of the loss of Alssace and Lorraine. There was also a feeling among the French that the industrial prosperity of Germany was due to the iron mines of Lorraine. The Frenchmen must have burnt their blood when they found that the same in the hands of their enemies.

It is pointed out that if Germany had not interfered in *Morocco,* Frenchmen might have found some alternative material compensation for the loss of Alssace and Lorraine and forgotten their revenge against Germany. *But the German interference in the affairs of Morocco added to the betterness between the two countries.* It appeared more or less like adding fuel to the fire.

Pan-Germanism

Germans believed that *"He who succeeds is never in the wrong"*. In other words the end justifies the means. Victory was identified with morality. The Prussians were tought that the war was the most logical thing in the world. According to Mirabeau, *"War is the national industry of Prussia"*.

Germans believed in *Pan-Germanism.* They think that the Germans' were born to rule but not to be ruled over by others. Thus the younger generation of Germany was indoctrinated with such practical philosophy. The eminent German historians like Droyden, Sybel and others devoted their energy in spreading the gospel of pan-Germanism.

The character of William II, the German emperor, further fanned the Prussian spirit. *He was very arrogant and haughty.* He wanted to make Germany as the strongest power in the world. He believed in the policy of *"World power or down fall"*. He was not prepared for any compromise in the international affairs. Further, he had formed a poor opinion of the English character. It was a misunderstanding of the British character by Williams II that was responsible for his attitude towards England and that mistake proved to be his undoing.

Near Eastern problem and the Bosnian crisis

The Balkan problem provided the required situation for the outbreak of the war. Many factors complicated the situation in the Balkans. The tyrannical and the despotic rule of the Turkish sultan resulted in discontentment. Second, there was a rivalry between the Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria for the control of Macedonia. Third, Russia was trying her best to establish her sphere of influence in the Balkan peninsula. Finally, Austria, like Russia, showed very keen interest in the Balkan politics.

The *Congress of Berlin of 1878* empowered Austria to occupy and to administer Bosnia and Herzgovina. Though Austria was not permitted to annex these provinces, she annexed the provinces in 1908 by her unilaternal action. A strong agitation was started in Serbia to separate these provinces from Austria and unite them with Serbia. *It should be noted here that the people of Bosnia and Herzgovina were more anxious for their independence from Austria than for their union with Serbia.* However, they were willing to accept help from Serbia in their efforts to become independent.

The rivalry between Austria and Serbia became intense in the Balkans. Many secret societies had been setup to bring about the union of all the Slaves. The *"Black Hand"* or *"Union of Death"* society was the most powerful one. The seal of the society showed, a skull and cross bones, a dagger, a bomb and a

bottle of poison. The society came to know that Arch Duke Francis Ferdinand was coming to Bosnia to act as its governor. Serbian government supplied the required arms to this society. According to the plan, the Arch Duke and his wife paid a visit to Sarajevo the capital city of Bosnia on 28th June 1914. At that time one of the members of the society of *"Black Hand"* fired two shots at point blank range and as a result the Arch Duke and his wife were killed.

Austria decided to take the advantage of the situation to crush Serbia. Serbia was immediately supported by Russia. At this stage Austria was supported by Germany. *Before this, Great Britain and Germany tried to localise the war, but it was soon found that matters had gone out of their hands, because France supported Russia.* When Russia ordered general mobilisation on 23rd July 1914, Germany sent an ultimatum demanding demobilisation with in 12 hours. As Russia refused to accept that ultimatum Germany declared war on Russia. Thus started the First World War.

The war was fought between the Central Powers and the Allies. The Central Powers were Germany, Austria, Turkey and Bulgaria. The Allies were Russia (left the Allied camp in 1917), France, Britain, Italy (joined in 1915), Japan, Rumenia and U.S.A. (1917). Ultimately the Central powers were defeated.

Causes for the defeat of the Central Powers

i. Allied sea power was decisive, enforcing the deadly blockade which caused desperate food shortage, while keeping the Allied armies fully supplied.

ii. The German submarine campaign failed in the face of convoys protected by the British, American and Japanese destroyers. The German campaign itself was a mistake because it brought America into the war.

iii. The entry of America into the war brought vast resources to the Allies. It literally changed the very course of war in favour of the Allies.

iv. The Allied political leaders were more competent than the leaders of the Central Powers. Loyad George and Clemenceau were the most outstanding Allied leaders.

v. The continuous strain of heavy losses was telling on the Germans. They lost their best troops in the 1918 offensive and the new troops were young and inexperienced.

vi. The Germany had to defend herself and at the same time she had to help Austrians and Bulgarians. Thus Germany was badly let down by her allies. The defeat of Bulgaria by the British and Serbia was the final straw for many German soldiers, who could see no chance of victory afterwards. When Austria was defeated by Italy and Turkey surrendered, the end of the First World War came.

PEACE SETTLEMENT

The termination of the war was followed by a peace conference. It was soon obvious that a settlement would be difficult because of the different views expressed by the Allied powers regarding the treatment expected to be given to the defeated powers.

France (represented by Clemenceau) *wanted a harsh peace to ruin Germany economically and militarily* so that she could never again threaten France.

Britain (represented by Lyod Geoge) *was in favour of a less severe settlement* enabling Germany to recover quickly so that she could resume her role as a major customer for British goods.

U.S.A. (represented by Woodrow Wilson) proposed the *famous Fourteen points* to guide the peace settlement. Some of them are as follows.

i. Abolishion of secret diplomacy.

ii. Free navigation at sea for all nations in times of war and peace.

iii. Removal of economic barriers between the states.

iv. Reduction of armaments.

v. Impartial adjustment of colonial claims in the interests of the population concerned.

vi. Implementation of *the principle of national self-determination.*

The rest of the points deals with the territorial adjustments.

Treaty of Versailles with Germany

The Germans submitted to the ultimate peace based on the Wilsonian Fourteen Points. But the German delegates who came to Paris to participate in the peace settlement were humiliated. They were kept in a hotel behind barbed wires. Guard of honour given to the other delegates was withdrawn to them. They were treated like prisoners during their stay in Paris. When the German delegates left Paris for Versailles where the ceremony of signing the treaty was to be held in the Hall of Mirrors, the Parisian mob threw stones and rotten eggs at them and also hurled abuses on them. It was in these circumstances that the German delegates signed the treaty of Versailles on 20th June 1919.

Provisions of the treaty

i. Germany had given Allssace-Lorraine to France. Eupen and Malmedy to Belgium. Memel to Lithunia and a large part of Posen and western Prussia to Poland. Germany was also forced to give up her right over Upper Siletia and the southern part of east Prussia to Poland.

ii. Danzig was taken away from Germany and setup as a free city under the League of Nations. Poland was given special rights in the city of Danzig. Thus the *"Polish corridor"* was created.

iii. *Germany had to give up her right over the coal mines of the Saar valley.* The Saar Valley was put under the League of Nations for 15 years and then a plebiscite was held to decide as to whether the Saar valley was to remain under the League of Nations or go to Germany or France.

iv. The *Rhineland was demilitarised.* Germany was forbidden to maintain or construct any fortifications on either side of the Rhine river. The existing fortifications were to be destroyed.

v. Germany was forced to give up all *her rights and titles over her overseas possessions.* Japan got the lease of Kia-Chow and other German concessions in the province of Shantung.

New Zealand got the German part of the island of Somoa

England got the German West Africa.

England and France divided among themselves the Kamaroons and Togoland.

vi. The complete independence and full sovereignty of *Belgium, Poland* and *Czechoslovakia* were recognised by Germany. She also agreed to cancel the treaties of Brest-Litovsk and Bucharest.

vii. *Germany gave up her special rights and privileges in China, Egypt, Thailand, Morocco and Liberia.* The Allies also reserved to themselves the right to retain or liquidate all property, rights and interests of the German nationals or companies abroad and the German government was required to pay compensation to them. The property and the concessions enjoyed by Germany in Bulgaria and Turkey were forfeited.

viii. An attempt was made to cripple once for all *the military strength* of Germany.

(a) The German General Staff was abolished.

(b) The total strength of the German army was fixed at one lakh. That army was to be used only for the maintenance of law and order and to protect her frontiers.

(c) The police force was to be increased only in proportion to the increase of population.

(d) Restrictions were placed on the manufacture of armaments, munitions and the other war materials by the Germany. Both the import and export of war materials was banned.

(e) The Germany navy also met with a step-motherly treatment. Germany was allowed to have 6 battle-ships, 6 light cruisors, 12 destroyers and 12 torpedo boats. No submarines were to be allowed.

(f) Germany was allowed neither to make nor purchase from outside tanks, armoured cars and poison gasses.

ix. William II, the German emperor, was charged with "the supreme offence against international morality and the sanctity of treaties". He was to be tried by a tribunal. This provision became infructuous, because the government of the Netherlands (Holland) refused to handover the German emperor to the Allies. *Germany was forced to admit that she was responsible for the war.*

x. The *German rivers, Elbe, Oder, Danube and Niemen were internationalised.* The river Rhine was put under the control of an international commission.

xi. Germany was required to *return the trophies, works of art and flags taken from France* after the Franco-Priussian war.

xii. Germany was to *pay reparations for the damage done to the Allies.* After much argument and haggling the amount was fixed at £ 6,600 million. The Germans protested against this huge amount, and they soon began to default on their installments. This caused resentment among the Allies who were relying on German cash to pay their own war debts to the U.S.A. Eventually the Allies admitted their own mistake and reduced the amount to £ 2,000 millions.

xiii. *Provision was also made for the enforcement of the above terms of the treaty.* The German territory to the west of Rhine was to be occupied by the Allied troops for a period of fifteen years. If Germany carried out her obligations faithfully the Allied troops had to be evacuated after five years. If Germany misbehaved, the occupation was liable to be extended.

The end of the First World War also saw the conclusion of three more treaties and they are as follows.

Treaty of St. Germaine (1919)

This was concluded between the Allies and the Austria-Hungary.

i. *Hungary was cut off from Austria* and the latter was made to recognise the independence of the former.

ii. Bohemia and Moravia were taken away from Austria and were formed the part of a new state by name *Czechoslovakia.*

iii. Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzgovina were given to Serbia. Montenegro was later on added to Serbia. Thus the new state of *Yugoslavia* was formed.

Treaty of Trianon (1920)

This treaty was concluded between the Allies and Hungary.

