

MODEL 2A : PROTO-NATIONALISM

We have seen that the Dharma Sabha group had no vision of a new kind of man or a new kind of society. They did not need such a vision, because they did not question that their model of society, - the Company monopoly with social conservatism and tributary privilege, - was justified by high opportunity for material benefits. They were also content with the socially limited and economically subservient model of man. More so, because they did not find any contradiction between this model of man and their model of society. All that could be done was to prevent government from destroying the status-quo, and for this, a selective conservative bullwork was sufficient.

But by about the second decade of the nineteenth century changes in that society were thrusting themselves onto the attention of the native elites, - changes which required quite different models of man and society. One change was that for some Britishers it became a mission to do away with Company monopoly and social conservatism. The other change was that the younger members of the native society were increasingly being exposed to liberal ideas which started altogether a new quest for self. Both these changes demanded fresh conceptualisation and rationalisation of the colonial structure, and therefore, a new model was needed. Those who provided such a model had pursued changes most vigorously, so much so that posterity hurled all conceivable adjectives on them, 'father of modern India,' 'representative of the new age,' 'founders of

'renaissance' and all that. The two most prominent native spokesmen in this regard were Raja Ramnighun Roy and his friend and disciple Prince Dwarkanath Tagore. That they did arrive at a new model - because of these actual changes or, at any rate, they had a keen awareness of the forces of change, was revealed in their own writings. In the petition of the Indian modernist group represented by Ramnighun Roy and Dwarkanath Tagore in Calcutta Town Hall on December 17, 1829 they formulated some of the premises of India's economic modernisation¹ :

Legal obstructions to the application of British skill, capital and industry to the commercial and agricultural resources of India are incompatible with national prosperity and repugnant to the laws by which other colonies and dependencies are governed ... trade cannot be profitably conducted by government, without the urgent and impolitic advantages of a monopoly.

There was thus a clear echo of Adam Smith's economic doctrine. To the official argument that since people were not actually buying more salt than a given amount at the existing price, they were having enough and would not buy more at a lower price -- Ramnighun answered under the pseudoname of Ram Horee Doss)² :

Was there no professor, Sir, in the College in which you were reared (at our expense) to teach you that in an argument we should never assume that which it is the object of the argument to prove ? You wish to prove that our supply of salt is ample, and to do it, you assume

that it is so, because we do not buy more at your monopoly price ... Give your starving workmen at home a full supply of bread and meat, at the price they would obtain it through your corn laws, and see then if they would consume more of it or not.

Clearly, he was arguing how interference with free market forces to serve monopolistic economic interests was detrimental to the welfare of the vast mass of poor consumers. The exposure to liberal ideas also convinced Rammohun of the value of civil liberty. When the people of Naples failed to obtain a constitution and was crushed to a defeat, Rammohun wrote a letter to Mr. Silk Buckingham on August 11, 1821 with much mortification³:

I am obliged to conclude that I shall not live to see liberty universally restored to the nations of Europe, and Asiatic nations, especially those that are European colonies, possessed of a greater degree of the same blessing than what they now enjoy.

Under these circumstances I consider the cause of the Neapolitans as my own, and their enemies as ours. Enemies to liberty and friends of despotism have never been, and never will be ultimately successful.

Rammohun's 'cosmopolitan sympathies' in the political sphere is further illustrated by the joyous enthusiasm with which he greeted the news of liberation of the Spanish colonies of South America from the tyranny of Spain.⁴ Thus, Rammohun and Dwarakanath in their support to these forces of change were led

to abandon or transform the model of undeveloped nationalism. The extent of abandonment or transformation of the undeveloped nationalism will appear, as we look more closely (in the next section) at the new model, but some essential differences may be pointed out beforehand.

The striking difference is in the role- conceptualisation of the native elite vis-a-vis the colonialists. Rammohun Roy and Dwarakanath Tagore did not question the superiority of the Europeans in mundane matters. But they set for native population a goal of self-improvement which they thought impossible to achieve under existing conditions. A liberal society and a modernised economy were valued as means to that improvement. The middle-class had to become demoralised "when they had no prospect of bettering their condition by the savings of honest industry, and no hope was held out to them of rising to honour or affluence by superior merit." Rammohun was convinced that if people "saw by experience, that merit would be appreciated" and that they could "hope to gain an independence by honest means" and that "just and honourable conduct held out the best prospect of their being ultimately rewarded by situations of trust and responsibility," there would be an incentive for honesty and industry among the people.⁵ So, the model native man is not to be content with a socially limited and economically subservient role. It requires a role, which is enterprising, meritorious, industrious, honest, responsible and independent. Both of them thus laboured to create the means along the lines of political liberalism and economic modernisation.

This takes us to the root of the new model. The root is a nativist claim very different from that on which model I was based. Political liberalism and modernising traits are not opposed to the essence of native civilisation. The culture, religion and tradition of the native society permit and encourage everyone to act as exerter, developer and enterpriser. Reform in all its manifestations, therefore, is not imposed from without but from within. So, the new model was very different from the model of undeveloped nationalism. Its models of man and society were very different from those to which model I was fitted.

In offering the new model Rammohun and Dwarakanath together set the tone which came to prevail in Bengal and dominated the expression of nationalism in Bengal until about the second half of the nineteenth century. The civilisational claim that they put in their model was dropped by later advocates but the central vision and arguments as well as the class basis remained much the same. If we keep the essential points in mind then Rammohun and Dwarakanath on the one hand and the later advocates, who were mostly young Bengal members on the other, would appear to reveal certain continuities and differences that actually affect their respective claims to nationalism. So it will be useful to look at the two versions in turn as Models 2A and 2B. We do not treat the Model 2B as altogether a separate model because despite variations from the Model 2A, this does not reveal any new relationships in the objective level. What warrants analytical separation is the subjective aspect of their models of man and society.

One difference between the Models 2A and 2B may be stated briefly in advance. Rammohun and Dwarakanath recognised the objectively same position of themselves as the British middle-class but they also recognised their difference with the British middle class in terms of achievement while conceding them rank. They did see their underdevelopment as a problem and tried (however unsuccessfully) to deal with it as comprehensively as they could and deeply concerned themselves with necessary social and economic prerequisites. Their followers scarcely saw this as a problem, at least not as a central problem: when they did not let it drop virtually out of sight, they treated it as something which would or could be solved in one way or another,-- for instance, by a higher dose of political liberty or through increased scale of cosmetic social reforms. Another difference was in the attitude to socio-economic and political reforms. In claiming reforms Rammohun and Dwarakanath never surrendered their indigenous nature but the later advocates dropped the civilisational claim. Indeed, one can see a cumulative decline in realism from model 1 through Models 2A and 2B. The Dharma Sabha group was realistic about their class position and class-structure of colonial Bengal, though they had to give way. Rammohun Roy and Dwarakanath Tagore were less realistic about colonial structure : they conceptualised correctly their changed role and saw that it was incompatible with social conservatism and monopoly but failed to realise the inadequacy of their suggested means of improvement. The radicals or the Young Bengal were even less realistic on this score. They generally wrote as if they constituted a middle class

in the European sense and fell into the trap of vicarious thinking. So the model 2B was doubly unrealistic: its self-projection as at par with the European middle class had no basis and the vicarious attitude was in direct conflict with erstwhile sense of national prestige and self respect.

Raja Rammohun Roy

Raja Rammohun Roy was an amphibian who lived simultaneously in two worlds --- the given, the world of pecuniary transactions, the world of business and the world of religion. There is nothing to be surprised of if we find intimate connections between the two, nothing also in the fact that he indeed lived in two worlds. The whole background of conditioning, his family tradition, his upbringing and the society he lived in shaped his thought. Ramakanta, the father of the Raja held the post of Sarkar under Siraj-ud-Dowla, the later Nawab and after retiring participated in the Company's destructions of the old Mughal economy and became a talukdar by profession. In this respect Rammohun was a true member of his family which had disaffiliated itself from the Mughal tradition to be attached to the Permanent Settlement. Rammohun entered public life in his early forties and died at the age of 59 or 61 years. His entire public life comprised the last 20 years or so of his life. This was also the period of a great religious ferment without which public life was inconceivable. Rammohun could not avoid the popular line of religious discussion

and he preferred a course of confrontation. The main dimensions of his multifarious ideas may be spelt out now.

Religious and Social Reforms

Rammohun's early researches in theological truth were systematised in his first work, a pamphlet, Tuhfat-ul-Muwahhidin published in 1803-04.⁶ It suggested that all the great religions of the world had their basic messages alike. -- they were all monotheistic and conceived God as a spirit devoid of corporeality. From this basic premise of unitarianism Rammohun attacked two current features of Hindu profession and practice -- Polytheism and Idolatry. This involved him in an exciting debate carried on through the press and discussions held at different places.⁷

For Rammohun religious reform logically implied social reform. But as it will be further probed we will find that for Rammohun it was social reform that logically implied religious reform. Among the current practices in the Hindu society, those which came under his sharp criticism were: Satidaha⁸, caste division, Kulinism (superiority of Kulin Brahmans in society), sale of girls for marriages, polygamy and dis-inheritance of women from paternal property.

As for Satidaha Rammohun cited from Manu that for widows an austere life of 'Brahmacharya' was the religious prescription. The current practice of tying up a widow to the funeral pyre of her dead husband was nothing short of homicide.

Regarding caste divisions and consequent prejudice against the Sudras or the so called lower castes, Rammohun was always unhappy. He upheld the right of the Sudras to listen to the Vedas.⁹ Rammohun further argued that it was improper to debar the Sudras, or for that matter, any section of the Hindu population from studying the holy texts.¹⁰ He published a Bengali text of the 'Nirnay', a chapter of a tract called Vajrasuchi written by Mritunjayacharya.¹¹ This work discarded at first the idea that a person is Brahmana because either of 'Jibatma' (soul in living body) or 'Deha' (physical constitution), birth, body complexion, religious piety, learning and activity. It asserted that all persons are at birth Sudra, they might become twice-born (Dwija) after Upanayana, Bipra after practising the Vedas and finally Brahmana after they had comprehended Brahma (the highest truth or Spirit). Thus in all probability Rammohun had rejected descent as a basis for caste identity of the Hindus.

Rammohun was quick to see that the evil practices of Sati, satidaha, Polygamy and sale of girls had also an economic side. In his view because of lack of economic support "only three modes of conduct" were left for these women to pursue after the death of their husbands: 1. To live a miserable life as either slaves to others, without indulging any hope of support from another husband. 2. To walk in the path of unrighteousness for their maintenance and independence. 3. To die on the funeral pyre of their husbands, loaded with applause and honour of their neighbours.¹² Thus Rammohun urged for the restoration of the

ancient rights of Hindu daughters to a share of their patrimony. Established by Rammohun Roy on the 20th August 1828 the Brahmo Samaj pursued all these ideas of social reform in an organised way.

