

MODEL 2B : VICARIOUS NATIONALISM

The period from the late twenties to the forties of the nineteenth century witnessed a revolution of intellect in Bengal. The years during this period were restless and creative years, intellectually dominated by the young radical minded students of the Hindu College. Not much really changed from what we found in the case of Proto-nationalist model except one which went a long way in shaping the present model. This was the exposure to secular education, not the type introduced by the missionaries.¹ It provided the first glimpses into the literature and science of the western world and introduction to the root ideas of nationalism and democracy over which half of Europe fought in that century. The works of Shelley and Wordsworth, among others, inspired with the seminal ideas of the French Revolution struck deep roots into sensitive oriental minds. The prose of Gibbon, Hume and Paine probably produced a deeper impression. The study of history revealed to them how in England royal despotism had been replaced by the rule of aristocracy; and how Parliament had grown. Thus it was in this period that the Bengal elite were for the first time being intimately acquainted with the humanist and rationalist thought of western Europe and the way standards of values had been actually applied in Europe to outgrow mediaeval and feudal backwardness on its march towards cultural, social, political and economic progress. This new intellectual climate was a watershed in so far as the growth and development of modern ideas were concerned and this can be traced to 1817, the

year of the establishment of the Hindu College. The present model of Vicarious nationalism was substantially, though not wholly, concerned with the students of the Hindu College of Calcutta, who had been described as 'Young Bengal' - those who came into personal contact with Henry Louis Vivian Derozio² (1809-31) or at least who imbibed from his thoughts the spirit of free inquiry in every sphere of life and also from other important personalities of this period, namely, Raja Rammohun Roy and David Hare.

The leading members of Young Bengal were born between 1804 and 1815 and they deceased between 1855 and 1898. The generally accepted academic procedure of identifying Young Bengal has been with reference to a particular period in Bengal's history. This period has been variously conceived as one between the late twenties and the mid-forties of the nineteenth century.³ Conflicting judgements have been given on Young Bengal. They have been dismissed as aristocratic Indians who "failed to rouse political consciousness even among the limited circle of educated men in Bengal." The group has allegedly been characterised by "extreme progressivism, frivolity and recklessness"⁴ and as essentially "intellectual."⁵ Again, some have pointed out their "aggressive attitude" and "de-nationalising emasculation"⁶ as the prevailing characteristics. A variation in judgement could be found when Young Bengal was discovered to be "our first nationalists."⁷ Whatever might be the assessment of Young Bengal all were based on a narrow conception of the period of the Young Bengal.

It is our case that no complete understanding of this group will be possible on such a narrow definition of the period of Young Bengal. If we fail to analyse the ideas associated with this group in their totality or in their continuity or departure from past or future patterns of thought, we are likely to provide rather impressionistic judgements on them. It is to such types of piecemeal analysis we will have to provide an alternative procedure of treating the Young Bengal that would be in keeping with our object of building models of nationalist ideas. One of the major limitations of the current procedure of identifying the period of Young Bengal consists in the elimination of two major movements and their impact on the Young Bengal, namely the Revolt of 1857 and the Indigo Revolution of 1859-60, which most of the acknowledged leaders of Young Bengal outlived.⁸ Among them except Tarachand Chakravarti (1804-55) who was eldest of them all and actually older than Derozio, and Russik Krishna Mullick (1810-58) who failed to witness the Indigo Revolt marginally. Others, namely, Krishnamohan Banerjee (1813-85), Ramtanu Lahiri (1813-98), Radhanath Sikdar (1813-70), Dakshinaranjan Mukherjee (1814-78), Peary Chand Mitra (1814-83) and Ramgopal Ghosh (1815-68) witnessed the two major movements. Thus, unless we change the favourite academic procedure of concentrating on the initial phase of their thinking and activity to a focus on their actual life-span we might, for obvious reasons, fall short of a genuine class appreciation of the Young Bengal.

The current academic approach to Young Bengal has also been responsible for not taking into account the range of association-

building undertaken by them without which no analysis can be complete. It has been correctly suggested that the various phases of group formation are generally neglected by the historians.⁹

The Young Bengal actually exhibited three different phases of their associational activities. Initially, they formed in 1828 the Academic Association with H.L.V. Derozio as the President. The group was then not avowedly radical and actually it avoided controversial questions. The rule was : "That the object of society shall be to investigate questions in literature and science including the science of law, government and political economy and history of religious parties and opinions, but excluding all political and religious controversies." When the Hindu College management interfered with the rights of the students to assemble even outside the college premises, the Association turned radical and the original rule was changed ^{to} the effect: "That it shall henceforth be a fundamental law of the society to discuss all questions without restriction tending to discovery of truth and promotion of philanthropy."¹⁰

The second phase began after the death of Derozio. The members wanted to unite all the English educated youths of Calcutta in a learned society *and* thus the Society for the Acquisition of General Knowledge (SAGK) was founded in 1838. Their radicalism was at a low ebb and the Society excluded 'religious discussion of all kinds.' The SAGK was in a languishing condition in the mid-forties. By then the members of Young Bengal were taking direct interest in politics. The third phase started when they began participating in the Bengal British India Society which was founded in 1843. Ramgopal

Ghosh, Tarachand Chakraborti and Peary Chand Mitra, inter alia, continued to play ^{or} leading role also in this phase. Considering the role of the Society in defending aristocratic interests, its political importance can hardly be overemphasised. When we cut Young Bengal off in the mid-forties we thus leave out a very important dimension.¹¹ We will return to this subject shortly.

At this point let us clarify one implication of our alternative procedure. If we extend our focus in point of time then we would find some other important personalities coming in, who are generally not regarded as members of Young Bengal. They are generally regarded as radicals. These are Akshay Kumar Datta (1820-1891), Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar (1820-1891) and Harish Chandra Mukherjee (1824-1861). The question that must be answered in this context is this: Could we do justice by treating Young Bengal together with the radicals for the purpose of our analysis, to both? The answer, prejudging the case we shall be putting is, 'Yes', because we would find that they exhibited little differences in regard to their economic rank path and their opinions on various social and political issues. So, while we would be treating them together, we would, to avoid confusion, use the term 'radical' instead of 'Young Bengal.' The present model, in other words, would be concerned with the radicals of the nineteenth century Bengal and not with the Young Bengal as is commonly understood.^{11A}

Radicalism

Faith in rationalism and humanism, - a product of secular education, guided the radicals in their appreciation of economic

and socio-political questions. The liberal model man implicit in the ideas of Rammohun and Dwarkanath became further reinforced and much explicit in the ideas of the philosophical radicals. While the radicals did nothing to generate or strengthen any religious reform movement, they ruthlessly exposed the irrationality in and the absence of humanism from the religious and social practices of the Hindus. Though two of the members of the Young Bengal embraced Christianity as early as in 1832 they did so only to avoid the wrath of their own coreligionists and it was not characteristic of them to feel an attraction for Christianity. Alexander Duff who was much interested in the proselytization of the educated Hindus was much disappointed by the growth of scepticism and atheism among the students of the Hindu College and wrote to Dr. Inglis: "The youngmen, having their own eyes opened to ... abnormalities and profanities of their own religion, very radically concluded that all religions were alike."¹² In his paper on "The Present State of the East Indian Company's Criminal Judicature and Police under the Bengal Presidency."¹³ Dakshinaraman Mukherjee asserted: "God in his impartial wisdom created all man alike equal to one another, in their birth-rights." He again suggested that the "Brahmin priests sowed the seeds of division, alienation, disorder and anarchy." These were, according to him, "first introduced by an ambitious and domineering priesthood, and subsequently upheld and sanctified by ignorance and error, tending to stupidity of human reason." Thus, though Dakshinaraman began with Hinduism he eventually offered a general critique of priesthood. We find great similarities between

his views and the French enlightenment notion of priestly deceit put forward by two radical French philosophers, Helvetius (1715-71) and Holbach (1723-89). In their view also the priests are interested in keeping people in ignorance so that they can maintain power and riches. This conspiracy can only be destroyed by education. Thus, the faith in reason was the dominant trait of the Bengal radicals. In fact, Akshay Kumar Datta who was deeply religious adopted, due to his faith in reason, a materialistic approach to religious texts and converted religion, so to speak, into moralism.¹⁴ He thus rejected the common popular belief in the observance of religious duties as a substitute for earthly work. His equation was revealing for understanding his absolute faith in reason¹⁵ :

Labour and Prayer to God = Crops

Labour = Crops

∴ Prayer to God = 0

Iswarchandra Vidyasagar, like Akshay Kumar Datta, adopted a rational approach to religion. It is true that for all his social reform activities he referred to religious sanctions to justify such reforms. But this could not be taken as evidence for his faith in religion. In fact, in his first essay on child marriage which appeared in a monthly magazine, Sarba Subhakari, he gave precedence to secular considerations over the prescriptions of religious texts. Only later he felt the need of changing his tactics and began to draw support from religious texts because he correctly realised that people would be more receptive to reformist ideas if those could be shown to have the support of religion. All the while he however

marshalled support from the authority of religious texts for things of which he was first convinced rationally.¹⁶ In practice he displays, like the members of Young Bengal, the same disinterestedness in religion. He showed no respect for Hindu enthusiasts about religion, neither for the evangelical activities of the Christian missionaries, nor for the advocacy of monotheism and non-corporality of God. The omission of any reference to God in his first edition of Bodhodaya was probably prompted by his reluctance to be drawn into insoluble controversy regarding existence, nature and designs of God. On the question of religion of course both Akshay Kumar Datta and Ishwar-chandra Vidyasagar differed from the Young Bengal in their emphasis on stoic principles of personal and social conduct and character; but all of them adopted a radical approach in the tradition of liberalist enlightenment.