Hungary gave up non-Magyar regions. While *Slavak provinces* were given to *Czechoslovakia, Transylvania to Rumania* and *Crotia was given to Yugoslavakia.*

Treaty of Neuilly (1919)

This treaty was concluded between the Allies and Bulgaria. According to this treaty Bulgaria gave up most of those territories which she had got during the Balkan wars of 1912 - 13 and the First World War.

i. Bulgaria gave up *Macedonia to Yugoslavakia.*

ii. The whole of *Dobrudja to Rumania.*

iii. She gave the *Thracian coast* to the Allies and the latter gave it to *Greece.*

Treaty of Severes (1920)

Turkey had fought on the side of the Central powers and she too was defeated along with them. The treaty of Severes was signed between Turkey and the Allies.

i. The *Arab state of Hedjaz* was freed from the control of Turkey.

ii. *Armenia* was made into a *Christian Republic* and she was put under an international guarantee.

iii. *Mesopotomia, Trans-Jordan, Syriya and Palestine* were taken away from Turkey. Syriya was given to France under the mandate of the League of Nations.

Mesopotomia, Palestine and Trans-Jordan were given to England under the Mandate system.

Provision was made for the mandate system under the League of Nations. The territories captured from the Central Powers and Turkey were not to be restored to them and were also not to be given to any victorious country for annexation. The administration of these conquered territories were entrusted to various powers under the supervision of the League of Nations.

iv. *Galitia* was recognised as a *French sphere of influence and southern Anatolia* as an *Italian sphere of influence.*

v. *Adrianopli, Gallipoli, Smyrna, Dodecabese islands etc.* were given to Greece.

vi. The straits of *Dardenalles and Bosphorous were internationalised.*

Critical analysis of the Treaty of Versailles

This treaty, as stated earlier, was concluded between the Allies and Germany The Germans had expected the peace terms to be based on the Fourteen Points of Woodro Wilson. *But they were cheated.*

The peace settlement was a *"Carthagian Peace"*. It was immeasurably harsh and humiliating. It was based on the principle : *"To the victor belong the spoils and the Allies are the victors"*.

The treaty of Versailles was imposed on the people of Germany. *It was a dictated peace.* The Germans were not in a mood to accept the treaty, but it was only when they were threatened with the invasion of their country they surrendered and signed the treaty. Even then the German representatives maintained that they signed the treaty under coercion and justice was on their side. Obviously the treaty of Versailles was signed at the point of bayonet. It had absolutely no moral backing. Thus the treaty was torn to pieces by Hitler at a later time.

The peace settlement was made in a spirit of revenge. The peace makers ought to have remembered that kind treatment of Germany was more likely to maintain peace in Europe than the punishment of the German people.

The Allies not only scored victory over Germany but also converted it as a Republic. The victors should have treated the Germans kindly and accorded the required strength and support to the Republic. As they did not do so, the Republican forces in Germany were weakened from the very beginning. It may be stated here that the harsh treatment given to Germany by the peace settlement of Paris and the subsequent behaviour of the Allies, particularly France towards her, destroyed all chances of the Republican regime in Germany. *If the bad treatment of France by Bismarck in 1870-71 led to the war of 1914, the treaty of Versailles of 1919 was partly responsible for the war of 1939. Thus the peace settlement of 1919-20 had in itself the germs of Second World War.*

The creation of "*Polish Carridor*" was a great political blunder committed by the Allies. The grant of *carridor to Poland* through Germany divided Germany into two parts. This act created bitter resentment amongst Germans. It is this thoughtless act of the Allies which made Hitler, at a later time, to create the *"the Polish Crisis"* which is the sign and signal for the outbreak of the Second World War.

The peace makers also *could not realise the importance of the Italian contribution in the war.* Thus Italy was very much disappointed at the peace settlement. There are many causes for the same.

i. Orlando, the representative of Italy, was completely ignored by Clemenceau of France and Lyod George, the Prime Minister of England.

ii. Very big and tempting promises and assurances were given to Italy in 1915 and hence she deserted the Central Powers and joined the Allies. She had lost millions of soldiers and lost millions of dollars during the course of the war. After the end of the war Italy was given merely Trentino, southern Tyrol and a part of Dalmatia. She got very little as compared with what was secured by Great Britain, France and Japan.

iii. The Italian patriots were upset when they *got no colonial possessions.* Further, *they were upset when they were not given the whole of Tyrol and Fiume which were inhabited by the Italian speaking people.*

Defects in the execution of the disarmament policy

It is also pointed out that when Germany was disarmed, it was intended to take similar action with regard to other powers as well. However, the other powers, except England, remained armed. As they refused to limit their armaments, a feeling was created that they were preparing for another conflict in the future. This led to a competition in armaments which ultimately resulted in the war of 1939.

Treatment given to the allies of Germany, viz; - Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey

Austria was reduced to a tiny state. Her empire, dynasty and army disappeared in the whirlwind. She had lost much of her territory. Her population was reduced from 21 million to 7.5 million. Her industrial wealth lost to Czechoslovakia and Poland. Vienna, once the capital of the Hapsburg empire, was left high and dry surrounded by farming land which could hardly support her,

Hungary was forced to give up the non-Magyar populated regions. She had lost Slavok provinces, Transylvania and Crotia to Czechoslovakia, Rumania and Yugoslavia.

Bulgaria was also hard pressed by the Allies. She had lost Macedonia to Yugoslavia and Dobrudja to Rumania. Her army was reduced and forced to pay huge war indemnity.

The treaty of Severes gave a death blow to the Ottoman Turkish empire. She had lost her control over Asia Minor. Most of her territories in the Balkan peninsula were offered to Greece. This was treated by the Turks as a national humiliation and ultimately paved the way for *the rise of Mustafa Kamal Pashas and the emergence of modern Turkey.*

The treaty of Severes and the principle of national self-determination gave impetus for the development of *Arab nationalism, Jewish Zionism* and *British imperialism.*

Principle of National self-determination

It has been advocated that the principle of national self-determination received due recognition in the peace settlement. More people were placed under governments of their own nationality than ever before in Europe. *Poland, Yugoslavia* and *Czechoslovakia* were created on the basis of this principle. In this connection we have to consider certain anomalies and some of them are as follows.

i. *Three million Germans were placed in Czechoslovakia* (in the Sudetenland) *and a million in Poland.* It was done with the view that these new states needed them to be economically viable. It was unfortunate that both these instances gave Hitler an excuse to begin territorial demands on these countries.

ii. According to the treaty of Trianon Hungary lost Transylvania and Crotia to Rumania and Serbia. *As a result six lakhs of men and women of Magyar race were put under alien domination.*

iii. The *attempt of France to get Rhine frontier* and of *Italy to get Dalmatia* could not be justified on the grounds of nationality.

iv. The authors of the peace settlement were condemned for their attitude towards *Armenian Christians.* These people had suffered terribly under the Turkish yoke and there were wholesale massacres from time to time. During the war, Britain declared that the Armenians would be liberated from the Turkish domination. However, when the final settlement was made with Turkey at Lousanne the promise was not kept. The unfortunate Armenians were left at the mercy of the Turks and had to suffer immensely later on.

In conclusion we may state that this collection of peace treaties was not a conspicuous success. It had the unfortunate effect of dividing Europe into the states. Some wanted to revise the settlement and the others desired to preserve it. Prof. Seaman points out :

> *"The real weakness of the Versailles system, however, lies not in the creation of small states to the east and south of the Germans but in the absence of any effective means of maintaining and defending their existence".*

The peace conference was guided by much the same considerations as the Congress of Vienna of 1815. These considerations were the desire to safeguard the peace of Europe and the transfer of the territories to the victorious powers and their allies.

The Peace of Paris based its *guarantees for the future on the principle of nationality,* while the *Congress of Vienna had based it on the principle of balance of power.* In both the cases, the principle was carried out at the expense of the defeated nations and in favour of the victorious ones.

It should be noted here that U.S.A. failed to ratify the settlement and refused to join the League of Nations. This left France completely disenhanted with the whole thing because the Anglo-American guarantee of her frontiers could not now apply. Italy felt cheated because she had not received the full territory promised to her in 1915. Russia was ignored. All this tended to sabotage the settlement from the beginning, and it became increasingly difficult to apply the terms fully. These accumulated defects reached its cumulative point when the Second World War broke out in 1939.

✧ ✧ ✧

The Second World War

The Second World War was another catastrophic event that occurred in the 20th century. Twenty years after the treaty of Versailles the Second World War broke out. Like the First World War this also brought immesurable loss of life, destruction and revolutionary changes in the international politics.

The German Nazism, Italian Fascism, Japanese militarism, lack of cooperation and understanding among the Allied powers, economic needs and material interests of the European powers, failure of the policy of disarmament, ideological differences between the democratic and dictatorship countries, etc; were some of the factors that were responsible for the out break of the Second World War.

Nazism in Germany

Circumstances that paved the way for the rise of Nazism

Germany witnessed in 1919 the birth of Nazism as a political movement. Its original name was *"National Socialist German Worker's Party"*. In course of time it not only became popular but also came to be known as Nazi party. Several factors paved the way for the birth and rise of Nazism in Garment.

1. The Treaty of Versilles

The treaty of Versailles had in itself the germs of Nazism. Germany was very badly humiliated by the treaty. She was forced to sign the treaty at the point of bayonet and the *treaty itself was based on the spirit of revenge.*

Germany was deprived of her *colonies and concessions abroad.* She was cut into two parts by the *creation of the Polish corridor.* Her navy was completely destroyed and army was reduced to an insignificant position. She had lost her coal and steel resources. Her soil was occupied by the foreign troops to enforce the provisions of the treaty. The French occupation of the *Ruhr valley* added insult to injury. This humiliating treatment given to the Germany provided a psychological background for the birth of Nazism.

2. Contribution of the Allies

The lack of foresight on the part of the Allies provided suitable situation for the birth of German National Socialist Party (Nazi party).

The first mistake that was committed by the Allies was that the Germany was asked to *"accept the war guilt"*. It was a blunder to incorporate such a clause in the treaty. *It brought no material advantage to the victors, but it created bitter resentment amongst Germans.*

Secondly, after the surrender of Germany, the Allies converted Germany as a Republic, and Ebert was made its President. This is another blunder. Firstly, the *Germany had traditions of autocracy and the Germans were not democratic at heart.* Secondly, if the Allied statesmen desired the establishment of the

democratic traditions in Germany, *they ought to have treated her leniently* in 1919. It is rightly maintained that the victorious Allies did not show much wisdom when they imposed very severe terms on the new Republican regime of Germany. The harshness of the terms of the treaty, particularly the payment of heavy reparations, the maintenance of foreign troops and the problems arose afterwards weakened the foundations of the newly born democracy in Germany.

Further, the Allies with the intention of checking the rise of Germany created new states like Rumania. Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia to the east and south of Germany. But the Allies did not show any interest in making these states powerful by offering financial and military assistance.