Political Liberalism

It is pointless to search for isolated evidence of liberalism in the life, actions and thinking of a man who was inspired by liberalism in its totality. Indeed the political liberalism cannot be divorced from the philosophical momentum stimulated by the cultural changes of the nineteenth century that discarded (at least philosophically) everything irrational, customary and prejudicial under which life, thought and actions of men were crushed and repressed in the middle ages. The nineteenth century viewpoint boldly stated that while no impediments to opportunity should exist, individuals ought to be generally entitled to the rewards of their industry, talent and foresight. The organisation of state on this basis called for a structure of rule of law and constitutionalism of which Rammishun was highly respectful, so much so that naturalist ideals did not have any appeal to him, a point that attracted criticism from the posterity. This sentiment was expressed clearly in his "Final Appeal to the Christian Public," where he offered his thanks "to the Supreme Disposer of the Universe, from having unexpectedly delivered this country, from the long continued tyranny of its former Rulers, and placed it under the Government of the English, a nation who not only are blessed with the enjoyment of civil and

political liberty, but also interest themselves in promoting liberty and social happiness, as well as free inquiry into literary and religious subjects, among those nations to which that influence extends."¹³ Some commentators have too easily read into these lines and similar other passages a communal tendency, a pro-Hindu and anti-Muslim feeling.¹⁴ This was unfortunate. As Rammohun was deeply impressed by the British system of Rule of Law he was actually asserting its relative superiority over both Hindu and Muslim systems of law. Rammohun, for instance, observed:¹⁵

Having made Calcutta the capital of their dominions, the English distinguished this city by such peculiar marks of favour, as a free people would be expected to bestow, in establishing an English court of Judicature, the same civil rights as every Briton enjoys in his native country; thus putting the natives of India in possession of such privileges as their forefathers never expected to attain, even under Hindu Rulers

[Emphasis added]

So it was a liberal Rammohun arguing in favour of the Rule of Law and not a communal Rammohun criticising Muslim rule from a pro-Hindu bias. The liberal in Rammohun led him to support the freedom of the press. "Every good ruler ...," he said, "must be conscious of the great liability to error in managing the affairs of a vast empire; and therefore, he will be anxious to afford every individual the readiest means of bringing to his notice whatever may require his interference. To secure this

important object, the unrestricted liberty of publication is the only effectual means that can be employed."¹⁶

While he argued that the Rule of law introduced by the British in their Indian territories had served well to secure the enjoyment by Indians of their civil and religious rights from a violent infringement, he was opposed to any measure tantamount to a threat to his broad conception of liberalism. For example, he was opposed to the idea that the Legislative Council of India be composed of the servants of the East India Company and expressed his fear that the administrators cannot be good legislators.¹⁷ He was equally opposed to the Jury Bill introduced in Parliament by Mr. Wynn which sought to provide a Christian jury for the Christian convicts and excluded Hindus and Muslims from the Grand Jury.¹⁸ He was aware that a free and independent judiciary was the guarantee of constitutional government and would best be provided through codification of both civil and criminal law, arming the Sudder Dewany Adalat with the power of issuing the writ of Habeas Corpus, making the court proceedings open to public view, conducting the cases ~~the~~ in vernacular particularly up to the level of the Zillah or City, and the judicial watch over the police and administrative malfeasance.¹⁹

The deep love of liberty that prompted him to criticise any impediments to it also gave rise to what Miss Collet has called the Raja's "cosmopolitan sympathies in the political sphere." This was evident in his support to people in search of freedom, --- the Spanish, the Neapolitans, the French and the

Portuguese.²⁰ The 'broad humanism characteristic of Rammohun's political ideas was expressed in two other instance. In his letter to Prince Talleyrand, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of France, Rammohun suggested: "But on general grounds I beg to observe that it appears to me, the ends of constitutional government might be better attained by submitting every matter of political difference between two countries to a Congress composed of an equal number from the parliament of each; the decision of the majority to be acquiesced in by both nations and the Chairman to be chosen by each nation alternatively, for one year, and the place of meeting to be one year within the limits of one country and next within those of the other ..."²¹ The same liberal attitude led him to agree on the fundamentals of Robert Owen's socialist proposals. Thus, though not in full agreement with Owen the Raja held that "more than two thousand years ago wise and pious Brahmanas of India entertained almost the same opinions"²² with what Owen offered. So his opposition to parochial nationalism was perfectly consistent with his tacit acceptance of the basic ideals of socialist equality.

Economic Liberalism

The clearest manifestation of his liberal ideas and modernising spirit was to be found in his economic ideas. The logic behind Rammohun's advocacy of free trade, of Permanent Settlement as having introduced private property in land, of European Settlement in India and of Western secular learning was a sound economic

reasoning. According to his idea, British industrial capital, if used properly, would set up a commodity economy in India and also foster the growth of an indigenous entrepreneur class. That was what he hoped for and wished others to work for.²³ Whether he did work for this is a different question to be taken up later.

Rammohun Roy submitted his evidence "On the Revenue System of India" making a strong plea for reform of Permanent Settlement. As one goes through the questions posed by the Board of Control and answers of Rammohun Roy to them one notices the following important observations made by the Raja.

First, referring to the plight of the cultivators under the Zamindari system of Bengal and ryotwari system of the Madras presidency he said: "Under both systems the condition of the cultivators is very miserable; in the one they are placed at the mercy of the Zamindar's avarice and ambition, in the other they are subjected to the extortions and intrigues of the surveyors and other government officers."²⁴

Secondly, despite his criticism of both Zamindari and Ryotwari systems he held that the former was by far the better because the "condition of the proprietors," is "being secured by the permanent settlement against further demands of revenue, in proportion to the improvement of their estates, they have in consequence brought the waste lands into cultivation, and raised the rents of their tenantry, and thus increased their own incomes as well as resources of the country."²⁵

Thirdly, Rammohun favoured a common increase of wealth, an expression which he himself used while blaming Permanent Settlement as having failed to bring any "common increase of wealth."²⁶ The Raja noted: "I am at a loss to conceive why this indulgence was not extended to their tenants by requiring proprietors to follow the example of government in fixing a definite rent to be recovered from each cultivator...."²⁷ There is no reason to suppose that Rammohun was very much concerned with the plight of the real cultivators of the soil, the landless peasants, the adhiars and bargadars. He was pleading for the occupancy ryots and in doing so was making way for a new class of entrepreneurs in agriculture. This theme appeared more prominently in the late nineteenth century. In any case, the liberal attitude of Rammohun was pretty clear.

Thus we find that Rammohun wanted to make Permanent Settlement remunerative to both the proprietors and the tenants. He also formulated a course of action to that end that the government should absolutely interdict any further increase of rent and should lower it too by reducing revenue demand on Zamindars. But the Raja was, at the same time, rational enough not to ask the Government to sacrifice its revenue. In his opinion the budgetary gap should be filled up first by indirect taxation on luxury goods; second, by reducing the revenue establishment and thirdly, by substituting the standing army with a militia for the purpose of the country's defence. One cannot fail to notice that Rammohun carefully avoided recommending to the Government an increase in the demand upon the

Zamindars for the said purpose. Rammohun thus was clearly in favour of developing an indigenous entrepreneur class. Additional evidence on this can be found from his comments on the subject of inheritance. With ~~the~~ his deep knowledge of Hindu law Rammohun stood in defence of a progressive economic philosophy of property and inheritance when on one occasion the judges of the Supreme Court interpreted the Dayabhaga law of Bengal in a retrograde manner. According to the Mitakshara law of inheritance prevailing outside Bengal "a man in possession of ancestral real property under any tenure limiting it to successive generations of his family, is not authorised to dispose of it, by sale or gift, without the consent of his sons or grandsons. According to Dayabhaga, he has the power to alienate the property at his free will."²⁸ Rammohun supported the Dayabhaga system on the ground that it made land or real property a mobile or transferable asset, -- a form of capital in terms of which capital formation in India could be triggered off.

We have already observed that Rammohun wanted scope for capital-accumulation (as the primary basis of economic modernisation) as a corollary to a reformed Permanent Settlement, to the full security of tenure and its transferrability. At the same time Rammohun was emphatic on the point that the tenants should have the knowledge of improved techniques and other facilities of increased production. According to him this could be made possible through selective colonisation. Another object (also

favourable to indigenous capital accumulation) of his proposal for European settlement was the checking of heavy "drain" of, as estimated by him, six million sterling annually.²⁹ We find, therefore, that he did not only contemplate to use British industrial capital to the advantage of his country but did see a possibility as well of exploiting foreign technology through colonisation. Rammohun pointed out nine advantages of colonisation before the Select Committee of British Parliament, among which were the possibility of learning better methods of cultivation and of the spread of education.³⁰ His advocacy of colonisation, however, stood on a basic hypothesis that the Europeans of "character and capital" would be totally benevolent to the natives even to the extent of permitting the natives to stand on a level with themselves. The Raja had an equally high opinion about the contribution made by the European indigo-planters to Indian economy. At a public meeting held in the Calcutta Town Hall on 17 December 1829 he pointed out: "There may be some partial injury done by the indigo planters, but on the whole, they have performed more good to the generality of the natives of this country than any other class of Europeans, whether in and out of service."³¹

Following the same logic Rammohun picked up from rapidly industrialising Britain the liberal free trade ideology. Rammohun's zeal for alliance with the British free-traders theoretically rested on the ground that such an alliance would fructify in some sort of mutual capital formation as a result of interaction among Indian entrepreneurs, free-traders, merchants and bankers. We need

not repeat his arguments against monopoly trading since we referred to them in the first section of this chapter.

Thematic unity

Searching for a clue, a premise in Rammohun's multifarious ideas and activities one can pick up his model of man. - a model which had close similarities with the liberal model-man provided by early liberals like Jeremy Bentham and J.S. Mill. Rammohun had adequate knowledge of the liberal tradition. With Jeremy Bentham he had direct correspondence and he fully grasped the significance of liberalism which appeared in Europe as a new ideology to fit into the needs of a new world. It was a reaction to the forces of religious dominance and political authoritarianism. Man was still held to be a rational creature having a purposeful activity, but the essence of rational behaviour was increasingly held to lie in unlimited individual appropriation as a means of satisfying unlimited desire for utility.³² Bentham, the original systemiser of utilitarianism, conceived individual as a self-aggrandising being: "human beings are the most powerful instruments of production; and therefore, everyone becomes anxious to employ the services of his fellows in multiplying his own comforts. Hence the intense and universal thirst for power; the equally prevalent hatred of subjection."³³ This being his model of man Bentham could think of society only as a collection of individuals seeking power over and at the expense of other, the stronger, the more able naturally becoming more successful. The

society had to be class-divided and Bentham accepted it as such: "In the highest state of social prosperity, the great mass of citizens will have no source except their daily industry; and consequently, will be always near indigence."³⁴

Rammohun likewise accepted the individualist tradition of liberalism. Individual initiative and control were provided by revolutionary actions in England in the seventeenth, in America in the eighteenth and in France in the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries and all of them won his support. In his political ideas, in his social reforms and in his economic suggestions he wanted to remove all impediments to individual enterprise and self realisation. The significant activities of Rammohun that we can recall in this connection are: creation of Brahmo Samaj with a view to overcoming sectarian differences among people and inviting the individual to come out of the oppressive social customs; the abolition of Satidaha with a view to freeing women from social stagnation; the spread of scientific education and the study of liberal arts, natural history and philosophy of the West so that man could discover himself in the light of reason; inducting a rational inquiry into all fields of knowledge and public activity; encouragement to the new and improved techniques in agriculture, manufactures and commerce to improve productivity and to rectify inefficiency and dilatoriness; arguing for an impartial judicial system to preserve a common code of conduct; urging upon the government to maintain conditions of liberalism through freedom of the

press and assembly; the list can be prolonged but already the individual is writ large.