Ideology of Reform

On the question of reform, both socio-political and economic, the radicals actually continued the trend initiated by Rammohun and Dwarkanath. Most of the notable members of Young Bengal, such as Russik Krishna Mullick, Peary Chand Mitra, Kishorichand Mitra and Gobinda Chandra Dutta, inter alia, appealed to the British rulers to bring about wholesome reforms in the political, social and economic conditions of this country. The earlier demands of political reforms were most ably defended by Ramgopal Ghosh when he spoke in support of so called "Black Acts" (a description by the Europeans). In this connection he upheld judiciary's role to check the abuse of

executive power, demanded a more matured trial by jury and supported the intended placement (by Government) of Europeans and natives on an equal footing before the judiciary.¹⁷ The members of Young Bengal, like Rammohun, criticised the existing caste structure of the Hindu society. Krishna Mohun Banerjee, for example, commented :

How far these multiplied distinctions tend to weaken the national character may be understood from the consideration that every person's rank in life is immutably fixed at his very birth by the operation of such a system. Should it then receive the least encouragement from a body of enlightened and educated men? Should they put their seal upon such a monstrous system? No! Gentlemen, that ought not to be.¹⁸

Akshay Kumar Datta also echoed the reforms advocated by others before him. Among them were the remarriage of widows, the prevention of polygamy, the introduction of marriage among different castes and the prevention of early marriage. Iswar Chandra Vidya-sagar also worked for the same causes.

The members of the Young Bengal, like Rammohun and Dwarakanath, regarded British rule to be beneficial to India but they never hesitated to criticise the harmful patterns and practices of the East India Company's administration. Kishorichand Mitra, in his introductory discourse at the Hindu Theophilanthropic Society in 1843 said that he would be the first person "to reprobate the narrow and short-sighted policy of our Merchant Princes, - our joint - stock sovereigns, to advocate the abolition of their salt, opium

as well as administrative monopoly, in order that the natives may participate in the benefit of an unfettered commerce and enjoy those situations of emolument and responsibility to which they are entitled."¹⁹ This was simply a continuation of the support of the Proto-nationalists to the ideology of free trade and opposition to Company monopoly. Further echoing the earlier demands for the Indianisation of services Peary Chand Mitra remarked in 1846 : "If the interest of the country are to be served, line of demarcation which now exists between the covenanted and the uncovenanted must be broken down, as properly qualified candidates increase in number."²⁰ There was thus a tacit acknowledgement of the usefulness of alien rule with areas of criticisms, - a trend in close consonance with the newly found economic rank path. Both Akshay Kumar Dutta and Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar adhered to this line of thought. Akshay Kumar Dutta spoke of the lofty achievements of the English people in the fields of science and technology, mentioned the square responsibility of government to provide security of life, property and liberty to its people and invited the government to take legislative and executive action whenever necessary, while being vocal about the failures of the Company government.²¹ Ishwar Chandra did not express articulately any ideas on the politics of the country but there were probably no substantial differences between his political views and those of the other radicals. His confidence in the British rule could be traced to his pleadings with the government in various social reform movements and in his advocacy of liberal Indianisation of

of the services.²² The radicals, as we can see, did not depart from the Proto-nationalists on the question of reform.

On the question of Permanent Settlement the Young Bengal, like the Proto-nationalists, believed that this measure of Cornwallis was not in itself a harmful system, but, it operated on a wrong basis which was responsible for immense hardship of the people. Writing in Gyananneshun Rassik Krishna Mullick observed : " The Permanent Settlement in Bengal, though perhaps concocted and set to work with the best motive imaginable, has, in consequence of glaring defects in the judicial system, betrayed an utter neglect of the rights of the humbler classes."²³ "Another member of the Young Bengal criticised not the Permanent Settlement itself but the "radically wrong basis of the Permanent Settlement" such as "the grinding consequences of the sub-letting system," "the too general inefficiency and apathy of the administrative authorities"²⁴ etc. Thus, the members of the Young Bengal did not demand the abolition of the system of Permanent Settlement but demanded definite improvements in it in the line suggested by the Proto-nationalists, especially Rammohun Roy. The same attitude was shown by both Akshay Kumar Datta and Ishwarchandra Vidyasagar. The former actually wrote a series of articles in Tattwabodhinee Patrika (from Baisakha, 1772 Saka under the title, "Palligramastha Prajader Durabastha Varnan" (A description of the miserable state of the subjects living in villages). He went ^{to} a great length to describe the actual treatment meted out by the landlords to the

ryots, when he observed :

Does he (the landlord) remain satisfied with the collection of only the prescribed revenue? He remains firmly determined to deprive the subjects of all their belongings by hook or by crook. Their poverty, emaciated physical appearance, depressed look, soiled and torn clothes -- nothing can melt his petrified heart -- nothing can evoke tears in his cruel eyes. He goes on oppressing his subjects with numerous pretexts of collecting, over and above the legitimate revenues, the illegal cesses like bata, unprecedented increment over arrear revenue, increment over bata, increment over increment, agamani, parvani, hisabana, etc. ...²⁵

He regretfully wondered : "It is beyond conception how the ryots can keep their body and soul together after meeting the greeds of four monsters one after another -- the landlord, the pattanidar, the ezarader and the dar-izaradar. Their extremely miserable condition beggars description." He also adverted to the exploitative role of the moneylenders. What is important for us to note is that he in his extensive writings never recommended abolition of Permanent Settlement. Probably he wrote to invite immediate sympathetic attention of his educated contemporaries for selective reform of the system. Iswarchandra also, it seems from the absolute lack of reference to the issue of permanent settlement in his writings, that he did not bother very much about the system and was satisfied with the avowed policy of the British rulers.

We have referred to the identity of the views between the Proto-nationalists and the radicals in regard to the economic policy. We may now look more closely to the issues of free trade and abolition of the Company's monopoly. Some of the members of the Young Bengal expressed themselves strongly against the salt and opium monopoly of the East India Company. They were thus rallying behind the free traders, English merchants associations and their patrons in British Parliament who advocated and advanced strong pleas in favour of free trade ostensibly for the mutual benefits of both the British businessmen and the native elite but actually for the sake of British industry. As early as in January 1835 Rassik Krishna pointed out :

... the abolition of the Company's monopoly in Tea, had not done Indians any good. The actual beneficiaries of this provision in the Act (the Charter Act of 1833) were Englishmen. Had the Act abolished the Company's monopoly trade in salt and opium, Indians would have had some reason to be grateful.²⁶

Kishorichand Mitra followed up in 1843 the demand for the abolition of monopoly of "our Merchant Princes" over salt and opium "in order that the Natives may participate in the benefits of an unfettered commerce..."²⁷ Akshay Kumar and Ishwarchandra did not participate in the debate over monopoly or free trade. But there is no reason to suppose that they broke away from the dominant anti-monopolistic trend of thought among their contemporaries.

From the brief account given above about the ideas of the radicals one can pick up a thread of continuity of theme and

substance from the Proto-nationalists to the radicals: all of them were against, in varying degrees, the religious and social practices that hurt their rational understanding of life and society, while they had full trust in the legitimate right of the government to come forward with a reforming zeal; they wanted reform of permanent settlement, abolition of company's monopoly and growth of secular education. In short, the package of reforms suggested by the Proto-nationalists was resuggested by the radicals. As we will see the radicals also resembled the Proto-nationalists as constituting a class. But there were at least three factors among the radicals that were rather new and thus apparently caused a break in the continuity of the earlier set of ideas. These new phenomena were concerned with (1) role of education, (2) indigo cultivation and (3) rare but very explicit anti-colonial attitude. If these were really new and distinctive of the radicals then we could not really include them and place them together with the Proto-nationalists in a single model which we actually did when we placed the radicals in model II instead of placing them in model III. We placed them together on the basis of the case we would be putting; that the ideas were not substantially different but similarly structured phenomena in view of the common class position of both the Proto-nationalists and the radicals. To put it differently, the ideas of both the Proto-nationalists and the radicals were to serve the same function for the same class in a colonial environment. And in this respect a single model for them was in the logic of things. But let us first note the apparently new ideas first.

First, the radicals exhibited an unprecedented interest in education. Indeed education became the be-all and end-all for them. Whether it was the superstitions in religious thought and practices or the unfair and prejudicial arrangements in social, economic or political subjects, -- everything could be ameliorated, they felt, only if the mind of the people could be inspired with reason and humanity which education served to stimulate. Rassik thus declared : the effusion of knowledge "is the best means of reforming the character of the people." He pleaded :

"... therefore it becomes the paramount duty of our government, if it really have the good of its subjects at heart, to spare no means in its power to facilitate the education of the native, nor we can be said to be expecting too much, when we request it to appropriate part of the immense revenue that India yields to the intellectual improvement of her benighted sons."²⁸

Tarachand said in a similar vein :

An enlightened government ought likewise to direct their attention to the dissemination of sound and useful knowledge among the rising generation of their subjects. The general enlightenment of the people is undoubtedly the best guarantee of a good government. While it checks the commission of crime, it contributes to the preservation of peace, and by promoting the interest of commerce, it strengthens the resources of the government.²⁹

So, for some members of the Young Bengal, education was the most important of all means of reform. However, for some other members,

such as Gaur Mohan Das, education became a goal in itself. He observed :

It is the duty of all men to acquire knowledge. Education is at the root of knowledge. Hence all learned discussions lead to awakening of knowledge. That is why the spread of education among the masses is the most excellent of all work, because in this wide world, there is no greater friend than education.³⁰

Akshay Kumar Dutta shared the same conviction of the members of the Young Bengal about education and expressed in the third Hare Anniversary Meeting in 1843 his pleasure at the growing interest displayed by the urban population in the education of the poor Hindu boys and hoped that this would help integrate individuals of different opinions and religious belief. He went on :

If this integration leads to greater interest among us then we will be able to fulfil all of welfare schemes which we dream of now. We will then unitedly work for the improvement of administration, prevention of unjust taxes, maintenance of peace and improved administration of justice, extention of agriculture and development of industry, the spread of commerce and see that the happiness and comfort of our people really augment. We are eagerly waiting for the day when Indians will, by dint of their ability and intelligence, build ships, construct bridges, produce steam operated machines and work for the development of manufactory skills at home. But where we are to find the root of all good signs that we are witnessing today? ... This great and noble individual is Mr. David Hare.³¹

Akshay Kumar Dutta was thus echoing the same opinion of the Young Bengal and was grateful for the fact that David Hare took keen interest in the development of native education. Ishwarchandra justified his title Vidyasagar (ocean of learning) by showing a deep concern for the progress of education in Bengal. But, though he had a great knowledge of the philosophies of the Hindus he had very little regard for the Vedanta, Nyaya and Sankhya schools of Indian philosophy and clearly revealed his preference for European philosophy and theory of logic represented by, for instance, J.S. Mill. His preference for secular and liberal education was unambiguous, definite and more pronounced than that of the other radicals of his age.³²

The importance the radicals accorded to secular education was however accompanied by a clear emphasis on vernacular and female education. There was, however, no contradiction between the two. They would not accept vernacular education if such education was professionally irrelevant and rationally indefensible. For instance, Uday Chandra Addhya, in mootng a proposal for the cultivation of Bengali language, criticised the type of education offered by the Sanskrit College as discriminatory (for it was relevant to only Brahmins and Vaidyas) and totally 'worthless.'³³ Referring to the students taught in the present system of vernacular education, Addhya observed : "As for knowledge of life at large, i.e., trade, commerce, official work, national peculiarities etc., they know nothing and are totally worthless. "He further observed :

I hold that the English educational system is excellent.