Thus all these blunders committed by the Allies not only strengthened the Nazis but also paved the way for the rise of Hitler.

3. The Economic depression of 1929-30

The economic depression had its impact on Germany. International trade received a check. Industries were paralysed. Unemployment became acute. The enormous expenses of the war, the payment of reparations and the maintenance of foreign troops had a devastating effect on the Weimer Republic. Further, a large amount of paper currency, with out gold reserves, was printed and this process was continued. Germany was under the firm grip of inflation. Thus Weimer Republic was in a sea of troubles and it was too weak to solve these problems. Further, the communists and the independent Socialists were trying to overthrow the Republic. It was under these circumstances the Nazism under the leadership of Hitler started gaining ground.

Mention may be made in this connection that at this time the Germans cared more for a party which would give them security, safety and glory. They were sick of treachery and cowardice of the Republican politics who had brought the country to ruin. *The Nazi party looked like a Manna from heaven to the Germans.*

4. The German thinkers.

The German thinkers like Hegel, Nietzsche and Tietsche promoted the authoritarian and totalitarian traditions. Hegel held the view that the *"State was the march of God on earth"*. Thus the individual exists for the sake of the state and not vice-versa. Nietzsche advocated the concept of *"Super Man"* and said that everything within the state should be subordinated to him. The Germans were very much influenced by the theories of these German thinkers and formulated their own ideas of state.

5. The personality of Hitler

Another important factor for the rise of Nazism was the personality of Hitler. Further, the clever use of the mass media by the Nazis for the propaganda purposes also had its impact on the Germans.

Hitler was a great politician and orator. Gifted by demonic dynamism and possessing mesmeric powers, he swayed the millions of frustrated Germans, and gave the impression of rescuing Germany from the despair into which she had sunk after the treaty of Versailles.

Characteristics of Nazism

i. *Extreme nationalism* was one of the characteristics of Nazism. It may be equated with Italian Fascism and Japanese militarism.

ii. *It was anti-democratic in nature.* The Nazi Germany suppressed all forms of democratic forms by the application of repressive measures.

iii. *Anti-individualism* was another characteristic of Nazism. The Nazis believed that individual exists for the sake of the state and not the state exists to cater the needs of the individuals.

iv. Nazism was also marked by *anti-communism.* The Nazis in the beginning adopted friendly posture towards the communists of Germany and the Soviet Union only with the intention of consolidating their position against the Social Democrats. In the next stage they not only persecuted the Communists in Germany but also joined *Anti-Commintern Pact* with Japan and Italy in 1936-37.

v. Nazism was for *anti-peace.* The economic crisis of 1929-30 enabled the Nazis to capture power in Germany. The Nazis thought that they would remain in power only through perpetuating that crisis. In fact Germany, between 1933-36, recovered from the economic crisis. But it was necessary for the Nazis to create some other crisis in order to remain in power. Thus Hitler through his foreign policy created an artificial crisis not only enabled Hitler to occupy the neighbouring countries but also paved the way for the out break of the Second World War.

vi. Nazism was *pro-capitalist* in nature.

vii. *Anti-Semitism* was the other characteristic of Nazism. This was responsible for developing hatred towards the Jews. The Nazis believed that the economic domination of Germany by the Jews was responsible for the economic hardships faced by the Germans. Most of the Jews in Germany were the money-lenders and bankers. This anti-Semitic character of Nazism explains not only the persecution of Jews in Germany and Europe but also responsible for the development of racial superiority by the Germans.

The rise of Hitler and his Foreign policy

Hitler and the Nazi party offered what seemed to be an attractive alternative just when the Republic was at its most incapable stage. It should be noted here that the latter day economic crisis also fostered the rise of Hitler and Nazis. Hitler offered the following to the Germans to get their support to Nazi party.

i. He offered to the Germans, *national unity, safety, security and glory.*

ii. Creation of *Greater Germany.* This would include bringing all Germans (in Austria, Czechoslovakia and Poland) back into the Reich.

iii. Hitler and the Nazis promised to *overthrow the Versalles Ssettlement,* so unpopular with the most of the Germans.

iv. The Nazi army created by Hitler attracted the young people who were out of work. They were given wages and uniform. Thus the *unemployment problems was solved to some extent.*

v. Hitler and the Nazis attracted the *wealthy landowners* and *industrialists.* They encouraged the Nazis because they feared a communist revolution. The Nazis were financed by the landowners, industrialists and anti-communist forces.

The progress of the Nazis in capturing power was gradual. The Nazis secured 32 seats in 1924, 107 in 1930 and 230 in 1932. Early in 1933 Hitler became the Chancellor of Germany. On the death of Hindenbarg in 1934, he got himself elected as the President of Germany and thus combined in himself the office of the chancellor and president. He abrogated the Weimer Constitution and himself became the dictator of Germany.

Foreign policy

Hitler from 1933 until his death was supreme in Germany. The first half of this period was spent in preparation for war and the war itself occupied the second half.

Hitler's policy towards the countries of South and East of Germany

The rise of Hitler to power shocked the people and the rulers of Europe who had not forgotten his utterenced from time to time. *The real objective of his foreign policy lay in the south and east of Europe.* It was there that the German nationalism hoped to fulfil her objectives.

It was felt that *the Germany had a growing population* and it was only the south and eastern part of Europe would give her more space to accommodate her population.

It has also been maintained that region was *economically complementary to Germany.* It was rich in coal, oil and wheat which Germany required for her development. While *Austria had coal,* she did not produce grain. *Hungary had grains,* but not factories. *Rumania had ores and oil* but she had no markets. The best results could be achieved only after one political power was established in the whole region and that role was intended to be played by Germany under Hitler.

Hitler from the beginning followed the policy of caution. He declared in unequivocal terms that Germany was determined to follow a policy of peace. *He did this to avoid the unity among the Germany enimies and to consolidate his position in Germany. In 1934 he entered into a Non-Aggression Pact with Poland for 10 years.* This he did to show to the world that Germany was really interested in peace.

If Germany wanted to advance southwards, she must make peace with her eastern neighbour, Poland. Polish friendship was purchased by giving her a guarantee of peace for 10 years. Hitler thought that he could not win the Soviet Union on account of his persecution of communists and the Jews. Austria, was also hostile as she feared her own security from the Nazis. Czechoslovakia was considered to be too small to be bothered about. Hence Hitler decided to enter into a friendly pact with Poland. Poland also had her own reasons to join the pact. *The German minorities had proved too much of an headache for her.* Hence she felt that the treaty with Germany would silence the German minorities and would be safe from the perpetual nuisance. However, it was a stop-gap arrangement as for as Germany was concerned. As a matter of fact, the Second World War started on the question of Poland.

interest

Hitler's in Austria

Hitler showed interest in the Austrian affairs. He was an Austrian by birth and that partly explains his interest in the affairs of Austria. The Austrians were also Germans. But the Allies, in the treaty of Versailless, kept it separate from Germany with the intention of weakening it. In otherwards a powerful Germany would be a source of menace to the peace and security of Europe. However, Germany would like to annex Austria and with that object in view, Hitler encouraged the Nazi agitators in Austria to capture the government. At this time England, France and Italy not only showed interest in Austria but also determined to maintain the independence of Austria. Hence the Nazi agitation failed in Austria. When it failed, Hitler declared that he had absolutely no hand in the whole affair.

His attitude towards Saar Valley

After the failure in the affair of Austria, the Nazis and Hitler turned their attention towards Saar. The treaty of Versailles empowered France to occupy and exploit Saar for 15 years. However, it was provided that after the lapse of that period, a plebiscite would be held with a view to allow the people of the

Saar to decide for themselves, whether they would like to go back to Germany or not. Such a plebiscite was arranged in 1935 and in it the people expressed their will to join Germany. This recovery of the Saar valley added to the resources of Germany. It also revealed the effectiveness of the Nazi techniques of propaganda.

Violation of the military clauses of the treaty of Versailless

The recovery of the Saar region made Hitler and the Nazis assertive and also aggressive. Hitler declared that Germany was not bound by the military clauses of the treaty of Versailles and as a consequence the peace strength of Germany army was increased to 5 1/2 lakhs of soldiers. The German army was increased by the *application of the policy of conscription* which was also against the provisions of the treaty of Versailles.

Naval Agreement with England

In 1935 Hitler entered into a *Naval Agreement with Great Britain* by which Germany agreed to limit the size of her navy to 35% of the strength of the British navy. By this agreement, Hitler was able to remove the suspicion of England and win her to his side. However, this agreement was against the provisions of the treaty of Versailles, which required Germany to maintain much smaller force that was allowed by the *Anglo-German Naval Agreement.* This agreement was a master-stroke of HItler's diplomacy.

Remilitarisation of Rhineland

The treaty of Versailles *demilitarised the Rhineland and* it also stated that the German troops would not be stationed in that region. In 1936 Hitler violated these clauses and the German troops were marched into the Rhineland. This act of Hitler exposed both France and Belgium to the German danger and all the powers condemned Hitler's action. But no action was taken against him.

Hitler and the Spanish Civil War

Hitler and Mussolini intervened in the internal politics of Spain. In 1936 a civil war broke out in Spain. The Republican government of Spain was supported by the Soviet Union and General Franco who stood for dictatorship was supported by Hitler and Mussolini. General Franco with the assistance of Germany and Italy overthrow the Republican government and captured power. At this time England and France followed the policy of neutrality and that was exploited by Hitler and Mussolini.

Hitler and the Anti-Commintern Pact

In 1936, Germany entered into *anti-Commintern Pact with Japan.* In 1937, Italy also joined the Pact and thus *Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis* came into existence. Germany and Japan came together as both of them were opposed to communism. The same is the case with Mussolini. It was at this time Japan created *Manchurian crisis* and Mussolini *Abyssinian crisis.*

Annexation of Austria by Hitler

It may be stated here that in 1934 Mussolini opposed Hitler on the question of Austria. After the Anti-Commintern Pact with Germany Mussolini agreed to give Hitler a free hand in Austria. Having removed the Italian hurdle, HItler decided to annex Austria.

In 1936 Hitler entered into a pact with Austria and as a consequence cordial relations existed between these two countries. Then with the instigation of Germany, Nazis made violent demonstrations in Austria. Due to the pressure from Hitler, the Austrian Chancellor agreed to take the Nazi leaders of Austria

into his cabinet. Next it was announced that plebiscite would he held in 1938 to decide whether Austria would like to remain independent or merge herself with Germany. Arthur Seys, the Nazi minister of Interior in Austria, thought that the time was not suitable for conducting the plebiscite because the Nazis did not have sufficient time for propaganda. So he presented to the Austrian Chancellor with an ultimating demanding either his resignation or the postponement of the plebiscite. Further, he was told that in case he failed to do so, the German troops would enter Austria. The result was that the Austrian Chancellor not only cancelled the plebiscite but also resigned. Aurhur Seys became the Chancellor of Austria and in his new position, he invited Hitler to come and save Austria from internal chaos. The German army and airforce rushed to Austria and occupied it. Hitler himself went to Vienna - the capital of Austria. At this time the Western Democratic countries practically did nothing. The annexation of Austria was of great importance and help to Germany.

i. The Austrian National Bank brought to the German treasury 20 million pounds of gold and foreign exchange.

ii. Germany came into direct contact with Italy, Hungary and Yugoslavia.