So, it was the faith in the individual, his rational faculty that Rammohun shared with the greatest of the philosophical radicals, - Jeremy Bentham. But unlike him, Rammohun was not led to the logical conclusion of a class-divided society. For him the essence of individuality was developmental and not predominantly acquisitive. The society too was not an area of heartless competition but an area of cooperation and a means to development. In this respect Rammohun was nearer to the position of J.S. Mill who revised Benthamite Utilitarianism. We are not suggesting any direct influence of J.S. Mill on Rammohun. That would be a historical nonsense. We are comparing them in order to get clearer insights into Rammohun's ideas, their points of strength and weakness.

In the alternative model of man that J.S. Mill had offered, the worth of individual was to be judged by the extent to which he could develop his human capacities. For Mill: "... the end of man ... is the highest and most harmonious development of his powers to a complete and consistent whole."³⁵ A good society, therefore, would be one that would permit and encourage everyone to act as exerter, developer and enjoyer of the execution and development of his or her capacities. Rammohun arguing in the same vein observed that if people "saw by experience, that merit would be appreciated" and that they could "hope to gain an independence by honest means" and that "just and honourable conduct held out

the best prospect of their being ultimately rewarded by situations of trust and responsibility" there would be an incentive for honesty and industry among the people. Indeed this was a liberal model man: independence-loving but seeking to develop all his capacities in the way of which there should not come any impediments from society. Mill's model was primarily a moral model, so was Rammohun's.

Mill was troubled by the incompatibility he saw between the claims of equal human development and existing class-inequalities of wealth and influence. He denounced as utterly unjust the position "...that the produce of labour should be apportioned as we now see it, almost in an inverse ratio to the labour, - the largest portions to those who have never worked at all, the next largest to those whose work is almost nominal, and so in a descending scale ..." ³⁶ Rammohun, like Mill, was deeply troubled by the inequalities of wealth and income that he saw in Bengal. While he welcomed the Cornwallis Settlement of 1793 he qualified his welcome in clear terms that was quite in Mill's way: "The power of the new leases and rents, given to the proprietors by Reg. I and III 1793, and subsequent Regulations, has considerably enriched, comparatively a few individuals, the proprietors of land, to the extreme disadvantage, or rather ruin of millions of their tenants." ³⁷ He further commented: "In short, such is the melancholy condition of the agricultural labourers, that it has always given me the greatest pain to allude to it." ³⁸

Mill wanted to replace the unsatisfactory situation by "... the elevation of the dignity of labour; a new sense of security and independence in the labouring class; and the conversion of each human being's daily occupation into a school of the social sympathies and the practical intelligence."³⁹ That Rammohun also thought of similar replacement is not difficult to see. He expected that society should make possible "just and honourable conduct" and "independence by honest means." Mill's "school of social sympathies" for Rammohun was "common comforts of life." At least the sentiment of both ran parallel. Mill did not see any contradiction between this developmental goal and the capitalist relations of production. For him the ethical principle of 'reward in proportion to labour' was synonymous with the capitalist principle of "reward in proportion to the market value of both capital and labour."⁴⁰ Rammohun likewise did not find any contradiction between his developmental goal and the capitalist principle he supported. His solution was a liberal solution security of property, freedom of trade and a modernised economy as a corollary to agricultural and industrial development with the aid of western technique, capital and enterprise. We now must note that both have already exhibited their lack of realism. Mill failed to see that capitalist market relations enhance or replace the previous inequitable relations or distribution. Rammohun also naively assumed that a liberal reform would be a sufficient condition for the realisation of his developmental ideal. But there was

further lack of realism in Rammohun. Mill after all did not totally ignore class-issue. He was afraid of class threat to bourgeois democracy and wanted to provide safeguards in the form of plural voting. But no such awareness was found in Rammohun's advocacy of a liberal way of development. J.S. Mill after all identified the class aspect of his own society but Rammohun in his fascination for liberalism ignored it. There was another lack of realism in his transplantation of a liberal model man directly to a colonial situation. This was indicative of Rammohun's unwillingness or inability to see the colonial situation differently from that of a free country like England. For the British colonialists the liberal model man could be a fair abstraction of their class position. But for the native elite like Rammohun who were dependent on and subservient to the colonial economy such uncritical adoption of the liberal model man was highly unrealistic. We would probe into this aspect further in a subsequent section where we would be discussing the class basis of the model. It is true that the adopted or transplanted model man served as the basis, and perhaps gave enough justification for the ideas of native elite on socio-political questions. But the lack of realism inherent in such imitation constituted an important feature in the development of both subjective and objective aspects of nationalism in Bengal. Though the full implications became prominent only very late in the century the confusion regarding the model man went a long way in retarding the objective development of the native bourgeoisie and subjectively alienating

the native elite represented by Rammohun Roy from the larger segments of native society. We will explore this theme in greater depth in a subsequent section on the class basis of the model. Before we do this let us make a quick review of the ideas of Dwarakanath Tagore, the illustrious friend and ^{disciple} of Rammohun.

Dwarakanath Tagore

Dwarakanath Tagore (1794-1846), the son of Rammoni Tagore was adopted by his uncle Ramlochan Tagore and inherited sizable landed property after the death of the latter. He himself started supervising his estate since 1812.⁴¹ Rammohun cast a deep influence on Dwarakanath and presumably familiarised the latter with Company regulations as well as the legal and operative aspects of administration.⁴² One is impressed by the similarities between their principal modes of life. Both were the products of a land system nurtured by the British to which their families owed their prosperity, both had substantial landed properties, both were traders in baniya activities and both served under the company. But surely one is likely to be impressed further by the similarities that can be located in the realm of their ideas.

Though Dwarakanath did not dissociate himself from Hindu Polytheism and idolatrous practices and worshiped the Hindu Goddesses,⁴³ he was known to have developed a preference for Europeanised life-style. His wife Smt. Digambari Devi was said to have followed the practice of purifying herself by the holy water

of the river Ganga after each time she lived with her husband.⁴⁴ In fact Dwarakanath Tagore, though not converted to Brahmoism, was associated with the Brahmo Sabha in 1828 and was among the five individuals who were signatories for the Brahmo Samaj when land was purchased for the Samaj in 1829.⁴⁵ It can be inferred that Rammohun could at least instil an unorthodox detachment from Hindu ways of life in Dwarakanath if not develop a monotheistic faith. The inference seems to be justified when we find Dwarakanath Tagore opposing the practice of Satidaha together with Rammohun. After the abolition of Satidaha by the Regulation XVII of 1829 Bentinck was thanked through a letter by a section of people among whom were Rammohun and Dwarakanath.⁴⁶ In 1842 Lady Bentinck mentioned in a letter the pioneering role of Rammohun and Dwarakanath in the abolition of Satidaha.⁴⁷ Dwarakanath was not ~~that~~ very vocal against caste division as Rammohun was but he was not respectful of the Brahmins and openly criticised them.⁴⁸ This is sufficient to illustrate Dwarakanath's disenchantment with the typical Hindu faith. Rammohun, we have seen, was deeply shaken by the abject state of women in the Hindu society and recommended measures for their intellectual and economic independence. Dwarakanath shared this feeling and came forward to setting up a school for the female at his own expense though the effort did not finally succeed.⁴⁹ One British lady quoted Dwarakanath as having said : "The day is far distant for this happiness to be conferred on my country-women. I would give something to see that men, among the Hindoos, who will have the courage to bring forward their wives

and daughters to be instructed upon European principles of education."⁵⁰ The love of secular education that he shared with Rammohun was further exhibited when Dwarakanath took personal interest in the promotion of medical education and even himself observed dissection of human corpses with the students.⁵¹ He also arranged scholarships for the meritorious students and donated Rs.2000 a year for three years since 1846.⁵²

Dwarakanath's progressive outlook on social questions was accompanied by his faith in political liberalism that he shared with Rammohun. He, like Rammohun, was impressed by the British rule of law and gratefully acknowledged the advantages accruing from British administration in India. This he did in a meeting convened to celebrate Queen Victoria's accession to the throne held on the 29th September, 1838. There he admitted that under British rule the life and property of the citizens were fully secured.⁵³ In his first visit to England in 1842 when he was given a gold medal Dwarakanath expressed his thanks and praised "the just and liberal rule of the Hon. Court" and expressed his "firm conviction that the happiness of India is best secured by her connection with your own great and glorious country... whose noble solicitude for the welfare and improvements of millions committed by Providence to its charge, may challenge the admiration of the whole world."⁵⁴ This is illustrative of the infatuation that Dwarakanath shared with Rammohun about British liberalism. Dwarakanath also had an abiding faith in the freedom of the press and did never hesitate to provide economic and moral support to Raja Rammohun Roy for the publication of news-

papers. When in 1823 Regulation III was enforced to suppress the freedom of the press a petition was sent to the Supreme Court protesting against the Regulation in which both Rammohun and Dwarakanath were among the signatories.⁵⁵ Not only in the case of the press, Dwarakanath was signatory with Rammohun in other petitions also against the Stamp Act and the Jury Act before 1816.

Rammohun, as we have seen, saw the possibility of higher productivity and prosperity as a result of economic freedom that was supposed to be the essence of Permanent Settlement. Dwarakanath likewise regarded Permanent Settlement as a great piece of administrative reform and was hopeful that it would enlarge the scope of freedom for the country.⁵⁶ With the hope of utilising British capital and technology for laying the foundation of a growth-oriented native economy Rammohun supported the demands for free trade and advocated the colonisation of India. Dwarakanath supported indigo planters from the same viewpoint. In a meeting on the issue of colonisation at the Calcutta Town Hall on December 15, 1829 Dwarakanath observed: "I have found the cultivation of indigo and residence of Europeans have considerably benefitted the country and the community at large, the Zamindars becoming wealthy and prosperous, the Ryots materially improved in their condition and possessing many more comforts than the generality of my countrymen where indigo cultivation and manufacture is not carried on, the value of land in the vicinity to be considerably enhanced and cultivation rapidly progressing."⁵⁷

In fact this support to colonisation was perfectly consistent with the support of Rammohun and Dwarakanath to free trade. In one of ~~the~~^{his} speeches Dwarakanath explained the comparative advancement of the businessmen of Calcutta from that of the mofussils as a result of the cooperation that the former received from the bankers and free traders of England which was not available from the Company twenty years ago.⁵⁸ Thus Dwarakanath shared Rammohun's zeal for alliance with the British free traders and hoped that such alliance would fructify in some sort of mutual capital formation.