Their children receive education in general schools where they learn the letters and scriptures but at the same time they acquire useful knowledge for being effective in society. They become useful technicians as well as intellectuals. They can do any work if they stick to it for some time. Hence, I propose that an educational institution be set up at the heart of Calcutta on the lines of such an educational system.³⁴

Reflecting the same attitude Peary Chand Mitra appealed to the Government in an article contributed to the Calcutta Review of July-December 1846, not only to spread vernacular education among the people but also to teach agriculture in schools and colleges in Bengal. Akshay Kumar Dutta too recommended the introduction of vernacular as the medium of instruction at all levels of education to make it effective, cheaper and an agent of uniting rather than dividing the people. The point that is to be noted is that Akshay Kumar Dutta was recommending vernacular education as complementary to secular and scientific education. It is thus not surprising that he recommended translation into Bengali works of such great authors as Bacon, Locke, Newton, Laplace and Humboldt. Iswarchandra, likewise, observed on the pre-existing type of vernacular schools : "The Pathsalas or indigenous schools under Gurumahashayas, such as they are now, are very worthless institutions these schools require much improvement."³⁵ In 1846 he submitted a number of proposals to facilitate "the acquirement of the largest and sound Sanskrit and English learning combined," so that training in the Sanskrit College might produce "men who

will be highly useful in the work of imbibing our vernacular dialects with the science and civilisation of the western world."³⁶ Vidyasagar also hoped that education was the core of reform: "Let us establish a number of Vernacular schools, let us prepare a series of Vernacular class-books on useful and instructive subjects, let us raise up a band of men qualified to undertake the responsible duty of teachers and the object is accomplished."³⁷

The fact that the radicals considered education as a panacea was indeed new, because Rammohun and Dwarkanath did not accord that supreme importance to education. But there was no substantial difference either. Rammohun and Dwarkanath conceded rank to the British rule and yet supported the vernacular system of education. The radicals did the same. All of them were pro-liberal first and pro-vernacular later. The extra emphasis put on education by the radicals was partly the result of the enhanced opportunity of secular education and partly of the continued and further developed euphoria that they had already constituted a middle class in the European sense, a bit underdeveloped owing to lack of appropriate educational facilities. We would return to a discussion of this aspect in course of our analysis. Meanwhile it may be observed that the Proto-nationalists and the radicals did not differ widely in respect of their views on education.

The second new phenomenon in the views of the radicals was related to indigo-cultivation. Unlike the case of education, here the question was not one of emphasis but of a qualitative

difference in the appreciation of indigo-cultivation. Unlike the Proto-nationalists the radicals were highly critical of the tyranny of the indigo-planters. Gyananneshan, the mouth-piece of the Young Bengal, was of the opinion that the ryots could never secure redress of their grievances against the indigo-planters.³⁸ Ramgopal Ghosh described the atrocities of the ~~pa~~ planters vividly in his remarks on the 'Black Acts' in 1849:

To a large extent the cultivation of the indigo is forced upon the Ryot. In innumerable instances it would pay the poor cultivator far better to sow many other crops than the indigo plant; but ~~the~~ he is bound hand and foot, till he receives a money advance and signs a contract to cultivate the planter's favourite crop. When once thus in debt, he is never allowed, even when he is able, to get out of it. Toil he must, to minister to the services of his oppressive lord, or he has to answer for it in the tyrant's own Katchary, where he would have little chance of escaping imprisonment in the godowns of the factory. The uninitiated may stare at any alluding to the Court and the Jail of the European planter. But these are facts of common notoriety to the residents in the Muffusil.³⁹

Akshay Kumar Dutta, though highly appreciative of British rule, did not gloss over the tyranny of the indigo planters. In an essay in the series on the plights of the ryots he wrote: "... it would be anything but fair if no mention is made of certain foreigners of noxious character who carry on oppressions on the calmly enduring natives of this country. These heartless persons are known as indigo planters." In another issue he described the actions of the

planters in detail and condemned them.⁴⁰ Describing the cruel and dishonest treatment meted out to the ryots by the planters he concluded : "No Englishman of good character and gentlemanly disposition would take to the plantation of indigo. Only the heartless and mean among them take to it."⁴¹ Iswarchandra's views on indigo cultivation cannot be ascertained from records available to us. But from the respect he showed to the progressive views of Akshay Kumar Dutta on contemporary issues it can be assumed that he did not deflect from the radical trend.

The third and the most striking deviation from the pattern of thought exhibited by the Proto-nationalists was the anti-colonial attitude expressed by some of the radicals. Some commentators with whom we would share our differences in due course found in Young Bengal "a strong patriotic feeling, deep love for the country and a sense of national self respect," a successful application of "the concrete lesson of American independence" and "dream about the independence of India."⁴² They found in other words a "stream of direct political consciousness starting with exposures of British misrule in India and culminating in the demand for self-government."⁴³ These observations are in order if we review the documents and let the facts speak for themselves. But a model is intended to interpret facts in the light of other facts and to go beyond mere appearance so that the same facts may generate a different interpretation. But before we examine the 'facts' in terms of a model let us have a look at brilliant flashes of anticolonialism.

A paper entitled, "On the Colonisation of India" was published in India Gazette of February 12, 1830. Its authorship has been traced to a member of Young Bengal on the basis of the introductory remark made by the editor that it was from an Indian youth "whose attainments do high honour to himself, and to the seminary where he was educated It was lately read before a Hindu literary society composed chiefly of native gentlemen, who have been instructed in the language and literature of England, and who endeavour by monthly papers on subjects of general interest, to confirm and extend their previous acquisition."⁴⁴ In this paper the author compared the ancient colonies, such as Roman, Greek and Phoenician with the modern Dutch, British and Spaniard colonies and noted the oppressive and exploitative character of both of them. Though the author did not refer directly to the Indian colony of Great Britain he casually remarked that the condition of the people in the mofussil in India was better than those in Calcutta because European settlers had not settled in villages. Certainly the drive of the paper was against the rule by alien races. In the moderate paper Reformer of Prasanna Coomer Tagore a letter was published in February 1831 which attempted to answer two allied questions, as to whether India was possessed of adequate natural resources so as to be able to flourish without the assistance of foreign resources and as to how England would fare without her association with India. The writer,⁴⁵ with reference to the first question, referred to the old glories of India and observed : "I acknowledge, India in her dependent state is incapable of such efforts but I vow she

is more than what at present she appears to be." About the other question the writer observed: "...the brightest gem would be torn off from her radiant crown and her glory would suffer at least a partial eclipse." Most significant was the final comment of the writer: "... it is problematical why India should groan for ages under foreign yoke ... without her dependence on England as her conqueror and possessor, her political situation would be more respectable and her inhabitants would be more wealthy and prosperous. The example of America which shows what she was when subject to England and what she had been since her freedom must naturally lead us to such a conclusion." Another instance of this trend of thinking has been furnished by Gautam Chattopadhyay from a Calcutta journal. This was a piece of writing by Kylash Chander Dutt who was one of the founder members of the Society for the Acquisition of General Knowledge.⁴⁶ Kylash was drawing a pen-picture of an imaginary armed struggle of Indian people against the British rulers to be fought a century later. He visualised that the rebellion was crushed and the patriot, about ~~to~~ to be beheaded, addressed his countrymen with the following words :

I have the consolation to die in my native land and tho heaven has doomed that I should expire on this scaffold yet are my best moments cheered by the presence of my friends. I have shed my last blood in defence of my country and though the feeble spark within me is about to leave the frail frame, I hope you will continue to preserve (sic) in the course you have so gloriously commenced.

Uday Chandra Addhya while pleading for the cultivation of Bengali language expressed the same preference for independence. He

Uday Chandra Addhya while pleading for the cultivation of Bengali language expressed the same preference for independence. He observed: "But try to understand that only when the people of this country learn properly the languages of this country ---- then and then alone will they acquire the efficiency which can enable them to shake off the present slavery and become master of their own land."⁴⁷

These few instances are sufficient to exhibit the anticolonialism of the radicals. As we take them as they are, or when we allow these facts speak for themselves, we have to interpret them as essentially anticolonialist and nationalist and this has, in fact, been done. But if we relate them to factors of contextual importance, to the impact of these ideas, to the role of political associations and class aspects of contemporary socio-political movements we begin to see these facts in a new light; their anti-colonialism appears more vicarious than real, their progressivism rather still-born and essentially circumscribed by the rank path they were pursuing. In other words, we would, to put our case in advance, show that the deviations of the radicals from the Proto-nationalists, especially in regard to indigo cultivation and anti-colonialism, were not substantial differences if we look from the class basis of these ideas. These were, so to speak, to serve the same function for the same class in a colonial context. The minor alterations in the economic rank path of the native elite were often reflected in terms of the changing ideas and assessments but their class basis which remained the same gave a general framework for which we placed them in a single model. The difference between the Proto-nationa-

lists and the radicals could not, therefore, be comprehended at the level of these deviations or at the level of class. The difference, if any, was in their nationalist claims. But before we examine this difference let us examine what led to a common model for both the Proto-nationalists and the radicals, or, the class basis of their ideas.