Annexation of Czechoslovakia by Hitler

Hitler then turned his attention towards Czechoslovakia. This country was created by the Peace of Paris of 1919. Her greatest weakness was that she had many minorities in her population and the most important among them was the Sudatan Germans. Hitler had special reasons to intervene on behalf of the Sudatan Germans.

i. The *Sudatanland had strategic importance.* If this region came under the control of Hitler, it would become easy for him to penetrate into Southern Europe.

ii. Further, this region was *industrialised.* Its occupation was to add to the industrial out put of Germany.

However, there were certain difficulties for its occupation.

i. Czechosslovakia had a *large number of forts in the Sudatenland.* Hence it is not easy to conquer that region.

ii. Besides, *Czechoslovakia was bound by treaties with France and Soviet Union.*

However, Hitler decided to deal with Czechoslovakia as he pleased. In this connection he exploited the passive policy followed by the western democratic powers. The Sudatan Germans were encouraged to stage demonstrations against their government. Hitler at this time demanded the *right of self-determination* for the Sudaten Germans. He declared that if the latter could not defend themselves, they would be helped by Germany.

The Soviet Union, at this time, proposed a conference with England, France and U.S.A. and expressed her willingness to take part in *any collective action* that might be taken to defend Czechoslovakia against Germany. The proposals were not accepted. The Sudatens were determined to join Germany. The western powers were in a very difficult position and they did not know what to do. If they supported Czechosslovakia, there was the certainity of a war in which every one was likely to be involved. If they did not support her, she could not be expected to resist the German pressure signel-handed and *in this war of nerves Hitler won.*

Chamberlin, the British Prime Minister, *decided to prevent war by following the policy of appeasement.* He met Hitler in 1938 and he was frankly told that nothing could stop the war unless the Sudaten Germans were given the right of self-determination. At last Great Britain and France asked

Czechoslovakia to agree to the immediate transfer to Germany of the areas inhabited by a population of more than 50% Germans. Czechoslovakia agreed. However, at this stage, Hitler increased his demands which were considered by Chamberlin as unreasonable and he refused to do more than refer them to the government of Czechoslovakia. It was decided that if Germany attacked Czechoslovakia the latter would be supported by Great Britain and France. War preparations were started. At this stage President Roosevelt made a *"Peace Conference"* proposal to Hitler to settle the matter amicably. Then Chamberlin told Hitler, *"You can get the essentials with out the war and with out delay"*. At the same time Mussolini asked Hitler to settle the matter peacefully without going for war. Camberlin met Hitler and after prolonged discussions concluded *Munich Pact* in 1938. The provisions of the Pact are as follows.

i. Czechoslovakia was to evacuate all the territory occupied by the Sudaten Germans with out damaging the existing installations.

ii. The government of Czechoslovakia was to be held responsible if any damage was done to those installations.

iii. The territory to be evacuated by Czechoslovakia was to be occupied by the German troops.

iv. An *International Commission* was to be set up to decide in which areas the plebiscite was to be held.

v. The Sudaten German prisoners who were serving the terms of imprisonment for political offences should be released.

It is rightly said that the heart of the lamb of Czechoslovakia was butchered in the midnight by a knife supplied by Chamberlin. Ribbontrop, the foreign minister of Germany, said : *"The old man (Chamberlin) has signed the death warrant and now it is for us to fix the date"*. The Munich Pact was the culmination of appeasement and warrant of death for the western democracies. *"It was a symbol of the collapse of collective security"*.

The western powers were not prepared for war. There was a strong belief in France and Great Britain, that after having got everything in Czechoslovakia, the attention of Hitler would be diverted towards Soviet Russia, the two dictatorships would get involved in a life and death struggle and thereby exhaust themselves. The western democracies were likely to gain under these circumstances. Chamberlin also believed that the apetite of Hitler was limited. His view was that Germany and Italy had certain grievances and if those were redressed, peace would be maintained in Europe. That is the reason why Chamberlin persisted in the *policy of appeasement* inspite of warning from Winston Churchill.

Hitler first maintained friendly relations with Poland and even concluded *Non-Agression Pact in 1934*. With the passage of time, the attitude of Hitler towards Poland began to change. It was said that the German minorities in Poland were being oppressed. Poland was asked to give back Danzig to Germany. Poland refused to accept the demand of Germany. At this time Poland was backed by England and France. *Then Germany not only abrogated her Non-Agression Pact of 1934 but also repudiated the Anglo-German Naval Agreement of 1935.*

Hitler, before attacking Poland, sent Ribbontrop to Soviet Union to conclude *Non-Agression Pact between Germany and Soviet Union.* This was realised in August 1939. This mastroke of diplomacy of Hitler weakened the defences of Poland, England and France.

Hitler after neutralising Germany and weakening and defences of Poland, on 1st September 1939, attacked and occupied Poland. Thus the unsatiable imperialistic hunger of Hitler and the Nazis created the *"Polish Crisis"*. This became one of the potential factors for the out break of the Second World War.

Fascism in Italy

Factors responsible for the rise of Fascism

i. Italy, though originally the member of the Triple Alliance, deserted it and joined the Allies in the First World War. Although Italy fought on the side of the Allies during the First World War, she was not happy at the Peace Settlement. Italy did not get what had been promised to her by *the Treaty of London of 1915.* The interests of Italy and Yugoslavia conflicted and hence the Allies favoured Yugoslavia. Italy was cheated and hence frustrated and simmering with discontentment.

ii. The *War had disastrous effect* on the economy and standard of living on Italy and Italians. The government had borrowed money very heavily from the U.S.A. and these debts now had to be repaid.

iii. The *economic depression of 1929-30* added insult to injury. The trade and commerce received set back. The industries were paralised. The unemployment problem became acute. The inflation reigned supreme. Thus the economy of Italy was in a battered state and she was on the brink of economic bankruptcy.

iv. Besides, the *liberal parliamentary system of government* introduced in Italy, like the Weimer Republic of Germany, failed to solve the problems. Corrupt politics reigned supreme. The government failed to get the required support from people.

v. The peace and tranquility became rare in Italy. A wave of strikes in 1919 and 1920 accompanied by violence, looting of shops and occupation of factories disturbed the normal life of Italians.

It was under these circumstance the Fascist Party and Mussolini came not only to lime light and successfully captured power.

The basic characteristics of Fascism

i. It stood for extreme nationalism.

ii. It, like Nazism, advocated totalitarian or authoritarian system of government.

iii. It aimed at establishing one party government and state, wherein individual was the subordinate of the state.

iv. It stood for violence and war.

v. It was anti-communist.

vi. It laid emphasis on economic self-sufficiency and militarism.

vii. *Italian Fascism deviates sharply from the German Nazism in one respect. Nazism laid uncommon importance on the racial superiority of the Germans. This concept is conspicusly absent in Italian Fascism.*

viii. Fascists always advocate aggressive foreign policy.

Mussolini successfully exploited the conditions that prevailed in Italy and ultimately captured power and started ruling Italy like a double distilled dictator. He, like Hitler, followed an aggressive foreign policy to win the support of the Italians. He resolved to raise the prestige of Italy. He would like to *revive the glories of the Roman Empire.*

Further, the Italians had not forgotten the humiliation to which they were subjected after the First World War.

Another factor which prompted Mussolini to follow aggressive foreign policy was that *the need for the colonies* to provide an outlet for hundreds and thousands of people deprived of work in the fatherland and no longer emigrate abroad on account of the limitations imposed on immigration by foreign countries.

Mussolini, in the beginning, diverted his attention towards the south-eastern part of Europe. In 1920, Italy had to surrender Dodacanese islands to Greece according to the terms of the treaty of Severes. But she got them back by the *treaty of Laussane in 1923*. Mussolini made peace with Yugoslavia according to which Fiume was divided between Italy and Yugoslavia. In 1926, Mussolini concluded a treaty with Albania according to which *Albania became practically a dependent of Italy.*

Mussolini, then turned his attention towards Abyssinia and many factors were responsible for the same.

i. The *population of Italy* was on the increase and this became a cause of concern for Mussolini. To solve this problem he had to acquire some territory to rehabilitate the surplus population.

ii. Italy wanted *raw materials* to feed her industries and *markets* for finished products.

iii. It was also necessary to *divert the attention of the people* from their miserable economic conditions at home.

iv. Abyssinia was also of *great strategic value to Italy.* It could link the Italian possessions in Somaliland. From Abyssinia, Italy also could afford to attack the British positions in the Sudan.

v. From the *attitude of the League of Nations and the Great Powers* towards the conquest of Manchuria by Japan, Mussolini had come to the conclusion that inspite of the principle of Collective Security, no body was going to stop him from conquering Abyssinia. Resolutions might be passed condemning his action, but no solid help would be given to the ruler and the people of Abyssinia.

In 1935, Mussolini ordered the Italian troops to invade Abyssinia.The matter was taken to the League of Nations by the emperor of Abyssinia. Great Britain France and the League of Nations tried to stop the Abyssinian adventure of Mussolini. But invain. In 1936 the Italian army conquered Abyssinia and its emperor left his country.

The conquest of Abyssinia by Mussolini was a flagrant violation of the Covenent of the League of Nations and the League was completely discredited. In 1936, the *Anti-Commintern Pact* was concluded between Germany and Japan. In 1937 Italy joined the Pact and thus the *Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis* came into existence. Hitler referred to this Axis as *"Great World Political Triangle"*. Thus the *Abyssinian crisis* created by Mussolini became another cause for the out break of the Second World War.