The thematic unity between the ideas of Rammohun and Dwarakanath discussed so far indicates also the fundamental misconception about the liberal model man. As Rammohun transplanted the liberal model man directly onto a colonial situation so did Dwarakanath. The myth of identity of interests between the natives and the Europeans had little relationship with political reality. In other words, while a common front of native elites and colonists could be justified on political grounds the assumption of essential unity was quite removed from reality. The false sense of unity was best illustrated by the unequivocal support of Dwarakanath to the European opposition to the so-called "Black Act" (Act XI of 1836 which sought to place the Europeans on an equal footing with the natives in the Mofussil Courts). In a meeting convened at the Calcutta Town Hall on November 24, 1838 for the purpose of petitioning both the Houses of Parliament to

repeal or disallow the "Black Act" Dwarakanath observed: "Mr. Macaulay would equalise us by bringing down Englishmen to the level of the natives, instead of raising the natives to the level of Englishmen ... we ought to support the cause of the Europeans, ... in doing so, we support not only their cause, which in gratitude we are bound to do, but our own."⁵⁹ There was realism up to a certain point in this observation but the lack of realism was also evident on a different consideration. Dwarakanath thought of mundane advantages from a political alliance with the colonists. Thus in the same meeting Dwarakanath observed :

The resumption operations was another Government measure of equalisation. The operation on which they wished to proceed was to equalise all the tenures. They assess the rent-free lands in order to bring it on a level with the lands that pay revenue ... These are the consequences likely to result from allowing the Black or Equity Act to go unnoticed, -- these are the dangers which threaten our countrymen. I, therefore, call on them to come forward now and support the Europeans against the encroachment with which their rights are threatened.⁶⁰

As far as the alliance was a give-and-take policy it was highly realistic. Dwarakanath's hope was met when the Planters supported the Landholders' Society against the resumptions proceedings.⁶¹ However Dwarakanath hardly realized that the co-operation was actually sustained by the peak indigo production

in this period and was sure to crumble down as soon as the planters got the upper hand. While participating in the joint actions against the recusant ryots like the followers of Doodoo Meah and the Faraezis⁶¹ of Faridpur Dwarakanath failed to realise that while two competitors could unite against their common enemy the alliance was likely to break down in the absence of such enemy. This was what happened subsequently and the priorities were changed from opposition to the measures of equality to demands for racial equality. Thus Dwarakanath realized the political aspect of his opposition to Act XI of 1836 but only imperfectly. Instead of taking the alliance as only a temporary measure, he took it as an instance of abiding cooperation between his class of native elites and the British free traders and planters. He gave vent to the same feeling on 8th January 1842 when ~~xx~~ he referred to the mark of respect shown to him in England as a solid proof to the world that Britishers and Indians, especially the landlords of the two countries were deeply related by virtue of a unity of feeling and interests.⁶² Nothing could be more unrealistic. He not only failed to distinguish the colonial situation from the condition of political freedom but also failed to see the difference of truncated economic existence of his own class from the productive British bourgeoisie. The lack of realism was thus an unmistakable part of the present model. This will come up again in connection with our discussion of its class basis.

The Class Basis of the Model

The class basis of the conservatives, we have seen, had three broad aspects of their economic rank path. To be specific, these were (i) Baniya and money-lending activities as well as rent receiving functions under the direct patronage of the Company, (ii) petty government jobs and (iii) income through traditional structures of social behaviour. Important changes started taking place since the Charter Act of 1813 and more particularly since 1833 Charter Act. The policy of restricting the export of indigenous cotton products not only destroyed our artisan cotton industry but also damaged the source of income for those who thrived on internal trading or money-lending for that purpose.⁶³ This was, therefore, a big blow to the older types of baniya and trading capital that was dependent on the Company. Within sixteen years of the new Charter Act private trade trebled over that of the Company. Whereas the value of the total economic activities of the Company was 18,82,718 Sterling Pounds the investment of private capital amounted to 54,51,452 Sterling Pounds.⁶⁴ This led to an increase in the scope of native baniya activities that now covered the new avenues of investment. The new scope of cooperation between the native elites and the free traders was shown by an enormous growth of business houses in Calcutta between 1834-46. While in 1835 the number of business houses in Calcutta was 46 the number rose to 61 in 1846.⁶⁵ Witnessing this favourable climate of profitable cooperation between the native elites and

the British free traders the Bengali journal Samachar Durpan wrote on the 27th August 1836:

Some of our readers inferred that the abolition of Company monopoly and the destruction of some big business houses would prove to be a great hindrance to commercial activities and lead to immense difficulties for the people. But within a short period these have been rectified. At present Calcutta is witnessing a great upsurge of commercial activities which it never witnessed before.⁶⁶

These changed circumstances called for an alteration of the older economic rank path for the native elite. The change could not be total, for Permanent Settlement still continued to make investment in land a profitable venture. But nevertheless, it was substantial because the circumstances called for a new set of economic and social behaviour. Any successful pursuit of economic rank path would have to be an extension from pure rent receiving to increased collaboration with the free-traders, - to new enterprises which did not have the assured security of Permanent Settlement. The corresponding social role would have to be a willingness to neglect caste and orthodox beliefs. While land under Permanent Settlement was still an attractive area of investment, buying shares, making deposits in the banks and collaborating with the British free traders and businessmen became more attractive propositions. Secular education still furnished the scope of career in petty government jobs. Thus the native elite was still buying

control over lands, entering into contracts or partnerships with private traders as with the Company and serving as salaried employees. They, therefore, were pursuing a substantially different economic rank path than that of the Conservatives like Radhakanta Deb.

It is not difficult to see how both Rammohun and Dwarakanath had pursued this new economic rank path. Rammohun acquired a few estates and became a virtual zamindar before he joined service under the East India Company and continued investing in landed property. He had followed at the same time a rewarding line of business by advancing loans to needy civil servants who were often in the habit of applying for loans to local money-lenders in order to finance their speculation and commercial deals on side lines. He lent money to distinguished officers of the East India Company. He, for example, "advanced a loan of Rs.7500 to the Hon'ble Andrew Ramsay, a civil servant of E.I. Comp.... lent Rs.5000 to Thomas Woodford ... "⁶⁷ Conscious as he was of the opportunities of the new situation he also tried his hand at a more speculative line of business. He dealt in indigo, in the Company's papers, the forerunner of the Indian giltedged securities and invested his money in the Agency House of Mackintosh and Company.⁶⁸ The objective class character of this type of native elite that was represented by Rammohun Roy cannot therefore be comprehended by treating them as zamindars but also as 'go-between-dalals,' and occasionally as partners in joint ventures with the British free traders and businessmen.

It was however Dwarakanath Tagore who practised more successfully what Rammohun recognised and initiated both theoretically and practically. He built up a fairly wide network of money-lending, baniya activities and export trade within 1820-21 and yet accepted a petty government job under the collector of 24-parganas at a meagre salary of Rs.150 per mensem and at an annual average commission of Rs.320 in 1822.⁶⁹ Surely he did not accept the job for the salary it offered but probably for having some practical experience of administration and developing connections with men at key positions for which Rammohun was an example and perhaps the man who advised Dwarakanath to take up this job.⁷⁰ Like Rammohun, he continued extending his landed property while still serving under the government. For example, he added Kaligram (1830) and Sahajadpur (1834) to his properties during this period.⁷¹ His zamindari properties constituted a reliable source of income. In 1834, for instance, the income from landed assets was Rs. 1,30,000.⁷² But unlike the conservatives, Dwarakanath was more interested in the new economic role made possible by the changed situation.

Dwarakanath was among the native pioneers in indigo cultivation and trade. He established his first indigo factory in his zamindari areas, i.e., in Silaidah in Pabna district in 1821. Among the seven factories that he established five were in the areas of Birahimpur and Sahajadpur in the district of Pabna and Nadia respectively and one each in the bigger Jangipur and smaller

Jangipur in the district of Murshidabad. Dwarakanath was definitely at a more advantageous position than the European planters who had to carry on at that time under nij cultivation, but for Dwarakanath the ryots had all the responsibilities of providing seeds and implements. Thus Dwarakanath had more or less an assured supply of indigo. It was estimated that the total production of indigo at his factories was almost sixteen hundred maunds that fetched him in Calcutta about Rs. 2,00,000.⁷³ Despite the oppression associated with indigo cultivation he did never discontinue this business and after his death mention was found of six indigo factories in his will.⁷⁴ It is interesting to note that Dwarakanath's dealings in indigo did not lead to any conflict with European planters, rather the relationship was one of cooperation. In 1836 he appointed one Mr. Rice in Birahimpur to control the disgruntled peasants and Mr. J.C. Miller for Sahajadpur also in the same year.⁷⁵ He also leased areas under his zamindari to European planters. In fact, the pursuit of new economic rank path called for collaboration with the British free traders and businessmen and Dwarakanath worked precisely in this line. Since 1820 he continued providing loans almost through the rest of his life to different individuals at the rates of interest varying from Rs. 8 to Rs. 12 per hundred, the loaned amount varying from two thousand to almost three lakhs. Most of the debtors were Britishers, - indigo planters, businessmen and government officials.⁷⁶ In all of his investment speculations European association was very significant. Initially Dwarakanath concerned himself with two important commercial organisations. One of them was 'Bengal Steam Fund' and another

was 'Oriental Life Insurance Company.' H.M. Parkar was the President of the Bengal Steam Fund and Dwarakanath was one of its Directors.⁷⁷ The venture, however, was unsuccessful. Oriental Life Insurance Company was established in 1822 and besides Dwarakanath its partners included Ferguson and Co., Crutendon & Co. and Mackintosh Co. When the partners were ruined Dwarakanath chose new partners and formed 'New Oriental Life Insurance Society.'⁷⁸ Two other hallmarks of Dwarakanath's enterprising spirit were the Union Bank (1829) and Carr, Tagore & Company (1834). Dwarakanath was actively associated with Ms. G. Gordon, John Palmer and Col. James Young in the planning of this joint stock company or Union Bank.⁷⁹ From the very beginning the Union Bank was providing liberal credit to the established British businessmen. The regulations governing credit and repayment were often flouted and personal relations counted more than credibility.⁸⁰ The investment that were financed by the Bank were mostly on indigo and in this respect the planters and the shareholders were personally benefited and the Bank suffered.⁸¹ In 1847 the Bank had a claim of Rs. 730000 upon the six agency houses --- Carr, Tagore and Company; Hamilton and Company; Gilmore and Company; Cockrell and Company; Ferguson Brothers and William Storm. This was not surprising because since as early as 1834 the Directors of the Bank were invariably selected from members of these agency houses.⁸²

The Carr Tagore & Co. was established on 1st August 1834 and actually started functioning since the month of October of the same year.⁸³ William Carr served previously as a broker in indigo

trade and had complete knowledge of mercantile affairs which Dwarakanath wanted to utilise. In a letter to Lord William Bentinck he made his intention clear when with reference to the Company he observed: "It is so far a remarkable one in the commercial history of Bengal, as it is the first instance in which an open and avowed partnership has been established between the European and the Bengal merchant with the capital of the latter ..."⁸⁴ Though the Company originated as an exporting house it also imported silk from China and liquor from England. The Company dealt in wide range of goods - raw silk, silk piece goods. Indigo, Sugar, Rum, Salt peter, Hides, Timber and Rice.⁸⁵ Its major business, however, was in indigo and people often described the Company as 'Indigo Mart.'⁸⁶ The Company also had Zamindari business and its revenue yield was only next to that of the king of Burdwan.⁸⁷ It also administered the Bengal Coal Company.⁸⁸ The Company further served as executing or managing agent of many business houses among whom were Calcutta Steam Tug Association, General Steam Navigation Company, Bengal Salt Company and Bengal Tea Association. There is little point in giving further accounts of the elaborate activities of the Company. By now it is clear that none of such activities was independent of the association of Dwarakanath's British friends.⁸⁹