The Class Basis of the Model

A look at the economic and political activities of the radicals will reveal that the rank path they were pursuing remained essentially unaltered from that of the Proto-nationalists. Most of them were still buying control over land, collaborating with the British traders and businessmen and were seeking fortunes in government jobs. They were thus pretty conscious of the profitable nature of their association with the Britishers and generally expressed themselves in favour of British rule of India. In this respect both the conservatives on the one hand and Proto-nationalists and the radicals on the other, conceded rank to the British. This served as the unifying bond in their divergent activities and made possible a broad based associational life.

Earlier, we pointed out that to appreciate the class aspect of Young Bengal we would have to consider their political and economic footings over an extended period of time. In this respect an appropriate vantage point will be the British Indian Association which was founded on 29 October 1851. The political importance of the Association can hardly be over-emphasised. Just as the Land-

holder's Society was set up to oppose the resumption proceedings the Association was set up in the context of measures that the government was planning effectively to pacify the restless and at times rebellious peasants. The basic interest of the Association was thus landholder's interest and hence overtly political. Its fortune was tied up with the status quo or the existing economic rank path, one of the components of which was landed interest. It is not surprising that in the broad combination of groups and individuals in the Association, the Young Bengal happened to be the most important continuing group. Some of their leaders like Ramgopal Ghosh, Krishnamohan Bandyopadhyay and Pearychand Mitra were highly active in it. In fact, Ramgopal Ghosh, Pearychand Mitra and Harimohan Sen were among the members of the Committee of the British Indian Association in its early phase. Kishorichand Mitra was one of the most prominent members of the Association in a later period. Among the well-known families having a leading position in the Association were both the branches of Debs and Tagores. Other individuals, who were to become important public figures but without any family-fame, included inter alia, Digambar Mitra, Harishchandra Mukhopadhyay and Girischander Ghosh. This was thus a strange combination, but quite understandable.⁴⁸ Their common concern was to defend the existing arrangement, the colonial structure to which their fortunes were tied.

A somewhat direct approach to the class-question would be to note the bio-graphical aspect of some of the leading members

of the Young Bengal. Gauri Sankar Bhattacharya (1799-1859) who was connected with the editorial work of the Young Bengal journal Gyananneshun was one of the founders of Bangabhasa Prakasika Sabha in 1836 which took part in the movement against Government's bid to resume rent-free lands. He, as the President of the Sabha, lent his full support to the movement.⁴⁹ Rassik Krishna Mullick (1810-1858) became an honorary magistrate in 1835. Later, he was appointed Deputy Collector of Burdwan District and served in that post for about twenty years.⁵⁰ Pearychand Mitra (1814-1883) came from a family that earned enough money in the business of security and stock papers and of Bills of Exchange of the East India Company. He himself was engaged, together with Kalachand Seth and Tarachand Chakravorty (both Young Bengal members) in the business of export and import and later established his own firm, "Pearychand Mitra and Sons." Pearychand became a directors of many other firms, was appointed an honorary justice of the Peace. He was also nominated a member of the Bengal Legislative Council from 1868 to 1870.⁵¹ Dakshinaranjan Mukherjee (1814-1878) inherited his mother's vast property. Starting his career as a Vakil in the Sadar Court, he became a collector in Calcutta and afterwards worked as a Secretary to the Maharaja of Tripura. Very soon he was appointed a Dewan of Murshidabad but submitted his resignation in 1859 to become the talukdar of the forfeited estate of Salkapur in Rai Bareili in Oudh in 1859. In 1871 Lord Mayo conferred on him the title of 'Raja.'⁵² Ramgopal Ghosh (1815-1868) was first employed as an assistant of a European trader carrying on business with the

East India Company, namely, Mr. Joseph. He worked for some time as partner of Messrs Kelsall, Ghosh & Co. Ultimately he established his own firm, R.G. Ghosh & Co. in 1848.⁵³ These brief pieces of information leave no doubt about the fact that the Young Bengal were pursuing the same economic rank path as the Proto-nationalists had earlier set an example for.

Another approach to the class basis of the ideas of the radicals may be to examine the class aspect of the contemporary socio-political movements and to understand the class point of view of the radicals from their reactions to those movements. While the demands of their economic rank path, studied in relation to the so called deviations in the ideas of the radicals, may indicate a recognisable pattern, a study of their reactions to the socio-political movements may actually complement such analysis by indicating the class character of the radicals and, therefore, the class nature of their ideas. Let us now take into consideration the major mass movements that the radicals in the present case witnessed; first, the class character of the movements and second, the reactions of the radicals to them.

The Santal insurrection of 1855-57 took the most intense form in places like Rajmahal, Murshidabad, Birbhum, Raniganj etc. That it acquired an anti-British character and a pro-peasantry bias was discussed by us in the fourth section of the second chapter of this work. It was a total challenge to the Raj, - not against a particular aspect of colonial rule but against the colo-

nial set-up as such. The British did recognise this and embarked on the course of most ruthless execution. One of the British generals who was given the task of suppressing the insurrection admitted the genocidal aspect of the British counter-measure: "A Lieutenant of mine had once to shoot down seventy-five men before their drums ceased, and the party fell back."⁵⁴ R.C. Majumdar thus observed: "Most inhuman barbarities were practised on the Santals after they were defeated."⁵⁵

The radicals, rank-conceding as they had been, opposed the insurrection. Harish Chandra Mukhopadhyay, the editor of Hindu Patriot, described the atrocities committed by the Santals in detail. He perhaps regarded the British counter-measure as too soft since he volunteered suggestions to effectively suppress the insurrection: "The obvious utility of keeping up small batteries of mountain artillery close to those hills seems never to have occurred to the administrators of our military affairs and to the discredit of those functionaries it is to be told that thousands of savages, armed with primitive clubs, bows and arrows, kept the power at bay."⁵⁶ Like Harishchandra, Gauri Sankar Bhattacharyya, the editor of Sambad Bhaskar also suggested appointment of army officers.⁵⁷ Ishwar Gupta, the editor of Sambad Pravakar, reported that the hill savages caused much chaos and wherever they were approaching they were mercilessly indulging in killing and the looting of ladies and children.⁵⁸ The Somprakash, a liberal newspaper, asked the authorities to garrison the small towns so that the insurgents might be

contained in the forest.⁵⁹ Thus, the unsympathetic attitude of the radicals was clearly demonstrated by their overt support to the repressive measures of the administration. The marked apathy of otherwise very prolific writers like Akshay Kumar Dutta and Ishwarchandra Vidyasagar on this issue was not insignificant. All of them were vociferous about free trade, colonisation, science and technology and the spread of English education, about issues that concerned their economic rank path in one way or other, but were understandably silent about the spree of killings. The British cut the Santals off from the mainstream by forming a Non-Regulation District, 'Santal Pargana.' The radicals turned a deaf ear to this piece of administrative reform. This attitude of them was not exceptional but typical of what they generally adopted to anti-colonial movements --- the struggle lodged by Titu Mir in Barasat at a stone's throw from Calcutta, for example.

The Revolt of 1857 constituted the most powerful 'primary resistance,' i.e., the opposition of pre-colonial, as yet largely unchanged socio-political structures to foreign intrusion, that the radicals lived to witness and react to. Divergent opinions have been expressed regarding the nature of this great outbreak. The official opinion insisted that the revolt was exclusively military in character and had been anticipated by no one. There have been at least three other interpretations of the revolt which all focussed on the extra-military aspect of it. Firstly, a large number of English writers such as Norton, Duff, Malleon and the like subscribed to the view that the outbreak of 1857 was an orga-

nised campaign to drive away the British from India. This view was made popular by an eminent Indian patriot, V.D. Savarkar in his book, "Indian War of Independence." Subsequently S.B. Chaudhuri advocated this view and showed how the mass of peasants in the interior, outside the district towns, also rose up. Having established this, Chaudhuri contended that its essence was anti-British and its character patriotic or nationalist. Secondly, there has been the alternative interpretation offered by R.C. Majumdar who rejected the 'war of independence' thesis and concluded : "... the miseries and bloodshed of 1857-58 were not the birthpangs of a freedom movement in India, but the dying groans of an obsolete aristocracy and the centrifugal feudalism of the mediaval age."⁶⁰ All the different emphasis was present in the third type of interpretation, i.e., in Karl Marx's interpretation of the revolt. This was so because Marx's ideas on this issue represented a quickly changing scenario of ideas wherein all the emphases discussed so far, namely, the military nature of the revolt, the popular involvement and feudal character, were accommodated. It may be mentioned that Marx did not devote his pen to it exclusively. Of Marx's 33 articles on India, 12 belong to 1853; 4 of the 15 written in 1857, and all 6 of them (total 10) written in 1858, deal with the general background of Indian affairs and among the remaining 11 on the mutiny itself, several are only fragmentary comments on current news. All the 8 articles on the course (mainly its military side) of the mutiny from November 1857 to September 1858 were by Engels. Marx first treated the revolt as essentially a military revolt. He wrote in July 1857 that it would be "preposterous" to imagine the rebels holding Delhi for long.

and disparagingly called them "a motely crew of mutineering soldiers who have murdered their own officers." By the end of that month Marx shifted his ground and was writing in a different strain. On 28 July 1857 he quoted with approval Disraeli's remark on the previous day: "The Indian disturbance is not a military mutiny, but a national revolt." Marx was evidently impressed by the extent of popular involvement. But with all his sympathies for the revolt Marx did not appear to have formed a much higher opinion of its leadership, of any rulers or ex-rulers who took part in this revolt. In his Notes on the Indian Mutiny he wrote in detail about the motives of Nana Sahib and the Rani of Jhansi and treated them as merely personal and selfish.⁶¹

From all these interpretations two points need to be emphasised for our purpose. First, regardless of whether the revolt was the first war of independence or a nationalist revolt, it was definitely anti-colonial. Second, though the revolt started as a military mutiny it had a civilian side which was led by a class of people who did not concede rank to the British or did not collaborate economically with the British bourgeoisie. They at best conceded power and in this respect the revolt was similar to the preceding Santal insurrection. The revolt had a restorative aim, - in this respect, a religio-political restorative aim.