Militarism in Japan

Japan became one of the powerful countries in the Far East in the 20th century. The Japanese militarism also paved the way for the out break of the Second World War. Several factors were responsible for the rise and growth of militarism in Japan and some of them are as follows.

i. Japan, like Italy, faced the *problem of over population.* This problem forced Japan to go for fresh lands.

ii. During the Maji Era Japan witnessed tremendous growth of industries. But the raw materials were not available in Japan, Thus the *urge for raw materials* to feed the industries stimulated militarism in Japan.

iii. The *serach for the protected markets* is said to be the other factor that was responsible for the rise and growth of imperialism and militarism in Japan.

iv. By the end of the 19th century and in the beginning of the 20th century *possession of colonies had become a symbol of status.* The more the colonies a nation possessed the greater was its strength and status. Japan, anxious to acquire world power status, developed imperialistic designs.

v. The emergence of *Expansionist Societies,* like *Black Dragon Society,* spread expansionist doctrines. This in turn paved the way for militarism.

vi. The *western imperialism in the neighbourhood of Japan* also influenced the Japanese leaders to pursue the path of militarism.

vii. The *failure of responsible party government,* like in Germany and Italy, and *lack of faith in democracy* made Japan to clung tenaciously to the traditional authoritarian concepts which were based on the glorification of the emperor.

viii. Another factor which fostered the growth of militarism in Japan was the *economic depression.* This literally paralysed the economy of Japan. The democratic government failed to solve the problems posed by the depression.

All these factors ultimately brought Japan under the control of militarists. The army and the expansionists began to propagate the idea of Japanese occupation of Manchuria and a forward policy in China could alone solve many vexed economic problems faced by Japan.

Japan, in the first instance, occupied Manchuria and thereby created the *Manchuria crisis.* When the League of Nations condemned the act of Japan, she left the League in anger.

The occupation of Manchuria did not satisfy Japan's geo-political ambition. In 1937 there started a war between China and Japan, although no formal declaration of war was made. Not only Naking but also Peking fell flat at the feet of the Japanese troops. Further, to strengthen her position Japan entered into *Anti-Commintern Pact* with Germany. This was the beginning of the *Berlin-Tokyo-Rome Axis.* Pan-Japanese programme of conquest and expansion was bound to result in war and peace was impossible in such circumstances.

Ideological differences between the dictatorship and democratic countries

There was a conflict of ideologies between the dictatorships and democracies. Germany, Japan and Italy represent dictatorship ideology whereas England, France and U.S.A. represent democratic ideology.

Mussolini described the conflict between the two ideologies thus :

> "The struggle between the two worlds cannot permit no compromise. Either We or They."

Basically the distinction between the two ideologies lay in *their attitude towards the individual to the state.* In the case of democracy, the individual was regarded as *the creator* and the *beneficiary* of all the state activities. Under the totalitarian regime, the individual had to subordinate everything to the state.

The *democratic states stood for the maintenance of status quo in political, and territorial matters* and were described as *"the Haves".* They had no immediate expansionist aims because they had already acquired what they desired.

The Axis powers, on the other hand were called *"the Have-nots".* They demanded additional territories. Japan was land hungry and she was determined to established her supremacy in the Far East.

She was not prepared for any compromise and willing to fight with any country which dared to intervene in her sphere of influence. The same was the case with Germany and Italy.

The Germans considered themselves to be a *"Master Race"* and were not prepared to put up with the limitations placed on them.

Under these circumstances a conflict was absolutely inevitable.

Weakness of the democratic states and a sense of over-confidence in the strength of the Axis powers

Great Britain and France, soon after the Pease Settlement of 1919-20, began to drift apart from each other. *Great Britain begain to follow the policy of isolation and aloofness from the European politics.* She was bothered more about her trade and commerce rather than European politics. She thought that she was more to gain from the economic recovery of Germany than by quarrelling over the question of war debts, reparations, etc.

The attitude of France was different. She felt that while German population was increasing, her own population was decreasing. There was also possibility of Germany having her revenge for her humiliation of 1919. France asked for guarantees from Great Britain and the United States and when she failed to get them, she entered into military alliances with countries like Poland, Czechoslovakia and Belgium. Unfortunately her alliances were more of liabilities than assets and hence she did not enjoy a sense of security. Under these circumstances, she continued to oppose every effort to revise the Pease Settlement of 1919, In 1935 she entered into an alliance with Soviet Russia and made an agreement with Italy. Inspite of these alliances she felt that her security was threatened.

If the democratic states had been ready for a war when the Axis powers launched upon a career of conquest and agression, there is reason to believe that a check could have been put on them. However, that was not to be. *The weakness of their military strength and the division in the ranks of the democratic states encouraged the Axis powers.*

The policy of appeasement also contributed towards war. The various concessions given to Hitler and Mussolini from time to time convinced that Great Britain and France would never fight whatever be the provocation. It was this feeling which encouraged them on the war path.

Failure of the disarmament policy

It was realised the militarism was one of the important causes for the outbreak of the First World War. The treaty of Versailles not only disarmed Germany but also expected that the other powers would follow suit so that peace could be maintained in the world. As a matter of fact, Great Britain began to disarm herself gradually and she followed that policy to a dangerous point of national security.

France was asked to do likewise but she refused to do so on the ground of national security. The same was the case with the other countries of Europe.

Disarmament conferences were held and earnest attempts were made to limit the armed race. But the efforts were not crowned with success. The result was that when Hitler came to power in Germany he decided to scrap those clauses of the treaty of Versailles which put limitations on the German armaments. The German air force began to grow and came to be recognised as one of the strongest air forces in Europe. In 1935, conscription was introduced in Germany. The Rhineland was remilitarised and occupied by the German troops. The same was the case in Japan and Italy. The military preparations of the Axis Powers forced the democratic states to arm themselves. Militarism and flagrant violation of the disarmament policy in both the camps were bound to result ultimately in an armed conflict.

The weakness of the League of Nations

Unfortunately, when hostility was growing between the two camps there was no effective international organisation which could bring the leaders of the two camps on a common platform and bring about reconciliation between them.

The League of Nations practically dead. It had ceased to exist as an effective political force after her failure on the question of Manchuria and Abyssinia. Both big and small states lost their confidence in that international organisation and *the only alternative left was that the parties should have a trial of strength by an armed conflict.* It was unfortunate that the very people who could have worked for the success of the League were not honest and made sincere in their actions. They all tried to use the League to serve their personal ends.

Problems created by the national minorities

During the course of the first World War and when it was about to be terminated the American President Woodro Wilsen announced his famous Fourteen Points of which *the principle of national self-determination was the most prominent one.* Its application was conditioned by such factors as *economic necessity, military defence, religious and political traditions and punishing of the defeated nations.*

In some areas of Central Europe the principle could not be applied as the *national minorities were intermixed* in such a way that the drawing of a clear-cut frontiers were not possible. The result was that the members of one nationality were included in the boundaries of the other states in which they were in minority. *It is these minority groups which became the hot-beds of discontment and dessent.*

If it is true that the First World War was fought for the self-determination of nationalism, *why was Austria forbidden to unite with Germany? Why a large part of Germany was put under foreign rule?* Germany under Hitler raised the cry that the Germans were being mercilessly persecuted and she had every right to liberate them. That served as a convenient pretext to Hitler for the annexation of Austria, the Sudatenland and subsequently Poland which led to the Second World War.

Course of the war

The German invasion of Poland was the starting point of the war. When the Germans were smashing the Polish resistence, Russians also invaded Poland from the east. The result was that Poland was conquered and divided between Russia and Germany.

In 1939 Russia attacked Finland and demanded a part of Finnish territory. Russia had no faith in Germany. It was feared that Germany might conquer Finland and thereby endanger the safety of Russia.

In 1940, Germany occupied Denmark, Norway, Belgium and Holland. France was attacked by Germany from the side of Belgium. France could not stand the might of Germany and she surrendered in 1940.

Italy joined the war after the collapse of France. After the entry of Italy into the war, the conflict started between Italy and Great Britain in North Africa. Mussolini with the help of the Germans captured Greece, Create and Yugoslavia.

At this time Britain was left all alone in Europe. Under the dynamic leadership of Churchill, Great Britain was able to pull herself up. In 1940 Germany attacked Britain. But the royal airforce of Britain *spoiled the German attempts in the battle of Britain.* The *battle of Britain* was the turning point in the war. President Roosevelt of U.S.A. and Churchill met on the board of a battleship and drafted a document known as the *Atlantic Charter* in which the war aims were enunciated.

In the South East Asia Japan created anxious moments to the Allies. Japan in 1941 *attacked Pearl Harbour* and this brought U.S.A. into the war. General MacArthur was made the supreme commander in the Pacific and Lord Mountbatten was given the command of South East Asia with his headquarters at Delhi.

In the African front the war was fought from 1941 to 1943. Abyssiniya, Italian Somaliland and Tripoli were captured by Montgomery. North Africa was cleared off from the German and Italian troops. Then the mainland of Italy was attacked. At this time there occurred a revolt in Italy. Mussolini was arrested and shot dead in 1945.

Britain and U.S.A. made preparations in 1943 - 44 for the invasion of the continent. The Germans were expelled from France. General Eisenhower crossed the Rhine and moved towards the river Elba, the Russians also invaded Germany from the east. The Germans could not to afford fight on two fronts and Hitler, Goebbels and Himmler committed suicide and their successors surrendered unconditionally on May 7th, 1945.

After the fall of Germany and Italy, Great Britain and U.S.A. concentrated their forces against Japan. On 6th August 1945, an atom bomb was dropped on the city of Hiroshima and it is estimated that more than one lakh of people died. Japan even then refused to surrender. Another bomb was dropped on the city of Nagasaki. On 14th August 1945, Japan surrendered unconditionally.

Provisions

1. Italy

She has to give up her right over the *Greece,* the *Rhodes* and the other *Dodecanes islands.* She renounced her right over *the African colonies* and recognised the independence of *Albania* and *Abyssinia.* She has to submit to the demilitarisation of frontiers with France and Yugoslavia. A very heavy war indemnity was levied.

2. Germany

Germany was divided *into four zones,* each of which was administered separately by the occupying powers. *Berlin came under the joint occupation* and each occupying power was assigned a sector of the city. An *Inter - Allied Body* was charged with the function of governing the city as a whole.

In 1947, Great Britain and the United States established *economic unity* of their two zones. Their invitation to join them was accepted by France and rejected by the Soviet Union.

In 1948, *a new currency* was put into circulation in west Germany. In 1949 a *constitution* was introduced and Bon became its capital.

The Russians also framed a constitution for their own zone. *Germany was caught in a Cold War.* In June 1948, Soviet Union cut off all communications by land and water between the western zone of Germany and Berlin. The western powers resorted to what is known as the *"Berlin-Airlift",* which losted for 10 months. Ultimately the Russians were forced to lift the blockage.

In 1952, the western states entered into an agreement with the west Germany by which the *Federal Republic of Germany* got virtually autonomy in foreign and domestic affairs. In 1955 she became the member of the NATO.

3. Japan

In 1951 a peace treaty was signed with Japan. By this Japan was asked to recognise the independence *of Korea.* Japan renounced her claims over *Formosa, Korile islands and Sakalin.* She gave up all special rights and interests in *China.* She agreed to maintain stable and friendly trading and maritime relations with all the signatories of the treaty.