The objective aspect of class relationship of the native elite with the Colonists was, therefore, a new form of collaboration with British private capital. The liberal model man was invoked as a subjective complement by the native elite. The ideology of reform that was jointly advocated by the liberal imperia-

lists and the class of native elite represented by Rammohun and Dwarakanath was felt necessary in their common interest of developing a market economy in a traditional society. The social customs, conventions, traditions and religious restrictions posed formidable difficulties to class collaboration, capital formation and development of necessary infra-structural facilities. In Bengal religious extravagance, religious endowments, expenditure on social and religious ceremonies and constructions on religious obligations very much hampered the growth of capital accumulation. "Hinduism, a religion of exuberance as also of asceticism, created a sense of social values that was most certainly not conducive to the worship of money."⁹⁰ The Hindus who accumulated some capital under British mercantilism were prevented from entering into the market economy as active members because the rewarding economic activities such as dealings in alcohol and organic matters, voyages across the seas or free-mixing with the Europeans were all prohibited by the sanctions of caste and religion. The spread of British business could thus be possible only after removing the social obstacles. Macaulay put the facts squarely when he observed: "To trade with civilised men is infinitely more profitable than to govern savages. "The native elite was equally aware of the necessity of social reform. The awareness was reflected in their growing neglect of caste and all forms of prohibitory social practices, - in their zeal for secular education and assertion of individuality in social, political and economic matters. Reform in its several manifestations was a class necessity and they recognised it as

such. That Rammohun did recognise this was evident from the following observation made by him⁹¹ :

... those exceptional practices which not only deprive Hindoos in general of the common comfort of the society but also lead them frequently to self-destruction...

... the present system of religion adhered to by the Hindoos is not well calculated to promote their political interest the multitude of religious rites and ceremonies and the laws of purification have totally disqualified them from undertaking any difficult enterprise it is, I think, necessary that some changes should take place in their religion, at least for the sake of their political advantage and social comfort

[Emphasis added].

The recognition of class advantage is quite clear here. Reform, even reform of religion, is not needed for its own sake, not also for moral or intellectual development, or at any rate, not primarily for such development, but for "political advantage and social comfort." There was thus a clear awareness of the ideological requirement of the newly found economic rank path. All questions of reform, including reforms proposed with respect to Permanent Settlement, were more or less guided by these considerations. Rammohun Roy, as we have already observed, wanted a number of reforms in the existing system of Permanent Settlement; the government should absolutely interdict any further increase of rent and should lower it too by reducing revenue demand on Zamindars, the budgetary gap should be filled by reducing revenue

establishment and taxing luxury items. There were other suggestions. What is interesting to note is that in the suggested reforms the proposed beneficiaries continue to be the traditional beneficiaries But then who were the beneficiaries and what were the benefits?

The beneficiaries under Permanent Settlement were both the government and the landlords. Before the introduction of the Permanent Settlement there was the simple arrangement for collecting revenue. One half of the total annual produce would be kept by the cultivating ryot, the other half would go to the ruler minus of course the 10% of Collector's share. The revenue was in kind and it varied according to annual amount of produce. The arrangement did not ensure uniform returns to the government or the landlord, but it offered some respite (relative, of course, to the annual quantity of produce) to the cultivating ryots when the produce was small due to drought or flood. The Permanent Settlement removed such uncertainties and ensured a fixed high annual return of revenue to the government. The Zamindars also got three major benefits: first, they were bringing under cultivation 'waste-lands' and consequently enjoying greater difference from what they had to pay as pre-fixed; second, they were imposing abwabs and different other cesses on the ryots, in addition to enhancement of rents through legal methods; finally, they were profiting from the 'increased value of the estates as a consequence of the first two factors. The increase in the common price at which estates changed

hands at public or private sales since 1793 was assumed by Rammohun himself as 'tenfold, and in some instances twenty.' There was little possibility that Rammohun's suggested reforms would change either the benefits or the beneficiaries. Simple legal restriction of rent enhancement was likely to be ignored by the landlords, as was evident from the extent of illegal cesses. Then it may be noted that Rammohun suggested, together with protection to the occupancy ryots, corresponding reduction in the demands of revenue from the government. The Zamindars were certainly the favourites. It may further be noted that the number of rent paying cultivators was insignificant compared to marginal farmers and landless peasants whom the reforms never had in view. The reforms therefore had a lexical priority. At the top ^{were} ~~was~~ the old beneficiaries. Whatever benefits could be given, and to whomsoever, were determined in that order of priority. The reforms had such priorities because they had to be consistent with the economic -rank path that the native elite were pursuing. Hence, the thematic unity of the ideas of Rammohun and Dwarakanath had the same class basis and the ideas were more or less consistent with such basis. We say more or less consistent and not fully, consistent because we will show that the native elite wrongly comprehended their own class position and accordingly, some of their ideas had to be less consistent with their actual class position.

While the scheme of social and religious reforms of the native elite were highly realistic as well as necessary for their

successful pursuit of economic rank path, they faltered in comprehending their actual class position vis-a-vis the liberal imperialists and therefore in their transplantation of liberal model man onto the colonial situation. This was unfortunate but not inevitable. They were highly realistic in suggesting reforms that were likely to remove many impediments on their economic rank path. But their lack of realism in comprehending their own class position led them to falsely equating themselves with the British bourgeoisie. This was not immediately harmful but ultimately proved to be most prejudicial to the growth of the native capitalist economy.

We have seen that the class represented by Rammohun and Dwarakanath developed a parasitical symbiosis with British private capital in pursuing their economic rank path. In doing so they took for granted the mutually beneficial aspect of such symbiosis and identified the rank path they were pursuing with the economic enterprise of the British bourgeoisie in a truly liberal market economy. This confusion generated in them the high optimism that they would in days to come be equal to the British bourgeoisie not only in the spirit and capability of enterprise but also in civil and political liberties. Nothing could be more erroneous. The British had their own calculations. 'The doctrine of "Free Trade" which they invented in order to refute the ideas of the earlier age of mercantilism helped them a great deal in this respect i.e. in controlling Indian trade to an everincreasing extent. They could righteously deny the parasitical nature of

their symbiosis with India and point to the mutual benefit derived from trade.⁹² The native elite represented by Rammohun and Dwarakanath was not however conscious ~~to~~ of the tendency produced by free-trade towards an economy peripherally dependent on the emerging industrial capitalism of British or of the fact that when they were collaborating with the British bourgeoisie they were not creating the basis for a self-reliant native economy but were actually destroying the rudiments of capitalist relations in their homeland.⁹³ Rammohun, for example, invested in the Agency House of Mackintosh and Co. The Managing Agency system operated as a strong medium of raw material export from India to Britain in the guise of providing financial support to Indian subsidiary processing. The increase in the export of indigo between 1800 and 1830 reached the high figure of 200 to 300 percent. The whole of this flourishing business was controlled by only six Agency Houses. These Agency Houses virtually established a quasi-monopolistic business that dictated indigenous production by the logic of colonial usefulness, - a situation that was most prejudicial to the growth of the native capitalist economy. Rammohun's lack of understanding of this phenomenon was evident in his support to the Agency Houses, and to the ideology of free trade as also in his hypothesis of British benevolence.

The lack of realism was also quite evident in Dwarakanath. He was also unable to understand the true nature of the collaboration. While he considered such collaboration as evidence of inter-racial equality and welcomed partnership with the Britishers on an

equal basis, the British free traders and businessmen took it as an opportunity to plunder the country and showed no spirit of equality. Blair Kling, thus, rightly observed : "Carr, Tagore and Company, for example, was not truly a partnership of equals. Dwarakanath established the house and invited Carr, Pricep, and other impecunious British merchants to join in the use of his capital. They had nothing to lose and everything to gain by accepting his offer, and they left for home as soon as possible."⁹⁴ Kling further commented : "Dwarakanath laboured in vain, for the British would not accept genuine partnership with an Indian."⁹⁵ In fact, the main principle of the colonial administration was to keep India as a raw material appendage in the interest of manufacturers in Britain. It is evident from the history of enterprises undertaken by Dwarakanath that they ultimately became effective instruments of plundering the capital and raw materials. Nobody would question the realism of the elite represented by Rammohun and Dwarakanath as far as personal gains were concerned but the trouble was that they saw no contradiction between what was personally beneficial and what was needed for a self reliant economy.

It is easy now to appreciate the class basis of the model. The economic rank path that the native elite were pursuing called for measures of modernisation and reform. In so far as they propagated such reforms they appeared to be very realistic. But there were defects and contradictions too. An obvious one was in the matter of modernisation and development. The idea that collabora-

tion with the colonists on the economic rank path which the native elite were pursuing was sufficient for the development and modernisation of their society had no real basis, because the benefits of free trade were not at all mutual and their own activities, such as investment in Agency Houses or in the export of raw materials and import of British finished goods were, instead of giving fillip to indigenous entrepreneurship were subjecting the country to the logic of colonial usefulness. So, though they stood for development, they were the unconscious participants in the process of economic underdevelopment. A deeper difficulty which was at the root of this phenomenon was in their model of man and society. The liberal model man and the model of liberal society which they picked up from rapidly industrialising Britain were most inappropriate in a colony where man was shaped more by oppression than by free competition.

We should not, however, speak of model 2A as a failure. Though it wrongly transplanted liberal models of man and society onto a colonial situation it did not fail to make or assert its indigenous claim to it. In other words, though the comparison was faulty the claim of originality went to produce a new type of nativism that was quite different from what was produced by the conservatives. This, in our opinion, was the basis of its proto-nationalism. This was of immense consequence. Its main lines continued to be generally accepted by subsequent thinkers and we would examine this issue in a moment.

Proto-nationalism

The concept 'Proto-nationalism' is not yet widely current in political literature. Going by the lexicographical meaning our understanding does not go further than referring to the first or original expression of nationalist sentiment in a country which eventually becomes developed to give rise to a fullfledged nationalist movement.⁹⁶ In the framework of analysis developed by David Kopf, Proto-nationalism was equated with a defensive and nativist movement, which in Bengal, was represented by a zealous appreciation of Hinduism by the Dharma Sabha.⁹⁷ There was no contradiction between the lexicographical meaning of the concept and Kopf's formulation because Kopf was indicating a development of religious defence of Dharma Sabha group (which he called Proto-nationalist) into militant Hindu nationalism of the eighties of the nineteenth century Bengal. We do not share Kopf's framework because we feel that there were other patterns in the intervening period which were equally relevant to the development of nationalism in Bengal. Again, we feel that the contradiction Kopf saw between the ideology of reform and Proto-nationalism was unjustified in so far as the expression of nationalism becomes significant only in the context of an identity crisis as a consequence of pressure for change. Thus, Proto-nationalism need not be viewed as opposition to reform or change; rather, it may be viewed as complementary to such change or reform. Kopf, however, suggested the apolitical nature of Proto-nationalism which was understandable in a colonial situation. Thus, elaborating on the theme suggested by Kopf, while differing widely in its application, we look for at least three

components in any set of ideas that may be called Proto-nationalist. First, to be Protonationalist, the ideas must exhibit attempts at trait-maintenance and must adhere to the familiar and traditional symbol-systems of language, customs, religion and the like while retaining apolitical nature. Second, there must be continuous development from apolitical level to political level or the ideas must be destined to acquire a vision of political freedom and independence. And finally, the nativism and indigenous claims must arise in the context of an identity crisis as a consequence of pressure for change. If the present model satisfies all these conditions then the Protonationalist claim may be granted to this model (2A). Let us see whether such claim can be granted.