In the first half of the nineteenth century the urban rim areas, -- Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, -- were the centres of public and political activities and also the first bases of organisations and nationalist struggles in the late years. All these areas were

physically and mentally insulated from the 1857 revolt. Nowhere did the urban elite welcome this revolt. The uniformity in their response to any anti-colonial struggle can perhaps be best explained by their consciousness of the advantages of pursuing a path of collaboration with the Raj, rather than of confrontation. While they cherished their economic rank path they were forced to adopt a hostile, at best, an apathetic, attitude to the revolt of 1857. In Bengal the revolt, therefore, did not appear to be nationalist or patriotic enough to the radicals ~~as~~ as was the case with progressive, city-bred, rank conceding English-educated native elite in other port cities of India. The revolt did indeed appear to them as anticolonial and a threat to their profitable rank path, and they took pains to reveal their sincere rejection of the revolt. In this respect the landlords, the conservatives and the liberals were all united by their dependence on British colonialism.

When the revolt broke out, the elite in Bengal hastened to express their continued loyalty to the British government. Addresses flooded into Government House from the British Indian Association, the Mohammedan Association, and other Calcutta organisations. Each offered its assistance in suppressing the revolt and vigorously denied *any* imputation of disloyalty. The bulk of the people, they insisted, were faithful, and viewed the "disgraceful and mutinous conduct of the native soldiery" with deepest condemnation and sorrow.⁶² Kishori Chandra Mitra, an eminent Bengali radical writing in 1858 observed: "The insurrection is essentially a military insurrection. It is a revolt of a lac of sepoyes ... It has nothing of

the popular element in it." Rajnarayan Basu looked upon the sepoys as evil-doers rather than fighters for freedom. One Bengali writer even brought out a book in 1859 the title of which clearly indicated its purpose: "The Mutinies and the People, or the Statements of Native Fidelity Exhibited During the Outbreak of 1857-58: By a Hindoo." The writer was, in the opinion of R.C. Majumdar, Sambhu Chandra Mukhopadhyay. The native public figures in Calcutta opened a fund for the victims of the mutiny. Its committee members included Prasanna Coomer Tagore, Ramgopal Ghosh and Ramaprasad Roy.⁶³ Educational institutions of repute such as Presidency College, Sanskrit College and Calcutta Madrasa were closed down to accommodate British soldiers. Lalbehary Dey, an active member of the Young Bengal, criticised the revolt and appealed to the Sepoys in the pages of the Bengali magazine Arunodoya to withdraw the struggle and pacify themselves.⁶⁴ The famous orator Ramgopal Ghosh loudly proclaimed in the public meeting at the Calcutta Town Hall: "... they [the Sepoys] do not understand the generosity, the benevolence of the governing power ..."⁶⁵ Iswar Chandra Gupta, the editor of Sambad Prabhakar wrote: "At this moment the flames of battle had engulfed and ruined lacs and lacs of people ... I am praying to you [the Sepoys] to lay down your swords and bow before the Almighty British government. If you do this the government will surely condone your offences and you will be able to spend the days happily ever after with the members of your family. If you become loyal to the Raj, God will bless you."⁶⁶ Akshay Kumar Dutta wrote some poems that contained his prayers to God to save his creation during the 1857

revolt. In one of the poems that appeared in Sambad Prabhakar, for example, he regretted the destruction of towns and loss of lives and called upon God to act as a saviour.⁶⁷ Ishwarchandra Vidyasagar, the then Principal of Sanskrit College in Calcutta made his college premises available for use by the Government's army and closed down the college at his own initiative without the prior approval of his higher authorities.⁶⁸ It requires little imagination to discover a uniform pattern in all these statements and actions; beneath them lay a clear perception of the benefits British rule had brought to them in Bengal. Indeed they had everything to lose and nothing to gain by a resurgence of orthodoxy and fanaticism.⁶⁹

Let us now come to Indigo Revolt. What was its immediate background? By the middle of the 1850's the Planters' factories were transformed into indigo go-downs, establishments for obtaining slave labour and for deceiving growers, courts for trying ryots, dungeons for confining and torturing stubborn elements, and brothels for serving the Planters and their native accomplices, - all combined into one. The tortures, pressures and economic hardships created the background of a great storm when Ashley Eden's (the Barasat Magistrate) vernacular notice appeared on the horizon. The notice stated that the ryots were free to decide whether they would grow indigo or not. It greatly encouraged the ryots, already determined not to sow indigo any more. The storm began in February-March 1859, when thousands refused to grow indigo any more. It led to an explosive situation in the indigo growing

districts of Nadia, Jessore and 24-Parganas by the middle of 1859. The revolt soon ceased with the achievement of victory.

A large section of commentators has attributed an anti-colonial character to this revolt. Suprakash Roy has treated this as a struggle against feudalism and colonial exploitation.⁷⁰ Promode Sengupta noted in it a development from economic struggle to political struggle against the British government.⁷¹ More cautious observers, however, have thought otherwise. Noting that the revolt did not develop into a conflagration against the John Bull, one commentator observed: "Combing documents to discover in the indigo revolt positive proofs of anti-British temper would perhaps be an uncompromising tack."⁷² A recent in-depth study of the revolt has characterised it as a distinguished revolt in the history of the colonial empire which emerged victorious with the active assistance of native Zamindars and the administrative back-up of the British Raj.⁷³ The role of Bengal administration has been substantially discussed in this particular work and hence we would restrict ourselves with a few examples to drive home our point.

Hemchandra Kar, the Deputy Magistrate of Kaloroah sub-division of the district of Barasat sent a vernacular proclamation to the police station. Its English version appeared in the book brought out by the Indigo Planters. The Proclamation was illustrative of the stand taken by the Bengal government⁷⁴:

'Proclamation'

'Translation'

To the Darogah of Thannah Kalorcoah. Take notice ---.
 A letter from the Magistrate of Barasat dated the 17th August, 1859, having been received, accompanied by an extract from an English letter from the Secretary of the government of Bengal, to the address of the Commissioner of the Nuddea Division, dated 21st July 1859, no 4516 to the purport, that in cases of disputes relating to Indigo Ryots they shall retain possession of their own lands and shall sow on them what crops they please, and the police will be careful that no indigo planter nor any one else be able to interfere in the matter, and the Indigo planters shall not be able forcibly to cause indigo to be sown on the lands of those Ryots on the ground that the Ryots consented to the sowing, &c. of indigo.

The Indigo Planters' Association petitioned the then Governor-General Lord William Canning against the attitude of the Secretary. The Governor-General, however, endorsed the stand taken by the Bengal government. Dejected, the Planters' Association shifted their agitation to the homesoil and published in 1861 the book 'Brahmins and Pariahs.' The title page bespeaks the perception of the Planters' Association of the intention of the administration and is, therefore, quoted below :

BRAHMINS AND PARIAS
 AN APPEAL
 BY THE
 INDIGO MANUFACTURERS OF BENGAL
 TO THE
 BRITISH GOVERNMENT, PARLIAMENT, AND PEOPLE
 FOR
 PROTECTION
 AGAINST THE
 LIEUT -----GOVERNOR OF BENGAL

Setting forth the proceedings by which this high officer has interfered with the free course of Justice, has destroyed capital and trade of British Settlers in India and has created the present disastrous condition of incendiarism and insurrection now spreading into rural districts of Bengal.

LONDON

1861

One more instance of government's attitude would suffice. The English version of the Bengali drama 'Nildarpan' on the woes of the indigo ryots was sent to men at key-positions in London under the Frank and Seal of the British Government ---- 'ON HER MAJESTY'S SERVICE ONLY'.⁷⁵ The government was evidently trying to convince influential people about the righteousness of its stand in the face of the attacks by the Planters' Association.

It is therefore clear that the government did never consider the indigo revolt as anti-colonial and did in fact passively encourage it. The reasons that have been put forward explaining the government's stand were the preparation for the new stage of exploitation by the industrial capital, the lessons of 1857 revolt, the approaching Russian influence, proselytizing interest and a gradual de-emphasis on indigo cultivation and corresponding stress on cash-crop cultivation.⁷⁶ We need not go into the reasons very deeply because already it is clear that the indigo revolt was materially different from the Santal insurrection and the revolt of 1857.