Importance of the war

i. *European domination of the world,* already in decline in 1939, *was now seen to be over.* The United States of America and the Soviet Union became the leading states, with China and Japan also playing an important role in world affairs.

ii. Towards the end of the war the hormony that had existed between the U.S.A., Soviet Union and Great Britain began to evaporate and all the suspicions came to the fore again. The relations between the Soviet Russia and the west soon became so difficult that although no actual armed conflict took place directly between the two opposing camps, *the decade after 1945 saw the first phase of the Cold War which continued inspite of several 'thaws' into the 1980s.* This means that instead of allowing their mutual hostility to express itself in open fighting, the rival powers confined themselves to attacking each other with *propaganda and economic measures* and with a general *policy of non-cooperation.* Thus the Cold War was one of the results of the Second World War.

iii. The Japanese occupation of the European controlled territories such as Malaya and Singapore. French Indo-China and Dutch Indonesia *ended the tradition of European invincibility.*

iv. The Japanese domination of Philippines, Malaya, Indo-China, Indonesia not only weakened the European domination *but also intensified the independence movements in Asia and Africa.*

v. The leaders of many of these newly emerging nations in Asia and Africa met in conference at Algiers (1973) and made it clear that they regard themselves as a *Third World.* By this they meant that they wished to remain *neutral or non-aligned* in the struggle between the two worlds - *communism* and *capitalism,* Thus the war saw the birth of *non-aligned policy.*

vi. The *United Nations Organisation* emerged as the successor of the League of nations to try and to maintain peace in the world. On the whole it was more successful in its achievements than its unfortunate predecessor.

✧ ✧ ✧

SRIRAM'S IAS

SOCIALIST AND LABOUR MOVEMENT IN EUROPE

SOCIALIST MOVEMENT :-

Bourgeois or middle-class rule superseded the domination of the absolute monarchies and aristocracy of the old regime. When the new governments were established, legislation restricting business enterprises was abolished and little, if anything, was done to improve conditions of the workers. Socialism was, therefore, the Proletariat's (workers') answer to the restrictions imposed upon them by middle-class rule. The socialist idea of political organisation has many variations, ranging from legislative reform without disturbing the political structure of the state to a general overthrow of existing government's and the establishment of political order controlled by the workers.

I. ORIGIN OF SOCIALISM :-

The roots of Socialism can be traced to the French Revolution, when all sorts of ideas for the reconstruction of the society were born. Baneuf, the "Father of Socialism" advocated compulsory nationalisation of wealth, social equality and abolition of property. Baneuf popularised his ideas through his own newspapers and through many pupular songs that he sponsored. Charged with causing an uprising, he was arrested and executed in 1797.

II. GROWTH OF SOCIALIST MOVEMENT :

(1) Early or Utopian Socialism :-

A group of idealists, including Saint Simon, Owen and Fourier, sponsored what has been called "Utopian Socialism", named after Sir Thomas More's 'Utopia'. They recommended volontary formation of social groups into large groups, family like organisations, in order that the unit could live together.

(A) Saint Simon (1760-1825) :

One of the many French men who fought in the American Revolution under Washington, spent a fortune on an unsuccessful social experiment. He advocated common ownership of all land and capital to be managed scientifically by the State. His slogan was : "From each according to his capacity and to each according to his need".

(B) Robert Owen's (1771-1858):

Experiments at New Lanark in England and at New Harmony in Indiana are good examples of their efforts to form ideal communities of workers and their families.

(C) Fourier (1772-1837) :

Another Frenchman, believed that people should be divided into industrial communities. The earnings should be divided, after each citizen was given a stated sum, giving labour five parts, capital four, and talent three parts of the remainder. Several attempts were made to carry out his plan.

The Utopian Socialists had only a small following, even among the working class. Their ideas were too theoretical and idealistic to be carried out, but they did attract the attention of reformers to the need for change, and thus indirectly accomplished a great deal. But till the middle of the 19th century (1850), the Socialist Movement had made little headway in Europe, both in England the continental countries.

(2) Marxian Socialism :-

Karl Marx (1818-1883) was the founder of Scientific Socialism or Marxian Socialism. He formulated his theory and then proceeded to sketch the kind of society that he desired. He provided the workingmen's orga isation with a social philosophy and a programme for social reform. The "Communist Manifesto", one of

SRIRAM'S IAS

the most famous documents in the history of Socialism, was written by him and his co-worker, Frederick Engels (1820-1895) during the Paris Revolution of 1848. This was an impassioned appeal to the workers of Europe to unite and throw off their chains. "Das Capital" was a much more detailed and scholarly work on the Socialist theory. Modern scientific socialism is based on these two works. The two basic principles involved are the theory of value and the materialistic conception of history. The influence of Marx would be difficult to over estimate. The Russian Communist state was based upon his fundamental concepts, and since its origin it has been a great influence on the Proletariat.

(3) Fabian Socialism :

Marxian Socialism, as has been noted, was distinctly revolutionary. It preached the inevitability of class war. Not all social-minded people were willing to go that far. An influential group, which sponsored what is called "Evolutionary Socialism", was the Fabian Society in England. It was organised in 1884 with an aim for "the reorganisation of society by the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual and class ownership, and vesting them in the community for the common benefit". The members were mainly journalists, artists, literary men and women, social workers and teachers. They took their name from the Roman general, Quintus Fabius, known for his delaying tactics. They spread their propaganda through the publication of pamphlets.

The Fabians, unlike Marx, do not attack capital as being stolen funds of labour, but admit that the capitalist has a useful part to play in society. The capitalists deserved a reward for the organisation of industry but ultimately they should be suspended by paid employers. The Fabians believed that there

SRIRAM'S IAS

were many values created wholly by the community, which should be used not for private profit but for the benefit of the whole community. The instruments of production should be utilised for the general welfare, instead of being exploited for the enrichment of the few.

(4) Syndicalism :-

Another form of social control that attracts attention is syndicalism. It is based on trade-union organisation, which is considered to be the foundation of the new society and the means whereby it can be brought into existence. It accepts the Marxian theory of an inevitable struggle between capital and labour, and proposes the abolition of private ownership of the means of production. This provides for a producer's control, giving the workers charge of the economic and political affairs of the state. Syndicalism claims to be more the product of the workers than any other form of socialism and, consequently, is much more in confirmity with their needs. Its efficiency is also emphasised. If workers own and control the industry in which they work, they will have a greater personal interst in the conduct of the plant and enjoy a greater amount of freedom than that offered by the capitalistic system.

(5) Guild Socialism :

Guild Socialism, which is closely associated with Syndicalism, aimed at "the abolition of the wage system, and the establishment of self-government in industry by the workers, through a democratic system of national guilds, working in conjunction with other democratic functional organisations in the community". Power and responsibility in society were to be related and proportional to the importance of the work that the individuals perform. Guild Socialists believed that industry should be supervised

SRIRAM'S IAS

by technical experts and not by unskilled workmen. Furthermore the interests of the consumer were to be taken into consideration. This they proposed to guarantee through consumer's councils, which, acting in cooperation with producer's guilds, would fix prices and control the distribution of goods.

(6) Anarchism :-

The most radical form of socialism is anarchism. Originally, the anarchists were affiliated with the coomunists, but they were expelled in 1869 at the fourth congress of the First International. Under the leadership of Bakunin (1814-1876) and Kropotkin (1842-1921), a separate organisation was formed. They preached the destruction of existing governments and, they stood for a theory of life and conduct under which society is conceived without government, and harmony in such a society being obtained not by submission to law, or by obedience to any authority, but by free agreements concluded between various groups. The Anarchists were not definite as to how this state of society could be brought about and were not specific in the stipulation of how it could be maintained after it had been brought about. However, they were quite definite in their criticism of existing forms of government.

III. Problems and Prospects of the Socialist Movement:

A considerable number of people no longer accept political democracy as the last work in government. In fact, there are many who contend tha democracy has failed. The rise in the power and influence of the proletariat has been accompanied with increased toleration of socialism. Democracy has been condemned as an agency of the bourgeoisie for the suppression of the proletariat. Socialist theories, inspite of their growing popularity, have many fundamental weaknesses. All forms of socialism are based on the

assumption that men are willing to work for the common good of society and not for their own pecuniary profit. This assumption seems questionable. The incentive to do better financially than one's neighbour is one of the most dynamic forces to spur men to greater things.

There are, of course, ways and incentives to make man work. "To consume without producing" is regarded by the socialists as a sin and subject to punishment. How well it can be enforced remains to be seen. The question of administration of the Socialist state is a problem of great magnitude. Most Socialists believe in the necessity of a fundamental change in existing political system. What adequate substitution can be made ? Chaos has followed practically every socialist experiment. Centralisation of authority destroys the Socialist aim. Something must be found as a substitute for the state. Some Central authority to regulate economic and social activities in a harmonious group seems indispensable. Reveolutionary socialists, by far the most dynamic group, insist upon the complete destruction of the capitalistic system. This would mean, not only a long period of chaos, but also the destruction of many important contributions that we owe to Capitalism. The risk of a reveolution is great and the ruling class that emerges from it may not be what the idealist prefers. However, these dangers are not insurmountable obstacles.

LABOUR MOVEMENT IN EUROPE :

From the beginning of the 19th century the European states attempted to regulate labour in order to protect the workmen from unscrupulous employers. And though improvements in the working conditions were made, in most cases factory legislation did not go far enough to statisfy the labour groups. Labourers ultimately found, after painful experience, that by forming combinations and working together they could make their demands much more impressive.

SRIRAM'S IAS

There were many problems facing such attempts. The best type of organisation, the way to appeal to fellow workers, dissention in their own ranks, difficulty of agreement on aims, and the best manner of confronting employers were questions that brought forth many plans and a variety of opinions.

Leaders were agreed on two things :

(a) replacement of individual bargaining, between workmen and employer, with collective baragaining for the purpose of obtaining a standard wage and standard working hours, and

(b) a united front on the part of labour to prevent one perons from underselling labour in general. The aim was to use peaceful negotiations but, if that method failed, a strike might be used as a least resort. The labour movement in modern Europe has followed three lines of development, viz., Unionism, cooperation and politics.

I. Beginning of Labour Movement :

(1) Guild System :

Probably the first semblance of a modern trade-union can be found in the journeyman's associations in the guilds in the 17th century. The Journeyman did not carry his demands far, because of the relative certainty that he would become a master craftsman add thus be felieved of the abuses about which he complained. There was no permanency in the status of the worker, and he lived in hopes of rising above the position of mere workman.