Rammohun, as we have seen, was conscious of the difficulties posed by the traditional social structure in living up to the ideals of market society and he frankly admitted⁹⁸: "... the present system of religion adhered to by the Hindoos is not well calculated to promote their political interest." He also made no secret to his belief that he considered Christianity as more appropriate for the said object: "I fully agree with you that there is nothing so sublime as the precepts taught by Christ, and there is nothing equal to the simple doctrine he inculcated." He was evidently aware of the 'use' value of Christianity as an appropriate code of ethics for a market society and wrote in 1817 to Mr. Digby⁹⁹:

The consequence of my long and uninterrupted researches into religious truth has been that I have found the doctrine of Christ more conducive to moral principles.

and more adapted for the use of rational beings, than any other which have come to my knowledge [Emphasis added.]

There is no reason to suppose that Rammohun was not arguing from the standpoint of market rationality which prompted him to reject Hinduism in its present form. Quite clearly, Rammohun was undergoing a pressure for change but the point is, how he tackled the problem of identity.

After the publication in 1820 of 'The Precepts of Jesus : the Guide to Peace and Happiness; extracted from the Books of the New Testament, ascribed to the Four Evangelists with translation into Sanskrit and Bengali,' he was drawn into a theological controversy and he developed in different tracts his attack on Trinitarian Orthodoxy. His arguments in favour of Unitarian Christianity were so forceful that the famous missionary Mr. Adam renounced his belief in the doctrine of Trinity and avowed himself to be a Unitarian. What interests us is the fact that though Rammohun was conscious of the mundane advantages of being a convert to Christianity, he refused conversion. It is on record that one Bishop Middleton entered into long arguments to persuade him to accept Christianity while indicating the possibility of "the grand career which would open to him by a change of faith" and that "He would be honoured in life and lamented in death, -- honoured in England as well as in India; -- his name would descend to posterity as that of the modern Apostle of India." The avenue

to achievement, we can see, was let wide open to him but Rammohun turned his back on the Bishop and never met him again.¹⁰⁰

If religion was to be considered in terms of its use value alone, and we have seen that Rammohun considered it so, then Christianity would have been the best replacement of decadent Hinduism. But Rammohun would simply borrow the appropriate moral principles from Christianity, the 'precepts,' appropriate for a market society, but would like to demonstrate that that was borrowed was really a forgotten custom, an indigenous trait; while he would incorporate the deep values of the market society he would find native roots for them. In other words, he would assert not only his identity as an individual or as member of a particular class but as a member of a nation with a distinct identity of its own. It is at this point that Proto-nationalism arises. Rammohun, as we find, was very categorical about the distinctiveness of his own culture. It was therefore, not surprising that he regarded Hinduism as metaphysically and spiritually the most advanced religion of the world even though he retained throughout his life a great admiration for the ethical teachings of Christianity. This has been admitted by the Abbe Gregoire, Bishop of Blois (France) who testified about Rammohun : "He asserts likewise that he has found nothing in European books equal to the scholastic philosophy of the Hindus "¹⁰¹ This definitely reveals Rammohun's traditional roots but does not serve as an evidence in support of his Proto-nationalism, because religious identity, unless accompanied

by a nationalist feeling, may not be a basis of Proto-nationalism.

Proto-nationalism in connection with religion was best revealed in the greatest of his life's work, - the establishment of the Brahmo Samaj as an independent religious community (1828) which was a sequel to a series of tentative social efforts. He incorporated the moral principles and values of his favourite religion Christianity into his new religion but naturalised them perfectly by making an indigenous claim through the history and mythology of the ancient Indian culture. He made such a claim when he spoke of the new religion as "exhibiting the simplicity, comprehensiveness and tolerance, which distinguish the religious belief and the worship formerly adopted by one of the most ancient nations on earth and still adhered to by the more enlightened portion of their posterity" [Emphasis added].¹⁰² Two things must be noted in this context. First, the religion (Brahmo Dharma) was not claimed by Rammohun to be an innovation, nor also as an innovative combination but as a continuation of the national tradition. And second, he was conscious of the use value of his system of beliefs because earlier he made his objective clear in the following terms: "It is, I think, necessary that some changes should take place in their religion, at least for the sake of their political advantage and social comfort."¹⁰³ Thus, he was looking at the religions from the vantage point of one whose main concern was to promote the development of a market society. This

was recognised, though late, by his friend Adam who observed¹⁰⁴:

Rammohun Ray, I am persuaded, supports this institution, not because he believes in the divine authority of the Ved, but solely as an instrument for overcoming idolatry. To be candid, however, I must add that the conviction has lately gained ground in my mind that he employs Unitarian Christianity in the same way, as an instrument for spreading pure and just notions of God, without believing in the divine authority of the Gospel / Emphasis added 7.

Adam recognised the instrumental aspect of Rammohun's religion but with his religious bent of mind could not think of any other objective besides overcoming idolatry. But Rammohun, as we have seen, was conscious of the 'use' value of religion for secular achievements. In any case, the catchword indeed was 'instrumental.' Rammohun was employing the instrument of religion to meet his avowed purpose of enhancing the 'political advantage and social comfort' of his countrymen. The fact that all the while he was calling this instrument a part of national heritage was the basis on which his Proto-nationalism rested.

Rammohun's claim to Proto-nationalism would be strengthened if we relate his emphasis on tradition to his firm rejection of the European ethnocentrism, the fiction that as a race the Europeans were necessarily superior to the Asiatics. On different occasions Rammohun regarded his own countrymen as being possessed of the same capabilities as those of any other civilized nation. In replying to the ninth additional query of the Select Committee of the

House of Commons (which asked with reference to Indians: "What capability of improvement do they possess?") Rammohun said briefly: "They have the same capability of improvement as any other civilised people."¹⁰⁵ Rammohun was optimistic about the potentiality of his countrymen and noted: "But should the Natives receive the same advantages of education Europeans generally enjoy, and be brought up in the same notions of honour, they will I trust, be found equally with Europeans, worthy of the confidence of their countrymen and respect of all men."¹⁰⁶ One could not miss in these statements the sense of pride which he nurtured in the great heritage of India's past. Here also he was thinking in terms of a nation. However much he was conscious of the decadent state of his nation was a comparison between a developed and underdeveloped nation and never between a superior and inferior one. His nationalism here was of course subdued but nevertheless, it was quite distinct.

Though Rammohun was a well-known advocate of the diffusion in the country of a knowledge of European arts and sciences and its consequent benefits he never ceased to be an Indian^{xix} either in his own way of life or in his efforts to shape the destiny of his countrymen. While his liberalism consisted of his persistent effort to absorb the best in the Western civilisation, his nationalism was evident in his refusal to sacrifice his Oriental roots. This attitude was openly displayed in course of his polemics with Tytler who made the supercilious remark that Hindus "who are indebted to Christians for the civil liberty they enjoy, as well as

T.D.

for the rays of intelligence " were criticising Christiانتy" in the most ungenerous manner." Rammohun replied¹⁰⁷:

If by the 'Ray of Intelligence' for which the Christian says we are indebted to the English, he means the introduction of useful mechanical arts, I am ready to express my assent, as also my gratitude; but with respect to Science, Literature or Religion I do not acknowledge that we are placed under any obligation. For by a reference to history it may be proved that the world was indebted to our ancestors for the first dawn of knowledge which sprang up in the East, and thanks to the Goddess of wisdom, we have still a philosophical and copious language of our own, which distinguishes us from other nations who cannot express scientific or abstract ideas without borrowing the language of foreigners.

His respect for native language, Sanskrit in general and Bengali in particular, was evident in a piece of composition entitled : "On the possibility, practicability and expediency of substituting the Bengali language for the English."¹⁰⁸ Doubtlessly, Rammohun was not going to lose his identity even when he was undergoing and himself pleading for important socio-economic and political changes.

Dwarakanath lacked the intellectual sophistication of Rammohun but he was also not prepared to work for an Anglicised India. He, like Rammohun, would also like to have a synthesis of the best of the two worlds and was most reluctant to sacrifice his tradition and took much pride in it. Of course, this feeling was somewhat hedged in by the eulogies he offered to his colonial

masters but should not be missed by us. Enthusiastic about the diffusion of European skill and knowledge and about the promotion of English language as he was, he also cherished a deep love for his mother tongue. Thus we find Dwarakanath taking initiative in forming 'a Hindu College Pathsala' together with Motilal Seal, Radhakanta Deb and others in promoting education in Bengali.¹⁰⁹ However, his sense of pride in the cultural heritage of his nation was most evident in his discussion with Max Müller in course of which Dwarakanath in a fit of emotional outburst exclaimed¹¹⁰ :

you say that our religion is no religion, our poetry is no poetry, our philosophy, no philosophy at all. We try our best to understand and feel what Europe represents but we nevertheless do not neglect what India represents. If you would follow the way we discuss about your music, poetry and philosophy then you would realise the essence of our areas of knowledge and also that we are not really as ignorant and hypocrites as you deem of us, rather possessed of greater understanding and insight.

While his sense of national identity was quite unmistakable such feeling remained rather personal. He did not labour, unlike Rammohun, to institutionalise his feelings. His lack of mobilisation effort robbed him of much credit as a nation-builder even at the level of Proto-nationalism but not as a Proto-nationalist in his individual capacity who through his various acts of charity and social service lent support to the sincere efforts made by Raja Rammohun Ray.

So, while looking at the models of nationalism, the previous one and the present, we find two broad marks of similarity and difference. They are similar in so far as both display a built-in nativism. The conservatives and the liberals, it might be argued, were equally respectful of tradition, religion, language and the honoured symbol systems of the native society. The similarity, however, is more apparent than real. The conservatives were found to have very often neglected, as we have seen, the cultural and religious factors. That was consistent with their class outlook but class consciousness need not lead them to a consciousness of a nation and did not. The liberals on the other hand consistently held up the sanctity of national heritage and cultural identity that had little to do with their pursuit of economic rank path. In their case national consciousness, though in an apolitical form, surpassed their class consciousness. Their nativism was a class-product/ but not strictly limited by it and they did not deviate from such nativism under any circumstances.

When we realise this and look beyond the apparent similarity we come to the crucial difference between the two models - the one which justifies our model-title. The difference relates to the respective frameworks of the conservatives and the liberals in which they saw themselves vis-a-vis the Colonists. The conservative case for nativism and identity was a reaction to a part of British nation. It was a class claim and not a civilisational claim. The liberals on the other hand made a case of civilisation vis-a-vis a civilisation. All the while they were asserting the nativist and indigenous trait in terms of a nation distinct from

Great Britain. This becomes particularly significant when we find that the liberals were doing this even while undergoing pressure for reform and working for an ideology of reform in their class interest. Nationalism, after all, is a kind of identity and a problem of identity assumes importance only in a context of change. Resistance to change is one way of asserting identity but when such changes cannot be resisted entirely they may be so explained as to pose no problem of identity. The liberals represented by Rammohun and Dwarakanath did this. They glorified national tradition, adhered to the familiar and traditional symbol systems of language, customs, religion and the like and (most notably Rammohun) mobilised the masses vertically to welcome important changes and to assert their distinctive identity as a nation. Their claim to Proto-nationalism is, therefore, justified. One more component of Proto-nationalism is the continuous development of its characteristic ideas from apolitical level to political level. We cannot take up this theme here. But we hope to show in course of our analysis that there was indeed such continuity and that in course of time this model was modified to acquire a vision of nation state.