The factors that prompted the radicals to oppose the preceding revolts now led them to accord their full support to the indigo rebellion. In so doing they supported more the administration than the ryots, for only by so doing they could effectively pursue their economic rank path. In this respect they did precisely what their class interest demanded of them. They lent their helping hand to the ryots only when they became convinced of the favourable attitude of the government. In other words, they were primarily pro-colonial and only secondarily pro-peasant. The author of the famous 'Nildarpan', Dinabandhu Mitra, openly admitted in his introduction to his book that the government, from all intents and purposes was bent on curbing the interests and activities of the indigo planters. This awareness on his part was significant because his priorities were just like those of any other radical, pro-government first and pro-peasant later. In fact on other occasions of more gruelling oppression by the government he preferred to remain silent. This pro-colonial attitude was reflected also in the manner in which the radicals supported the indigo ryots. While they led the movement they also taught the ryots to depend on the administration and the judicial infra-structure of the British Raj. One of the principal leaders of the revolt, Harish Chandra Mukhopadhyay admitted : "I cautioned them against ever committing any breaches of peace, or committing themselves in any manner by acting illegally I generally advised them to seek for redress in the civil courts."⁷⁷ Thus the administration and the Bengal radicals together ensured the purely economic nature of

the revolt and as a matter of fact, successfully converted the revolt into an elaborate strike!⁷⁸ It is in this respect that the indigo revolt stands out to be a case sui generis in the history of British colonial empire. If the revolt lacked the government patronage the radicals would have turned their deaf ear to the woes and groans of the victims of the British wrath, as they did in case-s of two other contemporary peasant uprisings (1860), namely the Kuki revolt and the revolt of the Hill Tribes in the district of Chittagong, both ~~xxx~~ of which were rudely suppressed by armed forces.⁷⁹

That the radicals were finding the changing policy of the government to their class interest may now be explained in some detail. This we can do best by citing the views of R. Montgomery Martin, who as early as 1855, explained the British interest and the policy remarkably well :

The export of British manufacturers and produce to India ought to amount to at least twenty shillings per head, which would be equal to £ 200,000000 sterlings or twice the value of our present exports to every part of the world. Let not this be deemed an extravagant assertion: the capacity of Hindoostan to receive our goods is only limited by that which it can furnish in return; and, happily the country yields, in almost exhaustible profusion, wherever capital has been applied, all the great staples which England requires, such as wheat, rice, sugar, coffee, tea, cotton, silk, wool, indigo, and hemp, teak, and timber of every variety, tallow, hides and horns, vegetable oils, tobacco, peppers, cardamoms, ginger, casia, and other spices, linseed, saltpeter, gum and

shellac, rum, arrack, caoutchouc and gutta-percha,
canes or rattans, ivory, wax, various dyes and drugs,
& c....

Hindoos would consume, in exchange, an equal proportion of the clothing, manufactures, and luxuries from the western hemisphere. The tarriff of India offers no impediment to the development of such barter: internal peace prevails, there are no transit duties, land and labour abounds; but capital and skill are wanting.⁸⁰

Martin's hopes were not unfounded. After the mid-century Britain was obliged to develop India into a producer of raw materials and semi-finished products that would feed into British industry.⁸¹ At the same time indigo was steadily losing its importance as an export-item since the fifties. In Bengal the production of indigo was 97,000 maunds in 1843-44, 50,360 maunds in 1857-58 and 16,502 after the revolt. From 1848 to 1858 the average decline in indigo production was 23 per cent.⁸² While indigo was quickly losing its importance other cash crops like raw cotton and linseed, opium and cereals were becoming commercially important. After Britain established her control over a few Chinese ports following the treaty of Nanking in 1842, export of opium was steadily increasing. In 1840 it was only 37,000 packs and it rose to 70,000 packs in 1850.⁸³ In 1813 the value of export of raw cotton was 9 million pounds, in 1844 it rose to 88 million pounds. The value of export of rice and wheat in 1849 was 858,000 pounds; in 1855 it was 3.8 million pounds and in 1877 it rose to 7.9 million pounds.⁸⁴ All these items, except indigo, were produced by the ryots as free

agents. The forcible cultivation of indigo thus was causing hardships not only to the ryots but also to the government and the native landed as well as trading interests. The radicals therefore got the clue and came out with all their support to the revolt. It now seems that we can fairly conclude that the deviation of the radicals on the question of indigo cultivation was no deviation at all. The radicals throughout maintained their pro-colonial position with respect to the mass movements; as the indigo revolt did never become a threat to the Raj, so did not the radicals.

Similarly the extra-emphasis that they put on education was also consistent with their pursuit of economic rank path. The connection between secular education and government jobs became well recognised and the radicals clearly perceived the benefits of siding with the Raj. The following extract from a government report clearly revealed the trend⁸⁵ :

Supposed cause of the fewer entries into the Colleges. The Director is disposed to think that one cause which has largely operated within the last year or so to diminish the number of lads resorting to our Colleges generally, and still more the number who stay to complete their college course, is, that the demand for educated labour exceeds the supply, so that tempting offers of salary and independence are placed at the disposal of lads still at school, or in the first year or two of a college career when their education, in the higher sense can be scarcely said to have commenced.

We have seen that the radicals were pursuing substantially the same rank path as that of the Proto-nationalists and in this respect their class position was identical. The different attitude that the radicals adopted in case of indigo cultivation and the extra-emphasis that they put on secular education were the products of realistic assessments of and adaptability to minor ~~situational~~ differences in the colonial situation. Opposition to indigo cultivation thus was never developed into an opposition to the British policy of free trade. Thus, the so-called differences were not essential differences. They had the same function of strengthening their pursuit of economic rank path in a colonial environment. Their socio-political and economic ideas, in other words, had the same class function for the same class. The other apparent deviation of anti-colonial expressions among the radicals was also a continuation and elaboration of the built-in unrealism of the Proto-nationalist model. The collaborationist strategy adopted by Rammohun and Dwarkanath, for example, led them to identify themselves with the European middle class. The radicals were more likely to carry forward the euphoria in a more developed climate of free trade and business collaboration, in the face of greater opportunities of white-collar occupation and under growing influence of liberal education. The radicals precisely did this. They generally wrote as if they constituted a middle class in the European sense. This was especially evident in the assertions of some of the members of the Young Bengal from whom the anti-colonial sentiments were seldom issued. It was they who reflected on the

question of Indian independence and drew positive conclusions on the experience of middle class in other areas of the globe which they did not represent themselves. The new opportunities to be familiar with the lessons of French revolution and American War of Independence aided the process of false imitation and led them into the trap of vicarious thinking. In other words, some anti-colonial expressions among the radicals which appeared to be a deviation from the earlier trend of thinking were not deviation in the correct sense of the term, rather they indicated a development in the false consciousness of their class position in the colonial environment. We have seen that the objective relationship of the radicals to the means of production was the same as that of the Proto-nationalists. Like them the radicals derived their livelihood from the complex land system created under Permanent Settlement, which they did not propose to reform radically. Like them they also served the colonial administration geared to the tasks of liberal imperialism and participated in the trading activities of raw-materials export and finished goods import under the illusive ideology of free trade. Both the Proto-nationalists and the radicals, thus, unconsciously supported the process of converting India into a periphery of British economy and every step of the Raj was designed to dictate native production by the logic of colonial economy that was most prejudicial to the development of the native economy. While the radicals resembled the Proto-nationalists in their objective class relationship they carried forward the myth of bourgeois self-image even further. Their non-conformism,

their faith in the middle class leadership, in short, their self-appointed role of an agent of social change was not stirred by the social conditions of their immediate environment. The society of Bengal did not supply the spark, so to say, but it came from the historical experience of a movement by the bourgeoisie in Europe and America, from the intellectual upheaval that followed the movement from feudalism to capitalism. The radicals were so intellectually impressed that the contradiction between their objective position in the colonial environment and that of the Western bourgeoisie was lost to them and the problem of synthesis between Indian cultural tradition and Westernisation which the Protonationalists recognised did not appear to be a problem to them. The occasional outbursts of anti-colonialism were the outcomes, therefore, of their faith in the repetition of the global process of nationalism inspite of the fact that they were far from preparing any ground for the rosy future. While this bourgeois self-image eased the process of invoking the elements of modernity in India, it must be recognised that it also went a long way in hiding the basic contradiction between British imperialism and Indian people. To understand how the radicals glossed over the contradiction between their hopes and deeds, between their self-image and their objective class position, we may have a look at the Remarks by Ramgopal Ghosh /A Pamphlate, cited in Note 177 on the four draft acts passed in 1849. These Remarks justified the government's intention of subjecting the Europeans to an equal status with the natives before the laws of East India Company.

which were disparaged by some Europeans as "Black Acts." How much he was obsessed with the philosophical aspects of liberalism could be seen in a related remark made by him: "Public men in England, I feel persuaded, would rather see the British residents generously cast in their lot with the natives of the land, striving with one united effort to obtain remedies against wrong and oppression" (Emphasis added). This was a reminder of what Dwarkanath Tagore thought about the basic unity of the native elites with the British middle class. Both overlooked the difference between the constructive role of the British bourgeoisie in their homeland and their retrograde role in a colony and also the objective limitation of their [the natives] own class in relation to their self-image. Ramgopal Ghosh was thus oblivious of the exploitative role of British capital and enterprise in India when he remarked: "Notwithstanding the strong remarks I have been compelled to make regarding a portion of the British residents in the interior, I would deeply lament the withdrawal of British capital, skill and enterprise...". Thus when we look into the class basis of both the Proto-nationalists and the radicals taking into account both objective and subjective aspects of their class positions, and observe the class function of their ideas we do not find any need of placing them in two separate models. But when we look into their nationalist claims, we realise the necessity of providing for them two related but separate models.

Vicarious Nationalism

The major difference between the models 2A and 2B is in their respective claims to nationalism. In this respect the radicals

resembled the Conservatives. Both the Radicals and the Conservatives conceded rank, despite differences in their rank-path, to the British but failed to make indigenous claims to their ideas. Unlike the Proto-nationalists the Radicals were never keen on asserting their nationality. Though there were occasional uses of the term 'nation,' especially in their plea to develop vernacular language, there was little pride in the tradition of the country or its civilisation. For inspiration the Radicals generally looked at the West. Uday Chandra Addhya, for example, justified his plea for promotion of vernacular language on the observation that the developed countries of the world have all promoted their own language. This dependence on the Western model distinguished the Radicals from the Proto-nationalists. Vidyasagar in his insistence on the study of Western philosophy created the impression that Hindu philosophy was essentially inferior to Western philosophy and entered into prolonged controversy with Dr. Ballantyne on this score. Thus the failure to make indigenous claim to the ideology of reform was generally shared by the Bengal Radicals as a whole. Thus the model 2B cannot be called Proto-nationalist. But could it be so that its claim to nationalism might be conceded on other grounds? The answer, we think, can be given in the affirmative with important qualifications.