(2) Industrial Revolution and Factory system :

The Industrial Revolution altered the position of the commong worker. The establishment of a factory system drew the employee and the employer further and

SRIRAM'S IAS

further apart. The factory, at the same time, gathered together in the group a large number of labourers, all of whom had common interests. These were generally opposed to the interests of the employer, and the natural tendency was for the workers to combine in order to promote their own intersts.

II. Obstacles to labour movement :

Progress in labour organisation was very slow due to several obstacles.

(1) Labourers were ignorant and without experience;
(2) laws in most countries made combinations illegal; and
(3) public opinion, largely because of the capitalistic propaganda, was hostile.

In England, for instance, the Combination Acts, passed at different times between 1700 and 1800, prevented artisans or tradesmen, either employers or employees, from combining for the purpose of changing rates of wages. The enforcement of the law seemed to be entirely in favour of the employer. In fact, there was, on the part of the upper class, a prevailing fear of democratic movements on the part of the masses. The clergy, philanthropists, and economists were suspicious of the motives and policies of labour organisations.

The movement toward trade-unionism faced what appeared to be insurmountable obstacles in the incompetency of labour leaders, in the influence of the employers in official circles, in the existence of prohibitory laws, and in the hostility of public opinion. However, one by one, these obstructions have been either removed or greatly reduced.

III. Growth of Labour Movement between 1800 and 1914 :

(1) England :

(a) The laws restricting labour combinations were not in conformity with the spirit of liberalism, which had

SRIRAM'S IAS

gained so much headway in England in the 19th century. The general abolition of various restrictions in conformity with the philosophic tendency brought about the repeal of the combination Acts (1825). Parliament, however still insisted that violence and intimidation on the part both of employer and employee was illegal. Collective bargaining was acknowledged as legal. More restric tions were removed in 1871 and in 1875, and this gave the trade union in England legal rights much the same as any other organisation. The result was the gradual disappearance of public suspicion and animosity against trade-unions,

(b) So, trade-unions grew rapidly after their legalisation. Funds were created through dues, in order to help the cause along and to aid members who were forced out of work becaus of illness. Unions to include workmen in different occupations were formed and annualk trade union congresses were started in 1864. Regular yearly meetings have been held since 1869. English labourers send delegates to London while Parliament is in session, to try to obtain favourable legislation and the appointment of officials in the interest of trade-unions. On the whole, they have been very successful. The principles of labour combinations used in England were later applied in Germnay, Francd, Italy and the U.S.A.

(c) The trade-unions in England even found a means of experession in politics. Members were used to vote for certain candidates and in 1893 a separate party called the Labour Party, organised. Not until 1900 did they succeed in electing a member to parliament. In 1906, seven labour candidates were sent to represent labourites in the government. Two famous cases the Taff Vale case (1901) and the Osborne Judgement (1909), accentuated political activity on the part of the labourites. The Taff Vale decision declares that trade-unions might be sued and, if convicted, be forced to pay damage for loss incurred to a company's property

SRIRAM'S IAS

through strike shic Enough presssure was brought to bear to force Parliament to pass, in 1906 the Trade Disputes Act, which practically reversed the decision. The Osborne Judgement declared it illegal for trade-unions to defray the expenses of members in Parliament. As members of Parliament received no pay, it was virtually impossible for a representative of the workers to serve, because of lack of funds. In 1911, the Labour Party members requested a bill for the payment of salaries to all members of the House of Commons, and it was passed. The Labour Party was strong enough during the First World War to become a part of coalition government.

(2) Germany :

German labour organisa tions go back at least to the Franco-Prussiona war. Labour leaders faced a hostile government. Anti-socialists laws were on the statute books in Germany until 1890, but by 1914 labour was well organised. German employers resisted labour groups by organising to oppose them. The Central union of German industrialists, made up of the colliery proprietors and iron-masters of Westphalia, is an example. They attempted to boycott the unions by refusing to give employment to trade-unionsts and socialists. The struggle was still going on when World War I broke out in 1914.

(3) France :

Labour organisation in France was slower and more irregular than in England or Germany. Labour combinations were forbidden by Napoleon; the problem was discussed the great length in the famous Penal Code of 1810. There was no marked relaxation until after the Revolution of 1830. At that time, the progress of Saint Simon and Furier began to attract attention. Napoleon III revived the labour legislation of the great

SRIRAM'S IAS

Napoleon in 1851, and it was not until 1864 that combinations of workmen were legalised. The famous Waldeck-Rousseau law of 1884 gave labour recognition in France that it had gained in Germany and England. The "Confederation General du Travail" or the General Confederation of Labour (CGT), one of the largest and most influential labour organisations in the world, was organised at Limoges in 1895. It excluded politics and declared that its sole object was the unification of workingmen. The society was active in the propogation of revolutionary syndicalism. Its published a paper, which carried ideas to the workmen so effectively that in 1906 there were 1,309 strikes invdiving 4,38,466 workmen.

IV. EUROPEAN LABOUR MOVEMENT BETWEEN WORLD WARS :

(1) England :

Labour movements survived the First World War in all the parliamentary democracies of Europe. In Britain, workmen had the hardest time. For, technology destroyed jobs and unemployment became chronic. Shop stewards, who had appeared during the war to fill an organisational gap assumed leadership. Simultaneously, the Labour Party under the influence of its socialist wing, increased its vote enough to form a government (with Liberal help) in 1923 and 1929. Even with the aid of strikes, neither the trade unions nor the party was able to solve the problems of the economy.

(2) France :

In France the labour movement was no more successful. The old membership of the CGT was replaced by new elements, mostly unskilled, with a wide variety of socialist persuasions. In late 1918 the CGT announcee a new programme, revealing a willingness to accept the government, as a partner with a demand for rationalisation of key industries. In 1920, the French socialists sympathetic to Communist influences precipittated a general

strike. The event proved so great a fiasco that the CGT expelled its Communist members who, established their own confederation.

(3) Germany :

The German workers recovered quickly from the war. They rejuvenated their old organisations, assumed a place of importance within the government of the Weimar republic and persuaded employers to make a compact providing for more freedom to organise and for an 8-hour day. All through the 1920's German trade unions operated cautiously, to preserve democracy and to promote their social gains. They accepted a works-council system, inspired by middleclass politicians, establishing committees within industrial units to advance peaceful labour-management relations. They hunted out and expelled trouble-making communists. But the world-wide Depression brought about drastic change. The declining economy produced an ideological political war in Germany that reached fruition in 1933, with the Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party in control.

(4) Hitler's effect on European Labour Movements :

(a) In Britain, where workmen focussed on rising unemployment and agitated for nationalisation of mines and railways, a shift occured in public attitudes. For the first time, non-industrial elements among the British people revealed sympathy for labour's plight. The shift encouraged a growth of membership in the Trade Union Congress (TUC); Workmen benefitted through collective bargaining; and a new atmosphere of mutual responsibility was created. As British moved towards greater cooperation with the government in preparing for resistance against aggression.

(b) In France, dissatisfaction with parliamentary democracy grew rapidly. Farm prices and middle-class incomes had declined, reduction in government pay rolls and in tax receipts were blamed on the government which seemed singularly inept compared to the efficient totalitarian governments of Mussolini and Hitler. After

SRIRAM'S IAS

and the socialists called a general strike (1934) which was joined by a million parisians including the communist party, and which was the first successful general strike in French history. In 1936 the Socialist and Communist Parties merged with the Radical Socialists to elect a popular Front government headed by Leon Blum. These events released a reservoir of suppressed hope among French workers. Almost instantly 2 millions went on strike. Blum managed to persuade employers to accept the inevitable; Parliament legalised the right to organise and to bargain collectively, along with establishing a 40-hour week. Membership of the trade unions mushrommed to uprecedented levels.

(c) In Germany, however, Hitle had destroyed the German trade-union movement with one legislation decree in 1933.

CONCLUSION:

When the second World War ended (1945), labour movements quickly revived and moved almost in concert throughtout Western European countries towards three goals:

(1) enlargement of powe ;
(2) more government control of the economy; and
(3) expansion of welfare programmes.

In Britain, the Labour Party won a parliamentary majority. In France, where the CGT claimed five million members, a coalition of communists, socialists and moderated took over control of the providional government and created a new Constitution (Fourth Republic) with the traditional aims of labour guaranteed. Im both Britain and France labour-influenced governments nat onalised a portion of industry. In Britain, Parliament rewrote earlier social legislation in accordance with W.H. Beveridge's proposals, while in France the social security system was overhauled.

--

CAPITALISM

The contrasting ideologies capitalism and socialism, both were products of Industrial Revolution. The geographical discoveries gave rise to the commercial revolution. The commercial revolution created much pressure on the supply of goods and services. But the feudalist form of production failed to meet the increasing demand. It is in this context that the beginnings of capitalism should be seen.

Capitalism can be termed as the highest mode of commodity production. Commodity means goods produced for the market. Under capitalism the production is undertaken mainly for the market. The capitalist produces goods to sell in the market and to gain profit. He does not produce goods for self consumption. That is why we may state that capitalism is a form of commodity production with the aim of getting profit. Under capitalism everything becomes a commodity including human labour. Under slavery a man is owned totally, under feudalism a man's labour is owned and under capitalism labour is sold and brought. Man under capitalism is free to offer himself for wages.

Capital plays a very important role in the highest mode of commodity production. No doubt, capital was used in the earlier times also but it is only under capitalism that capital occupied such a large and pivotal role. Infact the definition of a capital is that all resources used for the purpose of production rather than consumption are known as capital.

The capital is of two types, real and money. Under real capital we include machines, buildings, road-ways, etc; which are made use in the production process. Under money capital we include all forms of money such as currencies and coins and negotiable securities such as short term bonds. But it is only in the modern times that money premeated all aspects of economic life. The monetisation of economies began to grow at a rapid pace in the modern times. This is also a point of difference between the modern and earlier times in terms of capital.

Features of capitalism

1. Specialised economic activities :

An important feature of capitalism is that economic activities are highly specialised. In the earlier system the owner-manager himself saved, invested and ran his organisation. Under capitalism, we see also the emergence of a new class of entrepreneurs. They organise the rest of the factors of production such as land and labour.

2. Impersonal relations :

In capitalism the economic relations are impersonal. People are offered work and given wages in an impersonal manner.

3. Element of profit:

Commodities are produced for the market. These goods are sold in the market for profit. Thus the element of profit is a very important feature in capitalism.

4. Concentration of wealth:

Since there is a great specialisation of economic activity the resources of the country tended to be concentrated gradually in the hands of a few. Hence the concentration of wealth becomes inseparable element of capitalism.