Faltering of the Model

The proponents of Proto-nationalism, we have seen, transplanted models of liberal man and society onto a colonial situation. These models, though not fair, were abstractions of the British bourgeoisie. Rammohun, for example, distinguished between two types

of man: one the free, enterprising and economically independent; the other, the bounded and weak. He observed that those who had "no sufficient means to enter into commerce or business," nor had any prospect of improving their lot "by the savings of honest industry," were on the whole dishonest and had no "independence of character." "Men of real merit, worth and character" were those who were "engaged in respectable line of trade" and individual enterprise. This later group were capable of freeing themselves from "the useless restraints of religion" and of making "boundless improvement in intellectual, moral and social fields." Their model, therefore, was a class-model and similar to that of Britain. But for Bengal that model was unfair. Within the framework of a colonial system the banias and the landlords could not act as free agents to bring about social change. They were in reality dependent and oppressed and the collaborationist strategy that they adopted was not a partnership on equal terms. Productivity for the British bourgeoisie remained an achievable goal and for the native elite an euphoria. The economic rank path of the native elite, therefore, was not laying the foundations of native capitalism, rather it was making the country peripherally dependent on the capitalism of Britain. The net effect was stagnation in the productive activities in the rural sector while urban growth was also stunted due to lack of opportunities in business and industries. Thus the model of Proto-nationalism faltered on the score of contributing to a viable production base of Bengal. This was indeed self-defeating for a class that hoped to recharge society

with creative fire for transforming it. The present model in this respect delayed the development of contradiction between the native elite and their British counterpart, a factor that had a lasting impact on the development of our national liberation struggle.

The other important faltering of the model was on the communal front. The previous model of undeveloped nationalism did also falter on the communal front but it did so by building a class defence in the form of religious defence. While the Hindu conservatives invoked Hindu sanctions for their actions, the Muslim elite referred to the golden age of Islam for their class defence. Both of them thus encouraged exclusive identities for the Hindus and the Muslims and effectively reversed the process of cultural osmosis between the two major religions, Islam and Hinduism, in Bengal since the thirteenth century. The present model of Proto-nationalism did not falter quite in this way. It did not build a class defence in the form of a defence of religion rather in the form of a secular-humanist tradition. But the way it made its class defence (by attempting to construct Indian identity with reference to past history and claiming to represent that through a newly constructed religion of Brahmo Dharma) and in circumstances that gave it an exclusive Hindu look. The secular humanist tradition that the model stood for appeared, ironically enough, as a communal tradition. Now a word or two about this phenomenon will be in order.

Proto-nationalism, as we have seen, was an answer to the problem of identity. But the problem was a class problem it concerned only those who were undergoing pressure for change, either benefiting or receiving injury from reform, those who were caught between two worlds, -- the old and the new, the eastern and the western and so on. The problem did not concern the large mass of people in Bengal, mainly in rural areas. They knew their place, and their religion; the Hindu conservatives and the Muslim purificationists laboured to keep them so in their class interest. The Proto-nationalism, therefore remained relevant to only a section of the native elite. The Proto-nationalists were trying to solve their own class problem and they seldom thought about the power conceding part of their society and in the event they did so they illustrated the ambivalence of identifying their own class position. Thus we found Rammohun Roy both pleading for the ryots (for example, in course of his suggestions for improving Permanent Settlement) and ignoring peasant resistances to some major aspects of colonial oppression. We may refer in this connection to the peasant struggle under the leadership of Biswanath Sardar in 1808 which ended with the execution of Biswanath and his twelve followers by the British.¹¹¹ These contradictory attitudes were the outcome of a more basic problem at their intellectual level. In their ideas on social, political and economic reforms they were generally guided by Western concepts but they were also shaped by the colonial circumstances resulting in an ambivalence between Westernisation and their colonial existence. When they found

themselves caught in the intractable problem of reconciling post-enlightenment European rationality with their own colonial existence and universe of experience they could find the way-out of this problem only through the projection of an ideal man who would be as much Western as he was Indian, as much universalist as he was nationalist. The solution of ideal man and ideal code of social behaviour (as was provided in Brahmo dharma, for example) had necessarily to be an elitist affair and as such equally difficult one to translate into any concrete programmes of nation-building with the involvement of the masses both as subject and the object of action. To put it differently, their class conception or self image that led to devise a Proto-nationalist frame of thought was an unconscious self deception on their part. At the subjective level they were regarding themselves to be the bourgeoisie or to be nearly becoming so but at the objective level they were knocking the bottom out of a developmental process. In as much as they alienated the masses in this way their false consciousness about their true class position allowed the false consciousness of communalism to take root among the masses (what started with the undeveloped nationalism). Admittedly this spread of false consciousness of communalism was made easier by certain historical circumstances which were, as we would see, unfortunately ignored by the Proto-nationalists.

It is difficult to establish that in Bengal the ordinary Muslim population became worse off during the British rule than what they had previously been. Of course under Permanent Settle-

ment they were entirely placed under the mercy of the Zamindars who were mainly Hindu, but this, apart from the greater degree of oppression, was not new. The Muslims in Bengal traditionally had lesser scope or potentiality than the Hindus in absorbing new opportunities of development. The Muslims were traditionally artisans and peasants in Bengal. Even during the Mughal period, Bengal was not among the centres of high Muslim culture in the sub-continent. Excepting for a few posts in administrative and defence services, most other important positions in the society were held by non-Muslims. Most of the big landlords were non-Muslims. Education in Persian which was the official language was availed of probably by the Hindus more than by the Muslims. Even as late as in 1838, the Third Report of Adam revealed that the number of the Hindu students learning Persian at that time in six districts surveyed was more than that of Muslims. He counted 2087 Hindu students against 1409 Muhammadans.¹¹² Moreover, as we have seen, under the monopoly trade of the East India Company and Permanent Settlement it was again the Hindus who benefited the most. Historically therefore there was a situation of Muslim backwardness in Bengal. And in this circumstances a class outlook of the upper class was sure to appear as a communal outlook especially if a question of cultural identity was to be brought in. Indeed such a question was brought in and presented under the garb of a religion. Whereas the spirit was secular it was elbowed out as a form of religion. This was a weakness which was sure to be perceived as communal. A class defence thus in-

directly became a communal defence. If the proponents of the Proto-nationalist model were trying to forge a new identity for the country as a whole, that was also in terms of their community. As a consequence, revaluation and revival of indigenous tradition meant revaluation and revival of Hindu tradition.¹¹³ It was not surprising therefore that Brahmo Samaj which ostensibly was an open society and was vehemently opposed by the Hindus did not appeal to the Muslims. The present model, of Proto-nationalism thus faltered on the communal front because it offered a secular and a class package within a religious garb. In the context of Muslim underdevelopment in Bengal a class model could be justified on the grounds of indigenous tradition and religious sanction only to reinforce an exclusive Hindu tradition. This was destined to identify a Bengalee or Indian as Hindu as distinguished from a Muslim or a non-Hindu. Unfortunately that was what really happened and we propose to show this in our subsequent models. It may now be submitted that the explanation of Hindu nationalism in the late nineteenth century Bengal as the mature form of, or development of, the nativism or defence of Hinduism by the 'Dharma Sabha' group of the early nineteenth century, as was given by David Kopf, was highly simplistic. As we have seen the Proto-nationalist trend as found by us contributed in no small measure to the shaping of exclusive tendencies both among the Hindus and the Muslims. Thus also from the point of view of falterings of the model Proto-nationalism, together with undeveloped nationalism, predetermined the future patterns of thought in Bengal. Let us now look at the

model 2B which was both a continuation and a departure from model 2A.

N O T E S

1. Quoted in B.N. Ganguli, Indian Economic Thought: Nineteenth Century Perspectives, (New Delhi: 1978), p. 41.
2. Ibid, p. 54.
3. Dilip Chandra Biswas & Prabhat Chandra Ganguli (ed), Sophia Dobson Collet, The Life and Letters of Raja Rammohun Ray, (Calcutta: 1962), pp. 130-31.
4. Ibid, Vide Editor's note II at the end of Chapter IV, p. 162,ff.
5. These citations are from Rammohun Roy, Additional Queries Respecting the Conditions of India, (London, 28 September, 1831).
6. Satishchandra Chakravarti, (comp. & ed.), The Father of Modern India: Rammohun Ray Centenary Volume, (Calcutta: 1933), Appendix E, p. 133.
7. Sankar Sastri's long letter in defence of polytheism published in the Madras Courier in December 1816 was answered by Rammohun in his 'A Defense of Hindu Theism.' Mritunjaya Vidyalankara's Vedantachandrika in Bengali and its English translation, An Apology for the present system of Hindu Worship appeared in 1817 for controverting Rammohun's views. Rammohun answered to both through his Bhattacharyer Sahit Vichar (in

Bengali) and A Second Defense of the Monotheistic System of the Vedas (in English). Rammohun was also drawn into an animated debate with Subramanya Sastri in the house of a notable poet in Hindi, Biharilal Choubey at Barabazar, Calcutta. Rammohun's reply to him was later published in 1820 through An Apology for the Pursuit of Final Beatitude independently of Brahmanical Observances. Its Bengali, Sanskrit and Hindi versions were also published. Vide, Note VI to Chapter III, Collet, n. 3, p. 104.

8. Since 1812 (When her sister-in-law was burnt alive at her ~~dead~~^{dead} Husband's pyre) Rammohun moved about from one burning ground to another in an effort to dissuade widows getting ready to court the ordeal of Sati-dāha. His writings from 1813 on the subject were :

- (i) Sahamaran Vishaye Pravartak O Nivertaker Sambad (in Bengali)
- (ii) Counter Petition of the Hindu Inhabitants of Calcutta against the Suttee (in English), 1818.
- (iii) A conference between an Advocate for and an opponent of, the practice of Burning Widows Alive (English translation of no. 1), 1818.
- (iv) Sahamaran Vishaye Pravartak Nivartaker Dvitiya Sambad (in Bengali), 1819.
- (v) A Second Conference between an Advocate for, and an opponent of, the Practice of Burning Widows alive (English translation of No. 4), 1820.