Nationalism, as distinguished from religion and caste, was a new kind of consciousness, a new ideology, a set of new organising principles in politics, and therefore, essentially a modern,

post-eighteenth century phenomenon. Nationalism might try to appeal to the past and to establish links with the ideologies, movements and history of the past. But that does not mean that nationalism existed in the past. Nationalism in the colonial situation and as the consciousness of the new identity of the Indian people or nation was the valid or legitimate consciousness of the objective reality, that is, of the developing identity in real life of the common interests of the Indian people for modern social, economic, political and cultural development, and in particular, against the common enemy, foreign imperialism, and the need to unite against it in struggle.⁸⁷ Nationalism in a colonial situation arose, in other words, as an inculcation of a separate Indian identity and as a true consciousness of the necessity of overthrowing colonialism as the first necessary condition for opening the path to social development. The Proto-nationalists, we have seen, had emphasised the cultural and civilisational contradictions between Indian people and the Britishers. They, of course, failed to become fullfledged nationalists as they neglected the real contradictions between Indian people and British imperialism and between themselves and the British bourgeoisie. But the Radicals failed even more, that is, they failed to emphasise the cultural contradictions between India and British or the cultural distinctiveness of both, as the first necessary condition for a separate Indian identity, let alone exposing the political and economic contradictions between Indian people and British imperialism. Then, what about their claim to nationalism?

As we pointed out earlier, appeal to the past is not an indispensable condition for nationalism, though at times such appeals might be desirable. This was the case in regard to England, France or America, where reference could be made to Greek or Italian tradition for the sake of unity. However, Indian condition demanded an effort to keep away from religious idioms and symbols, because "a multi-religious, multi-caste and multi-cultural country could not afford to exult, or claim to restore, any one religion, caste, culture, or historical tradition; it could not afford to build the new by appealing to the past or by pretending to be restoring or reviving it. Hence nationalism and the nation had to be projected as new historical phenomena."⁸⁸ Undoubtedly 'new' or 'modern' may not be entirely so and the humanist and rational elements of traditional culture might simultaneously be incorporated in the modern cultural revolution, as was done by the Proto-nationalists, for example. Thus, in so far as Indian nationalism needed an "all-round radicalism,"⁸⁹ the model 2B was the nearest to it. By advocating an irreligious modernism the Radicals attempted to develop an appropriate cultural base for Indian nationalism. A more thorough programmatic formulation of Indian nationalism was left to the posterity to attempt on this base.⁹⁰ What the Radicals contributed for the development of a modern secular culture might justify their claim to nationalism. But surely this was not Proto-nationalism. The modernity they stood for, lacked an Indian reference. Modernisation and Westernisation

were equivalents for them. At the heart of this confusion was the euphoria that they constituted a middle class in the European sense. For them, thus, there was no difference between an educated British and an educated Indian. The modernity and nationalism of the Radicals, therefore, was largely vicarious, something that was felt to have been possessed by the Radicals but was actually enjoyed by the Europeans. In other words, since their modernity was vicarious their claim of nationalism based on such modernity was vicarious too.

Faltering of the model

Essentially the model 2B faltered on the same scores on what did model 2A. Since nationalism in model 2B was vicarious, it was also a false consciousness. Thus, it could not supply the other ingredients for nationalism in a colonial situation. Apart from modern culture nationalism in Indian context demanded a correct understanding of the basic central contradiction between colonialism and the Indian people and a mass basis for struggle against colonialism.⁹¹ These could not be present in this model. The Radicals, for example, were giving too much importance to education at a time when the Britishers were actively subjecting the country to the exploitation by the British industrial capital by refusing to establish protective tariffs and by discriminating against indigenous manufacturers in its stores-purchasing policy.⁹² From this point of view the falterings of the model 2 as a whole were alike. The model 2 was not communal, it never deviated from

the secular humanist tradition, but by failing to expose the real contradictions between the Indian people and British imperialism and by failing to mobilise the masses vertically against imperialism failed to arrest the spread of the false consciousness of communalism by both Hindu and Muslim elites. However, a comparison between the two variants of model 2 would expose a further decline in realism for model 2B. This was related to their vicarious attitude in regard to modernity. This failure of model 2B had made the model 2A appear as somewhat realistic.

N O T E S :

1. In this respect the enterprise of a group of Eurasians was important. Their motive was economic rather than philanthropic. Notable among them were Sherbourne and Martin Bowles. Many Bengalis who became distinguished later had been educated in their schools; for instance, Dwarkanath Tagore at Sherbourne's and Motilal Seal at Martin Bowles. Vide "Educational Establishments of Calcutta, Past and Present, in Calcutta Review, vol.13, 1850. The education consisted mainly in committing English words and their meanings to memory. Vide Bhabani Bhattacharya, Socio-political Currents in Bengal: A Nineteenth Century Perspective, (New Delhi: 1980), p. 6.
2. Henry Louis Vivian Derozio (1809-1831), born in an Indo-Portugese family, had his education in the private school

of a radical free thinker Drummond (who was an exile from his country) and developed faith in French revolution and English radicalism. Derozio epitomized the spirit of free inquiry when he was appointed as the fourth teacher of Hindu College in 1828. He became very popular with the students. He taught not only the principle of non-conformity in social and religious matters but also inspired the sense of patriotism among the students. In this sense Derozio was the most important agent for the spread of French revolutionary ideas in Bengal. Vide Thomas Edwards, Henry Derozio (Calcutta: 1984).

3. S.C. Sarkar, "Derozio and Young Bengal" in A.C. Gupta (ed), Studies in the Bengal Renaissance, (Calcutta: 1958); B.B. Majumdar, HISPI, (Calcutta: 1967), Gautam Chattopadhyay, Awaking in Bengal (Calcutta: 1965).
4. B.B. Majumdar, HISPI, n. 3, p. 174; Benoy Ghosh, "Maharshi Debendranath Tagore" in Parichay, Feb., 1965.
5. Benoy Ghosh, Metropolitan Man, Madhybitta, Bidroha (In Bengali), (Calcutta: 1977), p. 104.
6. C.H. Heimsath, Indian Nationalism and Hindoo Social Reform, (Oxford: 1964), pp. 12-13.
7. Gautam Chattopadhyay, n. 3, p. Li.
8. In none of the assessments cited above the attitudes of the Young Bengal members to contemporary mass-movements have

been explained. The assessments thus were partial.

9. Rajat Sanyal, Voluntary Associations and, Urban Public Life in Bengal (Calcutta: 1980), p. 109.
10. It is not known definitely who were the members of the Academic Association. But the prominent members of the Young Bengal were probably present in the Association. This can be understood from the list of the members of a committee formed for presenting an address to David Hare. The committee included thirteen members : Krishnamohun Bondyopadhyay, Rasik Krishna Mullick, Dakshinaranjan Mukhopadhyay, Harachandra Ghosh, Ramgopal Ghosh, Radhanath Sikdar, Madhab Chandra Mullick, Peary Mohun Basu, Umacharan Basu, Tarachand Chakraborty, Kshetramohun Mitra, Kashiprasad Ghosh and Mahesh Chandra Ghosh. Vide Calcutta Monthly Journal, March, 1831, p. 103.
11. Unfortunately the scholars do not generally accord sufficient importance to this phase. For example, Gautam Chattopadhyay pitted the nationalist claim of the Young Bengal mainly on the discourses of the SAGK. Considering the importance of the claim we should also pay equal attention to the role of Young Bengal with reference to the Bengal British Indian Association. Vide Gautam Chattopadhyay, n.3. The exclusion is the logical corollary of the current procedure of identifying Young Bengal.

11 A. Satyendranath Pal in his voluminous research work on the Philosophical Radicals of Bengal has tried to analyse the 'moral ideas, reason, rationalism and revolution of the radicals of Bengal'. By employing an extended definition of Philosophical Radicalism he described social, economic and philosophical ideas of Tarachand Chakravorty, Russik Krishna Mullick, Dakshinaranjan Mukherjee and Akshay Kumar Datta, thinkers on whom, we are afraid, he was not able to produce more materials than what we find in B.B. Majumdar's History of Indian Social and Political Ideas, (Calcutta:1967). Pal however added to our knowledge by trying to establish the relation of Philosophical Radicalism with later day socio-political thinking of Bankimchandra and other nationalists. He was of the opinion that subsequent nationalist thinking was much influenced by the Philosophical Radicals.

Although Pal's study tried to cover a wide ground he based his analysis mostly on the semantics. For example, he identified the spirit of opposition to anything as one of the features of the Philosophical Radicals. It would have been better had he taken note of the fact that they never seriously opposed the colonial rulers. He also totally ignored land question in colonial period and Rent Bill Agitations which would have shown convincingly that the Radicalism of those concerned never went below the substantial peasants. Pal actually had chosen the elites of that period but did not analyse their social composition or cultural distinctiveness. Nevertheless the study was useful from the point of view of the information the scholar was able to put together. Vide S. N. Pal, Philosophical Radicalism in the Nineteenth Century, (Calcutta: Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis of C.U., 1973).

12. Quoted in K.P. Sengupta (ed.), Christian Missionaries in Bengal (Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1971), p. 184.
13. Excerpts quoted in B.B. Majumdar, HISPI, n.3, pp. 61-2.
14. K.S. Bhattacharya, The Bengal Renaissance: Social and Political Thoughts (New Delhi: 1986), p. 165.
15. Ibid., p. 166.
16. Ibid., pp. 188-90.
17. Vide Remarks by Ramgopal Ghosh (Serampore Carey Library), vol. BKI 50.
18. Krishnamohun Banerjee, "Reform, Civil and Social" in Gautam Chattopadhyay, n.3, p. 192.
19. Quoted from Calcutta Review, Oct.-Dec., 1844 in B.B. Majumdar, HISPI, n. 3, p. 89.
20. Quoted from Calcutta Review, July-Dec., 1846, Ibid., pp. 87-8.
21. K.S. Bhattacharyya, n. 14, pp. 177-78.
22. Ibid., pp. 201-8.
23. India Gazette, May 10, 1833.
24. Quoted from Calcutta Review, July-Dec., 1843. Author is not named but B.B. Majumdar thinks that it was by Pearychand Mitra. Ibid., p. 88.
25. This and other passages are free translations from Akshay Kumar Dutt's writings. Vide Tattwabodhinee Patrika.