5. Part played by the market:

The other essential aspect of capitalism is both commodity market as well as factory market. The commodity market means a market where the goods are sold and bought. The factory market means a market where the factors of production such as land and labour are bought and sold.

A market is one where there is a demand, and supply of commodities. The market runs on the principle of price mechanism. Goods which have greater demand gets high prices. Hence the capitalists supply high priced goods. If the price of a commodity falls, it would mean that either the demand for that commodity had come down or that the supply is more than the demand. When the price comes down the capitalist reduces the production of that good. Thus the price mechanism determines what kind of goods are produced in what quantity and by whom and for whom. Thus the basic question of economic activity are answered by the price. That is why price mechanism has been termed by Adam Smith as 'invisible hand'.

Thus we may sum up capitalism as a system where a relatively large amount of capital which is mobile and transferable is made available to investors or entrepreneurs who organize the different factors of production and produced goods for the market in an impersonal fashion to primarily gain profits.

Similarly, the capitalist system is, by definition, a system that answers to the aspirations of human nature. In fact it can be defined as a system that recognizes and protects private property, free enterprise and freedom of choice for the consumers through free markets.

In the political and Economic spheres generally it goes with democracy, freedom of press and wealth distributed unevenly with class destinations like upper, middle & working class.

Factors responsible for the birth of capitalism :

i. The major factor that helped for the birth of capitalism was the commercial revolution. There was enormous growth in the demand for goods during the period between 1500 to 1700. This gave rise to higher prices and greater profits. The chance to realise profit in the market was the major reason for the emergence of capitalist mode of production.

ii. The banking system and paper currency further accelerated the forces of capitalism. With the organisation of the central banks, beginning with the Bank of England in 1694, stability was brought into the banking industry and paper currency. The issue of paper currency became the monopoly of the central banks. Use of paper currency and the bills of exchange greatly facilitated to move the wheels of commerce and the needs of the capitalists.

iii. The other institutions that came about this time and paved the way for the birth of capitalism were Insurance Companies and Stock Exchange market.
Insurance Companies, particularly the General Insurance made the risk easy to bear. Without this what all a capitalist accumulate could be lost in one accident.
Since the Joint Stock Company was becoming the popular form of business organisation, the Stock Markets had to emerge to facilitate the selling and buying of the shares. The growth of Stock Markets also helped the capitalists because it gave them a market where they could easily mobilise the resources for investment.

Development and types of capitalism.

The development of capitalism had taken place in the modern times under the impact of commercial revolution. However, in the times of great commercial activity that included both internal and international trade on massive scale profits were to be held mainly by the merchants who indulged in buying and selling. Since merchants played a significant role in the economic activity of this time, this period, i.e; the early modern period is known as the age of merchant capitalism or mercantile capitalism. This mercantile capitalism was greatly helped by the increased flow of bullion, banking system, insurance companies and stock exchange markets. The Protestant ethic of not discouraging the interest taking also made the mercantile activity effective.

The commercial revolution soon paved the way for Industrial Revolution. With Industrial Revolution that true or mature form of capitalism was born. In this form of capitalism the, profits were to be had by the capitalists who undertook to produce goods and services. They mobilised large amounts of capital and used it to bring under the factory roof the other factors of production such as land and labour. The production for market with the intention of getting profit, the impersonalisation of economic relations and the specialisation of economic activity were complete under

mature capitalism. The economic activity was now guided by the price mechanism. In this age of capitalism also known as industrial capitalism, the division of society on class basis also became more prominent. The people who could mobilise large amounts of capital came to own the means of production. The vast majority of people, however, became wage earners.

In this form of mature capitalism which was the result of the industrial revolution, the capitalists enunciated certain basic principles. They said that self-interest is the ultimate servant of mankind. According to them every individual working in his own interest works for the benefit of all and hence state's interference in economic affairs was unnecessary.

The capitalists also stressed the sanctity of private property.

However, when the capitalists argued that self-interest is the ultimate servant of society, they were assuming perfect competition in both factory and product market. But perfect competition is a mere economic myth. What actually happened by 1870s in Europe was the emergence of Cartels, Monopolies and Oligopolis. The national wealth by now was being concentrated in the hands of few capitalists. This concentration of wealth could be seen more clearly in the banking sector. For example 200 families in France controlled the national finances. They were infact in a position to topple the governments which they did not like. This kind of development in the capitalism is known as finance capitalism or monopoly capitalism. This is the third stage of capitalism that appeared in Europe after mercantile capitalism and industrial capitalism. This finance capitalism which took a firm shape by 1870s continued unabated till 1920s.

Political developments and capitalism

The capitalist class, as stated earlier, were the first who unleashed the forces of the democratic movement. But the property classes wanted to confine the franchise rights only to those who had property. But once the movement was under way it was beyond the capacity of these classes to control it. Under the impact of liberalism the franchise rights were gradually extended to all in Britain. The birth and growth of Labour Party in Britain can be seen as a result of universal franchise.

Since greater voting strength was in the hands of poor, the political masters could not but adopt certain policies which would please the commoners. This paved the way for the birth welfare statism.

Besides, the later half of the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century witnessed the birth of trade union movement. The result of the trade union movement and the welfare statism was that greater benefits accrued to the masses now than in the earlier period.

The great depression of 1930s brought several changes in the economic sector. The principle of laissaiz-faire was being given up and states were assuming more and more powers in regard to the economic management of the country. The governments also started line practice of annual budget. The governments also recognised the principle of collective bargaining and passed important labour and factory laws.

The New deal of F.D. Roosevelt and the Keynesian methods of fighting inflation and deflation with the help of governmental fiscal and monetary policies underscored the principle of giving up the laissez-faire policy. In USA, more over, anti-trust laws were passed. Again the gaint Corporations were met by gaint trade unions. As a result of these policies the disparities of income and wealth began to narrow down in western economies.

Besides all the above developments there is no country in the world now which does not practice some sort of state economic planning. This was the result of the spectacular progress achieved by USSR under economic planning: With this new feature of economic planning, capitalism had undergone a radical change and what we have in many countries are mixed economies. It is in these four stages namely, mercantile capitalism, industrial capitalism, finance capitalism and modified capitalism that capitalism so far developed in Europe.

Development of capitalism

Capitalism had not developed in the same fashion in the continental Europe. Though the four stages followed on after another in the continent also, they got delayed by over 100 years when compared to England.

These four stages of capitalism developed in England in the following periods.

Mercantile capitalism - 1500 to 1700. The mercantile capitalism reached its momentum in France only in the 17th century. Of all the five western European nations such as Portugal, Spain, Holland, France and England, France was the last nation to benefit from free international trade that grew as a part of the commercial revolution of the early modern period. Only in the 17th century French East India Company was organised mainly due to the efforts of Colbert.

In the case of Prussia the mercantile capitalism appeared even later because Prussia was not on the Atlantic sea board. Moreover, in Prussia and also in France, International trade could not flourish due to the existence many customs zones. The absence of unified markets acted as a considerable check. Thus the mercantile capitalism, the first stage of capitalism, had taken shape only in the 17th and 18th centuries in France and Prussia while it happened in the 13th century in Italy and 15th and 16th centuries in England and Holland.

Industrial capitalism - 1750 to 1870. England was the first country in Europe to experience industrial capitalism. The following factors were responsible for the same.

i. It experienced agricultural revolution and this produced agricultural surplus.
ii. England had colonies round the world. Hence she could procure the required raw materials and the desired markets.
iii. There was no problem of labour as there was a population growth in England at this time.
iv. The surplus wealth was in the hands of those who were investing the same in productive exercises.
v. The labour in England were technically skilled, for they worked in the handicraft industries.

Thus England witnessed the industrial capitalism from the second quarter of the 18th century.

The onset of industrial capitalism also got delayed in France, Prussia and Holland by about hundred years, since conditions that help progress in industry were not ripe in the continent.

i. Feudalism was strongly entrenched in the continent. This was more so in the case of Prussia.
ii. The continent was involved in continuous wars. The resources were misspent on nonproductive purposes.
iii. The continental labour force was mainly employed in agriculture and was steeped in tradition. The labour force was neither skilled nor mobile.
iv. There was no free trade in France and Prussia due to the presence of tariff walls.
v. Even in regard to the supply of raw materials the continental powers were at the disadvantage, for the countries lacked either coal or iron - the two basic raw materials of the industrial revolution.
vi. Social values in the continent were also not conducive for the industrial development. The middle classes were not given social importance in France and Prussia. They were treated as unprivileged class.

Thus it is not surprising that the continent lagged behind England in regard to progress in industry. However, Prussia and France made valiant efforts to catch up with England since they sufficiently realised the importance of industry for national economic development. They tried to foster industry to the extent they could. Frederic II of Prusia and many French finance ministers beginning from Colbert tried to give stimulus to industrial development. In this connection they followed the following measures.

i. They gave patents to entrepreneurs.
ii. Subsidised the industry.
iii. Protection was given to the industries by discouraging imports,
iv. In a country like Prussia labour was compulsorily made available to the industries.
v. Certain monority sections such as Jews were also forced to invest in industries.

Besides these measures on the part of the governments, many private individuals tried to imitate the British developments in industry by trying to copy the new inventions. They tried to smuggle the new techniques and in general encouraged the migration of the British skilled labour to Europe.

These efforts were, however, not met with unqualified success since all the ills to stall the promotion of industrial development could be seen in this period in France and Germany.

France gave much importance to the production of luxury goods rather than for the production of mass consumption goods.

In Germany there was much dislocation of resources. Neverthless, some amount of progress in industrial development had taken place in France and Germany in 18th century.

But this kind of progress received a check during the French Revolution and Napoleonic wars. France, under Napoleon, followed the Continental System. This was a system devised to stop British imports to the continent. It was an attempt at the economic blockade of England. Through this system Napoleon desired to destroy the British industry and economy. But in reality it was the continent which suffered from this trade barrier.

After the defeat of Napoleon, the continental system was given up and there was a resurgence in adopting the British techniques. By 1825 England also lifted its ban on the migration of skilled labour and on the export of machine goods, England had to do so, because a surplus production was generated in the machine making industry in England and the capitalist lobby brought pressure on the British statesmen to lift the ban. From this period onwards the continent received a further filip in industrialisation and was well set to stage industrial revolutions of their own sort.

In the aftermath of the French revolution the different customs zones in France were unified. This unified internal markets gave a fresh impetus to industrial progress in France. France at this time also developed railways. Banking system and Joint Stock Companies grew in importance.

By 1833 Prussian customs zones were unified to a single zone known as 'Zollverin'. The mining of coal in Ruhr valley and Westphalia in Prussia and Seimens Martin process of using phospheric iron in steel making helped Prussia to develop its