- (vi) Sahamaran Vishaya (in Bengali), 1829.
- (vii) Address to William Bentinck, Governor General of India upon the passing of the Act for the abolition of the Suttee (in English), 1830.
- (viii) Abstract of Arguments regarding the burning of widows considered as a religious rite, (in English), 1830.
- (ix) Counter Petition to the House of Commons to the Memorial of the advocates of the Suttee (in English), 1830.
- (x) Some remarks in vindication of the Resolution passed by the Government of Bengal in 1829 abolishing the Practice of Female Sacrifice in India (in English), 1832.
9. Vide 'Pravartaker O Nibartaker Sambad' in Brajendranath Bando-padhyā and Sajanikanta Das (eds.), Rammohun Granthavali, vol. I, (Calcutta, n.d.), p. 10.
10. Ibid, vol. 2, pp. 99-100.
11. Ibid, vol. 4, pp. 46-48.
12. A paper entitled "Modern Encroachments on the Ancient Rights of Females, according to Hindu Law of Inheritance" was included under the title, "The Rights of Women" in Raja Rammohun Ray-His Life, Writings and Speeches, (Madras: n.d.), pp. 21-34.
13. Quoted in B.B. Majumdar, History of Indian Social and Political Ideas, (Calcutta: 1967), p. 36.
14. Ebadat Hossain, Marxyia Vichare Rammohun (in Bengali), (Calcutta, 1983), pp. 66-68.

15. Vide Collet, n. 3, p. 431.
16. Quoted from the memorial to Supreme Court, signed, inter alia, by Rammohun Ray and Dwarakanath Tagore, Vide Collet, n.3, pp. 423-429.
17. Vide his "Appeal to the King in Council" in Appendix I-B, Ibid, p. 448.
18. Vide excerpt from Raja's letter to Mr. Crawford, dated August 18, 1828, Ibid, p. 267.
19. B.B. Majumdar, n. 13, pp. 37-38.
20. Collet, n. 3, pp. 130-31, 162-63, 308, 333-34.
21. Ibid, p. 503.
22. Vide the letter in Appendix VIII, Ibid, pp. 494-95.
23. For an analysis of the inconstancies of Rammohun's scheme of economic modernisation vide Soumitra De & K.S. Bhattacharya, "Rammohun Roy and Economic Modernisation: A Dissection" in Society and Change, Vol. IV, No. 1, Oct-Dec., 1984.
24. Susobhan Chandra Sarkar (ed), Rammohun Roy on Indian Economy (Calcutta: 1965), p. 3.
25. Ibid, pp. 11-12.
26. Quoted in B.N. Ganguly, Indian Economic Thought, n. 1, p. 38.
27. Susobhan Sarker, n. 24, p. 24.
28. Quoted in B.N. Ganguli, n. 1, p. 50.

29. B.B. Majumdar, n. 13, p. 44.
30. Susobhan Sarker, n. 24, pp. 84-86.
31. Ajit Kumar Ghosh (ed), Rammohun Rachanavali, (Calcutta: 1978), p. 529.
32. C.B. MacPherson, Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval, (London: 1975), p. 5.
33. Quoted in C.B. Macpherson, Life and Times of Liberal Democracy (London: 1977), p. 26.
34. Ibid, p. 28.
35. Quoted in Ibid, p. 48.
36. Ibid, p. 53.
37. Susobhan Sarkar, n. 24, Para Nos. 9 & 11 in Appendix A, p. 23.
38. Vide answer to question No. 43. Ibid, pp. 13-14.
39. Quoted in C.B. Macpherson, Life and Times, n. 33, p. 61.
40. Ibid, p. 55.
41. Kalyan Kumar Dasgupta (ed.), Kishorichand Mitra, Dwarakanath Tagore (Bengali version), (Calcutta: 1962), pp. 7-8; Kshitindra Nath Tagore, Dwarakanath Thakurer Jibani (in Bengali), (Calcutta: 1076 B.S.), p. 47.
42. Kishorichand, n. 41, p. 9.
43. Brajendranath Bandopadhyay, (ed.), Sambadpatre Sekaler Katha (in Bengali), Vol. II (Calcutta: 1384 B.S.), p. 241.

44. Kishorichand, n. 41, p. 9.
45. Ibid, p. 66. ✓
46. A.C. Dasgupta (ed.), The Days of John Company (selections from Calcutta Gazette): 1824-1832, (Calcutta: 1959), pp. 473-75.
47. Kishorichand, op. cit., p. 34.
48. Vide the statement of Max Muller quoted in Satyendranath Tagore, Amar Balyakatha O Amar Bombay Prabas, (in Bengali). (Calcutta: 1915), pp. 11-14.
49. Kishorichand, n. 41, p. 123; Krishna Kripalani, Dwarakanath Tagore, (New Delhi: 1981), p. 110.
50. Quoted in Bengal Hurkaru, 8 June, 1850.
51. Kripalani, n. 49, Note 31, p. 134.
52. Sambadpatre Sekaler Katha, n. 43, Vol. II, pp. 37-39.
53. Kishorichand, n. 41, pp. 71-72.
54. Krishna Kripalani, n. 49, p. 178.
55. A.F. Salahuddin Ahmed, Social Ideas and Social Change in Bengal, (Calcutta: 1976), pp. 27-8.
56. Kishorichand, n. 41, p. 78.
57. Saumendranath Tagore, Bharater Silpa Siplab O Rammohun (In Bengali), (Calcutta: 1963), p. 78.
58. Kishorichand, n. 41, p. 61.

59. Vide the Report of the Public Meeting in Serampore Carey Library, Vol. No. B.K.I-119, pp. 29-30.
60. Ibid, pp. 30-31.
61. Chittabrata Palit, Perspectives on Agrarian Bengal, (Calcutta: 1982), p. 29.
62. Kishorichand, n. 41, pp. 89-90.
63. N.K. Sinha, The Economic History of Bengal, (Calcutta: 1970), Vol. III, pp. 11-12.
64. Romesh Dutt, The Economic History of India, (New Delhi: 1976), Vol. I, p. 202.
65. Blair B. Kling, Partner in Empire, (Calcutta: 1981), p. 54.
66. A free translation has been used. Vide Samachar Durpan, 27 August, 1836.
67. Collet, n. 3, p. 14.
68. Barun De, "A Biographical Perspective on the Political and Economic Ideas of Rammohun Ray" in V.C. Joshi (ed.), Rammohun Roy and the Process of Modernisation in India, (New Delhi: 1975), p. 148.
69. Blair B Kling, n. 65, p. 37.
70. Kshitindranath, n. 41, p. 55.
71. Ibid, p. 57. An estimate of his Zamindari property is given in Kishorichand, n. 41, p. 19, and N.K. Sinha, n. 63, Vol. III, p. 119.

72. 'Landholders' Society' was established in 1833 and it continued upto 1844. Dwarakanath Tagore was included in its executive committee. The only qualification to become its member was the possession of interest in the soil of the country and hence the society had a vested interest in Permanent Settlement and British rule. Vide Sambadpatre Sekaler Katha, n.43, vol. II, pp. 405-8; Kishorichand, n. 41, p. 34; R.C. Majumdar, British Paramounty and Indian Renaissance, (Bombay: 1965), vcl. I, p. 315.

It has been suggested that it was Dharma Sabha which took the initiative in forming the society. But Dwarakanath was actively associated with it. Thus it further revealed the flexibility of ideological positions when class-interests were involved. Vide Rajat Sanyal, Voluntary Associations and the Urban Public Life in Bengal (Calcutta: 1980), pp. 106-7.

73. Blair B Kling, n. 65, pp. 86-87.

74. N.K. Sinha, n. 63, vol. III, p. 119.

75. Kshitindranath, n. 41, p. 49; Blair B Kling, n. 65, pp. 33-34.

76. Blair B Kling, n. 65, p. 40.

77. Ibid, pp. 58-59.

78. Ibid, pp. 43-44, 61-62.

79. Kishorichand, n. 41, p. 16; Kshitindranath, n. 41, p. 142.

80. Kishorichand, n. 41, p. 199; Kshitindranath, n. 41, p. 152.

81. Kshitindranath, n. 41, p. 156.
82. Blair B Kling, n. 65, p. 205.
83. Samachar Durpan, 4 October, 1834.
84. Amalesh Tripathi, Trade and Finance in the Bengal Presidency: 1793-1833, (Calcutta: 1956), pp. 250-51.
85. Blair B Kling, n. 65, p. 82.
86. Kshitindranath, 41, p. 104.
87. Blair B Kling, n. 65, pp. 89-90.
88. Ibid, p. 101.
89. We cannot have complete knowledge of the activities of the Carr, Tagore and Co. because its papers were destroyed under the instruction of Dwarakanath's grandson, Sri Rabindranath Tagore. The natural question is: Were the activities so unethical and exploitative that they caused much shame to Rabindranath ? Vide Kshitindranath, n. 41, p. 104.
90. N.K. Sinha, n. 63, vol. III, p. 96.
91. Ghosh Ajit Kumar et al (ed) Rammohun Rachanavali, (Calcutta: 1973), p. 462.
92. D. Rothermund, The Indian Economy Under British Rule and other Essays, (New Delhi: 1983), p. 3.
93. Soumitra De & K.S. Bhattacharya, "Rammohun Roy and Economic Modernisation: A Dissection," n. 23; Binoy Choudhury, Growth

of Commercial Agriculture in Bengal, (Calcutta: 1964), Vol. I, p. 83. For two opposed interpretations on Rammohun in regard to Free Trade Vide, Kumud Bhattacharya, "Abadh Banijya Andolon O Raja Rammohun" (in Bengali) in Tista Theke Ganga, (First issue 1380 BS); Saumendranath Tagore, Sharater Silpa Biplob O Rammohun (in Bengali), no. 57. It is our conviction that this way on concentrating on one or two specific issues alone would preclude our understanding of the totality of colonial situation and significance of various patterns of thought. Thus we intend to discover comprehensive models in an effort to get over piecemeal studies.

94. Blair B Kling, n. 65, p. 251.

95. Ibid, p. 252.

96. Webster Universal Dictionary says that 'proto' as a prefix in a compound means, a first in time, hence original or primitive; Oxford in addition suggests the meaning 'chief.' None of these dictionaries gives the meaning in particular of the combined form, 'proto-nationalism.'

97. David Kopf, British Orientalism and the Bengal Renaissance, (Berkeley, 1969), pp. 263-72.

98. Quoted from a private letter written on 18 January 1828. Vide Collet, no. 3, p. 213.

99. Ibid, p. 109.

100. Ibid, pp. 125-6.
101. Satishchandra Chakravarti, n. 6, p. 162.
102. Collet, n. 3, p. 225.
103. Ibid, p. 213.
104. Ibid, p. 227.
105. Kalidash Nag & Debayoti Burman (ed.) Rammohun's English Works, (Calcutta: 1946), Part II, p. 66.
106. Ibid, part - I, p. 9.
107. Ibid, Part - IV, pp. 70, 71-72.
108. Brojendranath Bannerjee, Modern Review, December 1928, pp. 635-36.
109. 'Sambadpatre Sekaler Katha, n. 43, vol. II, p. 27.
110. A free translation has been used. Vide the report of the discussion in Satyendranath Tagore, n. 48, pp. 11-14.
111. Kumudnath Mullick, Nadia Kahini (in Bengali), (Calcutta, 2nd edition, 1319 BS), pp. 60-70.
112. Sanat Kumar Saha, "Social Cohtext of Bengal Renaissance" in David Kopf and Safiuddin Joarder (eds.), Reflections on the Bengal Renaissance (Rajshahi: 1977), p. 147.
113. Ali Anwar, "Renaissance in Bengal: The Question of Identity and certain Conceptual Reconsiderations," Ibid, p. 161.