- Baisakh, 1772 Saka, pp. 5-12. The Bengali title of this series was, "Palli Gramastha Projadiger Durobastha Varnan."
26. N.K. Sinha (ed.), Freedom Movement in Bengal, 1818-1904; Who's who?, (Calcutta: Government of West Bengal, 1968), p. 76.
 27. B.B. Majumdar, HISPI, n. 3, p. 89.
 28. India Gazette, Feb. 2 and March 29, 1833.
 29. Bengal Spectator, Nov. 15, 1842.
 30. Translated in English from Bengali original by Gautam Chattopadhyay, Awaking in Bengal, n.3, p. 69.
 31. Free translation from original in Bengali. Vide Baboo Ukhay Coomar Dutta, Discourse Read at The Third Hare Anniversary Meeting, (Calcutta: 1843), pp.5-6.
 32. Vide the report of his controversy with Dr. Ballantyne in K.S. Bhattacharya, The Bengal Renaissance, n.14, p. 198.
 33. Translated into English by Gautam Chattopadhyay, Awaking in Bengal, n. 3, p. 29.
 34. Ibid., p. 32.
 35. Vide memorandum on vernacular education in India in Indra Mitra, Karunasagar Vidyasagar (In Bengali), (Calcutta: 1969), pp. 746-48.
 36. Ibid., pp. 726-735.
 37. Quoted in K.S. Bhattacharya, Bengal Renaissance, n. 14, p.199.

38. Swapan Basu, Banglay Nabachetanar Itihash (in Bengali),
(Calcutta, 1975), p. 292.
39. Ramgopal Ghosh, Remarks on the Black Act, (Calcutta: 1849),
p. 26.
40. Vide no. 84, Part IV of Tattabodhini Patrika, Sravana, 1772
Saka; for the quoted lines. The description was given in
no. 86, Agrahanana, 1772 Saka.
41. Vide no. 88, Ibid, p. 118.
42. Gautam Chattopadhyay, Awaking in Bengal, n.3, p. XLIX.
43. Ibid., p. L.
44. B.B. Majumdar, HISPI, n.3, pp. 54-5.
45. Gautam Chattopadhyay says, the writer was a young Bengali
radical. Vide J.R. Maclane, (ed.). The Political Awakening
in India (U.S.A., 1970), pp. 19-23.
46. Ibid., pp. 22-3.
47. Gautam Chattopadhyay, Awaking in Bengal, n. 3, p. 27.
48. Rajat Sanyal, n. 9, pp. 122-25.
49. Brajendranath Bandopadhyay, Gaurisankar Tarkabagish, Sahitya
Sodhak Charitmala, (Calcutta, 1364 B.S.), vol. I, No. 8.
50. Jogesh Chandra Bagal, Unabinsha Satabdeer Bangla (In Bengali),
(Calcutta, 1963); Sibnath Sastri, Ramtanū Lahiri O Tatkalin
Banga Samaj (in Bengali), (Calcutta, 2nd edition) 1957.

51. Brojendranath Bandopadhyay, Peary Chand Mitra; Sahitya Sadhak Charitmala (Calcutta, n.d.) vol.II, no. 21; Nirmal Sinha (ed) Freedom Movement in Bengal, n. 26, Sirnath Sastri, n. 50.
52. Manmatha Nath Ghosh, Raja Dakshinaranjan Mukhopadhyay (Calcutta, Riddhi, 1982); N.K. Sinha (ed) Freedom Movement in Bengal...., n. 26.
53. N.K. Sinha (ed.), n. 26, Ramgopal Sanyal, Reminiscences and Anecdotes of Great Men of India (Calcutta, 1980) Parts I & II; Swapan Majumdar, General Biography of Bengal Celebrities, (Calcutta, 1970).
54. Vide the "Personal Narrative of Major Vincent Jervis" in W.W. Hunter, The Annals of Rural Bengal (Calcutta, n.d.), pp. 130-31.
55. R.C. Majumdar, History of the Freedom Movement in India, Chap. VI, Vol. 2 (Calcutta: 1971 Edition), p. 127.
56. Hindu Patriot, 26 July, 1855.
57. Sambad Bhaskar, 29th January, 122 no., 1856.
58. A free translation of a passage from Sambad Prabhakar, 4 Sravana, 1855.
59. Quoted in Sunil Sen, Peasant Movements in India (Calcutta, K.P. Bagchi & Co., 1982), p. 4.
60. R.C. Majumdar, History of the Freedom Movement in India, n.25, p. 225.

61. V.G. Kiernan, "Marx, Engelles and the Indian Mutiny" in P.C. Joshi, Homage to Karl Marx (Delhi, 1969).
62. Petition of B.I.A. to Governor-General, 23 May, 1857, and of Mohummedan Association to G.G., 28 May 1857, in S.K. Majumdar (ed) Indian Speeches and Documents on British Rule 1821-1918, (Calcutta, 1937), pp. 56-8, 64-9.
63. Swapan Basu, Ganaasantosh O Unish Sataker Bangali Samaj (in Bengali), (Calcutta, March 1984), p. 58.
64. "Sipahideger Bidrohacharan" in Arunodaya, 15 October, 1857.
65. Ramgopal Sanyal, n. 53, pp. 6-7.
66. A free translation of a passage from Sambad Prabhakar, 27 May, 1858.
67. Sambad Prabhakar, 19 Sept., 1858.
68. K.S. Bhattacharya, The Bengal Renaissance, n. 14, p. 202.
69. C.R. Metcalf, The Aftermoth of the Revolt (U.S.A. 1965), p. 82.
70. Suprakash Ray, Bharater Krishak Bidroha O Ganatantrik Sangram, (in Bengali), (Calcutta, 1972), p. 339.
71. Promode Sengupta, Meel Bidroha O Bangali Samaj (in Bengali), (Calcutta, 1960), p. 93.
72. Subhas Bhattacharya, "The Indigo Revolt in Bengal" in Social Scientist, No. 60, (A reprint), p. 19.
73. Tapabijoy Ghosh, "Nilbidroher Charitra O Bangali Buddhijibi" (in Bengali), (Calcutta, December 1983), p. 1.

74. Ibid., p. 84.
75. Ibid., p. 41.
76. Ibid., pp. 51-60.
77. Report of the Indigo Commission. Answer 3873, Parliamentary Papers, 1861, vol. 45, p. 260.
78. To know how the ryots became dependent on the administration vide "Udasin Pathiker Maner Katha" (in Bengali) in Bishnu Basu (ed), Mir Mosharof Hoshen Rachana Sangroha (Calcutta, 1978), pp. 247-61. The administration was not responsible for any killing of the ryots. Vide, Satish Chandra Mitra, Jessore Khulnar Itihash (in Bengali), (1st edition, 1922), p. 792.
79. C.E. Budaland, Bengal Under the Lieutenant Governors etc., (1976 Reprint), Vol. I, pp. 179-83.
80. R. Montogomary Martin, British India: its history, topography, Cavenant etc. (Delhi, 1983), pp. 544-5.
81. Blair B. Kling, "Economic Foundations of the Bengal Renaissance" in Rachel Van Baumer (ed), Aspects of Bengali History and Society (New Delhi, 1976), p. 38.
82. W.M. Reid, The Culture and Manufacture of Indigo (1887), pp. 84, 163-5.
83. Quoted from Chiner Afim Yuddha (in Bengali), in Tapobijoy Ghosh,

84. R.P. Dutt, India Today (1979 edn.), pp. 163-5.
85. Report on the Administration of the Districts under the Government of Bengal, 1856-57, p.121.
86. These citations are from Remarks by Ramgopal Ghosh, n. 17, pp. 41, 34-35.
87. Bipan Chandra, Communalism in Modern India, (New Delhi, 1984), p. 21.
88. *Ibid.*, p. 152.
89. *Ibid.*, p. 154.
90. Nehru who is generally credited with the presentation of Indian nationalism in a complete and programmatic manner with a socialist tinge was much influenced by the concept of synthetic universalism propounded by Rabindranath Tagore. His own agnostic attitude also made him no sympathiser of the assimilative-integral religious approach to nationalism which was sponsored by Dayananda , Vivekananda, Bipin Pal and Aurobindo. In Nehru the spirit of irreligious modernism ran high and basically a romantic conception of nationhood moved him, though it may be noted that he also recognised that apart from self magnification nationalism has to offer certain concrete social, political and economic foundations and material advantages to offer.

Loknayak Jayaprakash Narayan, the foremost spokesman of Indian socialism also had a romantic conception of nationalism but he was much original and theoretical than Nehru and was certainly more radical. Since 1934 he felt that socialism alone could be the the basis of Indian freedom . He highlighted the necessity of the emancipation of the masses from imperialist

political domination and native feudal thralldom. Hence he emphasised socialist philosophy as a war-cry on two fronts ---- national liberation struggle and social revolution. Later, during his phase of 'total revolution' he tried to formulate an even greater synthetic whole whose core was a profound humanism.

Subhas Bose, whose name is usually bracketed with Nehru, J.P and Gandhi as the nation-builders of India, had not, like Nehru, made any theoretical analysis of nationalism. But he popularised with great force the ideal of the supremacy of nation in a country dominated by the heritage of feudalism, ecclesiasticism and despotic imperialism. It is often overlooked that he added, much more emphatically than Nehru, the item of socio-economic planning to the programme of political emancipation. For an informative discussion of Indian nationalists and socialists vide V. P. Varma, Modern Indian Political Thought, (Agra: 1987).

91. Chandra, n. 87, pp. 153-54.

92. Amiya Kumar Bagchi, Private Investment in India, 1900-1939, (Cambridge: 1972), pp. 43-47; Sunil Kumar Sen, Studies in Industrial Policy and Development of India, (Calcutta; 1964).